A Introductory Items

Call to Order

A.1 Observance of a Moment of Silence

A.2 Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Brekhus</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>4:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Delgado</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoma Jardon</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Schieve</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Woosley</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Reno</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Weiske</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Duerr</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McKenzie</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bobzien</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Schneider</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM.

A.3 Public Comment

Mayor Schieve called for public comment. There were no requests to speak.

A.4 Approval of the Agenda - August 25, 2015

The agenda was approved by the Reno City Council and Reno City Planning Commission.

A.5 Pledge of Allegiance
B Presentations

B.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Presentations, discussion and potential direction to staff regarding On-Premise Digital Signs. 4:07 PM

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends Planning Commission and City Council discuss the draft ordinance and examples of on-premise signs and provide staff direction regarding the on-premise digital sign ordinance.

Claudia Hanson, Community Development Planning Manager, provided an overview of the Staff Report. She said that the City Council directed staff to revisit the digital sign ordinance, and later revised that direction for staff to specifically address digital on-premises signs. The Council established a moratorium on the acceptance of applications for flashing/animated on-premise advertising displays, the moratorium has been extended once, and is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2015.

Lori Wray, representing Scenic Nevada, presented their report entitled "Reno's Draft Digital On-Premise Sign Regulations." She said that their letter dated June 10, 2015, describes how they feel about digital signs.

Mike Freeborg, Director of Government Relations for Young Electric Sign Company (YESCO), discussed digital sign regulations and the need to provide a fair and unbiased approach to digital signs. Mr. Freeborg presented the report entitled "Finding Common Ground: EMC and Digital Sign Issues."

James Carpentier, representing the International Sign Association, discussed regulatory issues, including message hold time, brightness, transition methods, and electronic message centers (EMCs).

Mr. Freeborg discussed the economic impacts of LED (light-emitting diode) signs.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREKHUS PRESENT AT 4:22 P.M.

Ms. Hanson presented numerous examples of signage types in the City of Reno, information regarding zoning and Master Plan districts, and possible direction to staff regarding signage.

Council Member Brekhus asked the difference between monument and pole signs, and Ms. Hanson replied that monument signs have a solid base and are typically architecturally compatible with the structure.
Council Member Jardon asked if some businesses have wall-mounted rather than free-standing signs due to a lack of space near the building, and Ms. Hanson agreed that most places downtown, for instance, would not have space for a free-standing sign.

Council Member Jardon said that most businesses want to stay current with technology, and as a tenant or small business owner she would like to know that her message could be up within hours rather than days. She stated that she does not favor the elimination of digital signage, but does have some concern about the brightness of some signs. She suggested making the size of the signage commensurate with the size of the building, and stated that it is important to allow small businesses to have tools in their tool boxes, but the signs should be regulated, particularly with respect to brightness.

COUNCIL MEMBER JARDON ABSENT AT 4:23 P.M.

Council Member Duerr said that she would like time to process all of the information presented at today's meeting before making any decisions.

Council Member McKenzie said that while he would not want to impair the ability of businesses to advertise, the brightness, height, orientation and distance of signage from residential areas should not deprive residents of their quality of life.

Commissioner Reno asked if parks, in addition to schools and churches, are considered public facilities, and Ms. Hanson replied that parks are listed as public facilities. Some parks are zoned residential (those typically surrounded by residential uses), and digital signs would not be allowed in those, but they would potentially be allowed in some parks because they are zoned as public facility.

Commissioner Reno said that item C.1 of the ordinance states that one free-standing on-premise digital sign is allowed per frontage, and asked if that means that properties with three frontages could have up to three digital signs. Ms. Hanson said that is correct the way the ordinance is worded. Commissioner Reno said that the wording should state that they are allowed one per property, and they can determine where best to place that sign.

Commissioner Reno referred to item C.3 which states that on-premise digital signs should not be placed within any building setback for the zoning district, and Ms. Hanson explained that currently freestanding signs, not static signs, are allowed within building setbacks. If a building has a 20-foot setback you can place a monument sign within that setback area, so this is saying that a digital sign would have to be out of the setback area, a little bit further off the street.

Commissioner Woosley asked if Code Enforcement can enforce illumination standards, and if businesses will have the ability to measure the amount of light a sign emits, or
simply trust in the sign companies to do that for them. Ms. Hanson said that a standard note would be placed on the permit informing the applicant up front that they would have to meet the standards, City staff would ensure at the time the permit is issued that the sign is capable of dimming during darker hours, and Code Enforcement staff has meters that can measure brightness. If a sign owner wanted to check their own, a foot candle meter is affordable and easy to understand. They would be responsible for monitoring it themselves, but if there were a complaint Code Enforcement would take a reading.

