

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 23, 2017

The regular meeting of the Mission Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Mike Lee at 7:06 PM Monday, January 23, 2017. Members also present: Jim Brown, Scott Babcock, Robin Dukelow, Stuart Braden, Dana Buford, Brad Davidson, Charlie Troppito and Frank Bruce. Also in attendance: Danielle Sitzman, City Planner; Brian Scott, Assistant City Administrator; Laura Smith, City Administrator; and Nora Tripp, Secretary to the Planning Commission.

Election of Officers for 2017

Mr. Braden moved and Ms. Dukelow seconded a motion to elect Mike Lee as Chairman of the Planning Commission.

The vote was taken (8-0-1). The **motion carried**. Mr. Lee abstained from the vote.

Mr. Lee moved and Mr. Troppito seconded a motion to elect Stuart Braden as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission.

The vote was taken (8-0-1). The **motion carried**. Mr. Braden abstained from the vote.

Ms. Dukelow moved and Mr. Braden seconded a motion to elect Nora Tripp as Secretary to the Planning Commission.

The vote was taken (9-0). The **motion carried**.

Approval of Minutes from the November 28, 2016, Meeting

Mr. Troppito moved and Babcock seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2016, meeting, as verbally amended by Mr. Bruce.

The vote was taken (9-0). The **motion carried**.

Case #16-07 Zoning Code Text Change – Signs – Public Hearing

[Chairman Lee opened the public hearing.]

Ms. Sitzman: We do need to conclude our public hearing, so, we are still open for comments. Then, we can move on to discussing more about the signs. My objective for this evening would be to get direction from this body to work on it as much as I can, to prepare a revised version for you.

Mr. Lee: Would anyone like to speak?

Laura McConwell, Mission Bank, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. McConwell: I'm here this evening on behalf of Valley View Bancshares, which is the owner of Mission Bank. I would like to address your attention to the ordinance that you're working on and the proposed changes, and talk to you about the sign maintenance and sign re-facing, specifically the sign maintenance, which is on page 8. Before I talk to you about this particular provision, I do understand that the goal is to ultimately phase out some of the pole signs. We have had some pole sign clutter in Mission, and over the years, that has been eliminated. We do have some that are left, and the business that I'm representing this evening has four of those signs. They find themselves in a bit of a pickle, and staff needs direction. I think it was insightful to hear your conversation this evening at your planning session.

Mission Bank is owned by Valley View Bancshares, which owns nine banks. The owners of Valley View Bancshares determined that they wanted to have all of their subsidiary banks have the same name. They have already gone through a rebranding, which is the leaf that you see on the Mission Bank signs, but they determined that they wanted all of their subsidiary banks to be called the same name, which is Security Bank of Kansas City. Nothing about the operation of the Mission Bank has changed. We have the same president, the same officers, the same employees, the same bank location. For the two larger banks, the main bank and the auxiliary bank are remaining exactly the same. They have the same products, the same accounts; you can write checks to Mission Bank. However, they went through re-branding. This sign maintenance ordinance does not allow them to reface those existing signs because they don't want the signs to be larger; they don't want to change them. All they want to do is put the re-face, which isn't technically called a re-facing; it's maintenance, as I understand it. But, this prohibits them from doing it because rather than saying "The Mission Bank," they'll have "The Security Bank of Kansas City." That's an impairment to this business that's been in Mission for, I don't know, its been in Mission for as long as I've been around, and I've been around for a long time. It requires them to take those pole signs down. They've been maintaining them, they've worked with Danielle on the ordinances and the permits.

We've also run into an issue, which I don't think this is the import of what either the Planning Commission or City Council is looking to cause those types of an issue when a business doesn't change. You were very clear, if you're going to change the business, change the function of the business, the sign needs to come down. That's been very clear. But, when the business has stayed the same and stayed identical, then those signs tend to change. It's sort of similar to the sign that happened with Keystone, when Keystone changed the type of car dealership they had. They were Chrysler, and then they went to a different dealership, and they were in the West Gateway, that required a change. I know when we first did our downtown district, the zoning and visioning, we had a few different rules for the eastern business district, the downtown district, and the west Gateway district. I don't know if those are things that we can effect because, quite frankly, Mission Bank has signs in all three locations. They have a sign at their main building on Johnson Drive and Martway, the motor bank on Martway, and the main one that, you're within the 1,000 feet of Metcalf.

Another interesting thing. I can propose language if you like, but Danielle, as staff, needs some direction from you all on what to do on this. I think this is a problem and an impediment. It's trying to help people not circumvent what the ultimate intent is, but I don't think Valley View Bancshares are trying to make all of their subsidiary banks have the exact same name thwarts the intent of the City and Council, or thumbs their noses at the sign ordinance, or the community, in any type of way. I don't think this is a special thing that they're asking for. They're the same business. I have a letter I can give to Danielle. Staff had asked me about that. It talks about how it's still the same ownership. The banking commission required them to file to have the new change with their subsidiary banks, but everything is exactly the same.

Mr. Babcock: I have a question. Valley View is the bank holding company, correct?

Ms. McConwell: Valley View Bancshares, yes.

Mr. Babcock: And the Mission Bank that's currently under it is a separate entity, correct?

Ms. McConwell: Well, it's a subsidiary. It's wholly owned by Valley View Bancshares.

Mr. Babcock: Right, but it's a wholly-owned corporation, I would imagine. It has its own bylaws

and all that stuff.

Ms. McConwell: Well, the way that the banking organization works, I think they're required to have their own entities, which is why they had to go through the banking commission on those to do their names. But Valley View Bancshares is the owner of all of those entities.

Mr. Babcock: Right, but the key is that it has its own entity.

Ms. McConwell: Well, yes, but the owner of it, who is Valley View Bancshares, has the ability to change the name.

Mr. Babcock: I'm just looking for the business – It is a separate business entity. What I'm getting at, which is along the lines of what you're asking, is that if this is the same entity, you can have a parent, but this corporation is separate. It's the same business, everything is the same. It's just the name.

Ms. McConwell: It's a name change. Which right now is prohibited because it says it has to have the same business firm name. So, with the way that the bank works, I know the guys at Mission Bank wanted it to stay the Mission Bank, but they didn't – Well, maybe one of them had a vote, but most of them didn't have a vote.

