

Date: October 27, 2016  
To: Michael Shannon  
From: June Kachtik  
Re: Revisions to Ch. 28 – Process for dealing with new technologies

**The process to deal with new technologies** – see Page 9, new version

You are making the argument that staff will have a process in place to judge whether or not new technologies are safe. The proposed wording seems to refer more to structural safety. For the public's assurance that other forms of safety are being considered, I suggest making these modifications related to driver safety:

- A. Add another type of sign to those that constitute a violation to Chapter 28:  
(10) Signs emitting excessive luminance.  
See Page 2, ARTICLE II – ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES. Sec. 28-4, (a) Public Considerations. No sign or related structure shall be approved or erected in contravention to public life, health, safety and welfare considerations as outlined below and a sign or related structure so constructed constitutes a violation of this chapter.
  
- B. Add to information the applicant must submit for an administrative exception:  
The proposed luminance level must meet the criteria of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, 'Recommended Luminance for Poster Panels, Painted Bulletins, and Other Advertising Signs', IESNA (2000). Lighting Handbook, New York, Illuminating Engineering Society.  
See Page 5, ARTICLE II – ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES. Sec. 28-5, Jurisdiction, Enforcement and Appeals, Section (c) Administrative Exceptions.

My note regarding B:

From what I have been reading, Lewin is recommending measuring light trespass, which seems to be the wrong criterion. I put in the one recommended by the IES. Could the Committee discuss the appropriate criterion for excessive lighting?

- C. Add to wording regarding safety:  
including prevention of driver distraction