Commissioner Gower and Ms. Hanson discussed creating a digital sign zone overlay for specific zones and regulating sign density.

Commissioner Schneider and Ms. Hanson discussed current digital and static sign restrictions.

Commissioner Johnson and Ms. Hanson discussed ambient brightness issues. Commissioner Johnson said that how bright something is does not necessarily translate into how much light is actually hitting another location. I can, for instance, see the Grand Sierra's sign from my house but none of the light from the Grand Sierra's sign, foot candle wise, reaches my house.

Commissioner Weiske asked how it was determined that a free-standing sign can be 20 feet in height. Ms. Hanson explained that staff originally set the height at 10 feet, but it was later raised to 20 feet after discussions about 10 feet being too restrictive due to the topography in some areas.

Commissioner Weiske asked why US 395 or I-580 south of South McCarran Boulevard to, say, Mount Rose Highway, was not included in the location restrictions provided in item C.2 and page 3 of the draft ordinance. Ms. Hanson said that staff brought the areas over from the digital off-premises portion of Code following recent action from City Council on a proposed sign, and that is something that might be reasonable to put back in should they get that direction.

Mayor Schieve called for comments from the Council Members.

Council Member Brekhus stated that she is not an advocate of going the zoning district way. The industry itself says there would be some large retail establishments that would not get digital signs, but there are situations where around the corner they might. Having watched the evolution of the Code since 1998, I think we have too many districts, and there is a need to wind down. I promote a use consideration. The gamers are special, there are nine of them, that go off on one side with some regulations. Large retail establishments, that is an ordinance that a shopping center site more or less could be a parcel or not. A 50,000 square-foot building with one retail tenant in there is the
definition of a large retail establishment, and they get them. For everyone else, I believe there is a place within the public facility, but not necessarily. It could go in residential, maybe churches and schools. I disagree with Council Member Jardon about maybe wall-mounted along here. No. These wall-mounted districts, these zero lot lines where you do not have room for free-standing, were built in a different time in a different scale and we absolutely need to protect those and the signage character of those. Digital should go through a discretionary process of the Planning Commission to make decisions and set conditions. Standards -- height, brightness, flip signs, size percentage, allowance for extra height on the freeway, etc. I do not agree with. Let us have staff come back with three options. I see signs in general going lower. Nonconformance -- the safe harbor provision of amortizing out five years and that is it. Five years and you are done. Rebuild to full size standards -- I think that should go, but have the discretion if you went through the Special Use Permit process. How to measure -- the sign industry representative said he used a meter somewhere. I think that is the evolved standard way to go, and I think it is more technical. I am directing my comments to the Planning Commissioners because you are the experts and can help us mold these ordinances. I am prepared to bring this moratorium out until January 2016 if we need to. Code has grown worse over the years. Signs are one of the hardest to deal with and we need to do it right.

Mayor Schieve stated that continuing on with the moratorium was of concern to her. We should send the right message to businesses. We should settle the issue.

Council Member Duerr agreed with much of what Council Member Brekhus said, and reiterated that she needs time to research the issues. I will, she said, send my specific comments to staff. We need to get it right even if it takes an extra 30 days.

Commissioner Reno said that parks should not have signs, and schools and churches should be allowed to have a sign, but the size of the sign should be regulated. If a property has more than one frontage, one sign is adequate, and they can decide where to place that sign. I like Ms. Hanson's suggestion that if you want a digital sign on the property you get rid of all the other signs on the property, and that can be phased in over time. For grand fathering in, people with the five-year horizon, my concern is that there will be static only on the on-premise digital signs with no optical illusions of movement or any video. The Grand Sierra Resort sign has video. We heard from YESCO that this is a great technology and we can flip it whenever we want, so I would say we give them 90 days or six months to come into full compliance with that. It has to be non-moving digital. It has to be static.

Commissioner Olivas said that, in reference to the timeline, he concurs with Commissioner Reno that five years is a long time. It is all computerized anyway. It is more of a reprogramming issue. They do not have to buy a new sign. On the issue of
brightness and signs that change all night long next to residential, perhaps we should look at restrictions on hours.

Commissioner Woosley said that brightness is a huge issue. I was not a huge advocate of digital billboards several years ago, but I have seen the technology change. I now believe that there is a place for them because I have seen it work here in town. They can actually be very attractive and not distracting with the correct amount of light, but there is also a place for them in town, and that is what we need to discuss. If a business closes at 9:00 p.m., should they be allowed to keep the sign running all night? As far as the five-year turn around is concerned, perhaps we can offer an incentive or make it easier for them to come into compliance, but some of the blight in our town is because there are too many signs on one property. With this new opportunity we can make that a little better.