Mr. Brown: Weren't they required by the banking commission to change their name? And the reason I bring that up is, a good example of this is the barbecue place off of State Line. When they lost their lawsuit, they had to change their name. They changed it to Joe's Kansas City Barbecue. So, in light of something like that, that's kind of a forced issue. Twisted Sisters ran into something like that. Some sort of a forcing legal issue beyond that, then maybe there needs to be an accommodation. But, if there isn't, if they just chose to change it, potentially –

Mr. Braden: I agree with that. I feel both ways, but I'm just thinking it's the price of re-branding yourself. Nobody makes somebody rebrand themselves and change their name. You have to change all your letterheads and everything else. That's just the cost of it, I feel. I'm on the fence on this, but I feel like that's just part of it when you change your name.

Ms. Dukelow: The issue is whether or not they can do it on the pole sign. Our current code would say that it is re-facing.

Chairman Lee: The logo remains the same.

Ms. McConwell: Right, the logo would remain the same. The logo doesn't change.

Mr. Troppito: Do you have proposed language?

Ms. McConwell: I can bring that. I did not bring that with me this evening.

Mr. Troppito: [*Inaudible, overlapping comments.*] – staff, and the city attorney

Ms. McConwell: Yes. I can do that. Where I am is that you as the body needs to give some direction to staff because, like, we had to open that dialog to talk with staff, and we knew that there was going to be a work session to talk with the Planning Commission and the Council. So, staff needed some direction on whether we could continue with that dialog.

The other issue that we had is – and I don't know if this is specific to Mission Bank – the pole sign that is located by the Centennial Bank building, which is the one on Metcalf with the time and temperature, that sign has been there, like Scott said, for, I mean, I remember it in high

school. Make sure you're not late to school, as you're whizzing by, driving into the parking lot. But, apparently there aren't records on some of the proper permitting for that time to go in. I would ask that businesses not be penalized if the way we – Most of you have been around long enough to know that we did a yeoman's job to clean up our ordinances 10 or 15 years ago because they were a little bit of a mess prior to that time. I don't think a business should be, whether it's Mission Bank or Village Inn, should be held their feet to the fire on this City not having all the right permitting process, or the copies of those things, if you're going to go in and allow them to re-face or do sign maintenance. Whatever this is ultimately called. But, yes, I can have proposed language to talk with Danielle. I can provide that to her and continue that conversation, and also talk with Mr. Heaven. Do you have any other questions? That's really my thing. I just want to make sure that we have this for our businesses, that we can continue to have it be useable as we come and go, and the ultimate phase-out if that's what Council decides to do, to allow them to go by natural attrition.

Mr. Brown: Just for clarification, what are you specifically calling out as the nuance that you're trying to establish here?

Ms. McConwell: The same business firm name. Because everything else on the sign maintenance, it follows, but on the same business firm name. That doesn't count for either the sign maintenance. It was the same business firm name, it's called sign maintenance. Otherwise, it's called sign refacing. If it's sign re-facing, it's not allowed.

Chairman Lee: So, for clarification, the ownership remains the same?

Ms. McConwell: Yes sir.

Chairman Lee: The logo will be the same?

Ms. McConwell: Yes sir.

Chairman Lee: The only change was the actual name that it has been known. And again, it was the Valley View group, I understand, who did it across the board. Would they have had the ability to change it at all the locations.

Ms. McConwell: I don't know. I honestly answer that -I don't know. I know that they had to work with the banking commission, and I know that they are a highly regulated industry. So, I don't know that they could have changed some and not changed others. I also know that the particular sign at 5201 Johnson Drive, when that sign was worked on, a monument sign was discussed at that time. There were concerns about the sites around having a monument sign at that location. Wild Oats was an inactive business at that point, and you also had Capitol Federal and their building, there are some unique issues on that particular site. When and if a monument sign ever becomes an issue on that site, particularly now that we've got the transit station adjacent to that, with some of the sight lines, with traffic coming in and out – At that location, there are a number of ingresses and egresses on Johnson Drive, both two into that location, and the two into the transit station, as well. Hopefully, the people who own that Wild Oats building suddenly become motivated to sell it and allow a business go in, we're going to have some traffic issues that you guys are going to have to wrestle with.

Mr. Bruce: One comment, Mr. Shepherd mentioned the longstanding history of the Mission Bank, which used to be the Merriam Bank. It moved to Mission when it [*inaudible*]. It has been an extremely good corporate resident of Mission ever since, and I'm sure Valley View will be the same way.

Ms. McConwell: Valley View has been the owner of the Mission Bank for a number of years and has been a very good corporate citizen in Mission. I think we're very fortunate to live in the community that we live in because we do have a lot of support from our business community, and I do echo those concerned. It's constantly balancing in between the interests of the city government, and also the businesses, with the residents. It is a delicate balance. I don't think what we're asking for in this slight modification to what would be sign maintenance is going to – I think that helps maintain that balance. I think to have to have them remove the four signs that they have comes down pretty heavy on this particular business for just changing the name.

Mr. Babcock: The one down at 5201, is that have a sign ? Is that about an eight-story building?

Ms. McConwell: Six

Mr. Babcock: It seems like there's a sign over the entrance. Is there? A canopy sign? Is there a sign on the building?

Unidentified: Yes.

Ms. McConwell: Not on the street.

Mr. Babcock: I'm talking about actually on the building.

Ms. McConwell: Yes.

Mr. Babcock: And is that somewhere around that six story?

Unidentified: Yes.

Mr. Babcock: Okay. You're going to change that one?

Unidentified: Yes.

Ms. McConwell: We've got that one covered.

Mr. Babcock: I know you do.

Ms. McConwell: Okay. Thank you very much for your time.

Chairman Lee: Anyone else wishing to speak?

Steve Caffey, Block and Company, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Caffey: We represent the owners of Mission West Shopping Center. So, the Hobby Lobby just left. As you know, we put a Planet Fitness in, along with Dollar Tree. There remains a 9,000 square foot vacancy that will be filled, we hope fairly quickly. As part of our leasing effort, we did take down the single pole sign representing Hobby Lobby. It is gone. But, there is another pylon sign that lists all the tenants that are in the center. This is the Kansas License Bureau, the Thia Orchid, the salsa place, little tenants, as well as Planet Fitness and Dollar Tree. Taco Bell is also on that sign. We have spent a lot of time and money in an attempt to stay within the same structure. No enlargement at all. We've owned or controlled the sign and property since about 1995, or maybe even before that. What I'm trying to determine is whether or not we can put a Planet Fitness sign back up on that sign and be in compliance with this proposed ordinance. I'm not sure. I understood at the last commission meeting that you were trying to accommodate the businesses that had the signs up. There was a maintenance standard, there's all sorts of things that need to be done in order to comply.

