

From: Dan Piper <pipe0008@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 9:17 AM
To: Mike Ridley
Subject: RE: Wednesday am download

You've described it precisely the way I would have described it.

Are we going to be in trouble later if some business owner says they want etched names of their business (or projected graphics) on 50% or more of their building in addition to typical building signage?

From: Mike Ridley [mailto:MRidley@[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 8:20 AM
To: 'Dan Piper'
Subject: RE: Wednesday am download

It was a "signage heavy" agenda last night.

We may need to clarify. I thought the APC landed on 20% on two sides of the IPF for naming partner signage, no issue with the same building having occasional integrated (non-advertising) graphics on the entire facade and the etched or integral Norseman head and Vikings script not counting against the signage percentages.

From: Dan Piper [mailto:pipe0008@[REDACTED]]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 8:13 AM
To: Mike Ridley
Subject: Wednesday am download

Were we crazy on the signage? The Vikings stuff seemed more artistic to me than advertising. Celebration of a community asset, etc. I tried to put that into the record for someone making a 50% signage request in the future. Maybe it'd never hold up, but I feel like we could still say no if some other business asks for 50% signage.

It seemed a little strange to approve the Vikings 50% signage right after we rejected the 9 signs proposal, though.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dan Piper <pipe0008@██████████>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 9:17 AM
To: Mike Ridley
Subject: RE: Wednesday am download

You've described it precisely the way I would have described it.

Are we going to be in trouble later if some business owner says they want etched names of their business (or projected graphics) on 50% or more of their building in addition to typical building signage?