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COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I'd like to call the
meeting of the 15th of July of the Kitsap County
Planning Commission to order. We'll start with
introductions to my far left.
  Joe?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Joe Phillips, Central
Valley -- Central Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Karanne
Gonzalez-Harless, South Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Erin Leedham, Central
Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Tom Nevins, North
Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Linda Rowe, South Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER PARANZA: Linda Paralez, North
Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Lou Foritano, North
Kitsap. And we'll have our absentee colleague
introduce himself when he comes.

As in the case of our last set of minutes, all
200-plus pages of them, these will be transcribed in
detail today. So with that, keep that in mind. I know
I didn't. As I read some of the minutes, I wish I had.
But that's all right.
The agenda is in front of you. We have one change; and that is, Larry is going to join us for a few minutes after we discuss the minutes and hopefully will help us in our deliberations today and give -- give us a heads-up as to what the commissioners have in mind as it relates to this subject and whatever else he cares to talk about.

Mr. Sommerhauser, would you care to introduce yourself?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Jim Sommerhauser for Central Kitsap.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Excellent. Okay.
Here we go. The June 26th minutes. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Second.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And comment to the fact that they were excellent minutes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: They were certainly detailed, and to my knowledge quite accurate. Anyone wanted to turn that into a novel, I think we could take signatures afterwards and get our respective okays. It's quite the reading. It's well done. Thank you very much. It is quite detailed.

Okay. So we have the minutes, motion made and
approved. And I guess we can go ahead and actually --
yeah, I guess we need a consensus, don't we. Getting
ahead of myself. Motion made and seconded. All in
Larry, you're on.

LARRY KEETON: Yeah, for the record, Larry
Keeton, Director of Community Development. I'm not
going to give any guides from the board about the sign
code because they haven't seen it yet and it's what
you're working on for them. But what I want to talk
about is the August 13th meeting with the board of
county commissioners. It's -- I believe it will be --
I don't know what time it will start. Well, you'll get
the time. But basically the board is looking for the
following thing, and will be talking to you from their
one agenda item, which is basically how we prepare for
the comp plan. And there's a thought that each
commissioner on the planning commission will be
responsible for a chapter or chapters as we look at it.
So that was one of the things that came out of it.
They'll be looking forward to hearing your comments,
and not necessarily right now, but basically becoming
the expert of that particular chapter or functional
area that we -- however the comp plan chapters get
written, and therefore would be advising them on that
as well. So something to be aware of.

In the past I guess the planning commission -- and
I think, Tom, you're the only one that's been here for
a comp plan, right? I don't think anybody else has
been here on a comp plan update. It wasn't my -- but I
wasn't here for it so I -- were you there in 2006?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Yes, I was.

LARRY KEETON: Okay. Well, unlike -- so I
don't know how they did it in 2006, but apparently we
want to do it a little differently.

The second thing I want to give you a heads-up is,
one of the comments that's come back from the planning
commision is when the -- how does the board vote when
you've made a recommendation. And last night they
voted on Title 12, the changes that was sent forward.
The -- what happened was the board or the planning
commission recommended Option 2. And if you'll
remember, Option 2 was allow the public -- public
right-of-ways, if you will, have asphalt and all of
those things. Private driveways and the rest would be
left as is under, what is it, gravel, impervious
surface. The -- both options were moved forward for
public testimony last night, and the board of county
commissioners voted for Option 1. And Option 1 is
where the public and the private sector get to enjoy
the same benefit. And they had testimony from the
public, and the public primarily was in -- in fact all
of it was in favor of Option 1. And the comments that
came back -- and I'm responding what the planning
commission has said before -- is they felt that
government shouldn't get a benefit anymore than the
private sector, if that makes sense. So citizens pay
the bill, government pays the bill or has the bill, but
they felt that if we're going to treat government one
way, we should treat citizens the same way in the rural
area. And remember, this is only in the -- what is it?
I want to call -- outside the urban census area because
the stormwater applies. Urban census area is the NPDS
2, which is the permit. So that was their reasoning.
Both -- there was only two commissioners. They both
felt the same way. So I'm just giving you that
feedback.

The third thing is, as you've noticed, you're
talking about your 204 pages of commentary. There's a
reason for it is that the board -- and I think we've
said this before. The board is having a hard time
understanding your discussions and the reasons for your
decisions when you make recommendations forward under
the previous system. And you've all made the same
complaint. So what we're showing the board is what the
cost of doing it this way is. So there is a cost.
Right now your 207 pages or 204 pages is $1,300. So
I'm going to ask you to make sure that when you focus
your discussions, you know, focus the discussion so we
can capture that data, and we give them the data that
they need, but it's imperative that we do it. And the
good news is, is that I get to go back to the general
fund, because this is general fund activity, and say,
You know what? When we decide what the debate is,
whether -- I'm going to use the term for the sheriff.
If it's a sheriff's deputy or the public record, then
you gotta make a decision. So that's where we're at.
So that's the third thing.

And then the final thing is, if you haven't heard,
is that the hearing on -- this is not a planning
commission issue, but this is basically for three of
you who participated in the range control or the range
operational range permit. That hearing will be held on
July 30th, starting at three o'clock at the Silverdale
Beach Hotel. It too will be transcribed. In fact, the
transcripts, we also have transcripts of all of those
meetings that we had. The very numerous meetings that
we all attended, there's transcripts of those. So it's
-- if you're interested and want to come, we'll start
at three. There will be a dinner break in there so
that people after work can come and testify as well.
So that's where we'll be.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Let me back you up on
number one for a second.

LARRY KEETON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Because I just
happened to be looking at the 2016 comp plan update
scope and strategy document. I notice on page 7 -- I
don't expect you to have it in front of you, but
there's a division of responsibilities that you
suggested that each of us would be assigned? I didn't
hear the word assigned. Question one, how will the
match be made? Because you've made it by the -- on the
basis of expertise for the Home Builder's Association,
the realtors, the tribes. So where -- how do we get
matched? Is it in a hat or do we get a vote or what?

LARRY KEETON: I think that's a discussion
with the board to have.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. Who?

LARRY KEETON: It was a commissioner who made
the comment that when she sat on the -- it was Linda.
When she sat on the Bremerton planning commission,
apparently each of the commissioners got an area -- I
don't know how they did it. But they each took an area
to become the expertise, if you will, or the citizen
expertise or this expertise outside what the department is doing. So that's --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It could be expertise, interest, combination of both.

LARRY KEETON: Any of them. Yeah, I don't know how they got --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Designation by the elected --

LARRY KEETON: Or we could do lots and --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And match. Always a way to go. Since you -- oh, any questions or comments on the items that Larry has? But since he's come, I want to ask him one as well.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: My first question is, do we have that document you were just reading from?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I got it in November of 2013. Because I keep all of this stuff really close to me on a day-by-day basis, I happened to have it.

LARRY KEETON: You should have a copy. We briefed you. We'll get you another one. David will provide you another one.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further comments, questions?

Yes, Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The gun range
hearing, is that going to be televised? They going to have VCAT for that?

LARRY KEETON: We're going to have VCAT. It won't be televised.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So they will have a video of it.

LARRY KEETON: There will be a video of it, and the reason being is there's no audio there. So we're doing it at Silverdale Beach Hotel. There's no FTR Gold, there's nothing like that, so we're doing two things. One is we will have a -- again, like here, we will have a court reporter there doing the transcript, and there's some things we're going to do for that. But more along the idea of having the video in case they -- if they want to throw the video up online, they could. I don't know if they will.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Just a quick informational question since you're here and you were attributed to having a lot of knowledge about something called Experience North Kitsap, which I do not. I happened to stumble into it with some degree of ignorance, even though it's in my backyard, as it relates to the activities of the Kingston Citizens Advisory Council. And apparently they may be related, they may not. But what caused me to ask the question
is it isn't just Kingston, apparently. It's a multi-city, quote, branding effort.

LARRY KEETON: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And I thought it might be interesting to know what a multi-city branding effort called Experience North Kitsap is.

LARRY KEETON: Okay. So it's --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Where it's going.

LARRY KEETON: So it's a citizens group that is not county. It's not -- in fact it's a citizens group up north. It includes Port Gamble. And I've only been to the meetings. I'm not a -- and I know they say I'm expendable. I've been going to the meetings, but primarily for the Kingston group. But anyway, it's the citizens that includes Port Gamble, the S'Klallam Tribe, the Suquamish Tribe, if I'm getting those right, the Port Gamble tribe, Kingston UGA, Poulsbo, and Bainbridge.

And so what it is is they hired a guy named Roger Brooks, who is a destination developer in the region, well recognized. He's the guy that helped do Whistler in Canada when it became from whatever it became to a ski resort. And the intent is how do you brand the North Kitsap Peninsula in a way to bring people over to experience the county or experience North Kitsap. So
for example, in Port Gamble, one of the things they
came up with was saying this is a great place for
writing retreats, a writing retreat, artist retreats,
quilting, the small conventions, the small meetings.
Kingston was focusing more on -- is it apple cove --
Apple Tree Cove -- Apple Tree Cove and activities that
you would do there. Bainbridge, surprisingly enough,
was on the culinary arts because they have a cooking
school there, but how could you bring people in to do
that. Poulsbo, the intent was to talk about the
Norwegian heritage, focused more on that. And then the
tribes had a -- the, you know, Suquamish Tribe is --
the Suquamish Tribe was how do we do the hotel, the
concerts and all that, plus the historical aspects of
the Native Americans. And Port -- or the Port
S'Klallam is somewhat similar. So it's really an
effort to bring tourism into the area to promote growth
and all of that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Tourism and not slash
economic development?

LARRY KEETON: Well --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Tourism as a subset
of economic development.

LARRY KEETON: Well, actually tourism -- to
be honest with you, what Mr. Brooks pointed out was
that if you go to Seattle or in Edmonds, and he's got
kids over there, if you come to North Kitsap from
Edmonds, what do you think Kingston is?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: A gateway.

LARRY KEETON: Well, not even that. It's
just a ferry --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Ferry dock.

LARRY KEETON: Same with Winslow. It's just,
hey, you're on your way somewhere else. They don't
think -- they think Kingston -- first of all, they
think Kitsap as a county or a community is a long way
away. Most folks don't know it's a 30-minute ferry
ride for the most part, unless you go to Bremerton.
Swear to God, most kids that are over there, when they
come here they're moving through the county and out.
And what Mr. Brooks pointed out is that if you want to
have economic development in the county, regardless of
where you are, most likely where you're going to do it
is start with tourism. People will come here, they'll
experience it, and then they'll want to move here. And
I'm talking about --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: As opposed to
industry?

LARRY KEETON: Well, that's what we're
talking about.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But tourism is only one kind of industry.

LARRY KEETON: No. No. No. But it leads to other industries. So you have the senior leadership come in here and they say, you know, I like it here, or you're trying to recruit or you got something going on, the view that they have is, if they come to the north area and they say I really like this place, I think I would like to grow my family here, I could start a business here or move a business here, that's what he's saying is a gateway to it. It's not just go get a company and come here and then you've got wherever you want to go. So he's using tourism or the idea of this destination as a place to get people interested in coming here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: This raises some interesting questions if you're a planning commissioner if you're working on a comprehensive plan.

LARRY KEETON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I mean just for the heck of it.

LARRY KEETON: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Does it raise any questions? I don't want to dwell on this. It's not an agenda item, but I think it's interesting that it's
kind of happening out there. I think it's interesting
that it's a citizens initiative, as opposed to a DCD or
elected county commissioner initiative, and that
tourism is the center piece. That's just an
observation.

LARRY KEETON: Well, I --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any others? And then
we'll let Larry go and then we can kind of --

LARRY KEETON: Well, I was going to answer
your question.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Please.

LARRY KEETON: I think that one of the
problems is is that the reason the citizens group did
it -- and he made the same comment. Government's got a
role to play in this, but it's not the only role. It's
the business communities that have to come together to
help attract other businesses. And what you saw in --
and Kingston is a good example of it. When I sit in
the meetings that they have, they have this small
version of the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance,
and they're part of it, but it's a bunch of citizens
and businessmen who come together and say how do we
promote Kingston and promote business in Kingston.
It's not county government trying to do it. It's
really what do you do. And our role, the county has a
role, you know, in certain things, but not in all of it. So it's kind of a -- it's really kind of a nice initiative. The commissioner -- Commissioner Gelder is aware of it, but I've been going mostly for the county and attending it along with Heather Adams. And it's kind of how do you promote certain things.

It will fit into the comp plan. When you look at the economic development aspects that we're looking at for the comp plan, how does this visioning effort work and, oh, by the way, how can that branding effort, if you will, move all the way down throughout the county from, you know, north to central and down to south.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Typically, I guess my experience is old, but branding almost sounds like the end of the road, not the beginning with somebody's idea that we're going to be an ice cream factory and let's brand, as opposed to we're going to be a center for healthcare. That's kind of weird.

LARRY KEETON: Well, his point was -- and again, I'm not the expert. Mr. Brooks is. His point is branding is -- it is at the end of the road. You don't sell a brand; you sell an experience.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: You sell a culture.

LARRY KEETON: Well, and that --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Which is underneath
the experience.

LARRY KEETON: That's part of all of that. When you look at what they're playing with, there's a whole bunch of things they're trying to play with there.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: A quick example of county branding is the tourism group is calling Kitsap the natural side of Puget Sound.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's closer. I like that.

LARRY KEETON: Well, actually the brand that came out of this is sanctuary -- the Washington Sanctuary Shores. So when you look at coming over here, you're coming to a sanctuary and -- I mean it's just the stuff they've been working through up north.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Kind of interesting.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: A sanctuary shore pertains, in large part, to the small salmonids that seek sanctuary.

LARRY KEETON: That's the natural resources side. They're looking at the people side, so I don't know.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Sorry for the digression, but I just find this really interesting.

LARRY KEETON: Well, it will be -- it will be
part of our discussion over the next year.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Anything else of
Larry?

Thanks for coming in and thanks for the comments
and the response.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I have one. No,
I'm sorry. Larry --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Jim, I'm sorry. I
didn't see you.

We have one more, Larry.

Jim?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And I'm probably
going to -- later on when we get to findings of fact
around sign code, I'm going to stick something in
there, so heads up that I'm going to try to make it
happen. Enforcement. Have you got anything you can
tell us about current budget or at least the next
budget in relation to code enforcement?

LARRY KEETON: Yeah. Okay. So, you know, I
hear everybody talking about code enforcement. The
first problem with code enforcement in the county, the
current code doesn't work. So let's start with the
real problem. The reason it doesn't work is that the
methodology we have to go through to get enforcement,
if I send you a letter and you want to ignore the
letter -- in fact I had a citizen talking to me today
-- you can do it. Nobody cares. If I send you a
ticket, it goes to District Court. District Court
judge may or may not give you a fine. They probably
won't. And you go back and continue to do what you're
doing.

We've got cases out here and I'll -- I'll use Mr.
Young because it's been in the paper. We've got cases
where code enforcement on vehicles has gone on for 10
to 15 years in the courts and we still haven't got it
eradicated. We just took down a dangerous building
here early in this year at a cost -- a public cost of
$60,000 that took us eight years. That's the current
code enforcement code.

The stuff on the rest of it is we -- so we're
changing the code, and there's a Title 5 that's been
drafted. Maybe you haven't heard about it. It was an
early draft. So David Lyman and Mr. Jeff Rowe are
meeting with a stakeholders group to go over this, and
it's to basically change code enforcement from one --
this current model to two-fold. One is a voluntary
code agreement. So most -- most people in the Kitsap
County, when they violate code, don't even know they're
violating a code. When you tell them, they're willing
to correct it. So you just come to, you know, a
voluntary agreement. The second aspect of it is, if they don't meet the agreement or they refuse to do it, then you take it out of the District Court process and you go to a hearing examiner process. And that's what the cities do. So we're now moving in that direction because the hearing examiner understands code and he gets a -- he or she gets an idea of what land use code is. And the intent there is to then start moving people in a direction that when you start hitting the first group -- and it's what it will take -- other people get the message and things will be a little easier.

Extra adding -- we have two staff members for code enforcement. We have one that we just brought on who's the -- who basically will send the letters, keep up on it, keep track of those things, because that's been part of the problem in the past. And then we have our actual code enforcement officer who -- well, they're both code enforcement officers. The other one is Steve Mount, who is the senior one, who would basically go after the bigger issues.

Now, the issue about sign code. I heard this all the way through the process. The problem is that if you've got signs that are A-frames on the street or whatever you want to call it and they're all over the
county, and you've got people who are bigger issues
that we think are a higher level that's public health
and safety, I'm sorry, I don't care how many -- unless
you have a whole slew of code enforcement officers,
it's probably going to be the lowest priority to get
taken care of, initially. But there will be a point
when you can say, all right, we're now going to tackle
this and we're going to go do it. It is a funding
issue if you want more code officers. There may be
other ways to do it. We haven't addressed it to the
board yet because I think the first thing we want to do
is get this new ordinance in place before we move
forward with this issue of staffing.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The reason I ask
is currently the way we stand -- and we haven't yet got
to that part in our deliberations. But the way it
stands is, at least for signs, if there is a sign that
is not permanent --

LARRY KEETON: Permitted?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Say A-boards,
other signs, and it's not permanent, the code provides
that county staff is going to pick it up.

LARRY KEETON: Well, the code provides that
county staff -- it said could pick it up or -- I don't
know what the exact language says -- or it may say may
pick it up. It doesn't necessarily say shall pick it up. You gotta remember something. This is what we talked to the prosecutor about. Whether people like it or not, the director of the department, whoever it is, has the authority to determine when the code is going to actually be enforced because there's so much code it's when do you do it. And there's just not enough -- I hate to say it. There's not enough cops in the world to keep a handle on 250,000 people, and we wouldn't want to do that anyway. But I understand what you're saying.

The other thing that's also -- now remember, A-frame signs in the right-of-way, the public works department will pick them up, just like --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That's what we're talking about.

LARRY KEETON: The public works guys will pick it up. There's things we'll do, but I think the intent for us in the -- what the intent for us in the future is to send people a letter first. And if they don't do something, then we go after them. But you gotta do it in a logical way. And we want to have something with some teeth in it that when you say no the first time, great, we'll just take you to the hearing examiner and he can take and deal with you, and
word will start getting out and there's fines, there's things associated with it, which the current system doesn't work for us.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So my question to you is, how specific for your people to enforce, be that your code enforcement officer or --

LARRY KEETON: Or any other county employees.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- the other county employees, the road crews, how specific does the enforcement part need to be?

