



MEMO

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Renee Hall, City Clerk
Date: October 9, 2026
Subject: Packet of Communications to Council

Listed below are the communications to the City Council known to staff as of October 9, 2026:

1. Geoff Huff, Chief of Police – September 10, 2026
RE: Noise Permit Process
2. Justin Moore, Planner – September 22, 2026
RE: Request to Change the Lapse of Approval Timeframe for Special Use Permits in Section 29.1503(6).
3. Keith Arneson, Ames Property Owner – September 28, 2026
RE: Homelessness Issue
4. Sara Van Meeteren, Building Official – September 30, 2026
RE: Radon Requirements for Rental Properties
5. James Benn, Ames Resident – October 2, 2026
RE: Request for Administrative and Policy Review of Chickens on Residential Property
6. Allie Sankot, Ames Resident – October 8, 2026
RE: Request for Sidewalk and Pedestrian Crossing Signs on South 16th Street
7. Renee Gilmore, Canyon Holdings, LLC – October 8, 2026
RE: Request for Resolution on Bus Continuously Parked in Public Right of Way at the 300 Block of S 4th Street
8. Justin Clausen, PE, Director of Public Works – October 13, 2026
RE: Resource Recovery and Recycling Campus Progress update

9. Justin Moore, Planner – October 13, 2026

RE: Kwik Star request to initiate Zoning Text changes to signage regulations in the design standards of “CGS” Convenience General Service Zone



Staff Memo

To: Mayor and City Council
Date: September 10, 2026
From: Geoff Huff, Chief of Police
Subject: **Noise Permit Process**

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an overview of the process used by the Ames Police Department to review and issue noise permits under Chapter 16 (Noise Control) of the Ames Municipal Code. Chapter 16 establishes community noise standards while providing a mechanism for temporary relief (Noise Permits) when special events or activities may exceed normal noise limitations.

Overview of Chapter 16

Chapter 16 establishes maximum permissible sound levels based on zoning and land-use characteristics. In residential areas, the limit is 60 decibels between 7:00 a.m. and midnight and 55 decibels between midnight and 7:00 a.m. Commercial areas are generally limited to 65 decibels, industrial areas to 80 decibels, and park or agriculturally zoned areas to 65 decibels. Activities that exceed these limits require a permit unless otherwise exempted by the ordinance.

Section 16.6 authorizes the City Manager or an authorized representative to issue permits allowing temporary relief from the standard noise restrictions.

Current Police Department Noise Permit Process

The Ames Police Department administers the City's noise permit application process as the City Manager's authorized representative. Applications are submitted through the department's online system. The Police Department reviews each request and determines whether the proposed event can be accommodated while balancing neighborhood impacts and community interests.

Applicants are asked to provide:

- A description of the event location.
- The source and nature of the anticipated noise.
- The date and hours of the event.
- Contact information for the responsible party.
- Information regarding attendance and event supervision.

Applications are generally required at least 24 hours before the event. There is currently no fee associated with obtaining a noise permit.

Review Criteria

Current review practices include:

- Reviewing police calls for service and enforcement history associated with the applicant and event location.
- Determining whether another permit has already been approved for the same time period within the immediate area.
- Evaluating the likelihood of significant impacts on surrounding residential neighborhoods.
- Assessing whether adequate supervision and responsible contacts have been identified.

These considerations are intended to ensure that permitted events remain compatible with surrounding land uses while allowing community activities to occur.

Permit Conditions

Chapter 16 authorizes conditions to be placed on permits to minimize adverse effects on the community or surrounding neighborhood. Permits issued by the Police Department specify:

- The approved date and location.
- Authorized operating hours.
- Responsible parties.
- Any special limitations or conditions.
- The maximum sound levels permitted.

Under Section 16.7, permit holders may be authorized to exceed normal neighborhood sound limits, but only within the maximum sound-level and duration limits established by ordinance. For example, sound levels up to 80 dBA may be permitted for up to 24 hours, with shorter durations allowed as sound levels increase. However, it has been the practice of the Ames Police Department to limit noise permits to 5 additional dBA and never past midnight. In addition, permits are generally not issued for private parties absent some larger interest, community events, neighborhood events, philanthropic events, weddings, etc.

Enforcement

Noise permits provide authorization only for the specific conditions identified in the permit. Events operating outside approved conditions remain subject to enforcement under Chapter 16. Violations of the ordinance may be addressed through municipal infraction citations or as a simple misdemeanor, as authorized by Section 16.9.