Commissioner Gower agreed with Council Member Brekhus's comments about the discretionary approval piece, and said that would be a good opportunity if there are issues or concerns about sign projects, and would give the Planning Commission the opportunity to review it and leverage the expertise that is on the Commission to put any conditions on it to make it as appropriate as possible for the community. Sign density is an important component we can work with staff on to make it clear in the ordinance what folks are getting into. Let them know what they could be potentially giving up if they go down the digital sign route. The Commission needs to have more discussion about the difference between the zoning and the land use issue. Brightness is difficult because it so technical, so perhaps we could get more details from staff in that regard at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Schneider said that brightness seems to be the biggest issue. It is difficult for small businesses to attract business, and digital signs have their place. Without more discussion we should not draw a line in the sand saying we cannot have wall-mounted digital signs or digital signs on poles. Hopefully we can work something out in the next few weeks.

Commissioner Johnson said that the draft ordinance gives everyone something to work with. Looking at some of the specific elements in it will help us come to a conclusion much quicker.

Commissioner Weiske said that the brightness of signage is a big issue. It is time for government to take control of it, and the community will be better off because they did so.

Mayor Schieve called for public comment.
Janice Flanagan, 1460 Bermuda Circle, discussed her concerns about the proliferation and brightness of signage in Reno.

Tom D. Weatherby, 5350 Capital Court #194, representing YESCO, said that this is not just about whether you have a hold time or not. The way Code is currently written you have to comply with size and height restrictions along with everything else that is in this Code. It is not just about adjusting the sign to make it static rather than video operated. And are the casinos going to be allowed to do what they want to anyway? The zoning map has a lot of white on it and what I have seen, even before this new Code issue came up, was that in a Mixed Use (MU) zone, the way the Code reads right now, the only place you could have a digital sign is on Virginia Street, Mill Street, and part of Fourth Street. Most of the commercial areas in town are MU. There is very little CC or AC where you can have a digital sign, and if you are going to further expand the MU zone and then not allow digital signs in them, you are actually governing by zoning rather than by the Code. Why can't I have a digital sign if I have a business on Plumb Lane, Moana Lane, or McCarran Boulevard rather than on Virginia Street? Einstein Bros Bakery on the corner of Kietzke Lane cannot have a digital sign because they are not on Virginia Street, but Pinocchio's Bar and Grill can because they back up to Virginia Street. You talk about only one sign per property. In the Code you have right now it has to be on the street that you access the property from. Southwest Shopping Center should be able to have a digital sign on the freeway if they want one because they back up to the freeway. It should not have to be on Virginia Street. Same for University Village. They back up to 395 and that is where they get the most traffic, not on Clearacre. Why force them to have a sign at the entry point rather than where all the traffic is? Release the moratorium and then get to work.

Ian White, 1652 Islesworth Way, Plumas Lake, CA, representing an LED display manufacturer and the Government Affairs Committee for the California Sign Association, said that one of the hypothetical theories brought up today by one of the presenters and one resident was what if everyone who was allowed to had a sign? The cost of digital signage is what limits them or else everyone would have one. Then you would have the problems you are talking about. If you did say not everyone can have one and you limit it to 50,000 square feet, you are killing small business. Big box stores can afford digital signage, but it is the small businesses that need them the most. Mr. White also discussed brightness measuring techniques.

Mike Freeborg, 11689 Southeast Lincoln Heights, Happy Valley, OR, representing the Digital Signage Committee of the International Sign Association, said that in terms of the industry and their responsibility associated with lighting, it is difficult for them to regulate the brightness of digital signs. What is necessary is that the appropriate regulations be put in place.
Council Member Duerr requested consideration of greater distance limitations in the scenic byway of the Mount Rose Highway.

Ms. Hanson requested clarification concerning the expiration of the moratorium.

It was moved by Council Member Brekhus, seconded by Council Member Duerr to direct staff to bring back the issue for consideration at a subsequent City Council meeting.

Motion carried with Council Members Bobzien, Delgado and Jardon absent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Jenny Brekhus, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Naomi Duerr, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Brekhus, Schieve, Woosley, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Duerr, McKenzie, Gower, Johnson, Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Oscar Delgado, Neoma Jardon, David Bobzien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C Public Comment

NO ACTION WAS TAKEN ON THIS ITEM.

D Adjournment (For Possible Action)

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:23 P.M.