LARRY KEETON: I don't know --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Do we need general language and then you folks take that and interpret it and run with it, or do we need real specific language on if we're going to do a warning, you attach a warning to the sign?

LARRY KEETON: Well, you don't need to put that in this code. You don't need to put that in this code.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That's what I'm asking.

LARRY KEETON: No.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Do we or don't we?

LARRY KEETON: No. Okay. The code
enforcement, what will happen is you will -- the code
enforcement will be referenced to another title
eventually. At this time it's the current county code
for enforcement nuisances or whatever. So this code
should basically be that if code enforcement is
required that we'll follow whatever the code or
whatever the title is at the time. In the future it
may be a future Title 5. But I wouldn't put on there
inside this code that you gotta say that if this sign's
not done here we're going to put a letter to it and all
that. That's something our -- that's a general
processing thing that we would do under the follow the
same standards, if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And Larry, just maybe
a compliment because it's always nice to do that now
and again when you have a chance to. On your process
of code enforcement, we had a situation at the north
end that looked like out-of-code logging, severe-look
logging. A number of folks didn't know what to do,
weren't getting anywhere, so I thought well, why not
test the process, and I did. And I reached one of your
Kitsap One people, Holly Roberts, as I remember her
name.

LARRY KEETON: Holly is my -- works from code
enforcement.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: She was very professional, very responsive. It took a number of weeks because, as you suggested earlier, dealing with logging that had already been done wasn't something that Steve was going to drop everything he was doing.

LARRY KEETON: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But he got at it about week five.

LARRY KEETON: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And there was a degree of violation. It wasn't as severe as one of the neighbors thought it was, and it was addressed. I thought the process was as good as it could get for that situation.

LARRY KEETON: And that's -- that's the new person we hired was Holly, and she's the one who's actually running the administrative part of it and keeping this on track.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Compliments her.

LARRY KEETON: I'll pass it on. Thank you.

DARREN GURNEE: I'm responsible for keeping you focused?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Give me a signal.

DARREN GURNEE: For the record, Darren Gurnee, Kitsap County DCD and project lead for the 2014 sign code update, with Dave Greetham as the planning supervisor. We recently had gone through portions of the code with regards to motions passed. We initially started with a couple of areas and then went through a progression. As it progressed going through, we addressed staff comments. We still have a couple to go back towards that we missed in the beginning. But there are comments on the side that are staff review or work study related where there's suggested language. And any place that you see on the side here that it does not have a motion passed or does not have a closing to it, that is something that we do need to address. So with that --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Why don't you take us in order because we got a bit out of order last time. So just take us page 1 forward.

And then just a question, because all of us received a comment from Jim, who could not be here, Jim Svensson. Were you able -- I'm sure you saw that comment. Were you able to incorporate his prospective
motion in there? Do we need to just get that...

DARREN GURNEE: We're going to need to incorporate that as we go.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a comment?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Go ahead.

DARREN GURNEE: So are you requesting that I go through from the beginning to identify what we've already covered?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Just what we -- you said there were areas where we needed to act on. I assume, unless there is particular interest, we want to go --

DARREN GURNEE: We can go back to the beginning here where on the right side you'll see comment with motion and that it passed.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do we need to -- do we need to go back over that which has passed or just that which we need to revisit, either make a motion, clarify a motion, add a motion in the case of Jim? What's your pleasure, folks?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, one advantage to going through it now is that we don't have to do it at the end and he doesn't have to print it. We don't want to go back --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. As long
as we can do it somewhat --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: It's just an
option.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- expeditiously.

Sure.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I mean
there's two ways to do it. At the end he can print us
a copy and we can all sit down and read it or we can
just start...

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I know my personal
preference would be to step through it as quickly as we
could, only because we have a rather full agenda after
this one and I think a minimum break. Good with me.
Everything is fine. Any strong preferences?

Karanne, do you have a preference?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: No. I was
just --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Either way.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- saying --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Either way.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- that was
an option.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Gotcha.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: You know, it
could be a time saver in the end.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Yep.

Erin?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I'm [indiscernible] --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Front to back.

(Interuption by the court reporter.)

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I was just going along

with what Lou's saying that we skip through the parts

that we've passed already.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So so far I think I'm

hearing that as sort of the feeling of the commission.

Is that true or is there any dissent to that notion of

going front to back and moving through that which has

been passed, with maybe an occasional pause for

clarification if there needs any, and then focusing on

those areas where we need to discuss, re-discuss, make

subsequent motions, add in Jim's, whatever we need to


DARREN GURNEE: We'll start through from --
as you mentioned, from the beginning. In the section

here, as you look on your screen, can everybody read

that?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Not very well. If

you could give us a page and line reference as we walk
through here, it would be helpful.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. Give me one moment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It may also help the minutes.

DARREN GURNEE: So we are looking at -- for some reason this is different. We are looking at page 2, and we're looking at the comment under Planning Commission Work Study.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: DG1?

DARREN GURNEE: DG2. So the DG1 we already passed the motion, so we're trying to avoid going over this again.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. All right. So your page -- your page 2, you have an updated copy of this because it's on my -- what you're referencing is on my page 3, but that's dated 5/20/2014. That's okay. I've got the comment. It's comment DG2 PC Work Study discussion "electronic message center need to be"?

DARREN GURNEE: Yeah. It's 17.446.010 under Purpose, and it was the -- we were trying to identify content within the purpose statement. So it identifies, "The following standards should not regulate the content on a sign, rather the standards should apply to the design and location of a sign."

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We passed that as
a motion to include that statement.

DARREN GURNEE: We have not passed that yet.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: That's why I'm reading these ones that we have not passed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.


DARREN GURNEE: We'll move on from there.

And the format that you had last time it was something that you were working through it. If you'd like me to guide you through this, that is fine.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: No. Keep going.

That's fine.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. We'll move on to Page No. 3, and this was more of a discussion point from your work study session. "Does an electronic message need to be defined separately from a digital display center?" And that was something that you had actually discussed here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes, Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: As I remember the discussion, we had talked about the descriptions in the printed version, the 520 version, are electronic sign,
and then the different functions of an electronic sign
as opposed to a different sign. So we had talked about
having a definition of electronic sign, and then under
it a subparagraphing for the different functions. And
I thought we had passed a motion to that effect, but
maybe not. If we did not, then I'll so move.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And I'll second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Discussion?

Yes, Joe.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, if I remember
this discussion, I believe we did pass it that
underneath where we -- where it goes electronic signs,
animated, flash, and scroll, those are all just
functions that an electronic sign can do. So there
didn't need to be -- we're not differentiating
electronic signs into four different categories. It's
all electronics. It's what their function is they're
able to perform.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And one of those
being a message center?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yes.

DARREN GURNEE: I do believe that the third
comment on this page may refer to what you're
discussing that you had identified before. But this
was specifically to distinctly separate a digital
display center from an electronic sign.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We have not voted on that?

DARREN GURNEE: On that one specifically we did not have a definition provided for a digital display center.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm going to suggest to staff that now that I finally found the state definitions in these areas that staff use some off time to go back and look at WAC 468-66-50, and in the area of Type III, or Type II I believe it is, signs the state has a definition there that may be helpful. But I would propose that we pass over this now and give staff the opportunity to go to look to that WAC.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: If it's -- if it's a relatively short clear definition, why don't you read it if you've got it?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, I don't have the full thing. The part that I gave you is the part relating to temporary political signs that is a one-pager, and that comes up later.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: But for the definition part, there are some definitions. And believe me, I do not blame staff for not finding this
because this portion of the WAC deals -- is under
Department of Transportation Scenic Highways. So it is
an odd place, but this is where they give those
definitions relating to signs.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: News to you folks?
You really need to find that?

DARREN GURNEE: For the digital displays,
that is not true. The political signs it was.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So the WAC reference
that Jim has just expressed is not new to you?

DARREN GURNEE: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: You have any issue or
problem with using that definition? Would that resolve
this issue of resolving this?

DARREN GURNEE: It would be a -- we could
include the definition of a digital display center;
however, it wasn't used in the language throughout the
rest of the code. That's why it was not included. It
wasn't specified out later in the code.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Well, I think if I'm
not mistaken -- keep me honest, folks -- what we're
looking for is a straight-ahead definition in order of
hierarchy of electronic signs, electronic message
centers. And I think that the intent was to try to
clear up the multiple references to electronic signs,
flashing, scrolls, and all the rest, as well as message
center. Why don't we just fix that as best we can or
resolve it?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, my notes said
that the line 8 or sub-line 8 through 13 would be
subsets of the electronic sign.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes. And that is the third
comment identifies that those are subsets through a
motion that was passed.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I see.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. So we've
resolved that?

DARREN GURNEE: For those -- those
mechanisms, yes. The digital display had not been --
there was still a question on the table as to whether
we specifically identify digital display centers.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So let -- so maybe
what we need is a motion, brief discussion as to
whether an electronic message center is a subset of an
electronic sign or a whole different breed of cat.

Yes?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think we do
because I think several of us are leaning, later on
when we get into the prohibitions in the rural area, at
prohibiting --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Electronic message centers or --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Or digital signs operating as electronic message centers. We could get at it either way.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right, because we have an item that we've already taken a vote on that you can't change the message on the electronic message center more than, I believe, if I remember right, once in 24 hours.

DARREN GURNEE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And I think that we have a need to -- the general category of electronic signs is more general than an electronic message center, which is more specific. So we need a definition of electronic message center. Okay. And I believe --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Darren.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm operating on memory because I didn't copy that part, but I believe if you go to the referenced WAC they have a definition in there.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes, they do.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And when I read
that, it was a pretty good definition.

DAVID GREETHAM: I'll work on that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Thank you.

Appreciate that.

DARREN GURNEE: So as David is going to go work on that definition for you, I will be moving down. There was on page 4 -- this is more for formality purposes. The definition of LAMIRD under line 1 on page 4, we have, through the work study, identified that we wanted to include the definitions of the types of LAMIRDS. And these definitions that are provided here would be included in the language should you so motion and pass.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Discussion? All in favor? Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: The -- the next item would be the comment right below that regarding pylon signs. Through staff review, we identified that pylon signs were not going to be included as a signage type, therefore we were recommending the removal of that definition from this draft. And that would be another motion.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: How does this
relate to Jim's suggested change?

DARREN GURNEE: His suggested change referred to any sign that was going to be above the roof line. However, since pylon signs were not identified as a sign type that can be used, it was going to be that pole signs are the area where Jim's comments would be included.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Pole versus pylon?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All clear?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So move to remove "pylon sign."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I second.


Discussion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yes. I would point out that this is just a definition list. It's not part of the -- you know, just because you define something in the definition doesn't make it okay in the code. Keeping in the definition there might prevent somebody thinking oh, well -- you know, making the mistake.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I think the point is
that we're not using the word pylon signs anymore
because that section has been eliminated. And if it's
not used in the code, there's not much point in
defining it. I think that's the logic.

DARREN GURNEE: It was -- that is correct.
The only reason that they were recommending removal was
that it was not referenced anywhere else in the code.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: My -- my personal
reason why I think it ought to be removed is if you
have a definition but you don't use it then you're
going to confuse somebody in the public who tries to
apply for one, and then you gotta turn down the permit
because you can't have it. So if you don't put it in
there, hopefully we're going to lead people away from
applying for them.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Two different logics.
I suppose in support of Joe, you could put it in there
and then have a bracket that says not --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Not permitted.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Or whatever it is.
Either way. Is that -- did we -- we moved and seconded
a motion to exclude. Do we need to re -- do you want
revisit that in any way, Joe? Are you satisfied with
this?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No. This is not a
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. All right. In which case, we'll then move on.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: May I?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Can you give me clarity on pole versus pylon?

DARREN GURNEE: If I had the previous versions in front of me, I could very easily do that. It would be a pole sign is more where you have a supporting structure that is about a quarter of the size of the sign that is being held up, in general. Of course there's a much more -- much easier way to do it if you had a graphic. But it's like a large monument sign that goes taller, about to the height of a pole sign, is typically what's interpreted as a pylon.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: So then a pylon is two legs rising high in the air with a face above?

DARREN GURNEE: That would still be a pole sign.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: That's a pole. So a pylon is --

DARREN GURNEE: Pylon would be basically a monument sign that you --

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Solid base.
DARREN GURNEE: -- increase height. Very high.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Okay. Thank you.

DARREN GURNEE: And it has multiple architectural elements to it, a little bit more than a monument would have.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there some reason for why neither monument nor pole is part of the definition?

DARREN GURNEE: They are defined in the sign detail sheets. We could include them in the front here, but it was --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: They're included in the detail sheet, specifically.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We need to vote.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Need to vote? Could you restated motion for us, please. I believe it was in support of the county's recommendation about removal of pylon sign.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That is correct.

(Page 38, lines 19 through 25 read by the court reporter.)

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So the motion is in
favor of removing this term from the document. We have that motion and we have a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Looks like we have three -- one more time. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven in favor. Opposed? One abstention.

Darren, back to you.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. The next item will be on that same page under the definition of a sign on line 30, and that was specifically to identify a discussion between whether to incorporate a distinction between art and what a sign would be.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That gets us into an interesting area.

Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah, I'll lead that charge. I don't think this definition is sufficient because I think there are hard structures or paintings or other things that -- that rise to the level of being a sign, and several examples. One is obviously the Mattress Ranch. Under the ranch label all of those -- those plastic animals lends towards that, up to and including the fact that the Mattress Ranch has at least two of them mounted on trailers that they will haul around the county to advertise for their business. So somehow we've -- we've got to include
that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And Jim, just to reference the language, it says used for the purpose of communicating a message or attracting attention, and certainly it does the latter.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yes. Clearly. We -- in Silverdale on the -- and I'm forgetting the name of the business. The farm and animal supply, the mural on one end of that building is definitely meant to convey that. There are other instances that we have talked about in work study and other. Totum poles is very definitely for some folks a basis of advertising a business. Indian smoke shops are very very prominent with using totem poles. So more than just a lettered or word or picture sign needs to be included in the definition. Now, how do you differentiate that from art is the difficult thing. But because it's difficult I don't think we should leave it out.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yeah, Linda is going to tell us how.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, I guess I'm not clear why you think the phrase "any device, any structure, any fixture, any painting, any visual image" is not inclusive enough. What would you add? I mean you go away from the simplicity that's stated here, I'm
not sure what more -- to add more sentences you're not
going to get more clarity.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda, you're
suggesting that a distinction need not be made?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It answers the
question.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I think this is
inclusive enough.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: My difficulty is
it answers the question to Linda, and when I view it
that broadly it does, however staff didn't view it that
broadly. So with the language that's there staff
didn't think it meant those things that I think it
means.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Please explain.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Staff, clearly in
our discussions under work study, thought that that
definition of a sign didn't include the plastic animals
at Mattress Ranch, the murals, the other things.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is that true, Darren?

Is that how staff feels today?

DARREN GURNEE: The issue with the
distinction between what's art and what is a sign, I
wouldn't be able to give my interpretation as to
whether the Mattress Ranch has signs or not. That -- I have my personal opinion about that, yes. But as a member of the county and staff recommendations, I would actually say that you should probably err on the side of simplicity for this one because of the subjective nature. I also believe that we consulted with legal on this one as well to say that when you're going down that road of trying to identify what is -- what is a sign versus what is art, you're dealing with the freedom of expression if there are no words specifically attached to it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But I believe your statement in 30 would embrace both the murals and the animals that were used in Jim's example.

DARREN GURNEE: It would be --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Those would be considered a sign.

DARREN GURNEE: It would be a measure of interpretation, that is for sure.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I think it's rather literal. Symbols, numbers, letters, paintings, visual images.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: And this to me would include crosses, totem poles, the whole range of painted cows. Wouldn't have to have words on it.
DARREN GURNEE: I guess the -- the idea
behind it is that, yes, we feel that it includes those. However, the enforcement of art versus signage is going
to be very difficult regardless of how you define those.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: This definition would
not make that difficult at all. It would not be hard
at all. This definition is inclusive.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It's not saying --
we're not saying -- I don't believe we're saying it's
right or wrong, but as definitions go, this one seems
to meet your test of comprehensive and clarity.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Difference of
opinion?

Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Yes. It's a sticky
problem. In the case Jim mentioned a farm supply place
which has a lot of product out available, and that's
what I -- what tells me this is a farm supply place, is
just a whole lot of product. When I pass a used car
lot or a new car lot, I see inventory is stored outside
where I can see it too. That's supposedly to attract
my attention.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Although inventory is
not mentioned on my 30.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Not really, but it's --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Inventory would

not --

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: There is no --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- a sign. If I were

enforcing this, I would not consider -- if somebody put

the mattress out in the parking lot, I would not

consider that mattress a sign.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay. You would not

consider that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Only because it isn't

here.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I think we may see some

mattresses out there.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Keep going. Keep

going. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: My turn? I understand

what you're saying, Darren, about then somebody has to

define what's art and what's signage. And I mean

taking us a step forward, if we're looking at

redevelopment throughout the county, and let's say

you're in a commercial district and someone wants to

put a beautiful water feature in, under this code, and
the way I'm hearing it here, some people are going to say that's a sign. But, you know, and in no way do we want to tack on anybody that wishes to do something artistic and attractive on a property. So when he says he's not sure that we can look at those and enforce that, I can live with the language knowing that they're not going to say forget water -- you know, forget --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I mean I don't know. Maybe the word "any" now all of a sudden brothers me because I think your water feature example is a good one. A water feature is a device or a structure or a fixture, and I don't --

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: And it's --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- know of any --

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: -- drawing attention.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- wild-eyed enforcement officer just -- with nothing to do of course, and we have plenty of those. But maybe the problem is with "any."

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Then we -- for the people that don't like them, if we said devices, structures, blah, blah, blah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yeah.

Joe?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Could part of the
definition be helped out if we struck out "or attracting attention"? I mean a sign is going to tell you something. There's no point in it if it doesn't convey a message. Whereas art just conveys whatever, a feeling, or whatever you've got. Attracting attention I think is where it kind of goes off into artistic world and that.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That -- that then gets to the discussion, which I believe we've had in work study, when you hang a helium balloon and put banners on it, like our friends the RV sale down at the north end of the parking lot at the mall, the whole purpose of that balloon and the banners is to attract attention to the sale that they're conducting. They don't -- they don't do that over at the lot where they sell them. So it is -- I agree. It's a difficult thing. But I think it's something if we're looking -- if one of the things we're doing with this code is creating an aesthetic value for the county, I think that is something that we have to figure out what is the wording we're going to use to regulate that.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And I guess I would disagree in the fact that if you want to fly your helium balloon with a banner or balloons, or even a spotlight at night, it attracts attention, yes, but it
doesn't really convey a message other than, hey, why
don't you come over here and look.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Darren, if
somebody is going to set up rotating spotlights at
night, do they have to have a permit currently?