Conclusion

The Ames Police Department's noise permit process is intended to balance community events and temporary activities with the City's responsibility to protect residents from excessive noise. The process provides a structured review of proposed events, establishes accountability through identified responsible parties, and allows conditions to be imposed that mitigate neighborhood impacts while remaining consistent with Chapter 16 of the Ames Municipal Code.

While the noise permit process has historically provided reasonable accommodation for special events, it has become increasingly difficult in recent years to balance requests for amplified sound that exceed Chapter 16 limits with the interests of neighboring residents who are adversely affected by such noise. An excellent example of this friction is the Roosevelt Summer Concerts that has grown over the years from a relatively small event to a much larger one.

Given the increasing challenges associated with balancing competing community interests, the Police Department would support a review of the noise permit process, including consideration of whether certain permits should receive City Council review and approval, consistent with other special event processes.



Department of Planning & Housing

Memo

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Justin Moore, Planner

DATE: September 22, 2026

SUBJECT: Request to Change the Lapse of Approval Timeframe for Special Use Permits in Section 29.1503(6).

Kwik Star has made a request to City Council to allow for a Text Amendment to change the lapse of approval time limitation for Special Use Permits. In the attached letter Kwik Star requested two text amendments. This memorandum only addresses one part of the request. A separate memorandum will be forthcoming regarding the request for the other text amendment in the attached letter.

The timelapse for Special Use Permits in Section 29.1503(6) is currently 12-months from the date of approval by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The request is to change the timelapse to 24 months from the date of approval. The request is being made by Kwik Star to accommodate their anticipated timeline for construction of a planned store at the corner of George Washington carver Avenue and Cameron School Road.

Kwik Star anticipates finalizing their site plan with staff and going for consideration at Zoning Board of Adjustment this fall. However, Kwik Star does not plan to start construction on a planned new store at the corner of GW Carver Avenue and Cameron School Road within the projected 12-month timeframe should they receive approval from Zoning Board of Adjustment this fall. They anticipate starting construction on the new store in approximately early 2028.

Currently, all regular Minor Site Development Plans approved by City staff and Major Site Development Plans approved by City Council allow for 24-months before the timelapse deadline. Special Use Permits with Site Development plans only allow for 12-months. In most cases, the reason a Special Use Permit is required with a site plan in any given circumstance is due to a certain use being required to be considered by the Zoning Board of Adjustment as a Special Use in a given zone.

In the zone that Kwik Star intends to construct the new store at GW Carver Avenue and Cameron School Road, Convenience General Service (CGS), Convenience Stores were recently changed to require a Special Use Permit for approval of a Site Plan to review for compatibility and harmoniousness in surrounding neighborhoods.

Options

Based upon the request from Kwik Star staff believes the following options are most appropriate in this case.

Option 1-

City Council can direct staff to have Kwik Star submit an application for a Text Amendment to change the timelapse date for Special Use Permits with Site Plans from 12-months to 24-months. Staff would draft a text amendment for consideration. This would allow Kwik Star to have 24-months from the date of approval of a Special Use Permit by the Zoning Board of Adjustment to construct a new store.

Option 2-

City Council could choose to take no action on this request. This would require Kwik Star to start constructing a new store within 12-month of approval of a Site Plan by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Staff Comments

Staff believes that the request is reasonable and does not present an issue that would otherwise interfere with or be adverse to the impact on surrounding areas when Special Use Permits are considered. Regular Minor Site Development and Major Site Development Plans already have a 24-month window to start construction. Staff does not see a difference in a Special Use Permit approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment if the plan is already found to be compatible with a given location.

Staff believes that Option #1 can be supported, given the process of review already in place by the Zoning Board of Adjustment which gives public scrutiny of a proposed Site Plan through a longer process, a Special Use Permit with a Site Plan.

Council Request Letter



Travis Small
Real Estate

PHONE 712-254-2213
EMAIL tsmall@kwiktrip.com

1626 Oak St., P.O. Box 2107
La Crosse, WI 54602

www.kwiktrip.com

September 1st, 2026

City of Ames, IA
515 Clark Avenue
Ames, IA 50010

RE: Text Amendment Request - Signage - Special Use - Computerized/Digital Scrolling - A portion of 3220 Cameron School Road and George Washington Carver Ave.

