

**Digital On-Premises Sign Ordinance
Stakeholder Committee Meeting**

**Cliff Morton Development and Business Services Center
1901 S. Alamo
Training Room A**

Monday, January 4, 2010

Meeting Notes

Committee Members:

Robyn Lock
Teri Bilby
Paul A. Rohlfs
Bill Bourne
Chuck Saxer
Larry Gottsman
Peter Sitterle
Lydell Toye

Audience:

Joel Heine
Chris Fox
Darrell Keller
Nicholas Harris
Leon Apostoco

1. Introductions

- Staff and committee members introduced themselves.

2. Presentation by Andrew Spurgin (please see attached presentation)

3. Committee Discussion on Approach

- Staff recommends conditional approach, which utilizes existing ordinance and creates conditions for digital signs, i.e. dwell time, brightness, etc.
- A committee member questioned the Council Consideration Request (CCR) since it is over 2 years old. Staff responded that the City Council's Infrastructure & Growth Committee was briefed on the schedule so that the digital billboard issue could be finalized before beginning work on this ordinance. There was committee discussion on the contents of the CCR which indicated concern with animation, brightness, and blinking.
- Joel Heine with Daktronics of Houston, Texas discussed issue of brightness. Heine suggested that the City put into code the requirement that all digitals have a built-in photocell with an automatic dimmer that dims up during the day and dims down at night. He also recommended requiring photo cell be set at no more than 0.3 footcandles above ambient light conditions. A committee member responded that 0.3 is too bright; that it would be brighter than parking lot lighting. There was additional discussion about measuring footcandles rather than NITs. Mr. Heine said that photocells are standard for most manufacturers and can be built right into the sign face. A committee member asked about the cost and availability of photocells. Mr. Heine responded that most manufacturers have photocells and the cost is under \$100.00. Another committee member asked if it is possible for a sign to be retrofitted with a photocell. Mr Heine responded that he could look into it and possible alternatives could be dimming of the signs based on schedule changes. Mr Heine said that in other communities he has

worked in, brightness is the number one issue, more so than movement. A committee member asked if there were national standards. There was additional committee discussion about brightness measurements – a footcandle measures light off of the surface versus NITs which measure the source of the light. A committee member asked if the City can enact an interpretation about brightness right away without waiting for the new ordinance. Staff agreed to look at this issue *[note: staff has determined this can not be done through an interpretation and that an ordinance would be required]*

- A committee member discussed the need to address certain corridors, brightness, hours of operation, etc. Another committee member asked about the footcandle measurements of the most offensive signs. There was general consensus of the committee move forward with the conditional approach discussed in the staff presentation.

Next Steps

- City will develop a list of certain signs that have received citizen inquiries and work with the sign industry to schedule a tour at night of the identified signs and measure signs with footcandle meters. Committee members will be invited once this is scheduled.
- The committee agreed to meet next on January 25 at 3 p.m. at 1901 S Alamo, Training Room A.