DARREN GURNEE: I don't know. I would have
to look that up.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Darren, help
us. Is it -- from a practical standpoint, is a broader
or narrower definition of a sign helpful in the world
of reality and in enforcement?

DARREN GURNEE: I would say a broader
definition is going allow you to attend to multiple
situations, which I would suggest.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So you would say for
example that --

DARREN GURNEE: I would suggest leaving the
definition the way is it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: As it is. So --

DARREN GURNEE: However, if you wanted to
take out the distinction -- or if you wanted to -- if
you wanted to distinctly identify art versus signage, I
would take out the "attracting attention" as
Commissioner Phillips has identified.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Broad or narrow,
folks?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to retain the definition as stated in the work product --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- broad definition.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Moved and seconded. Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I would suggest you change "uses" to "used."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We have our...

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: This is an item -- I'm speaking for the motion. This is an item that will probably -- we have something that is used in DCD called director's interpretations, which are written interpretations of the code for people as we go along and get experience and find out if the language works and doesn't. And I think that this is one where the director's interpretations relating to this and its possible uses over the course of several years. Then the county may want to come back and look at how it needed to be interpreted to see if we need to rewrite language.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So there's a process that allows for judgment that steps up to the director level?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah. And that's something that for many of you on the current commission haven't been through our discussions. You have. But we went through quite a bit about making sure that those director's definitions were published so that people using the code where it had to be -- it's vague enough the directors had to interpret, let's make sure that that interpretation is also available to the public when they go to put in a permit.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: All right. This is where I lose the legality. Listening to the idea of dropping the "or attracting attention" to take the art part out, is that a second motion? How does that work? I know we have a motion on the table now to accept as is.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: How do I make a motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If you want to change that --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Try to amend the
motion.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- move to amend.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Okay. That's what I
thought. So then I'd like to move to amend to delete
the last three words "or attracting attention."

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Discussion on
the amendment?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think we've
argued it pretty well. We know where we're going now.
It's who's got which votes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. So the --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So can I ask a
question then? So in the case of the painted cows, how
would you interpret the painted cows if you just had
purpose of communicating a message and you didn't have
the words "or attracting attention"?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Well, I'm going to --
please help me if I'm wrong, Darren, but I think
painted cows would not be dealt with under this
language, period. I think they'd still be an ongoing
issue.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So they wouldn't --
they would -- they would not be communicating a
message?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Right.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: In that case they would just be attracting attention?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: If it were sheep with a little thing over their head maybe it --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: It would have to have words, in other words.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Well, if you're -- but the issue here is cows, which come up a lot. But also when we were talking about the totem poles, there's a totem pole in front of Michaels store in --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Ross Plaza.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Michaels Plaza, yeah, the Kitsap Place. And if I look at this "or attracting attention," that would say the totem pole is no good. And I just think it's too broad. I think art is something to be encouraged. And I think we can deal with it on a case-by-case. And I think Jim is right if it turns around and we're being too broad, then it's something that can be dealt with afterwards.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That way. Okay. We're still discussing the amendment. Go ahead, Joe.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And I would bring up one point about symbols, and that Norfolk adopted a
mermaid symbol that each business adopted a mermaid into a statute that they put on the street and to promote Norfolk. Really didn't have any business connotation other than it was something to see like artwork, and that's how they gain some of the attention for the city. So that's why I'm kind of leaning away from saying that attracting attention doesn't always make it a sign.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So it would not need to be permitted as a sign. It would be a non-permitted piece of art.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Or to -- back to Larry's discussion about branding, if in fact the county or six cities in the county developed a brand and wanted to have a logo, their version of a mermaid, they wouldn't have to worry about the sign code.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I think that's something that's missing here. You used a word I was just going to bring up. Instead of -- along with symbols, or instead, "logo," because you're looking at what if Target decides to throw a whole bunch of bull's eyes out, you know, right amongst political signs. Logos are what associates you to that business. Those cows are logos. The ranch theme -- that a logo associated with the theme of the business is what I
think is the problem, not something that gives
character to a community like a Viking holding a sword.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Or McDonald's Inn.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Yeah, that's
a logo. So I think we need to maybe explore how we --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Are you arguing --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- the logo
back to the business.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Are you arguing in
favor of the amendment to stop that communicating a
message or you want to maybe consider a secondary
amendment?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I'm thinking
that might help get to where we're trying to go to with
this. I'm not quite in favor of anything just yet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Gotcha.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: But I think
what we're trying to avoid is the proliferation of
advertising by using logos as art. I don't know if
that makes sense to anybody else, but that's what I'm
trying to -- so maybe we need to think about how we
want to address it in a different further amendment.
Sorry.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We've got one
amendment on the table. If you want to add or do a
different amendment, we've still got to deal with this
one first before we can pick up another amendment.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, I guess
how does that work for everybody?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We're going to find
out when we vote in a minute.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Anybody want to argue
in any way different than has been or reinforce further
on the amendment for removing words after "designed and
used for the purpose of communicating a message,"
period. I believe, Erin, is that true?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And words after
"message" would be deleted in Erin's motion -- or
amendment.

Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I would argue
from the standpoint of a fair amount of the testimony
that we received that advertising via signs is to
attract attention to -- to the sale that's going on, to
a specific product, other things. That is what signs
are for, is to attract attention to the business. So I
think removing that is removing a big chunk of the
definition of what signs are used for so I'm going to
vote against the amendment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: A yea and a nay so far. Other views before we see if we're ready for a vote? Any other thoughts? All right. All in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand. Two in favor. Opposed? One, two, three, four, five. I'll abstain.

Did you get the count? Thank you.

All right. Now we're back to the motion.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Motion to add logos associated with a [indiscernible].

(Interruption by the court reporter.)

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: For the purpose of communicating a message or attracting --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Give me the language of --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, she needs to hear my motion.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Motion to add logos associated with the business.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That would be up in the list of items?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes, that's what I
was searching for.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I'm thinking

where the --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Where do you want to

put that?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- the best

place to --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any device, structure, fixture, painting, logos, blah blah, for visual image? Give you a second to think about where you want to put that.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Yeah, I think that works there.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any device, structure, fixture, painting, logos?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Or logos -- well, we want to say --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Visual image or logos.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay. Do you need to say associated with business? Because I don't -- community logos are different than a business logo or a school logo.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: You're using logos in general. Could be you're saying community branding,
business.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Are we defining logos any differently than trademarks, registered trademarks?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: But schools have registered trademarks, don't they?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I think we're drilling down really detailed.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yeah. And one point here is that a logo is a symbol, and we do say symbols. I think we've covered what a logo would be by the word symbol.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Did we have a second?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No, we didn't have a second.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We did not.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll second that. I think logos is very specific and should be kept in there.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Associated with the business, because again we're getting back to the symbols of the cows and the ranch and everything else. If it was, you know, the mattress yurt and he had a bunch of little yurts out there or whatever, you
know, that would be associated with the business. So
the ranch is definitely -- not that that's the only
person who uses logos. All the businesses have a logo
and a symbol that they put out to attract...

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We have a motion to
add logos, language that would add logos --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Associated
with the business.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- into 30. I
believe we have a second. Do we have further
discussion? All in favor? One, two, three, four,
five, six. Opposed? One -- opposed, three. That's
more than we have people. We have five in favor; three
opposed.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Two opposed.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Two.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Let's do it again.
All in favor of adding logos? One, two, three, four,
five, six. Opposed? Two. And so are we really
through that?

DARREN GURNEE: Just to confirm, the language
that is on the screen in the bottom of that comment
box, is that -- making sure that that is what you just
voted on, "or logos associated with the business,"
right?
COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.
DARREN GURNEE: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I got it in there correctly.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Thank you. Next, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: All right. Let me find our next location here. All right. We're going to move to page 7, No. 4. This is under Prohibited Signs -- or Line No. 4 under Prohibited Signs, off-premise signs. There was also a discussion that signs seen from waterways, should a business be allowed to advertise directly towards the water or should it be a prohibited sign. I guess that does not relate specifically to off-premise, but that is where the comment was made.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion? Should a business be allowed to advertise directly towards only the water?
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Within the other limitations that are associated with signs, I don't -- I don't know why you wouldn't allow a business that faces the water that has sufficient traffic to justify a sign to try to attract people to that business to have a sign to do that. However, their signs would have to be regulated by the other things that we talk
about. So you don't put a sign up in Port Gamble
that's so damn bright you keep the people up over on
the other side on the peninsula.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And that's the
example.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So I would not
put any language to prohibit a sign that advertises
towards a waterway.

DARREN GURNEE: Oh, and just to clarify. If
there is no change, you do not need to actually put a
motion passed. So if everybody is in agreement, we can
move past it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I wanted to
back up to permitting.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Where are you,
Karanne?

DARREN GURNEE: Back to permitting on page 6?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Let's back up. Then
we'll go forward and be sure we're clear on page 7. Go
ahead, Karanne.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: On page 6
under permitting, Darren and I discussed the issue of
being very clear about properties that have land use
approval that are subject to signage like plats with specific design for monument signs or even commercial projects that have had previous sign approval would have to go back through and amend those approvals to basically get an upgrade under this code if it was the case.

DARREN GURNEE: This related back to Commissioner Svensson's comment where he was discussing conditional use permits where somebody would be able to come in and apply for a permit for a new sign, that they would actually have to go and change the conditions of approval prior to getting an approval for a new permit. And I believe a commissioner was suggesting we add that specifically at the end of the permitting section, if I'm not mistaken, so that it's explicitly stated.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Right. So that the person who is applying for the permit knows that, well, you know, I had a conditional use permit that gave me X amount of signage, they have to go back through that process. That's not something that this code -- it's a clarification. You can't exempt people through this code from doing that. It's just a way to guide them back to that process.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Do you have
language to that?

DARREN GURNEE: I don't have specific language to that necessarily. That is something that I can -- I can look up on a break.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. How about we hold that one in abeyance while --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yeah, let's do that.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- Karanne and staff work on getting us language for that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. Back to 7 and back to signs seen from waterways. I think Darren suggested --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't -- I thought we were finished with that. I didn't mean to interrupt.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: No. No. No. That's quite all right. I believe where Darren left us was if there are no motions pending then we can mark through that. I do not hear a motion, so we'll move on.

Next, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Darren, you jumped ahead. I see two comments on page 6 that I don't know how we've dealt with.

DARREN GURNEE: Which comments were those?
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: DG6 and DG7.

DARREN GURNEE: As I'm adding comments, they keep getting renumbered.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: That was from the original --


DARREN GURNEE: Yes. Just a moment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And it relates to line 12, fees.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That dated document.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. So I have the previous version in front of me here that doesn't include all these other comments. You had discussed those, and we actually had decided that they were not going to be included through motions, I believe. I believe those were included. I do have those in front of me. So if you wish to discuss and make motions based off of those DG6 and 7 on page 6, I can still include those here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And you're saying they weren't covered elsewhere? That's where you were going earlier, that language had been picked up elsewhere. No? Not so?

DARREN GURNEE: I believe it had been.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's what I heard you say. If it has, we don't need to go back over it unless -- until we get to those points.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Darren, help me out. We had a discussion in fees in relation to -- what was that -- expiration of a permit, a construction permit, and that one we did modify.

DARREN GURNEE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. I think I'm okay with these two.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We're back to page 7. Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Or perhaps we're through page 7.

DARREN GURNEE: Page 7 was that work study there. The work study comment was in relation to that first so you have already covered that.

Okay. So we are going to page 9 under flags. And there is a certain component that we were supposed to check with the building official and report back to you, and the -- the language that is provided here is a result of that discussion with the building official.

So it provides a remove and replace that you would
actually have to vote on. And if you'd like I can
actually increase the size.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If you -- if you
would. I'm just too --

DARREN GURNEE: No problem. Let me -- is
that better?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Thank you.
Move to add the language.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Both remove and
replace, Jim?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to
that motion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll second.
COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I'll second.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Discussion? All in favor? Three, four, five, six,
seven, eight. Unanimous.

Next, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. Next we are going to
go to page 10.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Nope. You're
going to stop right there on page 9 on political signs.
You got a handout.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do we need a break
before this discussion?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I think so.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Are you serious, Karanne? Because we can do that. We're just about at two and a half hours.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Actually, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Let's do that. Let's reconvene at 2:30 [sic].

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: How about 3:30.

(A break was taken.)

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So let's go ahead and reconvene at 3:26. And Jim, political signs.

Darren, why don't you lead us into this and we'll dispense with it quickly, I'm sure.

DARREN GURNEE: Well, I believe Jim has his language for political signs and where he'd like to include that in --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Motion is to replace the current Section 5 on political signs with the language on the handout that you were given. If I get a second I'll explain it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And this is a handout and it's led off by WAC 468- --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The WAC is on one
side. That's the language that the new language was
drawn from.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Here we go.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: On the backside
is the proposed new language for our...

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Why don't you give us
a second to read it, and then we'll entertain a second.
If you'd be kind enough to look up after you've read
it, I'll know we're ready to proceed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Or if there are
snoring noises from looking down.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I don't detect any of
that.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. I move
that the replacement of the current Item 5 language
with the new Item 5 language. If I get a second I'll
explain.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

And let me ask. I assume that staff has read
along with this. Does staff have a view? And then
we'll work off that.

DARREN GURNEE: It looks like it would

suffice to me.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Keep thinking while we're talking.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The current language only applies to right-of-way signs. And there are a large number of non-right-of-way signs that are larger than two square feet that are placed on private property. If we don't change the language to exempt those, then people putting those signs up would have to come in for permits, and that's not our intent as relates to political signs. They go up for political season. They come down at the end of political season. The biggest thing that is a -- we've got the new language allows right-of-way signs and private property signs. The private property signs relate to the language in the god-awful place in the world in the WAC, which is the language on the back, which is from the department of transportation regulations in the WAC related to scenic highways, but is that -- that is that portion of law that the Public Disclosure Commission uses to regulate signs. So that gets us there.

The one major difference is, because the WAC already says ten days after an election, I've altered both to be ten days after an election so that we're in sync with the WAC. So both right-of-way signs and
private property signs would have to come down within ten days after a general election or ten days after a primary for an unsuccessful candidate in the primary.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Just a question, Sincere, although it may seem a little frivolous. We started out today talking about Kitsap County, at least part of it, thinking of itself as the scenic highway. Not quite that language but something close, and your reference to where your code came from. So you're still comfortable with that in mind, that is the culture of the county and this language?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: This would not be in the face of that?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Like I say, the state allows these signs on scenic highways.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Actually supports that notion at least --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: It's kind of funny. It appears, when you look at the definition of a scenic highway, you've got freeways, other limited access, and just about any other state road seems to be a scenic highway, the way I've read the definition. So we in Washington State think of all of our highways as scenic.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All you have to do is travel road -- Highway 5 in Fife and you get that.

Okay. We have a motion. We have a second.

Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Ten days just seems so fast. I mean 14 days seems like a more appropriate time frame. Would we -- would there be conflict between the two if we went to 14 days.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The WAC would say that any sign that was on a highway would have to be down within ten, but any other sign, private property sign would have four more days to be up. And quite literally if you keep the two together you're better off. And what the parties do is, the day after the election, people go out and drive the roadways and pick up signs for everybody in their party. So you can tell who doesn't have any friends by the signs that remain by the third day.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So the stakeholders would be happy about this.

Back to the county. One quick shot before we vote. You've had now ample time to look at this. No inconsistency, no difficulty, no language from the staff standpoint?

DARREN GURNEE: No.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. All in favor?

Unanimous.

Next, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Next item for review would be under Page No. 9, Special Events. There's an item for remove of certain language, and the registration for a period of time allowed for multiple events of the same type. This was tied to the Eglon community comments that came up. It was to make that something that went toward the rest of the county. But if they have multiple events of the same type, they don't have to keep registering every single time that it comes up each week.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: If you would move your cursor.

DARREN GURNEE: Sorry. And I'll increase the size here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So in the Eglon scenario this would suggest or say 14 days in advance, five days after.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I motion to accept the language as altered in this staff note.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Remove and replace. Second.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. We have a motion. We have a second by Jim.

Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So is there a limitation on location of these types of signs? Does this apply only in the right-of-way, for example, or is it on private property?

DARREN GURNEE: They would be allowed on private property. The special event signs, as you see here, would be the -- the sign itself would have to be picked up after five days, couldn't be placed more than 14 days even if it's on a private property, I believe is the intent of this one.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So should we say that to make this more clear?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Especially since special event signs end up in the right-of-way as much as political signs do. So if our intent is only private property, we ought to say that. If our intent is not that, then we ought to say that.

DARREN GURNEE: It goes for -- so for a good example is a restaurant has a special and they want to put up a banner saying we have a special going on this weekend. That would be a temporary sign. That would be put up identified as Item C. The inflatable signs
that you were discussing earlier, those are addressed
in here as well.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But back to your
example of the Eglon corner.

DARREN GURNEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: There's inches, and
it's indistinguishable as to private or public
property, I think was the suggestion here. I think
there's general agreement about the time frames before
and after, but I've heard an additional comment or a
different comment that had to do with the delineation
between public and private. It certainly isn't in that
corner. You could no more tell, even if you lived
there, whether it's in the right-of-way or in the horse
farm next to it.

COMMISSIONER GONZALES-HARLESS: I have a
question about that. When you're talking about the
poles or, you know, that the signs are going to be
attached to, do they have to take down the actual poles
or can they remain and they can just change out the
face?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: One of the
classic things --

COMMISSIONER GONZALES-HARLESS: Because
you're talking about a 32 square foot sign, possibly,
DARREN GURNEE: These were intended to be a temporary sign.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: But if you're going to have the same events in the community, wouldn't you want permanent poles in the ground so you know they're structurally sound? Because like Eglon corner you're constantly changing it out from "Vacation Bible School" to "You Pick Berries" or "I've Got Eggs."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But then catty-corner across from that is a permanently poled sign that's administered by the community center, right catty-corner in the same intersection.

DARREN GURNEE: From the staff's perspective, it was intended that if you're going to have a permanent structure that is to remain and is solidified in the ground to stay there, that would be considered a permanent -- permanent fixture and therefore under permanent sign regulations.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Not a special event?

DARREN GURNEE: Not a --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Even though special events are -- are part of the --

DARREN GURNEE: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- are changed within
the structure that is permanent.