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

We respectfully submit this letter requesting revisions and amendments to Special Use Permit Section 29.1503, Subsection 6, and the Convenience General Services (CGS) Zone Development Standards related to signage in Section 12. Specifically, we ask that the City and Council consider modifying the standards to allow for the requested revisions.

Special Use Permit Section 29.1503 (6) Lapse of Approval. All Special Use Permits shall lapse 12 months after the date of issuance unless the use is undertaken, or a building permit has been issued and actual construction started. Where unusual circumstances may prevent compliance with this time requirement, the Zoning Board of Adjustment may, upon written request by the affected permittee, extend the time for required start of construction an additional 60 days. Excavation shall not be considered construction for the purpose of enforcing this Section.

Kwik Trip request that all Special Use Permits shall lapse 24 months after the date of issuance. The anticipated construction and completion of the roundabout at George Washington Carver Avenue and Cameron School Road will extend the project's development timeline, necessitating additional time beyond the standard permit period.

(12) Signage

(d) Number

- (i) **The number of wall-mounted signs shall not exceed two (2) signs per tenant space, including lettering on awnings.**

Kwik Trip requests that this be increased to three wall signs, as its site has frontage on three public streets. In no case shall the three signs comprise a combined total of more than 86 square feet. (CGS would currently allow signage of 86 sq.ft., but only on two signs, one of which must front on an arterial street to gain the additional square footage). A wall sign facing a local road may be no larger than 16 square feet. (On the Kwik Trip site, this would mean the wall sign facing south; such verbiage would prevent another CGS-zoned site in the future from installing a large sign along a local classification street, which is more likely to have residential uses.)

OUR MISSION

To serve our customers and community more effectively than anyone else by treating our customers, coworkers and suppliers as we, personally, would like to be treated, and to make a difference in someone's life.

(ii) Only one monument sign is permitted for each principal building on a lot. A monument sign is not permitted on a lot that is not the site of a principal building.

Kwik Trip requests that sites with frontage on two or more arterial or major collector streets be permitted two monument signs per site. Such signs shall only be permitted to front on the arterial/major collector street frontages. Only one monument sign shall be permitted on each arterial/major collector frontage, and the monument signs on site shall be separated by a minimum of 150'.

(iii) The cumulative area of all incidental signs shall not exceed 32 square feet per building for wall signs and shall not exceed eight square feet per site for ground signs, except that incidental signage on the rear façade of a building that does not face a public right-of-way shall not be included in the maximum incidental sign area.

Kwik Trip requests the cumulative area of all incidental signs shall not exceed 30 square feet per site for ground signs, since parking duration/no parking signs are included in this group. The parking signs are critical to prevent the store from becoming a park-and-ride lot and keep people from parking for long periods, such as on football weekends (we've faced the issue of people attempting to camp at stores). For the same reasons, Kwik Trip is installing several parking signs at Stores #1768 (S. 16th and S. Grand) and #1770 (South Dakota and Mortensen).

(e) Height restrictions. The maximum permissible height for a monument sign is eight feet, including the sign base; that is, the top of a monument sign shall be no more than eight feet above the grade of the site on which it is erected. However, the height of a monument sign, including the base, may be up to twelve feet if the sign is erected on a lot that abuts on an arterial street.

Kwik Trip requests that the two monument signs are allowed to be:

- 12' tall/64 square feet
- 8' tall/32 square feet

These dimensions are similar to current CGS code standards in terms of sign height/sign area.

(i) Computerized/digital scrolling signs are only permitted if the lot on which it is located abuts an arterial street, and the computerized/digital scrolling sign faces the arterial street.

Kwik Trip proposes that an Electronic Message Sign/EMC be permitted in CGS, subject to reasonable lighting standards. The EMC Kwik Trip proposes for use is programmed by the manufacturer to operate at 8,000 nits during the day and, when displaying all-white content, measure 320 nits (four percent brightness) at night, meaning most content would measure less than 320 nits. The EMC is equipped with a photosensor to adjust brightness in relation to ambient light.

No changes are requested to Sec. 21.131. ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS. The EMC Kwik Trip proposes would comply with the current standards of 21.131.

Allowing these amendments would enable Kwik Trip to implement signage that is consistent with our standard sign package implemented at stores across the Upper Midwest. Consistent signage helps customers easily identify a Kwik Trip/Kwik Star store, enhances wayfinding on site, and reinforces the strong brand recognition that Kwik Trip has established within the communities we serve. While often recognized as a convenience store, Kwik Trip also serves as a neighborhood destination for groceries, fresh food, and much more.