On the other hand, from a practical standpoint, if you have an ordinance that would require a from

commercial real estate transaction, typical timeframe and timeline to get it accomplished, if you have an ordinance that says anything that's not used for more than 30 days, even 60 days, it's impractical. You might as well just say it's [inaudible]. You can't make a transaction that quick. You couldn't make a transaction that quick if you had businesses lined up to go into that building. It just wouldn't happen. Take Hobby Lobby, for example, they held over for three months after the expiration date. They had the right to do so, and we couldn't have gotten relief from the court to get them out any quicker than that. So, things happen in our business and our industry. Again, a short timeframe like that would take down every sign out there. That's what we're going to end up having.

Again, what I'm trying to figure out is whether or not we can use the same area of the sign, which we've actually contracted for now, to change the face of that sign to include all the businesses. There were four businesses that were never listed on the sign before. We have rearranged the size of some of the others accommodate these four businesses. So, we will have everyone listed on the pylon sign. Are we in compliance?

Ms. Sitzman: Mr. Chair, I'd be happy to talk to this gentleman regarding his existing sign and what he can and cannot do under the current sign code, in case he wants to go ahead and add his current tenants to that sign. I can also talk to him about what would be allowed, once we get closer to finding out what the true action of the pole signs will be. We've been talking about amortization of pole signs. I think ultimately the ordinance, if it were worded that way, would say "nonconforming detached signs." He definitely has a nonconforming detached sign. So, if the pole signs were to be amortized, this would be a sign that would be one given a date specific to be removed. All those other things, I'd be happy to speak with him about, as far as what he can do currently.

Chairman Lee: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak? [None.] Okay, at this point, we will close the public hearing. This will actually be a closed meeting at this point.

Ms. Sitzman: So, it is up to you on how you want to proceed with next steps. I would perceive the next steps to be to get closer to a final draft. This means taking some of the comments that you all have about this and tinkering what other things you want to change in the current proposal, and then, we would bring that back to you for review. I don't know that one meeting would be enough to get it ready for recommendation, but we could certainly try to get it a little bit closer to a recommendation and have a working draft that you're more comfortable with. We can go through the list like we did earlier and cross some things off.

Chairman Lee: Various categories?

Ms. Sitzman: Yes

Mr. Brown: Can we do that? I'm totally confused about that last interaction. And the reason is, they never stopped using the sign. There are multiple businesses on that sign. All they did was change out the businesses on the sign. So, how did that sign become not in use or compliance at any point in time?

Ms. Sitzman: I'm not sure I understand his concerns, but I think there's some confusion in determining our codes and their circumstance.

Mr. Braden: Yeah, I guess he was trying to apply some temporary sign thing to his sign.

Mr. Brown: Well, if he was trying to say that they were re-facing the sign.

Ms. Sitzman: There is a section of our non-conforming sign ordinance that does say a 30-day

limit. Something that is not used for 30 days is considered abandoned.

Mr. Brown: But, I mean, he's talking about not having used just a section

Ms. Sitzman: And I don't think that's an interpretation I would make. There's obviously some misunderstanding.

Mr. Brown: It's not like the whole center was abandoned, like Indian Springs Mall, or whatever. I think we would have to expect that they're going to rotate businesses in a strip center, or a situation like that.

Mr. Braden: And some will be vacant for more than 30 days, too.

Mr. Davidson: And then again, it just has to do with the verbiage, that that type of permanent sign that has the ability to change the different tenants, or whatever. And as a business owner, I understand exactly. He doesn't want to invest in redoing something that he's not 100 percent sure that he can do. So, they just want to be sure that this is what we're going to do; we're going to invest this money, and we're okay with it. They don't want to have the City knock on their door and say, "I'm sorry, your sign is not in compliance." That's all.

Ms. Sitzman: And I think Mission Bank is a little bit of the same circumstance. They may not want to reface their signs if they know that, even in seven years, they might need to go to a monument sign, rather than a pole sign. So, lots of folks have lots of questions about reinvestment.

Mr. Davidson: Right. And ironically, we're here at this stage with our sign code, and here's Mission Bank, Valley View Bank, rebranding, which is all about rebranding, you know, you make everything like they belong to each other. And here we are ironically deciding what we can and can't do.

Mr. Bruce: A point of clarification - If that was a monument sign that listed all the businesses, he could change it out any way he wanted to, right?

Ms. Sitzman: Right.

Mr. Bruce: No restrictions.

Ms. Sitzman: Right.

Mr. Bruce: So, I think his concern is that since we're calling it a pole sign, we put all these restrictions on pole signs, and he can't change any elements of a pole sign. But if it's a monument sign, doing the same thing, it wouldn't be a problem.

Ms. Sitzman: That could be. So, I would start at the bottom of this list of things that we talked about earlier and just do a quick poll. Does anyone have any concerns about the changes that we proposed for maintenance? Basically, this is a process where we would be able to – currently, you're allowed to abate signs. It's just how we reclaim the money that we have to expend to do that, changing that process. Right now, it's got to go the City Council, and like other abatement which are part of the tax roles as a lien. This would just be standardizing that process. If nobody has any objections?

Marquee signs. Again, it seems like the smart thing to do, to allow buildings that have marquees and those districts to go ahead and install marquee signs, rather than having to do private sign criteria. I don't know how much this is going to come up again. It's already kind of asked and

answered.

Electronic signs. It was my recollection it was only Mr. Brown who had a comment on this. His comments were more to the effect that he was okay with these even more than this, if you wanted to pursue that. I don't know that I would recommend that at this time since we're trying to keep the scope of our sign code changes to a fairly limited basis. I will tell you, I've had at least one request recently to do a monument sign with the electronic fuel pricing on it, and I had to tell them we are in the midst of trying to decide. Technically, our code doesn't allow it now, so I can't approve anything. It would be nice to get this one. Maybe address the other issues with the electronic signs in a larger review of the sign code and we can take it back out into the field.

Chairman Lee: How did the one get changed? At that time, it wasn't allowed.

Ms. Sitzman: I would have to look. Whether an interpretation was made because it was an existing sign, it was okay. Our attorney has said, for example, with billboard signs, when those were converted to electronic, that was something we didn't really have a say in stopping because they were existing billboard signs. I don't know the exact history of every one of those. It seems like it's a very common sign type in the industry to have fuel pricing be electric. So, unless you have a burning desire to talk about electronic signs elsewhere? Mr. Brown, are you okay with limiting our current changes to fuel pricing?

