

MAP 21 Possibilities

Outcome	Result...
<p>New State regs applicable to MAP 21 City Principal Arterial segments are more restrictive than city code in some instances, less in others.</p>	<p>Where state code is more restrictive, city code must be changed to match state code – BB becomes...?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illegal? • Nonconforming? • Must be removed? • CCO gets compensation for removal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From state? ○ from City? <p>Where state code is less restrictive, City code governs.</p> <p>State policy on nonconforming signs: [insert explanation]</p> <p>ACTION: identify LOCATIONS and ISSUES where Stricter State regs might be imposed. Keep this in mind as solutions are developed.</p>
<p>State regs make clear that state compensation statutes apply if City or State requires removal of a BB on Map 21 arterial --because BB complies with new state regulations (it's legal)</p>	<p>If package recommended by CWG includes recommendation to remove a bunch of BB that now require compensation, this recommendation becomes newly expensive for the city to implement any forced removal of signs.</p> <p>Could mean that the exchange recommendation/receiving zone recommendation from CWG is not workable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TO avoid this outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ pick receiving zones that are not along Principal Arterials? ○ Other?
<p>State regs make clear that state compensation statutes do not apply if City or State requires removal of a BB on Map 21 arterial</p>	<p>No problems arise.</p>