Please consider these amendments to better accommodate development and retail signage while preserving the character and appearance of the community. Thank you for your time and consideration of this request. We appreciate the City's continued efforts to ensure that local regulations remain practical, forward-looking, and supportive of economic development. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this proposal further or provide additional information if helpful.

Sincerely,


Travis Small

Real Estate Development Manager



Hall, Renee

From: Keith Arneson <keithdarneson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2026 4:43 PM
To: City Council and Mayor
Subject: Fwd: Help

Some people who received this message don't often get email from keithdarneson@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Council, please see the attached email I sent to Steve, Kelly and Tim. I know this is sensitive but my problem has existed in town for several years. I am feeling helpless in watching my family estate be damaged at a time when estate planning is so important to me and my family.

Please reach out to me with questions. I would be happy to come in and speak personally. My management staff with Unique Apartment Homes is urging me not to go down and talk to this group in person. They fear for my safety.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith Arneson <keithdarneson@gmail.com>
Date: September 28, 2026 at 3:55:29 PM CDT
To: Steve Schinker <steve.schinker@cityofames.org>, Kelly Diekmann <KDiekmann@city.ames.ia.us>, Tim Gartin <tim.gartin@amescitycouncil.org>
Subject: Help

Steve, Kelly and Tim,

Since last fall I have had a homeless person living in their car directly in front of the entrance to my first large multi-family apartment building at 610 Stonehaven Drive.

I have called the Police Department and gotten the expected response to this issue.

This man showed up in front of my property after leasing had finalized last year. When some of our clients, especially the young women came to check in August 1, they complained very loudly and we let one unit of girls out of their lease. Now our existing residents are complaining that the homeless situation is deteriorating. Not only does this individual seem to have friends joining daily (with pets) but he is now frequenting with people who we denied renewals to because of their wishing to add sex offenders to the lease. Our residents tell us this denied tenant and her sex offender boyfriend is joining the homeless man in front of our building.

I know we live in a liberal community. I know homeless people are indeed people and have

rights.

This is negatively impacting my livelihood. What rights do I have not to let this deteriorate and create a stigma around my apartment and family asset which I hope to leave to my children? I worked very very hard to earn enough to buy this building. I think we are good neighbors and certainly are very accommodating to any and all renters.

Can you help me with this problem? Would you like this if they camped in front of your office? Can we ask these people to live in front of residential homes instead of businesses?

Desperate,

Keith

Sent from my iPad

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Sara Van Meeteren, Building Official

Date: September 30, 2026

Subject: Radon Requirements for Rental Properties

At the September 22, 2026 Council Meeting, the City Council reviewed a letter from Jessica Baker (attached) regarding elevated radon levels in the rental property that her daughter is living in. Direction from the City Council was to place the item on a future agenda.

As the letter stated, the Ames Rental Code does not regulate the testing or mitigation of radon in rental units. Additionally, there are no regulations for radon testing or mitigation in non-rental units through the Ames Municipal Code. There are no federal or state level requirements for radon testing.

Iowa City adopted an ordinance pertaining to radon mitigation in rental properties in 2021. This ordinance requires all single-family and duplex units to be tested for radon by a radon measurement specialist certified by the State of Iowa. The test results determine the next steps:

- If the test is less than 4 picoCurries per liter (pCi/L), the unit shall be retested in 8 years. If there is a habitable room in the basement it must be tested every 4 years.
- If the test is greater than 4 pCi/L, a radon mitigation system shall be installed and the unit tested within 90 days after installation. The system then requires testing every 8 years after installation.
- If the unit has an existing radon mitigation system, the unit shall be tested within 8 years of the date of the last radon test.
- Prior radon tests with a performance date in the last two years would be accepted.

A review of other states shows that the testing intervals vary from every two to every ten years. Additionally, most others do not exclude multi-family units from testing. Some require all units to be tested and others require, for example, only 25% of the ground floor units to be tested. Some states/jurisdictions not requiring testing require a disclosure of the most recent test to tenants prior to lease signing.

Hall, Renee

From: Schainker, Steve
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2026 4:22 PM
To: Hall, Renee
Subject: Fw: Request for Administrative and Policy Review — Residential Chickens / 121 McDonald Dr.