DARREN GURNEE: You'd still be able to do --
let me see here. So you have a double pole sign that's
identified in Item E. You can still put poles in the
ground, but you would actually have to take them out
when the event is done.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, I guess
to me it seems like keeping the poles in the ground and
just taking the sign off would make more sense as to
where it is if it's in the right-of-way or on private
ground. Then you don't have to keep going back to
where is it actually going because you'd actually know,
you'd already approved where that location is.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The difference to
me is this is a conditionally exempt so you don't have
to have a permit so you don't have to prove that the
structure is adequate for a permanent sign. If you put
those poles up and want to leave them permanent, then
you've got to have a permit, and you've got to prove
that the structure is adequate.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: A post in the
ground doesn't need a permit. The sign that attaches
to it does.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda.
COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, it seems to me that the heading of this section needs to specifically say temporary, or each item, each numbered item needs to say temporary, special temporary -- special event, temporary A-frame, temporary event or whatever, so that we don't have the confusion. This is only about temporary special event signs. Because like you, when I got down to E, my first thought was this is permanent signs because who would put in two poles for a 32 square foot, eight foot sign and not think of it as more permanent. That's what I got from this.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: But back, I think, to the clarification, the structure is permanent. The events change with the fourth of July and car show.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Apparently not. They're thinking this is only temporary.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.

DARREN GURNEE: There are -- there are some places around the county where you have a temporary sign that is set up with four-by-fours and a piece of plywood that is specific to a certain time of year where maybe trees are sold or you have a Kitsap
fairground event that occurs where they're putting up
these temporary type signs. That was the intent. But
I understand if --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: The sign is temporary.
DARREN GURNEE: It is temporary, yes. So
that was the intent.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Structure and
content.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Structure and content
are temporary. Right.

So this whole section is all temporary signs.
DARREN GURNEE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: In fact, back
when we -- the political signs, when I adapted the
state language, the state language says on everything
temporary, temporary, temporary. Because we didn't use
that format, I took the temporaries out. But in
effect, clear back in the section heading
"Conditionally Exempt Signs" we -- we could put the
term temporary there, and then it would apply to all of
the subsets under that.

DARREN GURNEE: And that would be a
recommendation as well. The only issue that you might
have with that is with 2 and 3 for arm signs and window
signs.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: But both of --

DARREN GURNEE: Those can be --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- those say permanent and temporary. So if you put "temporary" in the section heading, then unless it's something stated in the subsets, it is temporary.

DARREN GURNEE: That is something that we can include, yes.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So as -- as relates to structure, then when we get out from under this discussion, I'll make the motion to put the "temporary" up in the section heading.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Where are we on this discussion?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: We have a motion on the table to remove and replace specific items.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And that motion has been seconded.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: What used to be DG16.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Further discussion before we vote? All in favor? Unanimous. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Now, on my
commitment, returning back to the section heading .060 on page 9, insert the word "temporary" between "A" and "sign" on line 2. That way it will -- well, I'll explain it if I get a second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Page 9, line 2, insert the word "temporary" after "A."

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: By that -- by doing it in the section heading, then it makes all of the signs referred to under that section temporary unless otherwise stated, which it is otherwise stated in 2 and 3.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion?

Moved and seconded. All in favor? Looks like we have one, two, five in favor. Opposed? Two abstentions. Five in favor; two abstentions.

Okay. We're on, Darren, page...?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Excuse me. I think we're going to skip over something I think we might want to -- I'd like to try to address right here is the
human sign.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Human sign, Item 9, line 14.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Item 9, line 14.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Go, Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay. The language -- the language I would like to suggest is that "human signs shall not obstruct public bicycle lanes or public sidewalks," instead of the language that is there. I know -- and if there's a second I'll describe why.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Say your language again, please, Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: The language I would like to see in place of the language that is present is that a human sign shall not obstruct public bicycle lanes or public sidewalks.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And I'll --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Second that --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: -- second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- motion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Seconded by Joe. Discussion.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay. You know, I know this is difficult to enforce if -- if you have a
situation where we probably don't want people doing this. However, it is kind of a free speech point that public spaces are often used by individuals to promote their political agenda or whatever. Panhandling, I suppose, is another one. And if they are a public nuisance and are obstructing the right-of-way, then I think that can be dealt with at an individual basis. But some of the outfits that I've seen are not terribly bothersome to me personally, and I would prefer to be a little lenient in this area.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Just for clarification, Tom, looking at this language and thinking about corners of Silverdale on the weekend, a human with a sign or a human sign? Does your notion embrace both? Because we see both. We see humans dressed up in signs and we see humans throwing signs up in the air and doing all kinds of things.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Sign.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: To me the definition covers both.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Covers both. Okay. Just for clarification.

So we have a motion. We have a second. Is there further discussion? All in favor? One, two, three, four, five, six in favor. One opposed? One abstain?
One thinking? One opposed.

Next, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Just to clarify. The comment that you see on the screen here, I want to make sure that I got the language correctly. A human sign shall not obstruct public bicycle lanes or public sidewalks.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I've gone blank here.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: His screen went dead.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: A human sign shall not obstruct --

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: Is that exactly what we were discussing?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: It says what you can't do, but it doesn't say where it can be.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Let me find my space here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Human sign shall not obstruct public bicycle lanes or public sidewalks.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: That's the language --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That was your --

DARREN GURNEE: That's the language you --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Got it.

DARREN GURNEE: And it was passed.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Great. Go, Darren.

You're slowing us down here.

DARREN GURNEE: I'm terrible. Moving forward. So we've covered that. There was another discussion regarding A-frame signs. We are recommending to remove the language that you see here and replace with a new set of language.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's DG17, Darren?

DARREN GURNEE: On mine it's DG30. Let me look at my old copy here.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'd like to make a comment at this point.

DARREN GURNEE: We're not --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Darren, I find it a little disturbing that you have a different set than we do. And this was sent out to us before this meeting.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I believe -- I know I have the one that goes back to 5/20, which obviously isn't as updated as the additional comments here.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Did you -- did you get a new one?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No.

DARREN GURNEE: It's the same -- it's the same draft, but every time that I'm adding a comment that captures your comments --
COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: -- it's changing the numbers on the side as we go along here.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay. It's just...

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: It's hard.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It's just a test, Joe.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I haven't thrown anything.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: You can.

DARREN GURNEE: So the recommendation is to replace the language because certain things need to be advertised off premise, and the right-of-way is the most appropriate location. We have included the replacement language so that's what you're going to want to look at here. And I will zoom in for you as well.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: If you would look up when you're finished reading, then I think we've got a couple of questions in the wings.

Okay. Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: These are my -- my favorite irritation. A-frame signs, it's really difficult for me to tell that when they're used that they're used for how this is worded, "a special event."
The majority of time that I see them used, they're used for normal daily advertising. When -- when I see them used by most businesses that are the most irritating, they're -- they look the same every single day 24/7, 365 days a year so they couldn't possibly be a special event.

DARREN GURNEE: And that is covered under No. 1, under conditionally exempt, those signs specifically.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So how in the world are we ever going to police this? This seems impossible to enforce. They're probably the most popular sign that businesses use in the right-of-way.

DARREN GURNEE: Just to clarify, this is specifically in the right-of-way.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Right. And they're up and down Bond Road where -- in the right-of-way along those LAMIRDs. They're in the highway. They're in the right-of-way. They're in bicycle lanes. They're...

DARREN GURNEE: Yes. I understand.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I don't --

DARREN GURNEE: A lot of the staff -- the ones that say "Staff Review" are from the public comments that we received in the hearings. So we've tried to separate out what was said in the hearings
versus what you had identified in work study that you
wanted to make sure and cover.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Okay. I just don't
see how this is ever going to be sufficient to be
policeable.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: You're not going to print
an A-frame sign with a special event information. It's
going to be generic advertising, and so there's no way
to distinguish it between a special event and a regular
A-frame.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do we need to go back
and take a look at the original A-frame language and
see if it meets the test that you're talking about?

DARREN GURNEE: Well, the -- I will say that
part of the intent on this was for those community
events like farmers markets or things of that nature.
We wanted to provide them the opportunity for them to
have more than one A-frame sign that is identified in
No. 1 in conditionally exempt, and that's why this
language was included for that purpose. So that was --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: That's probably the
most appropriate use of them.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Yeah, to advertise
the, yeah, doggy trials or whatever they might be.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm confused.

Back on page 9, line 7, Item 1, A-frame Sign. And we talk about only one A-frame sign not -- not associated with a special event is allowed. Okay. Allowed where?

DARREN GURNEE: That would be on premise.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: On premise.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. It doesn't state that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: B.

DARREN GURNEE: Item B.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: On B. All right.

Now we get over here and we have special event, and this is allowed in the right-of-way for an A-frame sign, correct?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: But it has to meet the size dimension specified back in 1 on page 9; is that correct?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. Now, when can it be up and down?

DARREN GURNEE: You -- you have to register for the special event. It's the 14 days, five days after the event.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: All right. So it
doesn't have to come down at the close of business hours?

DARREN GURNEE: For the special event it doesn't identify that in here, no.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. And that's if -- if we've got something on one talking about A-frames that says that, on the other, if that doesn't apply, there needs to be a specific statement saying "may remain up during hours other than business hours."

Otherwise you're going to assume that -- that you're -- you're going to be jerking a lot of people. We want clarity here. We've told them A-frames gotta come down when it's not business hours. Yet for special event A-frames, it doesn't. If it doesn't, then let's state that clearly.

DARREN GURNEE: I believed that Item A on that had identified that specifically, but that -- let me see here.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Fourteen prior, fifteen days after.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: But that -- that's referring to all of the sign topics, not just A-frame.

DARREN GURNEE: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And Item B, which is A-frame only, and we're exempting this from the previous requirement of business hours somewhere in this addition, we need to say does not have -- may remain up 24 hours a day or however we want to say it during those time frames.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. Is there specifically where you'd like to see this or...?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I would add Roman numeral small b, and then put in the waiver that this sign may remain up 24 hours a day during the period authorized. So moved.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?
Do I hear a second? I do not. Oh, I do.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded to add the time frame within which that registered sign can be up.

KAREN ASHCRAFT: Who seconded?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I'm sorry. Second was Linda. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: The only thing I'm concerned about is, adding that language, though it clarifies here, I'm afraid it will be more disturbance to our permanent A-frame language, that people will go
back and forth, so I actually...

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If you've got a
better way to state it, I'm sure looking for help.

COMMISSIONER LEDDHAM: Well, I actually would
omit it and leave it as is because I'm thinking worst
case scenario is someone is overly cautious and removes
it at night, as opposed to someone with a permanent
saying, oh, no, over here these guys can leave it up.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So you're saying the
motion would create more confusion, and I think Jim's
intent was --

COMMISSIONER LEDDHAM: That's my concern is
the motion would create confusion with our permanent
A-frames as opposed to the amount of clarity it will
give our temporaries.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion or
comments on the motion? All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm persuaded. I
ask you to vote against my motion.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I was going to vote for
it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All in favor? All
opposed? So moved. Motion fails unanimously.

Complete abysmal failure.

DARREN GURNEE: That one is not passed.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. Next.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Time out.

Did we pass the replacement language? We were talking about --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Didn't we do remove and replace?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That's -- the motion was to -- to accept the remove and the replace language. That's why the discussion was in the replace portion.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I'm still --

DARREN GURNEE: So the remove/replace was denied in terms of the motion passed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No.

DARREN GURNEE: Or not passed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: My amendment to the -- to the replacement portion did not pass.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And we still have to vote on the main motion, which is the remove from what used to be DG16 and replace from what used to be DG17.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Are we all together or is further clarification needed? All set? So we have a motion. We have a second. Further discussion?
No. All in favor? Unanimous.

Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. Moving on to Page No. 11. This was Item B or Line No. 1. There was a discussion requested during planning commission work study that we identify remove and replace. The replaced with is what you would have for a single-family residential property, one attached special event banner is allowed in addition to one unlit arm sign on the subject property and easement leading to property. This is specific to real estate signage, allowing the arm signs to be at the end of the driveway where you are accessing the county road.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes, Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I have a question for our realtor. Are banners becoming the new thing in addition to an arm sign? I'm just curious. Arm signs are adequate for me.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Yeah, not that I'm aware of.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay. I --

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Are you seeing banners out there?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Then I would like to make a -- craft a motion here. I would move that the
language that cites banner signs be removed.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Second by Jim. So all references -- for clarification, all references to banners in this section, real estate signage program, be removed.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I believe that's what I intend. I -- I don't -- to me personally I think that the arm signs are a good service to a community that is looking for homes on offer. And I think banners, myself, clutter up a property and clutter up my view. So I'm generally opposed to seeing excessive signage that does not serve the purpose of just calling attention to the property on offer.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda, in the real estate world, aren't small A-frames used for open houses and things?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Yeah. Small A-frames.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I was looking for that in here, and I don't see it.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: And then there may be a small sign attached to the arm that would say "Open House this Sunday," but that's -- you're not prohibiting that.
DARREN GURNEE: The A-frames are specific to open house events under Item E, which is --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: There's the A-frame.

DARREN GURNEE: -- line 9. You have a maximum of four of any combination of these types.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: When this was being crafted, do we remember what we meant by banner sign? Because I tend to think that we were actually talking about the "Open House Sunday" and the attachment. And it says the banner sign -- "attached special event sign." Or were we talking a canvas banner attached to the "For Sale"?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Maybe the -- isn't there --

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: What does --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- multiple uses --

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: -- banner mean?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- of the word banner?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, we should go by the definition we have in the code, "Banner Sign." And I have "a sign made from fabric, vinyl, or other light weight flexible materials tied or fastened to a stationary object."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So that is defined as
type of sign versus an event.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, that's --
that's banner. So now we're saying that on special
events you may do that.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: So if there was going to
be an open house on Sunday, you could attach a plastic
sign to the arm that says "Open this Sunday," or "Open
House Sunday." I don't think you're trying to prohibit
that, are you?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: No.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I think you're looking
for something bigger.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I don't -- good
information. What I tend to prohibit is having a large
20 square foot banner saying "Open House."

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: But that's not
something you've seen out there yet?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: No.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Okay. So when we're
discussing banner signs, we're talking about the
attached right underneath the "For Sale."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is that close to the
definition, Joe?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That you're looking at?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: That's the way I read it. And my opinion is is that it should stand since it's only for special events.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We got a motion.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, I'm confused at what the motion does for us. Was the -- the motion -- I'm asking the maker. Was the motion to remove all discussion of banner only in Section 12, Real Estate Signage Program, or to remove it also from Section 8, Special Events?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: My intent is to remove it from the Real Estate Signage Program.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. If that's all it is then I'm fine with the motion.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So we have that motion. It's still alive. And we have a second.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: If we remove it from here, does that mean we're removing the ability to hang the "Open House" sign?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: That's what I'm hearing.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: That's what I'm thinking. Because our definition of banner sign that Joe brought up is the open house sign, not the full
fledged orange banner flying in the wind.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: When the real estate industry wants to have an open house, what -- what would you describe as a banner that -- I know that there's little plaques that go on the arm signs. Is that a banner?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I wouldn't describe it that way, but I believe the definition does because it says it's a plaque and plastic. It could be fabric. It could be plastic.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yeah, because it just says one attached special event banner.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: In light of the definition, and in light of the fact that it's not a problem and does not seem like anything that's being used, with the permission of the seconder, I would like to remove the motion from consideration.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay second?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Second that.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Who seconded the first one?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I think Jim did.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I seconded the motion. Yeah, I agree.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Motion
withdrawn. Next.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Well, don't we --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We need to then revisit this.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: So I'll -- I'll move to approve the remove and replace language on the Section B.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Second.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Second by Joe and Linda. Discussion? I think we may have had it. All in favor? I see six. Jim, where are you? Seven. Unanimous. Next.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. We also propose on page 11, Item C - this is specific to comments received - that we remove and replace. And the replacement is, "On-site develop for sales shall be limited to one sign per develop entrance." So if you have a development and you have two different entrances, that was what this was intended to be.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve the remove and replace.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Seconded by Joe.
Motion by Jim. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I thought Teresa's comments to get us here were real good. We've got the instance right now at Sterling Homes, two different entrances. I think they ought to be able to have signs at both.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any arguments against? Any discussion, questions? All right. Ready for the vote. All in favor? Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: Next would be the following comment, replace or remove -- or remove/replace again. This is also with relation to real estate and subdivisions. "Off-premise signs advertising subdivisions placed by real estate companies shall require a one-year permit. The permit may be renewed annually for up to three years provided that no sign maintenance violations occur in the previous year."

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve the remove and replace.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Seconded by Joe.

Excuse me. Discussion? All in favor? Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: This is going to be page 12.
For attached sign total area, we're replacing -- removing and replacing language. We identify a certain square footage for attached signs. So "attached signs may have an aggregated area that shall not exceed two square feet for each lineal foot of building facade width, except when 17.446.100 Sign Detail Sheet: Wall sign indicates otherwise." There are a couple of instances in the wall detail sheet that allow for a different square footage requirement.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And this was from staff review?

DARREN GURNEE: So as proposed, it's more of a formality in the sign detail sheet that identifies a three square foot per lineal foot, and it's a consistency factor between those two things. This is not a comment from the hearings.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Varying by zone, it looks like.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes. So you have an increased square footage allowance in certain zones in Silverdale and such, and this just accounts for that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll move to accept the language as written.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded by Jim. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: So just so I'm clear on this. I get two square feet for each lineal foot of my storefront?

DARREN GURNEE: In most instances, yes.

Later on --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: For 30 feet I'll get 60 square feet?

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: All right. And then you're also saying that it's capped at 100?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes. And it references a figure that you will see later on the following page, I believe.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion?

DARREN GURNEE: So this specific -- the remove/replace is specific to just be consistent with what else is in the draft and the actual specifics of that. We can -- we can go over them when we get to those.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. This is
where I told you the problem was going to creep up. How do I measure square footage on a plastic cow? We said back there that we're going to include that as advertising signage. If it's -- how do I measure that square footage? I don't think any of your examples are picturing three-dimensional objects. You're picturing two-dimensional objects for measurements.

DARREN GURNEE: This specific one is only for signs attached to the building.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. So if I attach a cow to a building, how do I measure it? Because in one location we do.

DARREN GURNEE: Then you'll measure the height, width, and depth.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And depth?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Just a point. If Jim wants to keep attacking the Mattress Barn, should we allow the Mattress Barn owner to come and argue his points?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So noted. Next.

UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER: And bring in his neighbors.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. So as long as you guys are going to be able to figure it out.
COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So in the case of a mural on the side of a building that formerly we might have thought of as art that now becomes a sign because it might have -- might be interpreted that way or it might have words in the mural that gets interpreted as communicating a message but it covers the entire side of the building, how does this section apply? It obviously covers the entire side of the building.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Not uncommon that it does that.

Darren?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes. The murals, let me scroll down to the detail sheet that will -- we'll take a look at the murals here real quick.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And is there some sort of an exemption for mural versus signage or more explicit signage.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Feed store would be one example.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If I remember right, the feed store mural, the picture says "Feed Store." It shows the feed store.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: You're looking at 25 now?

DARREN GURNEE: Page -- page 25. The wall
mural sign, that is actually a point that we were going
to discuss as a removal, as it would be determined an
artwork piece, or the justification here is all murals
were initially identified as a sign, it's more
representative of artwork. If you have text in and
around that, it's going to be an interpretation of
what's going on there. And the removal of that, since
there's no real restrictions that we're placing on
murals, we were going to remove that detail sheet and
delegate that down to artwork.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well --

DARREN GURNEE: I know -- I know your -- your
question about is the entire side of a building if it's
painted, is that going to be restricted by the
recommendations that we have here, we would say no.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Okay. So another
example would be, as Karanne brought up, what if
Target, for example, puts their logo across the side of
the building and it covers the entire side of the
building?

DARREN GURNEE: The logo that you're
discussing I believe you addressed in the definition of
sign when you identified --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So then --

DARREN GURNEE: It would be a sign versus the
artwork. That's where you're coming --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, if they paint a
bull's eye on the side of the building, our previous
section that we're just discussing now would prohibit
them from doing so.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right. They
would be limited to --

DARREN GURNEE: It would be considered --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- square feet.

DARREN GURNEE: It would be considered a sign
if it has that logo association with the business,
based off the way you changed the definition.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So a mural,
say for instance REI wants to put climbers on --
depicting climbers going up the side of the building,
without saying anything other than their own sign
that's already there, that would be considered artwork?

DARREN GURNEE: The way it is, yes.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I don't think so.

I think that REI mountain -- the mountain silhouette
with climbers is the logo.

DARREN GURNEE: I didn't know the exact logo
had climbers on it. So if --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I'm talking
about the actual painted picture of a mountain.
DARREN GURNEE: That's what --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So, you know, Mount Rainier or Mount Baker or Mount St. Helens or whatever.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Or just a rock cliff.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: What about a mural of a cow?

DARREN GURNEE: It is definitely a conversation that can go pretty far, so...

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I want them to paint a mural.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: When Chick Phillip applies for a store in Kitsap County we're going to face that.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Who?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Chick-fil-A.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Chick-fil-A.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Midwest it's called Chick Phillip.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And the black and white cow encouraging you to eat chicken is the logo for their company.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yeah, but they're only using that on billboards.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think I can show you two or three stores in California where that's not true.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda, I think you started us down this path.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, maybe we have it covered. I'm not sure, though, that the mural with the store's name in it, I'm not sure that this exempts it.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: It would not --

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: If the mural --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- to me.

DARREN GURNEE: If it has the name of the store, it would be considered a sign.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: A sign.

DARREN GURNEE: By the definition that you have.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So the feed store that has the words "Feed Store" and the mural.

DARREN GURNEE: Feed store would be -- there would be an interpretation, most likely, as to whether the background -- the mural is a background, but the sign itself is the text. That's where you're getting into the tricky area.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I leave it to the director or whoever gets --
DARREN GURNEE: That's where your director's interpretation --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: -- to make the judgment call.

DARREN GURNEE: -- comes into play.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: But isn't that part of the old town Silverdale ambiance?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And there's probably some, not many, but some historic signs that were painted up that you're going to get in trouble if you're going to try to remove or change, so...

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: But I think we want to.

DARREN GURNEE: I would suggest that you have already covered this through the definitions.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I did not hear a motion. Maybe we could move on.

Go ahead, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Let me find my place back.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So I'm wondering, though, if we don't need something in this area that we're talking about here "except an exception." We need some exception language here.

DARREN GURNEE: If a mural is not considered a sign without the text, then it would -- it wouldn't
be subject to 100 square feet or the square footage rule here. Has to be a sign to be considered for this item, if that clarifies anything.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Meet the test of definition of a sign.

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: We put a lot in the definition of a sign. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: Is there anybody to -- to address this comment for attached signage total for the formality of it, for the remove and replace for that square footage item?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do we have a motion for that? I think that's DG21. Are you saying we did not address that with a formal motion?

DARREN GURNEE: We have not yet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll make a motion to replace the verbiage for DG35 with the recommended staff verbiage there.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any discussion?

Absent discussion, all in favor? Unanimous.
DARREN GURNEE: The next one was an item in work study and a discussion with regards to will illumination apply to electronic signs which are exempted for schools, churches, government. I believe you -- you accomplished that part for rural areas that you prohibited electronic signs outside UGAs.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Tom, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I wish that were true. The -- well, as I mentioned to Darren earlier that I thought this panel has been well prepared with work studies and other hearings and such that we have lots of data and very well qualified before we make a decision, but one of the -- one of the things I did propose was -- in a motion that failed five to four was illuminated signs outside of commercial areas. Now this particular point we're looking at is one that since I'm one of the four that voted against the illuminated signs outside of commercial zones, that would include churches, governmental units, and schools, I would -- I would just like to explain myself that whatever the motion is that comes up to modify or change or do whatever with this, I will have to vote no because I intend to eventually vote no on the entire package as not out of bitterness, but just to express
clearly my feeling that lighted signs belong in a 
commercial area, and they don't belong in the urban 
growth -- anywhere outside of urban growth or the other 
areas that are not commercial.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And you feel strongly 

enough to vote the entire code change down?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Eventually, yes, and 

I'll explain myself. I like this code, and I like the 
work that has gone on. But I -- I don't see that 
Kitsap County's rural areas are protected in any way by 
having illuminated signs or digital signs outside of 
the commercial zones. And even within the commercial 
zones I want them to be fairly -- fairly well 

restricted. So that's where I'm at.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion 

regarding the comments on illumination?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I have a 

question.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: What is 
currently allowed in the areas outside the UGA for time 
frame? Is that the same timing, the 6 a.m. to 10 p.m.?

DARREN GURNEE: To my knowledge I couldn't 

find an illumination standard that applied like this. 

It basically was the obnoxious things ordinance that
identified no more than one candle foot, but it was at
any time of --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So how are we
conditioning different projects outside the UGA for
signs?

DARREN GURNEE: Currently or as proposed?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Currently.

Yeah, I mean we've got to be doing something about
timing on those.

DARREN GURNEE: To my knowledge we don't have
any conditions that restrict them on a time that --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So the --
DARREN GURNEE: -- the lights are on.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- existing
LAMIRDs that have the monument signs, have the
lighting, up lighting or down lighting, however, that
can stay on all night?

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: And that's
going to get to stay on all night unless they amend and
change?

DARREN GURNEE: The way it's written here is,
if you're outside UGAs or the Type III LAMIRDs, you
wouldn't be allowed to have it on all night.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So that's
really more restrictive --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So is the motion appropriate to include schools, churches, governments, and quasi governments in the time requirement?

DARREN GURNEE: That would be the question, I believe, is what you guys are trying to --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Would it be here or elsewhere? You say we've exempted it elsewhere, and I don't remember exempting it elsewhere.

DARREN GURNEE: We didn't exempt them, necessarily, but we didn't specifically call it out here. There was the question that we needed to discuss it during the work study session.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Karanne, did you finish your expression or question?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I guess my question is, this is more restrictive than what we currently have?

DARREN GURNEE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So people would be told to turn off their lighted signs in the rural areas?

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: And because --
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Except for schools, churches, and governments.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, I think what this was saying is since we were concerned about electronic message centers, and we already dealt with that, that it's actually moot for those.

DARREN GURNEE: And the idea was that this -- this still applies for the schools, churches and --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Just like the regular signage that --

DARREN GURNEE: Just like --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: -- we've been doing --

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Except now we're going to have a time limitation on it?

DARREN GURNEE: If it's outside UGAs or --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Which we didn't have before?

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: And they were allowed a light on their sign, either up or down, whatever. Is that a halo light?

DARREN GURNEE: Halo lighting is a backlight effect.
COMMISSIONER GONZALES-HARLESS: Okay.

DARREN GURNEE: You're talking about an external bulb that's a directional flood lamp?

COMMISSIONER GONZALES-HARLESS: Right. So that's the kind of signage they would have now for those schools and churches.

DARREN GURNEE: It's regardless of the type of sign, it would basically be that you can't have the light on after ten o'clock. It's not changing the lighting styles based off this language here.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So do we have a motion?

Yes, Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Adding to .070 Section 5, Paragraph A, on line 17, "signs located outside the Urban Growth Area or Type III LAMIRDS of more intense rural development, including electronic signs for schools, churches, government, and quasi government shall not be illuminated." So the addition in to include schools, churches so that they've at least got to turn them off at 10 p.m. and they can't turn them on before 6 a.m.

DARREN GURNEE: You clarify that, yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that motion?
COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Second by Linda.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'd like to make an amendment to his proposal, and that would be to -- on line 17, it should read signs located outside the Urban Growth Area, or somehow define that as business areas. Within the UGA there are residential and there are businesses. So the residential should come under this same control.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah, but the way the motion is proposed, it would be all areas outside the UGA and Type III LAMIRDs.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yeah, but you've -- the UGA residential areas are now not in that proposal.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is that true, Darren? Residential areas excluded from that motion?

DARREN GURNEE: The residential areas within a UGA would not be subject to this; that is correct. So it would be something that we would have to motion and pass in that residential areas --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That was the intent of Joe's amendment, correct?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Right. I wanted to clarify that within the UGA business areas we're not controlling it, but within the residential we are.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I second the amendment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Any discussion on the amendment? All in favor of the amendment? Do we need to have the amendment restated? Joe, can you...

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: As best as I can here. Signs located outside the urban growth business areas.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Joe, if I would suggest --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I would break it up into two sections. Signs located within the UGA in urban -- in urban -- or residential areas, and then continue the statement.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That way you've got the UGA portion residential only, and then you've got outside the UGA, you've got everything, including schools, government, and all of the other stuff.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay. And then we still need your inclusion of --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, your -- your amendment would include -- your part of it, if we vote that up, then that would go along with my
amendment for the other part.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So we have two votes to do.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We okay on the language of the amendment as discussed?

Erin.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I think Darren is trying to change that.

DARREN GURNEE: So you're talking about -- sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Darren, do you want to give it a read just so we --

DARREN GURNEE: So the way I have it written here is, signs located within residential areas and signs located outside UGAs --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No. Within residential areas within --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Within UGAs.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- UGAs. And we don't have any residential --

DARREN GURNEE: I believe this actually captures in and outside UGAs as written.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I think it needs the clarity. When I read --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Needs the clarity.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: -- that, it seems to skip the UGA part for the residential.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Could you read it once again, and then we'll vote on the amendment.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The amendment is from the cursor to the left. That's Joe's amendment.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Right.

DARREN GURNEE: This amendment?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay, Joe?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So we have a motion.

We have a second. All in favor of the amendment?

Unanimous. All in favor of the motion?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I'm going to abstain on all of these motions.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. So we have six for; one abstention.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Now we're back to the inclusion -- okay. You haven't got that in there yet, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: The inclusion of schools, churches, government, quasi government?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.
DARREN GURNEE: And we'd like to put that -- where was the exact location?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: After Type III LAMIRD, "including," and then it would say schools, churches, and the other language.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. As such. Is that what you were...?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: You need the word "including" at the start.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Now you've got it.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Want to read it, Jim, real quickly? Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The motion that we're voting on now would be the language that Darren just added in, plus the previous language we just voted to add in from Joe. So if we approve that, then this is the final vote.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay with the second?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Second.


All right.
DARREN GURNEE: The next item is on No. 7 on page 12 under Landscaping, specifically to add language that says identification of plant species is not required in a site plan. Native -- that's prior to the "native water-wise plantings are encouraged." This is to make -- try to make it easier for an applicant. They don't necessarily need to say what type of plant you're going to put there, just that it's low-lying.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll make a motion to replace the verbiage with the staff recommended.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Discussion? All in favor? Unanimous. No. One abstain or negative, Joe?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Abstain.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Next.

DARREN GURNEE: Next we have on page 12 you have your remove and replace language that is more of a clarification as it was before for the square footage. This directly relates to the earlier motion that was passed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve the remove and replace as stated.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Seconded by Erin.
Discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think we discussed it to death.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All in favor?

Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: We have on page 13 a couple of items. This is the regulations on electronic signs. I believe we have covered most of these, but there were a couple of items that were in the work study. So the multiple references for electronic signs with incorrect interpretations of code. "As proposed, electronic signs are allowed, billboards are prohibited." But there was a mention in the work study of electronic billboards, not wanting to be allowed. So I believe that discussion is covered in the fact that billboards are already prohibited.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So no action required?

DARREN GURNEE: According to staff you would not need to do any kind of motion that would require prohibition of billboards.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Not required. I do not hear any motions, so next up. Darren, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Can we address DG42?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: DG42.
DARREN GURNEE: On the screen.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: That's the hold on the electronic signs. I'd like to revisit that.

DARREN GURNEE: This was the motion passed to limit to a minimum of 24 hours, except for emergency and safety messages, for any and all electronic signage.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: We did discuss that, and I would like to reopen that discussion briefly. We are allowing electronic signs in the urban areas, and it just seems punitive to make the signs not be able to change for 24 hours at a time. And I know one of the objections was that it's distracting to driving. I would like to propose a one-hour limit, or even a 30-minute limit. I just -- I'm still feeling that 24 hours is just punitive and is defeating the purpose of an electronic sign.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I'd like to chime in on that too. I mean when I go back to the fairgrounds where they've got multiple events coming up in the course of the month of August, the idea of them only being able to advertise it for 24 hours at a time and then flip to the next one, they are supposed to catch our attention, hopefully when we're sitting in traffic and not driving by, but the point is to get that
information out. And I -- I agree with you that this is overreaching.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Before I hear any kind of a motion, because I don't just yet, do we have any kind of reference to go back to that for the kinds of examples that were mentioned, specifically something like "our fairgrounds" or other kinds of businesses, Linda, within the Urban Growth Area that you're thinking of that could just give us an example like the fairgrounds but in an Urban Growth Area that would be harmed by something like a 24-hour flip standard?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Different events at schools or community centers that have different events. You know, the purpose is to advertise them to let the public know, and it just --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there, Darren, any kind of a crossover point between reasonableness from a business standpoint and distraction from the standpoint of a motorist or a passenger? Is there any standards or is it just judgment?

DARREN GURNEE: In terms of -- so what you're talking about here with the hold time and the transition and the distraction of drivers, from a business standpoint, don't know if I can speak to that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Well, my
understanding is, from a business I would imagine that
their preference would be to leave it on or allow it to
be flipped as frequently as possible.

DARREN GURNEE: The preference is to get the
message across. If it's going across too fast, then
you may not have the effect that you want.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Chances are 24 hours
is not too fast.

DARREN GURNEE: 24 hours is not too fast.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I think the
suggestion is to come back from that somewhere, right,
Linda?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Yeah, I think we've swung
too far the other direction.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Point of order.

In order -- in order to come back to it you've got to
have somebody that voted on the winning side bring it
up for reconsideration. If you voted on the losing
side you don't get to bring it up again.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I'd like to remind the
group that most of us voted on the winning side so
that's only one person against.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: You know, I don't
want to cut off discussion, but I thought we had a
pretty full and complete discussion back then. And,
you know, in the vein of discussion, I live by the
fairgrounds. I drive by that sign on the fairgrounds
multiple times a day. I'm the most likely person that
changing it more often than 24 hours would be to see
it. For 85 percent of the population in Kitsap County,
changing it more often than every 24 hours, they don't
see it once every ten days so it doesn't mean anything
there. Now, down inside the UGA where all of us go and
where many of us or a much larger percentage of us,
changing it more often may have some validity, but we
still need to follow our rules.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So to Jim's
parliamentary point, do we have someone on the winning
side prepared to make a motion which will then allow us
to continue the discussion?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: A motion for
reconsideration.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes. A motion for
reconsideration of a prior positive vote. Am I not
hearing a motion?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I don't remember how I
voted, so...

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I was the no.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: So I am a yes. So I am
requesting a reconsideration, a motion --
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: A motion to reconsider takes two-thirds vote.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do you want to be more specific so we really have something to bite on like reconsideration from 24 hours to or just reconsideration?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I would do that. From 24 hours to once an hour.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Moved and seconded by Linda. Now, 24 versus an hour. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Now, this is only within the UGA or the LAMIRD? As it reads right now on line 2 it's all prohibited out of the UGAs and LAMIRDS. Anywhere else, other than schools, churches, and public safety agencies, quasi government, whatever, it's not allowed. So now we're only -- we're only talking about businesses in the UGAs?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I would think.

Although it's not a specific part --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'm wanting to make sure that --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It's just one comment. I would imagine that if we change from -- I'm not sure -- 24 to one, if you're a school or a fire department, and all of a sudden a standard for UGAs is flip it every hour, I think we may be opening up flipping or changing with greater frequency to those who have the okay to go ahead and use that kind of sign now. So I think we're into a broader area, at least as I perceive it.

Yes, Darren.

DARREN GURNEE: I would like to shed some clarification on it. If you -- it may be helpful to reference if you have the interchangeable letter signs, this is almost kind of the equivalent of saying that every hour you would be able to change the letters on a sign of that type. That's kind of the equivalent of what you're talking about right now. So if you have a business and you have a sign that you want to change, in terms of being consistent within the code, it would also be something where you might address that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Which --

DARREN GURNEE: The reader boards as also electronic signs, if it's electronic or a manual reader board, if you're changing or restricting the hold time, it's the equivalent of saying they can't put up those
letters manually.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No.

DARREN GURNEE: But just in an electronic form.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: This is more specifically electronic signs.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes, it is. I -- I -- it is that specifically.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And going down the road you just went down, now I'm going to monitor everybody with a little sign board that goes out and changes a number.

