

**PUBLIC COMMENTS / QUESTIONS RE SIGN CODE REVISION PROJECT**

*Note: This matrix presents the comments/questions received from members of the public regarding the Sign Code Revision Project. The matrix includes the comment/question received, how and when it was received, the applicable section of the Sign code, and City staff responses.*

Comment /Questions	Related Section	Public Comments & Questions	City Staff Responses
1a.	N/A	Comment Card at Sign Code Subcommittee Meeting, October 17, 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Facilitator running these meetings? This person seems to be doing more than facilitating; Does this committee have a chair?</li> </ul>	Committee members are volunteers and the role of the Chair requires a significant amount of work and attention to manage the meeting. By having a facilitator, it takes that burden off of that committee member so that they can focus on the meeting and revisions at hand.
1b.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presenter at one point made a reference to a specific citizen in the audience but the citizen was not allowed to respond. This should not happen!</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment.
1c.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The facilitator continually makes the draft revision the prominent document and the current code subservient to it. Committee is being guided through draft revision instead of having a free discussion of why changes should be made to current code.</li> </ul>	The direction given by Mayor and Council on August 9, 2016, was that "the Citizens Sign Code Committee and the Planning Commission hold joint study sessions and public hearings on the proposed changes to the Sign Code and that staff return to the Mayor and Council with a recommendation no later than January 2017." The City Manager requested Staff research solutions and to create a preliminary draft.
1d.	7A.1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new purpose statement is certainly not a simplification of the current code's purpose statement – isn't that one of the requests from Mayor &amp; Council?</li> </ul>	The direction given by Mayor and Council on August 9, 2016, was to do the following: "1) comply with the 2015 U.S. Supreme Country decision on <i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , 2) simplify the Sign Code by integrating it into the Unified Development Code (UDC), and 3) make practical changes that modernize the Code, improve the quality of design and flexibility of the overall code, and grounds it in technical standards." The revised purpose statement achieves all of these goals as this is a <i>Reed</i> Issue (it helps to ensure all code regulations are directly tied to this purpose statement).
1e.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems this ad hoc committee is being asked to respond to Staff's draft that was written without input from citizens – is this a correct impression?</li> </ul>	The Sign Code Revision project was a response to the <i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , which necessitates various changes to the Code in order to protect the public's right to free speech, and to ensure the constitutionality of the Code post- <i>Reed</i> . Due to that, the City Manager requested Staff research solutions and to create a preliminary draft as a starting point for the public process we have just begun. It should be noted; the constitutional issue of the <i>Reed</i> case does create a sense of urgency for the project moving forward, as the current Sign Code leaves the City vulnerable to legal challenges as various aspects of the current Code are not currently in compliance with the holding in <i>Reed</i> and could potentially force the City to approve previously restricted sign permits.