Attached below is Mr. Benn's email for the next non-agenda packet.

From: James Benn <jdbenn@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2026 1:16 PM
To: Haila, John <john.haila@cityofames.org>; Schainker, Steve <steve.schainker@cityofames.org>
Cc: Edwards, Ron <ron.edwards@cityofames.org>; Rollins, Anita <anita.rollins@amescitycouncil.org>
Subject: Request for Administrative and Policy Review — Residential Chickens / 121 McDonald Dr.

You don't often get email from jdbenn@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Mayor Haila and City Manager Schainker,

I am requesting your review of both the City's handling of an ongoing animal-noise complaint involving the chicken operation at 121 McDonald Dr. and a broader policy issue that this experience has exposed concerning the keeping of chickens in residential neighborhoods.

On September 1, I submitted to Animal Services a completed nuisance log, fourteen sound recordings, photographs, and supporting information documenting the continuing noise problem. In that original communication, I specifically requested that, if the City declined to treat the situation as an actionable public-noise nuisance, it identify the metrics used to reach that determination.

Animal Services subsequently requested additional information concerning the dates, times, and locations of the recordings. I provided the information reasonably available to me, including explaining that the recordings were made from our front-door stoop after the chickens were clearly audible from inside our living room.

On September 11, Animal Services advised me that **“the court system needs it narrowed down a bit more than ‘in the mornings.’”**

That statement raised what I believe is a very reasonable question:

What standard is the City actually applying to this complaint?

On September 13, I requested in writing that Animal Services identify the ordinance, policy, enforcement guideline, prosecutorial standard, court rule, or other authority establishing the evidentiary requirements being applied. I also requested the objective or consistently applied criteria used to determine when animal noise becomes sufficiently “prolonged” and “unreasonable” to constitute a violation of §3.115. I further asked Animal Services to identify precisely what is deficient in the evidence already submitted, explain the enforcement process following a documented nuisance complaint, and provide any written policies, checklists, training materials, complaint-evaluation standards, prosecutorial guidance, or forms used in evaluating complaints under §3.115. If no written criteria exist, I asked the City to simply state that and explain how complaints are evaluated consistently rather than through an ad hoc or subjective process.

Those questions remain central to my concern.

However, working through this complaint has also exposed what I believe deserves a broader policy review by the Mayor and City Council.

The City's own published guidance states that Ames “does not prohibit” the keeping of chickens and directs residents primarily to the general animal Standards of Care contained in §3.111. What I have been unable to identify is a comprehensive City policy specifically governing the keeping of chickens in residential neighborhoods.

There appears to be no clearly defined residential flock limit, no chicken-specific restriction on roosters that I have been able to identify, and no comprehensive chicken-specific standards addressing such matters as coop and run location, setbacks, construction, sanitation, or the potential impact upon adjoining residential properties.

Most importantly, when a problem does occur, the principal remedy available to an affected neighbor appears to be a general animal-noise provision prohibiting sounds occurring for “prolonged periods” that “unreasonably disturb” the peace and quiet of the vicinity.

This is not merely a theoretical policy concern.

During a 2022 City Council discussion involving restrictive covenants for the Baker Subdivision, Council specifically discussed whether allowing chickens should include a numerical limit. The existing nuisance law was identified during that discussion as a mechanism that would remain applicable, and Council also discussed the potential effect upon residents who might not want to live next to chickens.

My present experience illustrates the practical difficulty with relying upon that approach.

I have submitted a nuisance log, fourteen sound recordings, photographs, and other documentation. Yet after asking Animal Services to identify the objective criteria used to determine what constitutes “prolonged” or “unreasonable” animal noise—and what evidentiary threshold must actually be satisfied—I still do not have a clear understanding of the standard against which my complaint is being evaluated.

That leaves everyone in an unnecessarily ambiguous position.

A resident choosing to keep chickens should be able to determine beforehand what is permitted and what responsibilities accompany that activity.

A neighboring property owner should be able to determine what protections and remedies exist if that activity becomes a continuing nuisance.

And Animal Services should have sufficiently clear standards to administer and enforce the ordinance consistently.

I am therefore requesting review on **two separate but related issues.**

First, administratively: What objective and consistently applied standard does the City of Ames use to determine whether animal noise constitutes a violation of §3.115, and where is that standard documented?