DARREN GURNEE: And I'm not saying that that's what should occur. I'm just saying that that's kind of the reference to what you're talking about.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We have a motion from 24 to one. Is there further discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, I don't know that we have as such. We had a motion to reconsider.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: A motion for reconsideration with a second. Yep.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: I just would remind the chair that it's going to require six votes affirmative to reconsider.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: To reconsider has
-- the motion maker has to be previously voting in the
affirmative or the winning side, and it takes a
two-thirds majority.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Does it make sense to
even have a set time? Because if I recall the
argument, we were trying to prohibit them from changing
the sign every few seconds, that sort of rapid fire
thing that was a problem with safety. So I'm -- I'm
still confused about how we got from this rapid fire
every few seconds thing that we were concerned about
safety to 24 hours. So I'm wondering how the pendulum
got so far and --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I think because the
motion was made, seconded, and approved.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: And we might have just
been exhausted. So I'm not sure that -- that putting
the specific time in the code is necessary.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: If I could
speak to that. The reasoning, and I think Jim was the
one that -- sorry -- Jim Svensson spoke about quite a
bit, was the testimony was people wanted the ease of a
programmable sign, not necessarily a message center
that scrolled every three seconds. And this would
allow for people to -- Silverdale Lutheran, for
example, to change their sign so they could have a
chance to say they're going to have a warming station
or there's dinner tonight or whatever was going on that
they needed their sign to say, and for the ease of
rather than going out and manually changing their
letters every day. And so I think the way he proposed
it that this was a compromise to allow for an
electronic message center, but not have it scrolling,
and allow for the ease of change, but to use it the
same as the reader board signs.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I have a question for
staff. So the signs that we currently have on
Silverdale Way, with this sign code coming in, those
timings would not be affected, correct? They'd still
be under previous code that they were allowed to be
built with?

DARREN GURNEE: I believe that would go to --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Nonconforming.

DARREN GURNEE: Nonconforming. I would
actually have to confirm that, though. I don't think I
am the one to make that interpretation right now.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I too am looking at
it, and even the one hour, I look at it from the
business side and think they are paying for advertising
for it, and even an hour seems -- punitive is a good
word. I mean it's a lot better than 24 hours, but I'm not sure that that's the best answer for a business. And that's why I was wondering about the existing signs because they don't -- the ones down Silverdale Way, they're not scrolling quickly. They're not like how Klahowya is. But they do change with what Walgreens may have for sale or what's going on at the Y, and I'm -- I don't know. Do I get to vote on -- do I get to be part of --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Right now we have a motion for reconsideration.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And we have a second.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: We do need to take a vote to see if we can reconsider.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If I can make a suggestion to the motion maker. I think you would have a better chance of getting there if you made a motion just to reconsider, and then let us work our way through the various reconsiderations as to making a motion to reconsider a specific thing. Because on this one there's a whole bunch of different opinions, and I don't know that you're going to get two-thirds if you make it too specific.
COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'm agreeable to that. I make a -- make a motion to reconsider the amount of time on the signs for hold.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: How about the second?

Second okay with that language?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And that was Linda secondering the altered words on the motion for reconsideration.

Ready to vote? All in favor of reconsideration?

One, two, three, four, five, six. Okay. Motion passes, and now the process of reconsideration.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Could I make one point here that I think this -- this topic is going to eat up the rest of our time. Can we put this aside and bring this up at the end, towards the end, let people think about what their positions are going to be, and move forward with the rest of the changes that we have here? Because I was looking through and we're not that far away.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Chair, that's procedure. That's up to you.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Fine. Okay. We won't forget it, but let's differ for a bit.

DARREN GURNEE: So would that come back to me
then for proceeding through?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes. Next.

DARREN GURNEE: I'm actually going to take
the entire electronic signage page and hold that off
for that conversation.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Good. Definitely
bring us back to that.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay. Master Sign Plan on
page 16. There were -- in the work study there were
concerns expressed regarding whether a previously
approved development would be allowed to change signage
to reflect new sign code if less restrictive, and we
had already addressed this through we're going to look
into the permit language for changing a conditional use
permit that was already approved to allow a new sign.
This was specific to Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless'
comments in the permitting section.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We're still
waiting for staff to reply on this.

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So my
question is, in here you have it as a Type I process,
but the actual permit approval for the project whether
it's a conditional use permit is not a Type I.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I would agree
with that comment, that whatever the process type for
the project was should be the type required for
changes.

DARREN GURNEE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If it was a
Type I, then, yeah, it's a Type I now, but if it was a
Type II or a III --

DARREN GURNEE: The way this is -- so the
language that is here, this is for a new Master Sign
Plan. What you're discussing is back in the permitting
section when we come up with the language saying that
you have to change the condition, the original
conditions. The Master Sign Plan for a new sign plan
would be a Type I process.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: But it didn't
used to be, right?

DARREN GURNEE: I believe this is consistent
with what we have right now for a Master Sign Plan.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm going to ask
you to check that.

DARREN GURNEE: But I will check.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Can I ask for
an example of when you would use the Master Sign Plan
when you had a project approval that had signage with
it, how would they be separate?
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The mall was not.

The Master Sign Plan and the mall approval were
together.

DARREN GURNEE: The Master Sign Plan allows
for either businesses that are located close to each
other to consolidate their efforts to have one sign or
it allows you to have -- or it requires if you have
multiple businesses on one parcel that you have a
signage plan that accounts for changes in the future.
So if you have an extra business that comes into a
tenant space that got split, it identifies how you're
going to provide signage for that new tenant. When
you're talking about a previously approved project,
you're going to have to go through that process to get
the conditions changed, not through this. But this was
-- at the time that this was discussed in terms of the
conditions, it was at the time we were going over the
Master Sign Plan in the work study. So I was just
saying that we are covering this in a previous
component. I don't believe you need to address it
here.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So are you
going to remove that? Will that be just taken out
completely?

DARREN GURNEE: No. The information here is
going -- there's no recommendation to remove or replace or any of that for this. But there was a note here that you wanted to discuss that item.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So maybe to make it clearer we need to reference back to permitting where we talk about the condition -- like a conditional use permit and --

DARREN GURNEE: Yeah. So what --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: That might make it clearer so that people don't get confused between, well, I did a Master Sign Plan, but I have a conditional use permit.

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Can you do that, Darren?

DARREN GURNEE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. So are we there?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No. I think we need an answer from staff on that.

DARREN GURNEE: We need an answer for the conditions of approval, modification language if you're going to modify it to try and acquire a new permit.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Right.

DARREN GURNEE: We still need to provide
information.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Also, was previous sign plans done as a Type I or with plan developments and other things that those sign plans were done in conjunction with that, was that different than a Type I decision?

DARREN GURNEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So you've got two questions there you need to come back with answers.

DARREN GURNEE: Next item is going to be for arm signs. The language here, basically the change on this is to allow the same sign size, but if you wanted to have two posts you could. It provides that flexibility, instead of just having one post up and over. So that's the only change that this is recommending.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Moved and seconded.

Discussion? All in favor? Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: Next item is going to be on the page 25. We are recommending the removal of the wall mural sign detail sheet as we are --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Darren, what about page 22? You've given it for reference only, but
I think we ought to get a cut at is it for reference only or do we want to make a change there.

DARREN GURNEE: The -- on page 22 there was a comment of reference, and that -- those are the definitions that we previously motioned and passed and put into the definition section.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So the change was the Type III change?

DARREN GURNEE: There was no change. It was just to provide the information of what a Type III LAMIRD was. Those definitions are included, though, per your previous motions.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Under murals.

DARREN GURNEE: Wall mural sign detail sheet, we are proposing to remove this.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Remove wall mural detail sheet and associated definition?

DARREN GURNEE: The entire page here.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Based on what we previously did, I don't think we can now do that. If the wall mural is associated to the -- the picture is associated to the business on which the wall is painted, then you still need this.

DARREN GURNEE: If the picture is attached --
if the mural is considered to be a sign, it would be considered to be a wall sign.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: As opposed to a mural?

DARREN GURNEE: As opposed to any kind of regulations that you would have with a mural.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I thought that your answer to Linda was that only that portion of the sign where it said -- when we're using the example of the feed store in Silverdale, only that portion of the sign that said "Feed Store" would be considered.

DARREN GURNEE: That -- that is correct. So when you're discussing this -- this item, the mural itself would not necessarily be a sign, but the text within it would be a wall sign that is regulated through the -- through that square footage requirement that we identify earlier.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Linda, if you're happy with that, I'll go with it, but I'm not sure I am.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So the complexity that -- that I worry about is, so the feed store words may then exceed the square footage allowed. What's the remedy? Fixing an art -- piece of artwork is not an easy process.
DARREN GURNEE: No, it is not.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: And you might damage the piece of art or the historic value of the piece of art by trying to make the words feed store smaller or different or whatever to comply with your square footage. Seems to me like you're forced into a conditional use process or some variance process that's also expensive.

DARREN GURNEE: If the sign is there, it's a nonconforming sign and, as written, wouldn't be required to change. But then for a new sign, you would have to conform to the square footage requirements.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I see where you're going. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further comments about this or can we move?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I have a question, just because it came up now. The feed store, the mural is on one end of the building. The lineal foot measurement is that end of the building and where it faces; is that correct?

DARREN GURNEE: It is the facade where the sign is located, yes. If you had a five-sided building, you'd have five different facades.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: You'd have a
different -- different sign size --

DARREN GURNEE: With a total overall area.

Like if you had four sides to a building, and you have a 25-foot by an 80-foot building, that front space would be allowed a 50 square foot sign. The side of the building would be 160. But the overall total for the entire building would be 100. I'd have to look at the figures to be exact, but that allowed -- the intent for that was if you have a business that fronts onto a road, you can have a sign on that side. But then the internal circulation, vehicular circulation, you can have a sign on that side. And right now it's been very difficult for some businesses to do that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I think what Darren is telling us is no motion is required to --
pardon me. A motion is required.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yep.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. Move to remove this sheet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Second?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Discussion? Joe.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'm good.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All in favor?
Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: We are going to go to page 27 for nonconforming signs. And we provided a memo that identified -- I believe Karen got that to you -- for the different types of amortization possibilities. There are some that identify a ten-year amortization. To be consistent with Kitsap County, there is no amortization for structures and things of that nature. And then there's also a little bit of information providing the basis of amortizations, which is a little too much to go into right now.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So we've got 27 pages plus 6 pages -- 8 pages on amortization.

Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to have staff write up an amortization for signs covering a ten-year period using the style and format, but not necessarily the exact same language, of Tacoma. Much more simple straight to the point.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Joe seconds it.

You want to provide a brief description of what that is unless staff happens to know.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Staff -- basically what that is ten years from the date of passage -- and theirs did not have a secondary time frame, I don't think -- all signs in a nonconforming status would have be to redesigned, rebuilt, whatever, to come into conforming status that -- in addition, I don't think the Tacoma one required nonconforming permit. Is that correct, Darren?

DARREN GURNEE: I don't believe so.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay. One of the other cities required that nonconforming signs obtain a nonconforming sign permit. And there were, I think, two different methods. One, you just had to know on your own that you weren't conforming and apply. And if you didn't apply within I think it was 60 or 90 days, tough luck, you lost your chance and now you gotta tear the sign down. The other method was where the -- the jurisdiction would notify you of a nonconforming sign, and you had to apply for a nonconforming sign permit within so many days of the notice or, oops, your sign's gotta come down. Tacoma just doesn't do that. It doesn't say anything. It says if you have a previously legally built sign, you can keep it there for ten years, except for if it's destroyed or if -- greater of 50 percent of value. It's got some things in there
typical of nonconforming language. But it says at the end of ten years you've got to bring your signs into conformance.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We've got a motion. We have a second. Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: I'm a little concerned regarding the very beginning of this where they talked about legal precedence about being compensated for taken. And I would certainly want to make sure that we protect the County, however that's possible, in a way that if we do an amortization table for ten years that ten years from now we don't start getting sued for someone saying we're taking the value of the sign. I'm not sure. And it didn't get -- it was discussed in the overall, and I didn't see how Tacoma dealt with that.

And the other one is I think we need to have a pretty tight definition of abandonment. The phrase is used in everybody's calculation in here, but it kind of goes around what's defined as abandoned or not. So if we're looking at writing this up we need to put that in too.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Can you react in realtime, Darren? Those are interesting ideas.

DARREN GURNEE: The reason why we did not include an amortization schedule was primarily for that
reason, out of concern for future legalities and things because it had been viewed a couple of times that that had been challenged. But there is -- as Shelley had told you earlier that there are reasonable ways to do it so we can provide language for that.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And my motion would include that when staff builds the language that they build it in conjunction with Shelley to give us the maximum protection that she feels is necessary.

And further speaking for the motion, I don't know about everybody else's reason for doing the sign code at all. My reason isn't just to have a better code for people to use. It's also to get control of signs, to not have us end up like a whole lot of different places I've seen where signs get out of hand. And if you continually have different versions of what's approved, you never get that under control. So it's -- I'm giving the max time that I think has been recommended to us, which is ten years, to let everybody know that, and try to keep as much of the work for the department off of their shoulders. Folks should know about it, and it would be up to enforcing the ordinance for problem -- problem signs at the ten-year date.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion on this motion? All in favor? Any opposed? Unanimous
once again.

Is that it, Darren? Do we now back up to -- have we covered --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No. We've got one more page.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We do.

DARREN GURNEE: We have one more page. Yes, we'll go through these. The contractor's license section, we, through the work study, had identified that we wanted to discuss removing that requirement and the references in the document. And this was something specific to your discussions that you wanted to have.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Before I attempt a motion, to staff, is there a definition anywhere to what constitutes a licensed contractor for signs?

DARREN GURNEE: It was -- it's not a sign license. It's just a contractor's license, not specific to signs.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Joe.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Had a discussion earlier with the permitting group person. The actual permit as it goes right now is the person will fill out the permit request. That will be sent to the building department for review, which at that point they're
looking at structures and that. So if they have enough
information and that they will go ahead and pass it.
My intent on limiting the requirement for a contractor
is is that there are plenty capable people, given the
right plans and approved, can do this work.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So you're arguing
against the motion or against --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, I'm arguing for
the removal of the contractor requirement.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That is not the
motion, is it?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Oh, it isn't?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I thought the motion
was to approve the language. Oh, the motion is to
remove it. Got it. Sorry. Excuse me.

DARREN GURNEE: There has not been a motion
made yet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So we moved and
seconded to adopt the language of removal of the
requirement for the license. Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Darren, would you
help me out on what a blade sign is?

DARREN GURNEE: Blade sign is a sign that is
coming out from the side of a building. Typically
you'll see them in a pedestrian friendly --
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: You just passed it.

DARREN GURNEE: I don't think so. I think it's these guys.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: What is the risk issue that the county is concerned about that causes them to want to have a contractor license?

DARREN GURNEE: The risk was going to be a public safety if it's installed incorrectly and it falls.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Falls down.

DARREN GURNEE: However, we do feel comfortable that the building permit process, the way it is, would suffice for something like that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion?

KAREN ASHCRAFT: Who seconded the motion?

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: There's some concerns about addition --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Hang on a minute, Tom.

Karen.

KAREN ASHCRAFT: Who seconded the motion?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Joe, I think.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No. I don't think
anybody made the motion.

    COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah, we had
questions. We don't have a motion yet.

    COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Still waiting for a
motion. Okay. We're already discussing, but let's
back up and see if we can get a motion.

    COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I'll make the motion
that we replace -- we do the replacement of the
requirement for a contractor license.

    COMMISSIONER FORITANO: To adopt the language
that's under discussion, remove the contractor's
license requirement?

    COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Correct.

    COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

    COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

    COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. Seconded by
Karanne.

    And now further discussion?

    COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Well, the motion -- do
you want to defend your motion first before I oppose
it?

    COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: As I -- as I stated,
the county building department reviews the sign permits
for structural and safety compliance. If they look
through and they say it's approved, the person building
it should be able to do so, except -- and I should make
this qualification. There are electrical requirements
that require a contractor to do that. But structurally
there is no requirement for a contractor. I'm not even
sure if there is a sign contractor.

DARREN GURNEE: Not specific to signs.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, it's a
construction contractor.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: My only concern is not
with new buildings that are permitted and signed off,
but for additions and changes. And say I want to put
up a canopy, but, you know, I think I can drill into
concrete myself and maybe this bolt -- this size bolt
will hold, but I'm not sure but, you know, I'll do it
anyway. Liability concerns are transferred to the
contractor if a contractor does it, and the likelihood
of it staying up is a little better. So that would be
my -- I would say this because it's a private little
admission that I once upon a time was a sign maker, and
I did make a sign that I knew -- I did not know if it
was safe, and so I did not install that sign, but I
gave it to the proprietor on the condition that he
install it and that I have no liability for it.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: But if we're doing
the permitting process properly, somebody, the maker of
the sign or the installer of the sign has to go through
the county and get it permitted. And I'm -- I'm
comfortable if the county looks at it and says those
bolts are the right size, they're sinking to the right
level, fine.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Would the sign
permit show that level of detail? That's what I'm
worried about.

DARREN GURNEE: It would require to if it
were going to be placed on a building. That was the
intent; that they would be required to provide that
information.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And, Joe, give
you my for instance, in fact the one we dealt with last
time, and that's flagpoles. You put up that 50-foot
flagpole and then hang a 16 to 20-foot long flag on it,
that takes a little bit of design work to ensure that
that flagpole is adequate. And it's -- I would rather
have somebody that is licensed to do that than have Joe
Blow anybody put that up. Notice that we've got a
table here, and not every sign requires it. But I
think that some of the signs that we're talking about
here, pole, monument, and pylon signs -- and pylon's
probably going to have to come out since we already
pulled it -- but roof signs. It seems to me that
having somebody put it up that knows what they're doing
is -- is appropriate, and also, you know, they get a
license and agree to take liability.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion?
Okay. All in favor of the motion to remove? All
opposed? Six opposed; two for. Okay.
Do we back up to -- no. I guess we have one more,
don't we.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We have two more.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: County -- we have one
for reference and one...

DARREN GURNEE: The remove of a pylon sign
from Table 1b.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yep.
COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So moved.
COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Second.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Second.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Discussion? All in
favor? Unanimous.

DARREN GURNEE: And the last one here for
this page 28 is the removal at sign owner's expense has
been changed to comments that were made earlier by
Commissioner Sommerhauser about a yard that allowed you
to place signs -- let me take my curser off of it here.
So talking about replacing that language with "marked and placed in a retrieval yard for the first offense, or disposed of if the first offense mark was applied in a prior incident. Repeat violators may be charged for sign removal."

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And I'm okay with that repeat violators part.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve as proposed.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll second that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda seconds.