Mr. Brown: That's fine.

Ms. Sitzman: I mean, there are ways to do it, and you brought up very valid ways to go about regulating how frequently the messages change, the illumination levels, and things like that. It's just not currently part of our code. We would have to create whole new sections to address that, and I'd rather not.

Chairman Lee: That's not uncommon, and many cities around here have that?

Ms. Sitzman: Yes. It's certainly something that's more modern.

Chairman Lee: But it's not enforced. So, if you set it up, it has to be changed then.

Mr. Braden: I think gas pumps, once or twice a day, at the most.

Chairman Lee: Well, that's not the price. It's the other ones.

[Overlapping comments.]

Mr. Babcock: I imagine it's like the CVS on Johnson Drive, which had some sort of message on it.

Ms. Sitzman: I've seen them a lot at high schools. They use them a lot for changing events, that kind of thing.

Mr. Brown: Selling cigarettes and things like that, too.

Ms. Sitzman: In terms of attention-attracting devices, Mr. Troppito had some concern about whether people should be considered devices. I'm sure our attorney can tell us whether that's alright or not. I guess more of the question is, do we want to get into regulating costume characters, or not? We've asked this before; it's another thing I thought we should check again. Of course, it's the beginning of tax season, so you may see Lady Liberty a lot this year. But, it's not a burning issue. Staff would be okay with not making these changes if there's not a burning

desire to do it.

Mr. Babcock: My issue would be if they're out there every day. Not only that, but if you had every business with them out every day.

Ms. Sitzman: Which we're not seeing.

Mr. Babcock: We don't see it.

Ms. Dukelow: Are they temporary? They're a form of it. They're a sign.

Ms. Sitzman: Attention attracting devices are all temporary signs. These are just temporary signs that are all prohibited. So, calling them attention-attracting devices. But essentially, every one of these things is probably a temporary sign, as well. A larger definition of a sign.

Mr. Babcock: So, they would fall under that limited timeframe that we're talking about? We're probably looking at less than six months, total, per year.

Ms. Sitzman: Yeah, that would be one way to regulate them, as just the 60-days-on, 60-days-off, or whatever period of time that is. I think we would want to add them as a description of temporary sign, rather than the description of attention attracting devices, if you're okay with allowing them as temporary signs.

Mr. Braden: I'm just thinking, seeing row after row – Like you say, it's not happening now, but –

Ms. Sitzman: It's a seasonal thing when it does happen.

Mr. Troppito: I have yet to hear anyone say that this is a problem. And if it a problem, why it is a problem?

Ms. Sitzman: Today, we had to call a business and ask them to please have their employee not stand in public parking stalls.

Mr. Troppito: Well, as I said earlier, I can see not banning this activity, but regulating it. Like, so many feet from the centerline of the street, and not creating a traffic hazard. Or, a situation like you just mentioned. That would make sense to me. But to ban it all together, I just don't see that.

Mr. Davidson: I think what Danielle said is that it needs to be put into a category, is that correct?

Ms. Sitzman: It would be best, yes. Address them one way or another. If we're going to list them as a banned sign type as an attention attracting devices, or if we're going to allow them to be listed as a temporary sign.

Mr. Davidson: I think something needs to be mentioned in the ordinance, so that when issues do come about, at least there's something to govern it by, whether it's temporary or what-have-you. Again, another thing we talked about was the definition of "temporary." Is it 60 days is that the sign duration of those signs? We can talk about that real quick and get everybody's opinion as to whether 60 days is too long for the definition of a temporary sign. To just get things so that Danielle can get down as much verbiage and rewrite some things and move this down the road.

Mr. Brown: I struggle with that, just because it's not a sign; it's a person. And it's not a device; it's a person. So, how do you –

Mr. Braden: I think we can define it as a person, and then [*overlapping comments*] category for attention-attracting devices.

Mr. Brown: I guess I would ask the question, are there any older, more antiquated ordinances regarding hailers, or things like that? Like from Boston, Chicago, New York days? I assume there's a reason people stopped doing those types of things, because they finally got regulated out of it. So, I see it more like that, as a hailer-type thing. Even though they're not being vocal, they're really hailing you to come in with their actions and their costume. Personally, I just don't see it. I would look more in that direction maybe.

Ms. Dukelow: However, I would add that if they weren't promoting the business, if they weren't advertising for the business, the business wouldn't be paying them to stand on the street. And whatever it is, I mean, they are a form of advertising, and maybe they're not flat as there is a person, but I still think they're a sign. I think they are a temporary sign.

Mr. Babcock: You could stick them in that. It's an advertising person.

Ms. Dukelow: A lot of businesses get around the sign criteria, the temporary criteria, by having a person out there to hold it.

Mr. Babcock: I mean, when it comes right down to it, does it really matter if we stick them in a sign category versus a hailer category? How does that work? Why does it matter?

Mr. Brown: If you're being sued over something and they're saying you really didn't regulate it because [*inaudible*] of that thing, then –

Mr. Babcock: Well, no, if we actually put it in the definition of temporary signs that this includes individuals in costumes, then it becomes part of it.

Mr. Brown: Okay. But if you write the definition to include that, I suppose you'd be right.

Mr. Babcock: Yes.

Mr. Davidson: The definition would have to actually have a human being in it. Because there's a product out there I saw on Shark Tank a couple years ago, where you put a picture of someone's head on it and an antenna on it, and it moves its arm - ? Just like the what the Liberty costumed characters do, but it's all mechanical.

Mr. Brown: I guess the question is, do we want to regulate it, or not?

[*Overlapping comments.*]

Ms. Sitzman: There was a period of time where we had three or four of them in the same area of the commercial district and it seemed like a lot at the time. There was a pizza place, and a jewelry store, and it was tax prep season. But that was several years ago and it hasn't been an issue since.

Chairman Lee: The biggest issue that we have with them is the fact that they're distracting? Or because they're standing out - ?

Ms. Sitzman: It's their behavior. Because their behavior is such, we end up having to be involved with them. If they were just prohibited, we wouldn't have to take the time to monitor their behavior.

Chairman Lee: If I were to go out and do the same thing without the name, would I be allowed to do that?

Ms. Sitzman: If you were in a costume? Or if you weren't?