Second, as a matter of City policy: Does Ames' existing regulatory framework for keeping chickens in residential neighborhoods adequately define what is permitted, establish reasonable limitations and housing requirements, protect adjoining property owners, and provide a clear and enforceable remedy when problems occur?

I am not asking the Mayor, City Manager, or Council to prejudge whether a violation has occurred at 121 McDonald Dr.

I am asking the City administration to explain the standard being applied to my complaint, and I am asking the City's elected policymakers to consider whether this experience demonstrates a gap in existing municipal policy.

I have retained the complete correspondence with Animal Services, the nuisance log, recordings, photographs, and other documentation associated with this complaint and will provide any or all of it upon request.

I would appreciate a written response regarding the administrative questions above. I would also respectfully request that the broader issue of the City's residential-chicken policy be referred to the appropriate City Council process for review and discussion.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

James Benn

230 Hickory Drive

Ames, Iowa 50010

Hall, Renee

From: Alexandra Sankot <alexkot1025@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2026 11:40 PM
To: Hall, Renee
Subject: Request for sidewalk and pedestrian crossing signs on South 16th Street

You don't often get email from alexkot1025@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello,

I am a resident of the Old Orchard mobile home park along South 16th Street in Ames. The park's management told me that a sidewalk along South 16th Street and any pedestrian crossing signs would need to be handled by the City of Ames, so I am reaching out to you directly.

There is currently no sidewalk along this stretch, so residents, many of them students, have to walk along the road or its edge to get to and from the park. I would like to ask:

1. Whether the city has plans to install a sidewalk along South 16th Street near Old Orchard.
2. Whether pedestrian crossing signs or a marked crosswalk can be added near the park entrance.
3. Who I should contact, or what process I should follow, to formally request these improvements or add my name to an existing request.

Please let me know if you need more details, such as the exact location or photos of the area. I can be reached by email or at [your phone number].

Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,
Allie Sankot
317 Mulberry Blvd
Ames, Iowa 50010

Hall, Renee

From: Renee @ Canyon Holdings <canyonholdings8@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2026 10:11 AM
To: Nelson, Sheri; City Council and Mayor
Cc: Bridget Cundiff
Subject: Request for Collaborative Resolution - Bus on 300 Block of S 4th Street

Some people who received this message don't often get email from canyonholdings8@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Mayor, Members of the City Council and Parking Division Leadership,

I am writing to respectfully request the City's assistance in developing a practical and balanced resolution regarding the vehicle (bus) that has been continuously parked in the public right-of-way at the 300 Block of S 4th Street in Ames.

We understand the City's administrative position regarding the individual's housing circumstances, and we recognize the importance of approaching this situation with compassion and respect. At the same time, the vehicle's continued presence in this particular location has created significant concerns for neighboring property owners, residents, and the surrounding community.

Specifically, the conditions associated with the vehicle have resulted in severe animal waste odors and sanitation concerns, including reports that animals are housed inside. The vehicle's condition and erratic exterior visual displays have also generated ongoing widespread community concern. In addition, its continued stationary presence significantly impacts the marketability and leasing of nearby properties, creating an ongoing economic impact on surrounding property investments and local businesses.

Rather than an adversarial enforcement battle, we would like to propose a collaborative approach that addresses both the individual's needs and the City's responsibility to maintain a safe, sanitary, and functional public right-of-way.

1. Facilitate Relocation to a Low-Impact Area: We respectfully request that the City work with the vehicle owner to identify and facilitate relocation of the bus to a more appropriate, lower-impact location in Ames, if one is available and permitted under City regulations. An area less sensitive to residential properties, local businesses, and pedestrian and public activity - such as an appropriate designated industrial or transitional area - could provide a more workable solution for everyone involved.

2. Coordinate Housing & Community Services Outreach: In conjunction with relocation effort, we encourage the City to involve the appropriate housing outreach and community service resources. Connecting the individual with available shelter, housing assistance, safe-parking alternatives, or other support systems could provide a constructive path forward while also addressing the sanitation and animal-welfare concerns associated with the current situation.

3. Apply Applicable Parking & Right-of-Way Regulations: At a minimum, we respectfully request that the City review and apply the City's standard regulations governing extended or continuous parking and the use of public right-of-way. Regular movement or relocation requirements, where applicable, would help prevent any single public location from becoming a permanent encampment or creating an ongoing sanitation and public-health concern.