Motion made and seconded. Discussion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Is there not within the traffic rules in the county that if something is obstructing vehicular right-of-way it is removed? It doesn't matter whether it's a sign, structure, whatever, if it's in the right-of-way it would be removed.

DARREN GURNEE: I believe public...

DAVID GREETHAM: Dave Greetham here. I don't know if it's specifically in the rules, but certainly public works does enforce that. They have a right-of-way division that spends a good chunk of their
day enforcing that.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: So it's not -- this one, there is a back-up to the position of, yes, it is in the sign code, but if it is in the right-of-way it will be removed.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And Darren, check me. Didn't -- didn't we make some provision previously that when we were talking about right-of-way we specifically said not on the sidewalk.

DARREN GURNEE: That's correct, or you were not allowed to place a sign that would impede vehicular or pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So we have a motion. We have a second. Further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? One opposed.

We do have Linda's -- take us back to electronic. And did we cover Jim's request for a motion relative to the sign height on poles?

DARREN GURNEE: We have not covered that yet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. So we have two items. Yes.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: And we have a third. Variances.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Variances. Okay.

Thank you. One, two, three.
COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So should I bring that up now?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Please. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay.

Currently variances aren't done as a Type I in the zoning code.

DAVID GREETHAM: Dave Greetham here. Except for the -- I believe there's still a provision for a ten percent director's variance. You're correct. Typically variances are a Type III process that require a public hearing.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: So a sign, especially one if it needs -- you know, there's a unique special circumstance, that seems to me needs to be a Type III because the variance because that allows for the neighbors to comment on that. Just allowing the director to say yea or nay to a variance doesn't give, especially with a sign, neighbors the opportunity to comment.

DAVID GREETHAM: And if I can clarify your comments here. Type I, for those who don't know, is a director's or an internal administrative decision, no public review or comments. A Type II requires a public comment period of two weeks, does not require a public hearing. A Type III requires that public comment
period and the additional public hearing. So I just wanted to clarify that.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, I guess my concern is that if somebody doesn't like the code, I mean, and depending on, you know, what the situation is, there's a lot of unique circumstances with signs where people want variances. And to just grant them outright, I don't think that's fair to the neighbors. So I would make a motion to change that to a Type III process.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And Linda seconds. Type III on variances. And again, Dave, the Type III is public notice and public hearing?

DAVID GREETHAM: Yeah. Type III is public notice and a public hearing.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Before the hearing examiner?

DAVID GREETHAM: In front of the county hearing examiner. There is an increased cost, but it's an increased process as well.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We have a motion. We have a second. Is there a discussion?
COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I don't see where a
-- Type III is what I would consider almost overkill, I
think. And a Type II, where you're giving time for
comments and that to come in and the hearing is -- it
goes before the --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Director.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: -- director. You
know, on the variances, I don't know how much effort we
want to put in. And is there -- and I guess the other
thought is, is there -- if a hearing director wants to
say this is a real -- larger problem than I thought,
can they kick it up to a Type III?

DAVID GREETHAM: I believe it has to be
specified upfront in your decision here.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: It could be
appealed, I believe, if they didn't like the decision
of the director or the staff.

DAVID GREETHAM: So a Type II offers a
comment period and an appeal process. The Type III has
the public hearing and then the appeal process after
the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: But the thing
I would add with the Type II is it puts the onus on the
neighbors to appeal if they don't like the decision of
-- and have a public hearing to get their comments,
versus having everything out in the open and upfront, and it doesn't -- with the Type III, I think that's a fairer process because, remember, these aren't -- these are projects, mostly commercial, that have gone through different types of review already. So if they're asking for a variance, it's probably going to be few and far between. How many have you done?

DARREN GURNEE: How many variances?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Yeah. Sign variances.

DARREN GURNEE: I wouldn't have that number in front of me.

I will call your attention to there are some -- some things that will prevent just a lot of variances from coming through. Number 3, specifically, that they can't have any other sign alternatives, that you basically have to have no other alternative to actually get a variance.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Dave, what's the notification boundary for a Type II? 400 square feet?

DAVID GREETHAM: 400 square feet. I believe in our rural we've gone up to 800. This would -- well, it may occur in rural areas. So the rural areas, if I'm correct with the most recent changes, 800 feet, but at a minimum 400 feet surrounding the project.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. We have a motion. We have a second. Further discussion?

Yes, Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Is type -- Type I is appealable; is that correct?

DAVID GREETHAM: Type I is appealable, but it doesn't receive a public notice. So somebody would have had to express interest in it to receive the decision when it's made.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So as a neighbor I wouldn't necessarily even know --

DAVID GREETHAM: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: -- they had appealed -- or excuse me -- had asked for a variance?

DAVID GREETHAM: That is correct on a Type I, unless you specifically had knowledge and asked the department for their decision.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to amend to make it a Type II decision with the notification boundary outside the UGA to be no less than 1,000 feet.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that amendment?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'll second that.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda seconds it.

Discussion on the amendment?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Type II gives notice to the world. It also gives notice of the decision so that the appeal is known. But I don't think that in the rural area we -- one of the reasons the department is voluntarily going to a bigger limit is because 400 feet isn't much out in the rural area. So make it specifically 1,000 feet to try to get more notification to neighbors in the area.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Question for staff.

On the current 400 or 800 feet, is that from the location of the sign or is that the exterior corners of a tax parcel.

DAVID GREETHAM: I'm going to look for Karen's nod on this. She coordinates this. I think it's from the tax parcel.

KAREN ASHCRAFT: It is the parcel itself.

DAVID GREETHAM: From the boundary of the parcel.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: The entire outside boundary. Thank you.

DAVID GREETHAM: Karen, am I correct that it's 800 feet in the rural areas currently?
KAREN ASHCRAFT: 800 feet is really good.

The rural areas, they're so much larger and so, you know, 1,000 is just a few more neighbors, actually, on 20-acre parcels.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Yeah. You're not getting very many people.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Got a motion to amend. Got a second. Further discussion? All in favor of the amendment? One, two, three, four, five, six. Opposed? Two. Amendment carries.

Back to the motion, the original motion.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: As amended.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: As amended. Further discussion on the motion as amended?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: And the reason I'm specifying in the ordinance 1,000 feet is I believe that the 800 feet is an internal administrative thing, and I don't want to leave that subject to the next guy changing it back to 400 feet, which is the only regulation.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Time out. I think I got confused. Did we vote on what my motion was or did we vote on the amendment that he added?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We voted in the
affirmative to amend your motion.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So now we're on a Type II with 1,000.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All in favor of the original motion amended as just read? We have -- I believe we have one, two, three, six. One, two, seven. I'm sorry. Seven. Opposed? One. Okay. Motion carries.

And so electronic signs and Jim Svensson's motion, correct?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Do we need to break, Karen? 5:30 if we're going to do pizza or do we need to break now to come back at six?

KAREN ASHCRAFT: The pizzas are here.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Okay.

KAREN ASHCRAFT: If you want hot food.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: What is your -- what's your pleasure? Break now or finish?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, I don't think the two items that -- two or three items that staff has they're going to be able to get back to us today. Are you?

DAVID GREETHAM: Exactly. Dave Greetham
here. I don't have the answers right now for those questions.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: So I would propose that we go ahead and break now. And if staff cannot get the answers by the end of the agenda for tonight's meeting, then we'll continue over and pick those three answers up at our next meeting and finish then.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: How about Jim Svensson's motion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I can do that one right now.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Let's do that one at least.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to adopt Jim's motion.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Do you all have the detail of Jim's motion?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Motion to adopt seconded. Any discussion? All in favor?

So we have one item left, right, for after the public hearing if staff -- okay. Good enough. We're adjourned until six.

(Interruption by the court
reporter. No break was
taken.)

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Thank you. It was
unanimous. Sorry about that. Thank you for asking.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Are we going
to the electronics?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: If in fact -- I think
-- where did we leave off?

DARREN GURNEE: We are going back to --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We had agreed to
reconsider. We don't have a specific time. We were in
discussion about see if we can find a consensus. A
consensus on a new time only requires a majority vote.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Ready to vote?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I think we were
talking about eliminating a specific time on the length
electronic sign had to turn over.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We are -- we are
approved to reconsider. Now what we are reconsidering
is whether or not a time specific or complete
elimination.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Are we're still
discussing?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Okay. I am holding out
for the 24-hour time period. I -- for the following reasons: First of all, it still maintains the usefulness of changing a message, such as a gas station might change their price once a day. A church might say they need to do their outreach, whatever they're doing, once a day. They don't need to give you multiple messages. A digital sign that changes gives a person driving down the road an anticipation that they're going to see a new message if they just keep paying attention. That, I don't think is a useful function. Many many functions can be performed with the change once in 24 hours rendering an electronic sign useful for that purpose. The irritation is removed and the message is maintained. Once an hour is very difficult to police. Once it's between the hours of midnight and six a.m. is not that difficult to police.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Yes, Linda.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Well, I would -- I appreciate Tom's point of view. I guess where I'm having the heartburn is that we are allowing electronic signs in the urban area, and I know a lot of us are not fans of those. And I feel that it's insincere to allow them in the urban area and then do an end run around the purpose of them and -- and not allow them to allow
them to function, basically freeze the message for 24
hours. So and it's to me an end run and it's not being
sincere and not what -- what I think we're trying to
accomplish. I understand that the flashing and the --
is irritating and it can be distracting. But I think
if there was a longer than three-second hold time we
could overcome that, and so that is why I asked for the
reconsideration. So what that time frame is I think is
what we're discussing.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further questions,
comments, opinions?

Yes, Jim.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: From the previous
discussion, most of the signs that we're talking about
have the capability of multiple lines of entry. And
right now with the three-second hold you get one
announced event -- and I'm using the fairgrounds. You
get one announced event and five lines of amplified
advertisement for that event, where it is capable of --
the fairgrounds could put up the date and what the
event is and put up six different events on that sign
that they currently have. How much -- when we're
driving, how much advertising should we be reading
instead of watching the road. And I -- if you're going
to have it a short time frame, then there is the
expectation of the driver driving down it's going to
change while I'm looking at it, which means I'm looking
at it and I'm not looking at the road.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. So your
argument is in support of Tom, 24 hours?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I can come down
to something less than 24 hours to let the messages
change, but I don't -- I don't think that again we're
being sincere, because it is a sign that you drive by.
Very few people sit where they can see the sign all day
and watch it change.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, obviously it
doesn't work for the sign that tells you that there's a
two-hour backup on the ferry. It needs to change,
depending on how long the backup is on the ferry or --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We've already
exempted that.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: -- whether the Hood
Canal bridge is open.

So I recognize it's exempted, but still the point
is made that some signs are designed to alert you about
an event, that the event is more dynamic than 24 hours,
whether that's a social event or a sales event or a
traffic event. But our events in this society are more
dynamic than 24 hours.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Where is the reduction less than 24?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I think we don't put it in code, is what I think.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: The motion, I believe, is an hour, correct?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: I didn't hear you, Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I think we don't put the limit in code.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is that an amendment or an opinion?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: An opinion.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: An opinion.

Further questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: One of the things we're talking about is that these are advertising signs. So when we're talking about them advertising their event or their business, that's the point of them, and that's not a point of condemnation for them. If they've got -- I mean we'll go to the Y. You know, they've got something going and it has two more lines on it that talk about that item, that's the advertisement for the item, and we are allowing that
here in the county. So I too don't know where the time
frame is, so I'm not going to push on it. But I do
think we shouldn't beat up on these signs because
they're doing what we're allowing them to do in the
first place.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Further questions or
comments before we vote on the change from 24 to one
hour, the reconsidered motion? All in favor to --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We just had a
motion to reconsider. We don't have --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I thought we passed
--

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We changed that
at my suggestion to just reconsider.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And we did not pass
that motion to reconsider?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: No. We passed
the motion by that two-thirds to reconsider.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Okay. But we do have
the motion of change from 24 to X.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Yeah. To X. Now
we --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We need a
motion. And the discussion has ranged from zero to
something less than 24. Motion, please? Dare you?
COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I will -- I will make
a motion that we remove the time reference from the
regulation.
COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: I'll second that.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: We have a motion.
It's seconded. Discussion? Further discussion?
COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: How does that affect
what we did if we take the time out of the code?
DARREN GURNEE: The --
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: It takes their
time out of it also.
DARREN GURNEE: The -- from what I'm
understanding, you're talking about removing the hold
time?
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Correct.
DARREN GURNEE: If you remove the hold time,
then you run the risk of it becoming animation. I will
say that. The hold time is specific to keep a single
frame. And if you have multiple frames without any
hold time, then that is your animation. So this is
kind of defining what is not considered animation.
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Like to discuss this
over pizza?
COMMISSIONER ROWE: I'd like to make a motion
that --
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: It has to be --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It has to be an amendment.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- an amendment.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I amend the motion to put a 30-minute time frame on the message being changed on the electronic signs.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Question. Does that affect your comment about any time frame comment about animation? Does any time frame like minutes affect your comment you just made about animation?

DARREN GURNEE: I don't believe so. That's why there was the definition of animation upfront in the definition section, but it didn't clarify timing of those frames as to how fast they go by. So I believe 30 minutes would be appropriate, but that is a subjective matter. Animation is usually interpreted as a fluid of images across the screen.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We have --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Would you accept a friendly [indiscernible].

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I certainly would.

(Interruption by the court
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COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: -- which is the transition time to be no less than ten seconds. So it's 30-minute hold time, and the transition time of no less than ten seconds.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And the logic behind that?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Flashing. You shut the sign off, it's dead for ten seconds, and then it comes back. If you have a one-second hold time right now, when it changes, it flashes up a new sign.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Linda --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: If you're there when you're watching it, that flash, especially for nighttime, is disturbing.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: So it would be on hold.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: The message would have to stay there for 30 minutes. The transition time means the message would go away and a new message wouldn't appear for ten seconds.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So that's a further restriction on anything that is fluid, that could be considered fluid.

Linda, acceptable to you, yea or nay?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I don't know. Does
anyone have any --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Linda, if you
don't want to take it as a friendly, then don't take
it.

COMMISSIONER ROWE: Okay. I'll stick with my
original motion.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We have
an amendment and second to the amendment. Are we ready
to vote? All in favor? Opposed? Four opposed; three
in favor. Amended motion fails.

We're back to the original motion, which is?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Which is as is,
which is our previous approved motion which is 24
hours.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: 24 hours. Does this
end the discussion or are there further motions on
this?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: May I suggest we
talk over pizza?

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Fine with me.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: See if we can
find anything we can come to agreement on.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Fine with me. Any
severe objections to that?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Well, I don't
think we're supposed to have discussions outside of the tape, so we can't discuss it over pizza.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. You're exact -- my opinion, you're exactly right. We've paid for this nice person to come and report it entirely, so we'll finish it. Thank you for that. That's appropriate.

Where are we folks? Let's get it done. We're at a judgment --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: I will make one motion here, and it kind of summarizes how I feel about this. I think it should -- we should put it back to the original three-second rotation, and that's only within the UGA.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I'm not sure I understand the motion. Can you frame that as a motion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, the motion would be to go back to the original wording, which is, "The digital message or static image shall remain on the display for a minimum of three seconds." And also note that in there the transition method shall be executed in a minimum fade in and out time of one second.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second to that motion? I do not hear a second. Motion fails.
COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We always knew this was going to be a tough one.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's all right. Keep going, Linda.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: And I think it's back to your -- your last comment about how much is in those UGAs and how close those LAMIRDs are to residential rural areas. If it were just a true UGA, but it's all those residential customers or individuals.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Leave it alone at 24 hours, right?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: Well, it's the three second and then that one-second transition that's so disruptive to the residents.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay. So would you be amenable to if we did this only within the business areas in the UGAs?

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: If you took out LAMIRDs, yep.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: LAMIRDs are already out.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: No, it's included right here.

DARREN GURNEE: The highlighted language has been stricken as a motion that was passed, the one
that's highlighted here.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: So without LAMIRDS, and we specify clearer UGAs to take out residents, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Let me give you an illustration of what that just did. The YMCA sits on a road and it's got a sign. Right across the street from the sign is multiple multi-story residences. Now how do you do that?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: That sign does not face those residents. And they are made to be directional. They don't broadcast in 180 degrees.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Is there still more discussion? Oh, well.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: We're kind of batting this around.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I'm looking for some brilliant --

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Did you make the motion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: -- person to get us there.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: He made the
motion to go back to the language from staff, and it

got --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: And that got voted
down.

COMMISSIONER PARALEZ: If we could put your
language in that you put in the previous one that was
more specific about the UGAs.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Then I guess my
motion is to reword...

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: It's all right.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Wait a minute. Let
me back up a little bit further here. Electronic signs
are prohibited outside the UGAs and Type III LAMIRDS.
That's the first sentence.

COMMISSIONER GONZALEZ-HARLESS: Of your --

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: No. No.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's a given.

We're already there.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: We're already there.

But we did not specify on there that it is also out --
they're prohibited in the residential UGAs.

DARREN GURNEE: Correct. We did that in the
illumination, sign illumination, but not electronic
signs.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay. My first --
COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Part one.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Right. My first --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Let me -- let me try a motion.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Move to approve a 30-minute hold, ten-second transition for electronic signs only in the business zones of the UGAs.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Period.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: That's it. Not even in the --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ROWE: I will second that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's clear, at least to me. We have a motion. We have a second.

Discussion?

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: One more time on your wording.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Motion to approve a hold time of 30 minutes, a transition time of ten seconds, only in the business zones of UGAs. That way you can still have advertisements that can change, but they don't change on a frequent basis frequent enough that drivers going by are -- are encouraged to keep looking at it waiting for it to change. You still get
the advertisement value, the changing advertisement value, but the distraction value goes away. And even in the UGAs you can only do that inside the business zones.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I understand technically from Darren's comment that would eliminate the animation, or at least restrict it. It may or may not completely eliminate. Clever people will figure out a way around these time frames.

Further discussion? Tom.

COMMISSIONER NEVINS: Since this includes only business zones, I can approve of that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: Progress.

Erin?

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Can you -- Darren, can you or someone define for me what is a -- where the business zone areas, just like in general what areas we'd be talking about as considered business zones without pulling out a --

DARREN GURNEE: What we would call commercially zones.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Oh, so it would just be commercially zoned.

DARREN GURNEE: Commercially zoned.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: That's the gym or
Sears, even though the residential areas are within
sight.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: But those are
multi-family residential.