Chairman Lee: I'm in a costume, but I'm not advertising a business.

Ms. Sitzman: No. Because I think that Robin's point is, because they're advertising a business, that's the behavior.

Chairman Lee: So, if I wanted to just do it, to dress up as the Statue of Liberty - .

[*Overlapping comments.*]

Ms. Sitzman: Yes , if you wanted to dress us as the Statue of Liberty

Chairman Lee: - I can distract, and wave, and do all that kind of stuff?

Ms. Sitzman: There's other ways to regulate that behavior, like loitering, or whatever the other things are. Which is an entirely other way to regulate the behavior. It doesn't have to be in the sign code.

Chairman Lee: Once again, if Mike Lee decides that he wants to dress up as the Statue of Liberty, as a Mission resident, and I'm walking up and down the street, what would constitute that being loitering?

Ms. Sitzman: That is not my specialty, so I'm not going to try to answer that.

Ms. Dukelow: You're not getting paid to do it. You're not scheduled to do that.

Chairman Lee: But the concern is, is it because I'm advertising a business, or am I a distraction? Or, is it a safety hazard? That's what I'm trying to decide, in my mind. I don't like them, but it is sometimes amusing to watch them. Not so much in Mission, but some of these other guys.

Mr. Braden: If you're waving your arms around and you stepped into traffic, or if you were taking up a parking spot, or something like that, then I would think even as a citizen, it would become something [*inaudible*].

Mr. Troppito: Exactly. You would be subject to the same punitive action, whether you were being paid by a company to do it, or not. Distracting traffic, the penalty is going to be the same. It doesn't need to be the City of Mission's sign department going out and assessing the penalty.

[*Overlapping comments.*]

Chairman Lee: If you did it as a temporary sign where you could control where they stand, how far back they stand, and things like that.

Ms. Sitzman: And how many days of a year they can be there. Yes.

Mr. Braden: Yeah, but you were talking about 10 days or so for true temporary signs. Well, tax season is three to six months. How do you regulate that?

Chairman Lee: Well, again, if you did it like Overland Park does it, that there's 10 days where you could put all three of those at 10 times allowed or 30 days that's it.

Ms. Sitzman: You're talking about temporary signs then, since there seems to be a bit of an overlap between the two?

Chairman Lee: Yes.

Ms. Sitzman: Okay. So, lots of things going on with temporary signs. Like I said, staff's primary objective is to get something that's more useful for enforcement as far as duration goes. That's only one element. It sounds like finding a way to – height, size, setbacks, materials, all those

other things besides duration that came up.

Chairman Lee: In my mind, material is probably less of a problem. Setback is important, the overall height and size, I think that's important.

Ms. Sitzman: We currently have no setback. They have to be on their private property, not in our right-of-way. There are parts of town that would make them awfully close to the street. So, setbacks would be a new element.

Chairman Lee: Why should it be any different than the permanent signs?

Ms. Sitzman: Do you think we should be more sophisticated and tailor those standards to each zoning district, rather than have one setback standard for all zoning districts for temporary signs?

Ms. Dukelow: It seems to me that our sidewalks are pretty close to the street, no matter where – It would seem to me that it could be-

[Overlapping comments.]

Ms. Sitzman: Right. So, a 10-foot setback would be impossible to do in the downtown area. Where it might still be appropriate to have a temporary sign in that area, it couldn't possibly be 10 feet back from the property line because the building is built to the property line. So, if we tailored it by zoning district, we could take the built environment into account.

Mr. Brown: Downtown, I mean, those sidewalks are in the right-of-way, right?

Ms. Sitzman: Mostly.

Ms. Dukelow: But we're rarely going to put a temporary sign downtown anyway.

Ms. Sitzman: The sandwich board concept of a temporary sign.

Chairman Lee: Yes, but you don't want those out at the street.

Ms. Dukelow: I guess in my mind, the sandwich boards, I mean, that's like Lulu's, who has that chalkboard that they put out. I don't know how to distinguish that, but that's much more sophisticated and attractive. It doesn't seem to fall into temporary signage, to me, in my opinion. Is a table and chairs out on the sidewalk temporary signage? If a business is a coffee shop and had a temporary, I don't know - Where is the threshold? Maybe we need to define this by materials. Because the chalkboard, it seems like it belongs there. I wouldn't think of it as a temporary sign.

Chairman Lee: I think I would look at those types of signs, whether it be Lulu's, or Johnny's, or RJ's, coming up with some type of sign that they can have that would be permanent. They're not getting moved around. But you have to have some size restrictions and make sure it's not in the middle of the sidewalk. To me, it doesn't make a difference what the material itself is. I'm not looking at those as temporary signs. To me, the temporary signs are the stuff that we see that gets thrown out along Johnson Drive, along the street –

Mr. Babcock: The wire foam board things -

Chairman Lee: Well, that by itself doesn't bother me, but it does bother me when you've got 30 of them, or 40 of them, or whatever it is, and the more you have right by the street. But in that same general area, you've got bigger ones that go up across the street there, that are much, much bigger.

Mr. Babcock: You know why it bothers me? Because the day it goes in, it looks fine. But then, somebody walks by, they bend it, next thing you know, it's bent over, maybe the wind blew it over, etc.

Chairman Lee: Well, somebody should probably quit doing that.

[*Laughter.*]

Mr. Babcock: But that's the problem I have. It's less durable.

Chairman Lee: Well, if a temporary sign is really, truly temporary, for a short period of time, that's [*inaudible*]. It's not really a concern.

Mr. Babcock: True. Absolutely.

Mr. Davidson: To me, it sounds like the general consensus is in getting the definitions in multiple categories on, you know, temporary signs, versus –.

Mr. Babcock: It sounds like we need to zone it somewhat because of just the physical locations these would go.

Ms. Sitzman: Okay. I can take a crack at temporary signs by zoning districts, try to give you standards to consider by zoning district that may be appropriate for duration. I think I might explore what other jurisdictions have done about something more permanent. Higher-quality material that's removable. That's maybe what a sandwich board is, is something that's more like a permanent sign, but it's – I'm struggling with the definition of what that is. I can see if there's maybe another category of permanent sign that we can allow that would accommodate those daily specials, as long as it's a higher-quality sign. That it becomes more like a permanent sign than a temporary sign in that way.

Mr. Davidson: That would be good.

Mr. Troppito: That makes more sense to me.