Our goal is not to create an adversarial situation or to displace someone without consideration for their circumstances. Rather, we are asking the City to help find a reasonable solution that balances compassion for the individual with the City's responsibility to protect public health, maintain the functionality of public right-of-way, and preserve the viability of surrounding businesses, property investments and local residents.

We would appreciate the opportunity to coordinate with the appropriate City departments - including Parking, Police, and Community Services - to discuss a practical relocation and outreach plan and determine what steps can be taken promptly.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and leadership. We sincerely appreciate the City's willingness to work collaboratively toward a solution that is fair, constructive, and beneficial to the broader Ames Community.

Sincerely,

Renee Gilmore

Canyon Holdings, LLC

515-644-8651





MEMO

Legal Department

To: Mayor Haila, Ames City Council

From: Mark O. Lambert, City Attorney

Date: April 7, 2023

Subject: Bus/home parked on City streets

At the March 14, 2023, Ames City Council meeting, the Council discussed the situation of the individual living in a revamped school bus, which is parked on City streets.

Two motions were adopted by the Council:

- 1) Moved by Gartin, seconded by Corrieri, to ask staff to come back to the City Council with options on size of vehicles under Option 3A (of the previous memo).
- 2) Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, that staff look at other issues of safety with the woodburning stove and animal habitation, as well as where motor vehicles fit into the current City Code and what options the City Council has the means to regulate. Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

VEHICLES

Staff checked with the Iowa Department of Transportation, and the DOT indicated that they didn't have any authority over people living in their vehicles or having alternative heating sources in their vehicles.

A question was raised about whether the City could require that anyone living in a vehicle only live in a vehicle that was commercially made for such, and

included a source of potable water, sanitary facilities, heat, etc. I believe this would face the same constitutional concerns as outright prohibiting people from living in their vehicles. It is something that the Council could try if it wished, but I believe it might result in litigation and I am not confident that the courts would rule in the City's favor.

FIRE CODE

There is nothing in the Fire Code that prohibits wood-burning stoves in vehicles.

The Fire Code only applies to structures, not vehicles.

If this were a building instead of a bus, the Fire Code would require that the chimney be longer and that a spark arrester be installed on the top of the chimney.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Despite several attempts, I have not connected with staff at the Iowa Department of Public Health or the Story County Health Department. I did review the public health chapters of the Iowa Code, and I do not believe state or county public health authorities have any jurisdiction over the matter of someone living in their vehicle. Of course, human waste products must be disposed of properly, but we do not know how the bus owner disposes of such.

ANIMALS

The bus reportedly contains has five or so ferrets as pets. The owner used to also have two cats, but apparently doesn't have cats now.

Our "Animals" ordinance, Chapter 3 of the Ames Municipal Code, provides for a standard of care for animals, at Section 3.111. We have no evidence that the animals in the bus are not being provided appropriate care.

The bus owner has turned over the ferrets twice to Animal Control for temporary protective care, in June of 2021 and July of 2022, once because it was too hot in the bus because of excessive heat from the heater (reportedly, she used a gas heater at the time, not the current wood-burning stove); and once because it was too hot because the bus air conditioning was not functioning. The fact

that she has turned over the animals for temporary protective care would indicate that she is concerned for the welfare of the pets.

Animal Control staff have been in the bus to view the conditions and did not determine that the animals were in bad conditions or lacking appropriate care. Animal Control can only enter the bus with the owner's permission, unless a warrant is obtained, and there are no current grounds for such a warrant.

SIZE OF VEHICLES

The Council adopted a motion for the City Attorney to come back with options on limiting the size of vehicles parked on City Streets.

After consulting with the Public Works traffic engineers, and Police Department traffic enforcement staff, my recommendation would be that if the Council desires to limit the size of vehicles parked on City streets. I discovered that the largest "regular" vehicle appears to be the Ford F350 pick-up truck. The short-bed version is 250 inches, which is just under 21 feet. The long-bed version is 266 inches, which is slightly more than 22 feet. **Therefore, based upon discussions with City traffic engineers and their recommendation on a size limit, I would recommend a 25-foot limit if the Council chooses to adopt such a limitation.** A reminder that school buses range in size from 20 to 45 feet, with the average standard school bus being 35 feet long. Although a 25-foot limit would not prevent a 20-foot school bus from being parked on City streets, if we went a 20-foot limit, it would prohibit some pick-up trucks from parking on the street. City traffic engineering staff suggested a 25-foot limit, just to be safe, but a 23-foot limit would still allow the largest pickup truck to park on the streets.