DARREN GURNEE: It would be based off of
zone. So if you have highway tourist commercial, if
you have urban commercial. I might be able to pull up
a map. But, yeah, it's just commercially zoned areas
that allow for commercial uses.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: And if we go to the
wording that Jim has brought up, does that leave
anything uncovered? Did we not cover an area that we
are allowing electronic signs?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: We've excluded
Type III LAMIRDs. We've kept it within the UGAs. And
the only thing I could think to add would be those
signs could not face a residential area that would do
that. And I don't know how to phrase that one.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: Well, I'll --

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I'm in the
business zone, but if my sign faces across the street
to the residential area, I don't want -- I don't even
want that much flashing to them.

COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS: Well, and
specifically on the Y site, it faces down and up the
road. The residents are perpendicular to that road so they're not getting hit with that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: And must be situated so as not to face...

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM: But we have more development that's going to happen on Randall, those multi-family...

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Well, for instance, across the street on Randall we've currently got the newspaper building, we've got the credit union, and the coffee shop right there. So we've got some areas across Randall. So the only way I can figure that those people would be able to use this electronic sign -- well, they've got to already be some sort of business designation. But I don't want those signs to any way face back up the hill into those apartment buildings. So if staff can help me figure out how to word that and I'll -- I'll go with that.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: So as not to directly face residential development.

DARREN GURNEE: I would be -- I'd be careful to word that because you could pretty much find any location where residents could see a sign.

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: Not residents; residential areas.
COMMISSIONER PARALEZ:  Even still.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO:  Erin, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM:  And there's a part of doing a multi-family unit like that in basically a commercial environment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO:  Upstairs/downstairs. That's right.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM:  Well, and the idea is that you're in a downtown environment.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO:  Gotcha.

COMMISSIONER LEEDHAM:  And having -- it's not the same as being up on Ridgetop in single-family homes. Having a little illumination coming in your window, it's not as bad as living under the L, but there is --

COMMISSIONER FORITANO:  Gotcha.

DARREN GURNEE:  Just real quick. There is one item that I am noticing with the motion that Commissioner Sommerhauser has proposed, is that it does not address electronic signs that are not in commercial. It's -- and then the other -- the reason why I say that is that there may be industrial zones or things like that that might come into play for UGAs. So if you -- if you specify that business or commercial areas can have the 30 minutes, ten second, if there is
something else that might come into play, do you still 
want the 24 hours?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I don't think 
that industrial zones is that much of a problem, 
knowing where the industrial zones are in Kitsap 
County. We don't have that many that are -- I can't 
think of any that are in UGAs right now.

DAVID GREETHAM: Dave Greetham. I think 
there's some light industrial, for example, in the 
western part of Silverdale inside the UGA. Provost 
Road may have some. We'd need to look at a map to 
confirm, but there may be some light industrial within 
the Silverdale UGA.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: All right. We do 
have a motion and a second. Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER SOMMERHAUSER: I would suggest 
that we go ahead and vote on this and have staff 
research if there's any light industrial that we need 
to add in.

COMMISSIONER FORITANO: I accept that 
suggestion. All in favor of the motion? One, two, 
three, four, five, six. Unanimous.

We are adjourned until 6:30.

Whereupon at 5:55 p.m. the 
meeting was adjourned.)
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The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Kitsap County Administration Building Commissioner’s Chambers, 619 Division Street, Port Orchard, WA.

Members present: Lou Foritano, Tom Nevins, Jim Sommerhauser, Linda Rowe, Erin Leedham, Karanne Gonzalez-Harless, Linda Paralez and Joe Phillips

Member absent: Jim Svensson

Staff present: Lisa Lewis, Angie Silva, Darren Gurnee, David Greetham and Planning Commission Secretary Karen Ashcraft

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Open Space: Work Study, Public Hearing, Deliberations, Findings of Fact, Lisa Lewis, Environmental Planner, DCD

Ricky’s Preservation, 5542 SE Lake Valley Road, Port Orchard, WA 98366-9045

Sheila Anderson has requested approval of 1-acre parcel located in South Kitsap County, Commissioner District #2 be approved for Open Space. The property is zoned Rural Protection (RP). Staff recommends approval with 11 conditions.

Chair Foritano opens the Public Hearing

Chair Foritano requested a motion to close the Public Hearing.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to close the Public Hearing.

The Vote:

Unanimous

The motion carries.

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Leedham to approve Ricky’s Preservation Open Space as submitted.
The Vote:
Unanimous
The motion carries.

6:19:55
Estate of Joseph Mentor, 8567 Tracyton Boulevard NW, Bremerton, WA 98311
Correction to the Staff Report is the proposal is located in Central Kitsap County,
Commissioner District #3.

Jennifer Miller has requested approval of 1.24 acres parcel in Central Kitsap County,
Commissioner District #3 be approved for Open Space. The property is zoned Urban Low
Residential (UL). Staff recommends approval with 11 conditions.

Commissioner Leedham requested a correction to the Findings of Fact regarding the amount
of acreage from “approximately 26-acres” to 1.24 acres.
Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless requested a clarification regarding the allowance of Open
Space on the Shoreline.
Commissioner Sommerhauser requested clarification on the aerial photo of the site regarding
the single family residence and the driveway.
The driveway does penetrate the Open Space area. The driveway may be maintained but
nothing else can be done to it.

6:29:52
Chair Foritano opens the Public Hearing.

Jennifer Mills, 9330 Silverdale Way #201, Silverdale, 98383 is present to represent the family
regarding the Open Space application to protect the trees and the shoreline.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless gave an explanation of what is needed to create Open Space,
i.e. Urban Open Space, a significant wildlife habitat near the eagle’s nest.

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated that the Planning Commission needs to make sure the
Open Space is technically correct.

6:34:41
Chair Foritano closes the Public Hearing.

6:34:43
A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner
Leedham to move this item be tabled for decision to the next meeting, which are answers
from staff.

The Vote:
Unanimous
The motion carries.

Commissioner Sommerhauser explained what staff needs to review for this Open Space.
1. Qualifier is Rural Shoreline or because the Open Space isn’t covering the Rural Shoreline.
2. Status of the driveway that penetrates through the Open Space; staff needs to add a condition that allows the property owners to maintain that driveway and remove the driveway area from the calculation.

6:36:02
Rhododendron Preserve (Mountaineers Foundation) is requesting an Open Space Preserve of 69.70 acres located in Central Kitsap County. The parcel is zoned Rural Wooded and Comprehensive Plan Designation is Rural Wooded.

6:39:18
Chair Foritano closed the public hearing, since no one sign in to speak.

A motion is made by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Phillips to approve the Open Space application for the Rhododendron Preserve (Mountaineers Foundation).

The Vote:
Unanimous
The motion carries.

6:39:56
Ueland Tree Farm and the Mountaineers Foundation are requesting Open Space on approximately 61.48 acres located in Central Kitsap County. The parcel is zoned Rural Wooded and Comprehensive Plan Designation of Rural Wooded.

6:44:17
Commissioner Sommerhauser requested information on how the Open Space will be marked?

6:44:50
Chair Foritano opens the Public Hearing.

6:45:02
Jack Stanfill, President of the Chico Creek Task Force. He is concerned that a stream analysis was never done on Dickerson Creek on their property. There is a large beaver pond on Dickerson Creek and it was left out of the analysis. The Task Force is requesting a complete survey and delineation of Dickerson Creek starting on the boundary line of City of Bremerton on the south down to the large waterfall (distribution of three large charts).

Commissioner Sommerhauser inquired if any of Mr. Stanfill’s concerns were a part of Ueland Open Space parcels. Mr. Stanfill is uncertain what parts of Dickerson Creek they are protecting and Chico Creek isn’t in that area at all.

Lisa Lewis stated this is an excellent application. They are going from designated forest land to Open Space. Ueland Tree Farm is trying to protect Jefferson Creek. They meet all of the criteria for a 90% reduction.

6:56:51
Mark Mauren is the Manager for Ueland Tree Farm. The Open Space boundary is marked with metal tags and ribbon.

Commissioner Sommerhauser requested the position of the sign for access to the property be located?

Mr. Mauren stated that at the trail head is located at the end of Beaver’s Lane.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless requested how much of the buffer area would Ueland Tree Farm be allowed to log?

Mr. Mauren stated from the stream the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) perspective they can log within 100’ of the riparian zone. UTF moved the boundary of the Conservation easement to the break of the hill and back half a tree length approximately 45’. The average buffer with the Conservation easement is between 180’ to 250’ away.

Chair Foritano closed the Public Hearing.

A motion by Commissioner Paralez and seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless to approve this Open Space application.

A motion to amend the approval by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Phillips in the item of section four, Item four on the conditions states, “One sign no larger then 3 sq. square feet shall be posted on each parcel that states the following.” My understanding from testimony, there are at least two trails that penetrates these areas, so I would add in the requirement to post the same sign at the trails where they enter the properties.

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated this Open Space application is for people to use the trails and they need to know the rules of Open Space, so he is requesting that two more signs be placed on the property.

Commission Nevins requested a clarification on the first page regarding public access.

Mark Mauren stated that there will be a sign at the trail head of Beaver’s Lane.

The Vote:
Unanimous
The motion carries.

Commissioner Leedham requested a correction to the Carlson/Robinson staff report should read highway 303 not highway 3. This comment is noted by staff.
F. Work Study: Central Kitsap Campus Design Guidelines, Angie Silva, Senior Policy analyst, Kitsap County Commissioners Office.
   • Phased Development
   • Priority Uses and Partnerships
     o Haselwood Family YMCA
     o Community Center
     o Senior Housing
     o Library
     o Performing Arts Theater (WESTPAC)
     o Misc. Public Uses/Office
     o Retail

Draft Design Guidelines
Title 17 Zoning Code with footnotes
Draft Bucklin Hill Town Center Chapter

Chair Foritano requested information regarding an academic component to this proposal. Angie Silva responded that an academic component hasn't been considered at this time. Commissioner Sommerhauser requested the county's proposal document for the library.

   o Design Principles
     o Common & Open Space
     o Parking Standards
     o Site Design
     o Pedestrian Standards for Pathways
     o Poplar's Property

The Public Hearing is scheduled for August 5, 2014 at 6:00 P.M. before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Paralez would like to see included in the Community Campus Guidelines an up-to-date technology infrastructure guidelines for each of the proposed sites. Also, review new structures have the ability to pay themselves by the way they generate energy, waste, etc.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated Puget Sound Regional Council recently remodeled their conference room with the latest/greatest technology and suggested a contact name.

Commissioner Sommerhauser request a copy of KRL proposed design.

Discussion is held regarding the YMCA parking and the need for more parking spaces and parking consideration of the new facilities.
Discussion is held regarding a prototype library in partnership with Microsoft and/or Amazon.

7:42:15
Continued Sign Code Deliberation: Darren Gurnee and David Greetham

David Greetham gave a clarification regarding electronic signs, describing the location of Urban Industrial Zones within the UGA.
A second clarification was provided regarding the WAC language for scenic highways. The Planning Commissioners have the option to include this definition in the Sign Code.

7:44:33

Darren Gurnee indicated that Item 6 under Permitting (Sign Revisions) states "Should a conflict arise between the prior conditions of Land Use approval and the Code herein, the Sign Permit application shall be reviewed in accordance with the appropriate land use procedures under Title 21 KCC." This means if an applicant had previously approved conditions of approval, an applicant would have to go back and change those conditions of approval to get a sign permit.

David Greetham explained that Title 21 is the procedures ordinance. This lays out the Type I, Type II and Type III permit process. If the Planning Commission wants to go further, they could clarify it shall be reviewed under the exact same type of process the original land use went through. Otherwise, I think Title 21 will address the different types of applications already that is what it is set-up to be. So it's up to you whether you want to raise the bar beyond the language we propose.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated it needs to be if it's a Conditional Use Permit you have to amend the Conditional Use Permit in the process that is appropriate for that. You don't get to do it as a Type I Director's Interpretation.

David Greetham stated Title 21 does clarify that, but if you wanted to state that physically in this....

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated I think that it needs to be so people aren't mislead when they look at the file.

Commissioner Sommerhauser we need a motion.

Darren Gurnee stated that this section could be a motion to pass or motion to amend.

Commissioner Leedham requested what the current code gives us, if someone wants to re-do a sign and their sign was under a Conditional Use Permit? How is it handled then?

David Greetham stated it would be handled under a regular Conditional Use Permit, but some plats didn't require a Conditional Use Permit. It could have been permitted outright in the Commercial Zone. So in those cases, you wouldn’t need to revise the Conditional Use Permit. It's applied in the current Title 21, but I think your point is that you would want to make sure it's very clear in this code.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated right. I know that some are allowed and some aren’t, but it needs to be clear so that someone coming in realizes what their answer is of whoever is interpreting the code.

Chair Foritano requesting a motion.

7:49:08

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Leedham to accept the language proposed by staff and that language would go in. It's saying whatever you did on your original permit you have to meet the same process to revise it.

The Vote:

Unanimous
The motion carries.

7:50:00

Darren Gurnee has identified the Master Sign Plan as a Type I process previously, but it is a Type III process. The Planning permit staff had indicated that we should move to a Type I process, but I apologize for that misinformation, it is a Type III currently. So if you would like to amend to go back to that, we can do that now as well.

7:51:04

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless to change a Type I to a Type III process.

The Vote:

Unanimous

The motion carries.

7:51:15

Darren applies Gurnee has a question for the Planning Commissioners regarding the Tacoma amortization that you reference as an example for language which we are going to provide when the financing conclusion come out, it identifies the amortization schedule as only applying to billboards, I am assuming that you mean for all signs.

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated to all signs.

Commissioner Nevins didn’t see a notification process in there for non-conforming sign that we are talking about amortizing. The holder of the sign needs to be notified somehow.

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated that he specially chose to prevent that work load from staff and it would be up to staff at the end of the amortization schedule to communicate with the signs that need to be changed. If we have an early notice, then it involves staff going around the entire county or we go to the other thing which I believe, I think it was the Bellevue procedure. Which is you get 60 days to apply for a non-conforming permit so that you know, and if you don’t apply then you don’t get non-conforming either. If you do apply, then you get the permit and the alternative of that was have staff go around and notify everybody of non-conforming status. That’s a tremendous work load to dump on the beginning of this special.

Commissioner Nevins what I did see in my quick scan and it was a quick scan because I just looked at this today for reasons that you don’t need to know. I did notice that one of the cities or jurisdiction it was 9 years to do it or six years from the notification that you are out of line which ever is longer.

Now that gives some time. I think putting myself as a holder in a non-conforming sign, I would like to be notified that I am non-conforming rather than just somehow to the Chamber of Commerce being told that a new sign code is out and you had better read it. I would just like to have notification that I am wrong.

Commissioner Leedham would like to clarify, that I have read that part too and actually I thought that was really tight because what they tell you is. Its 9 years after the date of the installation of the signs, so if their sign code past four years after the sign was installed you only have five years left. So that is really tight or 8.5 years.
Chair Foritano asked if there was anything that goes with the transfer to property to say that, “I have a sign that has a five year life?”

Darren Gurnee not to my knowledge, but I don’t know.

Chair Foritano I guess so.  Ok where are we?

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated we previously had a motion pass.

Darren Gurnee yes I know that.  It was just for clarification for my purposes only.  I believe you are at the state of based off of all the motions and passing you have done.

Commissioner Sommerhauser do we want to change the motion on using the Tacoma format to the other format that involves the staff to then go around with the new code once passed and notify each property owner or sign owner that they have a non-forming sign and that their amortized no longer then 10 years?

Various conversations

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated the problem is for pole signs and big building signs and stuff like that, it may not be that big of workload.  We are talking about every damn A board in the county.  It is now, if they had a sign permit for an A board its non-conforming if they didn’t its illegal period.  So much work load do we want to dump on DCD? And I think that is a huge....

Chair Foritano stated it certainly a premise visit that everybody has got a sign out front of their location.  Guess What?  I can’t imagine that your organization would be compelled to do it that way.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated we hire interns.  We have done it before for all sorts of things where we have interns drive up and down the road to document things.  There’s google street view, there’s all sort of ways to do it and the county is really good about not...

Chair Foritano stated there’s a role for the new students.

Commissioner Gonzalez-Harless stated if the Board is willing to do it.  They will do it with you know.

Chair Foritano what does this tell us in a form of a motion?

Commissioner Sommerhauser first we have to have a motion to reconsider the previous motion.  Then we would need a new motion to change what we did.

Chair Foritano if that’s what this group wants to go there.  Or we can leave alone what?

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated to me leaving it alone with a 10 year window is plenty of time For the county to serve notice through all of its available communications means that current signs if legally approved are only good for ten years. At the end of the 10 year amortization, the signs must come into conformance of the new ordinance.
Chair Foritano Is there a motion? In that case, we are done.

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated you guys need to work with legal, design the language at our next meeting with that language and once we pass that we can do Findings of Fact and a final deliberation.

David Greetham so you want to see that completed prior to Findings of Fact as a stand alone piece of work?

Commissioner Sommerhauser stated have that on the last page of your Findings of Fact so you can modify the last page if you need too. If we look at the language if we have anything special. When you have the language, bring Shelley with you to hold our hand, as nervous as some of us are about this that we don’t want to create a legal or huge financial problem for the county.

Chair Foritano on the other hand ours is a recommendation, right? Process keeps going.

7:59:43

Chair Foritano Good of the Order:
What the Board of Commissioner have in mind is assigning us a piece of the Comprehensive Code.

Commissioner Sommerhauser a discussion on the Planning Commission minutes.
Chair Foritano regarding discussion on the 2013/2014 Work Plan.
Commissioner Sommerhauser stated his concern about DCD workload and the scheduling of Planning Commission meeting.

Time of Adjournment: 8:01:53

Exhibits:
   A. Memorandum from Darren Gurnee with attachments July 7, 2014
   B. Memorandum from Angle Silva- CK Campus Draft Design Guidelines and Code Amendments
   C. Draft Kitsap County Code Title 17 (Zoning) Central Kitsap Community Campus Code Amendments
   D. Central Kitsap Community Campus Draft Design Guidelines – Appendix A
   E. Open Space PC Packet for Ricky’s Preservation
   F. Open Space PC Packet for Rhododendron Preserve
   G. Open Space PC Packet for Estate of Joseph Mentor
   H. Open Space PC Packet for Ueland Tree Farm
   I. Open Space PC Packet for Robinson and Carlson
   J. Material submitted by Jack Stanfill

MINUTES approved this 5TH day of August 2014.

[Signature]
Lou Foritano, Planning Commission Chair

[Signature]
Karen Ashcraft, Planning Commission Secretary