Ms. Sitzman: Was height an issue for anyone, with temporary signs. There's no height limit other than 16 feet –

Mr. Davidson: My only concern is the line of sight and traffic. Public safety.

Mr. Babcock: I don't want to see a 16-foot sandwich board on the sidewalk.

Chairman Lee: On permanent signs, the sign can only be five foot overall [*inaudible*]. Why would we allow a temporary -?

Mr. Babcock: Exactly.

Mr. Brown: I'd say it shouldn't be any taller than the decorative fence that's allowed across someone's house.

Mr. Davidson: With that being said, I can see it, but I can't visualize Lulu's. What's that picture they have up in front of Lulu's?

Ms. Sitzman: It's a silhouette.

Mr. Davidson: That's right, that's what it is. And it's not three foot tall. You know what I'm saying?

Ms. Sitzman: Three foot may be too restrictive. Certainly the height of our current -

[Overlapping comments.]

Mr. Brown: -- to survey what, the ones that we are okay with, what the tallest one is.

Mr. Davidson: I'm just saying, there's a situation right there. It's like, okay, Lulu's silhouette, it can't be three feet tall because these are the restrictions. Just another challenge.

Ms. Dukelow: That's an interesting thing, that Danielle is going to considering this by district. I think the textural quality of the fabric that we're trying to create and the variety that attracts people I think some of these things are appropriate in the downtown district. Like the little sandwich boards. Somebody said it looks like it belongs out in front of that business because it's representative of that business. And it's not screaming at you. There's an antique store down there, next to The Bar. A couple doors down from Lulu's. And sometimes they'll put out a trike, or a wagon, or something like that. For some reason, that seems okay. But, at the same time, the flag snipes don't seem okay. So, I don't know where the threshold is. When I think of a three-foot-high temporary sign, that seems very reasonable to me. But to make the Lulu's silhouette three foot high doesn't seem – It seems inconsistent. It doesn't seem like we're talking about apples and apples. More like apples and potatoes.

[Laughter]

Mr. Brown: What do you think of that Danielle?

Ms. Sitzman: I think you just gave me a lot of work.

[Overlapping comments]

Mr. Babcock: Here's a thing I'll tell you. On the poles signs on this deal too- . Maybe that's a way you look at it, is that park that's next to Metcalf, being the park that has the longest period of time, you know, if the Council determines that they wanted to get rid of them after a period of time, make that period of time longer, possibly.

Ms. Sitzman: You're talking about pole signs?

Mr. Babcock: I do want to talk about this. Like in Mission Bank's case. I see no reason to allow them to do it on 5201. Because they can have a sign on the bank, on the building, that's actually taller than the pole sign. They have one over the entryway.

Ms. Sitzman: Let's start with pole signs in general before we get into the refacing in general.

Mr. Babcock: Okay.

Ms. Sitzman: We're still going to forward a recommendation on this to the City Council. The City Council wants to think about this. So, we'll proceed with preparing something that says that pole size amortization – a deadline on it. It's perfectly alright if you guys don't support that recommendation. So, unless somebody has something they want to add to the amortization, I don't know that we need to talk about that any more. Does anyone have a different number of years that they would recommend? You're talking about maybe different parts of town have different numbers of years -?

Mr. Babcock: That's a possibility, if they insist on going that route. But I don't think there should be an amortization.

Chairman Lee: Maybe we should take a consensus.

Ms. Sitzman: The question that came up about the Mission Bank signs is actually a separate thing from pole signs, entirely. It has to do with any nonconforming sign. There's just happens to be a pole sign. So, the question about considering changing the definitions in our sign codes of what "maintenance" is and what "re-facing" is, is that question. So, we'll see what they would like to do. My concern is the number of questions that we needed to ask just to figure out what ownership, how that was structured. It's not an easy thing to enforce. How do you document ownership? Does it matter if you're held by a corporation versus -?

Chairman Lee: I would think just the opposite. I would think by having those guidelines, that would be the simplest thing.

Mr. Babcock: You can document ownership. It's very simple. Every corporation has its bylaws.

Chairman Lee: You have state incorporation papers, etc.

Ms. Sitzman: We can consider changing the definition. I can bring that back and we can talk about when it would kick in, and what the circumstances would be. Then you would have a better idea of what that affects. I think the sign code was written to be as easy as possible. If you can see that it's a different business, don't get into the weeds on who owned it, or how it's structured. It's a sign.

Chairman Lee: But the type of business remains the same. The ownership in that case is the same. Their logo is the same. The name changes, but it's still the same business.

Ms. Sitzman: For uses, that's the same standard we use. Like the Keyhole. A couple years ago, they changed ownership, but the use was still a private club. It didn't matter. It's a private club. Sign code goes a step above that and says, Okay, you're defining maintenance and re-facing for a reason; it's because you want nonconforming signs to go away faster than you want nonconforming uses to go away. So, whereas it's okay for the use, for the business to be owned by different people and still be allowed as a business there, it was written so that it's not okay for these signs that are nonconforming to still be out there in the community. They need to go away faster than the way we make nonconforming businesses go away. That's just the way it was structured. So, if the body wants to consider changing those definitions to allow nonconforming to stay in use longer because it might still be the same business, we can consider that.

Mr. Babcock: My point is that the pole signs down by Mission Bank on the eastern side of town, there's other options. One, we don't want the signs. There's other options that they can do, that they can meet the same criteria, basically. Accomplish the same thing. On the other hand, the one by Metcalf with the time and temp on it, I look at that as, you're not going to put a time and temp on the side of the building. It's been there forever, it's got a little bit of –

Chairman Lee: Let me ask a question. Why would you not put one on the side of the building? It's done all the time.

Mr. Babcock: I know, but it's different. And I can't explain it.

Chairman Lee: I mean, it's done all the time. More times, it's on the buildings than –

Mr. Babcock: I know, but – Does it make sense that it doesn't have the character? Does that make sense?

Ms. Dukelow: You like that sign because it's classic?

Mr. Babcock: Yeah. That's kind of what I'm getting at.

Ms. Dukelow: I'm not sure that that would stand up in court.

Mr. Bruce: My question is, do we want to get rid of pole signs, whatever the cost? Or, are we trying to capacitate our businesses? If we capacitate our businesses, if it's a minor change and it's not unattractive, I don't see why we're making such a big issue over this.

Mr. Babcock: Here's the thing. If you look at the pole sign down by 5201. For them to go in there and change that sign, there's going to be a cost to it, right? So, the City doesn't want pole signs. So, what's the cost relative to taking that same sign and putting it on the sixth story of the building?

Chairman Lee: It's not even remotely close.

Mr. Babcock: What's more expensive?

Chairman Lee: Well, certainly, putting it on the side of the building.

Mr. Bruce: The business feels like that sign is important to them.

Mr. Babcock: That's the reason why we are having the conversation -

[Overlapping comments.]

Chairman Lee: I mean, you're talking about face change are minor compared to what you're talking about building it on the side of the building-

Mr. Bruce: Because it feels like that sign is important to them, enough that they Laura McConwell to have actually talked to us about that. They obviously feel like there's value in that sign. Now, if they change that, and there's probably 1,000 people a day that drive back there, if you ask how many of them notice the sign was changed, probably a lot of them wouldn't notice it. If they don't even notice the sign was changed, was it really unattractive to them? Was it an eyesore to them?

Mr. Babcock: And part of the reason why I'm having this discussion on it, though, is I'll tell you, like you've all heard me say, I've lived here since 1966. I can't even tell you exactly where that sign is on the property, but I can tell you where the sign is on the property at Metcalf. So, is it really that effective, if a resident that's been here for 50 years can't tell you that? But they can tell you exactly the other one? So, which one is more effective?

Now, that being said, I do believe there is a cost associated that that business is going to incur. That's great information, and that's one of the reasons why it's great he's on this committee, is I don't like the idea that they're going to have to incur a huge expense to put it on the building.

Mr. Bruce: I was at Goodyear a little over a week ago, and somebody called and wanted to know where they were. And they said, "We're right across the street from the Mission Bank." For the person driving through that obviously, that was a sign to them as they knew where Mission Bank was.

[Overlapping comments.]

Mr. Bruce: Is Western Auto in business anymore? No. But the people who bought that thought it was a good thing to have that. And that's a roof sign.

Mr. Troppito: That seems to me to be very easily discernible within *[inaudible]*. A business that's changing from one business to another, versus simply rebranding itself.

Mr. Brown: My preferred method of getting rid of the pole signs is by the attrition of the business.

Ms. Dukelow: I think we reached that consensus last time, didn't we? I think it was unanimous the last time we had this conversation.

Mr. Brown: How did they word that?

Ms. Sitzman: Actually, they have a suggestion, and we'll look at their suggestion. We've also been talking with Pete Heaven at Lathrop & Gage to see what he would suggest as an enforceable for rebranding, versus truly changing businesses. So, we'll get it.

Mr. Brown: So, if Johnny's Barbecue changes to Johnny's KC Barbecue, he can reface the sign? That kind of thing? Have you seen his sign? The one on the west side -It's just a white blank now.

Ms. Sitzman: I'm amazed that anybody needs a sign to find that place. You must have nose damage if you can't find it.

[*Laughter.*]

Mr. Brown: Great point.

Ms. Sitzman: Monument signs, that's not an issue for this body, I don't think, as far as allowing it. The folks on the BZA did have to go through the variances for two of them before we got to this stage it should curtail any other need for those requests. Like I said, I don't think it's going to be likely to see more, just because there aren't that many situations where they are needed or could fit. I think that's everything. Window signs would be the other one.

Mr. Braden: I understand the it was 50 percent but I'm kind of with Robin – Is 50 percent too much?

Ms. Sitzman: The feedback that I heard was sort of the consensus that in the downtown in particular, where we have higher standards for design criteria, 50 percent is way too much. Keeping it at 10 percent seems more reasonable in the downtown.

Chairman Lee: If you look at, for example, a hat shop. To me, that's perfect for them. This fish/seafood is not. But, if that were larger than 10 percent, you ought to have it.

Ms. Dukelow: I mean, we can't see the top –

[*Overlapping comments.*]

Chairman Lee: How do you define that? Is it rectangle like all the other signs, or is it just the actual space that it takes up?

Mr. Davidson: That's true - the exact volume of the font, in this case, versus the picture.

Ms. Dukelow: Well, I mean, visually, the fish/seafood looks like two big squares to me. I mean, it all runs together. There's no way to touch or feel the interior through that? Right? I mean, it's not integral.

Chairman Lee: Right, but if they have the same thing without the background part of it. It's still what we are trying to do.

Ms. Dukelow: But what I'm saying is that the hat shop is dramatic. It's so much less. So, the fish

shop could almost be seen as two big rectangles, and the hat shop, I mean, it's a whole lot easier to see that as just –

Chairman Lee: But again, if you draw a rectangle around the hat shop, it's a lot more than 10 percent.

Ms. Sitzman: Could the sign company itemize for me the actual opaque parts that have had the box drawn around it?

[Overlapping comments.]

Chairman Lee: For example, Kansas City, Missouri, that's how they are going about it.

Ms. Sitzman: So, I think we could measure in a different manner when it comes to window signs and what we do with other signs, a more sophisticated calculation. Being able to see through the window is the important part. The sign covering up the window is the only thing we care about, not the opaque parts, or the transparent parts. You only care about the opaque parts. So, if we were only going to do 10 percent, and we could get a better measurement than that, we could expand more of the window, as long as you could still see through between the lettering. That would be acceptable, is what I'm hearing. Being able to see through the window matters.

Mr. Davidson: If that hat shop sign was blown up where the fonts were actually taking up 50 percent of the glass area of that window, you would have, you know, a section of the "A" and the "T" and the "S," and everything else would be off the window.

Chairman Lee: Right, but even with that, you'd still see through it.

Mr. Davidson: Right. That's what I'm saying, is taking the actual footprint of, in that case, the font, or the print of what's going onto the sign space, take that into consideration instead of the triangle around it.

Ms. Dukelow: Do we really have to be this precise?

Laura Smith, City Administrator, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Smith: Let me tell you something, that when we talked about it at the staff level, what we realized, because when we started this by saying, let's do a sign inventory, find out where we have major areas of non-compliance, and make sure it still says what we want it to, before we go out and do any proactive or aggressive sign code enforcement. And so what we realized then was the downtown district is the only place now where window signs are technically allowed. So, move yourselves out of the downtown and think about McDonald's, and Taco Bell, and all the restaurants, and the posters, and all the things that get changed out with their specials. So, right now, technically, if we were going out and enforcing consistently, we would have to go into all of those businesses, and all of that window signage would come down. So, we were trying to think, you know, does it bother us in those other areas? Is that just part of doing business? I think if you think about how passionately people feel about pole signs, if you start talking about those other corporate establishments, franchises, etc., those things come out from their corporate headquarters every quarter. It's part of your program to change those out. So, we're trying to find that balance of, you know, in the character of downtown, what you might want to be, at that street level, interacting, versus what is an appropriate percentage as you're driving up to or through a fast-food establishment, or the Hy-Vee. That's where we landed more on that 50 percent. So, maybe it does make sense to limit, have it be

more restrictive in the downtown district, where you'd want that interaction from the street at the pedestrian level.

Ms. Dukelow: Right. I mean, clearly, 50 percent would be an improvement on some of the buildings. Like you said, the ones that have a sign in every window.

Mr. Brown: Popeye's, and Burger King.

Ms. Dukelow: That would be an improvement right there.

Ms. Smith: Well, your Hy-Vee's, your liquor – I mean, you look at any of those and the windows are really a major form of advertising and signage for them.

Ms. Dukelow: So maybe that, too, needs to be considered by district.

Ms. Sitzman: I would say that there would be a downtown and a non-downtown. Rather than every zoning district. Although it might work out to just list it by every zoning district.

Chairman Lee: So your thoughts, getting away from downtown would be 50 percent? And as you go into downtown, it would be decreased?

Ms. Sitzman: It's currently 10 percent. Keeping it at 10 percent downtown seems to make sense. I don't think the folks that have wanted to comply with that had a hard time with it. I think the folks that don't even know there's a requirement are the ones that, that's the violation.

Chairman Lee: Could you maybe look at how it's defined?

Ms. Sitzman: How it's measured? The definition? Yes. Right now, we have a definition of how to measure other signs, and we could make a specific definition of how to measure window signs, since it's a different medium.

Mr. Bruce: I personally have no problem with 50 percent, and I think that's the tool for the owner of the business. Like Laura said, a lot of it comes from corporate, from outside, and you're putting them a box. So, they're trying to manage their business in accordance with best practices, and also corporate requests. If we had an overwhelming thing that says, "Oh, if you go 50 percent, that's going to create a hazard, a safety thing," or whatever, I'd say yes. It's arbitrary.

Ms. Sitzman: I will refine that so that the changes are split between two different percentages and at least two different zones or areas. I think you had some questions that were probably answered by the definition of what's a sign.

Mr. Davidson: The sign and the graphics? Yeah, that was something I brought up as far as with the new graphic technology, with how they use that. What is a design, and what's a sign?

Ms. Sitzman: The interesting thing is, we've seen more businesses doing window display, which is not a window sign; it's like the hats. That's a window display. Versus a window sign. So, some of the window displays are also graphics. Freebird's World Burritos, they don't actually have window signs. They've got things inside their store that you can see through their windows, that are more like a window display. The CVS at 75th and Metcalf is another example of the older-style department store's display window. So, it could be in downtown, or it could be in other areas of town, too. That's not regulated by the sign code. There's no limit on that. We like to see merchandise in windows.

Mr. Davidson: Doesn't National Grocers have graphics on the building that faces Johnson Drive?

It seems like I recall seeing some type of graphics on that. Meaning, okay, is that taking more than 50 percent of the window out? I'm just saying, just to have that, you know, defined.

Mr. Troppito: What about graphic signs floating in the middle of the street?

[*Laughter.*]

Ms. Sitzman: I think we've been through it all.

Ms. Dukelow: I have a question on this matrix. On the window signs, under Residential, I'm trying to figure out what it means. Single-family residential has it down as a yes. Does that mean that it didn't have to have a permit for a window sign on a single-family residential building? But with the proposed changes, they would?

Ms. Sitzman: No, it's not the permit required, it's the, are they allowed? The first one is, are permits required? The next, all of the things that are in yellow are, are they allowed, or not?

Ms. Dukelow: So, we're saying that single-family residential can't have a window sign?

Ms. Sitzman: Currently. If you think that's a concern?

Ms. Dukelow: I don't understand. That's what it says currently? I guess I don't understand the motivation. I don't know why this would be an issue. Is it an issue?

Ms. Sitzman: We don't do a lot of sign enforcement in the residential district. We tend to let people display whatever signs they think are appropriate in their homes. Right now, it's not allowed. Right now, the only place where window signs are defined as being okay is in the downtown.

Mr. Brown: So, if I write "Merry Christmas" on my picture window, that's a violation?

Ms. Sitzman: Currently. Unless it's normally customary for people to soap their windows at Christmas.

Mr. Brown: It always has been.

Mr. Babcock: On the other hand, there's the guy who lives around 57th and Beverly that has a Darth Vader or something.

Ms. Sitzman: Is that a window display?

Mr. Babcock: Yes. It is. I'm not kidding. I ran into that when I was campaigning. And it drives the neighbors nuts. That's probably the reason why it exists.

Mr. Braden: Can I backtrack just a bit on the attention-attracting devices? Are we saying we don't want the attention-attracting devices except in what we consider the Statue of Liberty people, or something similar to that? Because I don't think we ever really talked about the floppy-armed things.

Ms. Sitzman: Those are not costumed characters. Those are already an attention-attracting device and already prohibited.

Mr. Braden: Okay, so we want to maintain that.

Chairman Lee: Ok so we have the flopping guys, but what about the flag

Ms. Sitzman: Are you talking about people, or - ?

Mr. Lee: No. The flag like ones..

[*Overlapping comments.*]

Ms. Smith: The feathers ...

Ms. Sitzman: The feathers are also prohibited.

Ms. Dukelow: The three-foot restriction will take care of a lot of those, too. If that survives.

Mr. Braden: Those are already prohibited, or unacceptable except for the human beings part.

Chairman Lee: Are they prohibited everywhere?

Ms. Sitzman: Yes. Searchlights, balloons, pennant flags – everything that has the action of movement, is prohibited. So, we have a meeting in February.

Mr. Babcock: By the way, they already have signs on the [*inaudible*]. You're going to have to change those out anyway.

Chairman Lee: Yeah, but, we don't know that any sort of movement. And they can change those.

Ms. Sitzman: So, agenda for February. This will be on it. Should we move on to staff update at this point.

Staff Update

Staff reminded Committee about the national conference is in May in New York.

ADJOURNMENT

With no other agenda items, **Mr. Brown moved and Mr. Braden seconded a motion to adjourn.** (Vote was unanimous). The **motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 8:31 P.M.

Mike Lee, Chair

ATTEST:

Nora Tripp, Secretary