The following exceptions should be considered: City public works vehicles, construction vehicles during active construction, school buses transporting children, and vehicles that are actively loading and unloading. (Perhaps others)

OPTIONS:

1. Prohibit vehicles 25 feet or more from parking on City streets in residential areas, with exceptions for loading/unloading, etc.
2. Prohibit vehicles 23 feet or more from parking on City streets in residential areas, with exceptions for loading/unloading, etc.
3. Prohibit vehicles 20 feet or more from parking on City streets in residential areas, with exceptions for loading/unloading, etc.

I note that I am presuming the Council would intend to prohibit these large vehicles in residential areas only. The Council could choose to make this prohibition apply to commercial and/or industrial areas of the City as well.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO LENGTH LIMITATION

As an alternative to a length limitation, both traffic and parking staff suggested that a limit on the type of vehicle might be an easier limitation to enforce. That would be a prohibition on “commercial vehicles” being parked on City streets. We would define commercial vehicles as commercial trucks (not pick-ups), boxed vehicles, tow trucks, buses, any vehicles that are designed to seat 16 or more people, recreational vehicles (RVs), and exclude such vehicles while loading/unloading merchandise or passengers, public works vehicles, etc.

Minutes Excerpt from the April 11, 2023 City Council Meeting

PERSONS LIVING IN THEIR VEHICLES ON CITY STREETS UPDATE: City Attorney Mark Lambert went over the memo provided to the City Council and detailed that the City has no jurisdiction from the perspectives of fire code, public health, or the animals living in the vehicle as there is no evidence the animals are not receiving adequate care. The Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT) had responded that they had no authority over those living in their vehicles. City Attorney Lambert provided the City Council with potential restrictions on the size of vehicles on City streets, and potential ramifications for each option.

Mayor Haila opened and closed Public Input when no one came forward to speak.

After thorough discussion between Council Members, Mayor Haila indicated that he would like the City Council to take a position on the record for this issue as there had been several complaints and letters from concerned citizens. Each member of the City Council shared their stance on this issue and engaged in discussion of the implications of any further action.

Moved by Beatty-Hansen, seconded by Rollins, to take no further action on this item.

Vote on Motion: 4-2. Voting Aye: Beatty-Hansen, Betcher, Junck, and Rollins. Voting Nay: Corrieri and Gartin. Motion declared carried.

Moved by Beatty-Hansen, seconded by Betcher, to request a memo from staff on current City ordinance that prohibits people from living in a vehicle on private or public property, in commercial or industrial zoning only, and following options to modify it.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.



To: Mayor and City Council
From: Justin Clausen, PE, Director of Public Works
Date: October 13, 2026
Subject: Resource Recovery & Recycling Campus Progress Update

The Resource Recovery & Recycling Campus (R3C) project is now approaching the halfway mark of construction. This memo provides an update regarding progress on the project. No Council action is necessary.

WORK PROGRESS:

Site work began in May 2026. The City staff project team has met onsite with the Construction Manager (Story Construction) and the design team (HDR, Inc.) on a weekly basis to review progress, address unanticipated issues, and make decisions about discretionary project details (colors, materials, etc.). HDR primarily participates virtually, and project engineers visit the construction site approximately once per month. Now that vertical construction has begun, engineer site visits will occur more often to coincide with the work.

Site grading and utility work were completed in the spring and early summer. Approximately 50% of the site paving work is complete, with the remainder to be completed after the building construction has finished. The electrical transformer has been installed, along with bases and conduit for the site lighting.

The month of September was exceptionally wet, which slowed progress. However, contractors continued to work when possible, including making concrete wall pours between rain showers. Fortunately, the site dries rather quickly, allowing work to continue when rain slows or stops. As a result, although work was proceeding slightly ahead of schedule early in the summer, it is now back on its original schedule for completion.

Foundation work is now occurring for the installation of the scalehouse and scales. The pre-fabricated scalehouse and the scales are anticipated to arrive and be installed by the end of November. Once this work is complete, the equipment contractor will move

to the installation of the indoor processing equipment (shredder, magnet, eddy current separator, and conveyors) and to the installation of the fueling tanks and pumps.

Cast-in-place walls in the office building have also been constructed. These include the wall dividing the office area from the tipping floor, the elevator shaft, and walls enclosing the electrical room, sprinkler room, and locker room areas. Wall pours are now 100% complete.

The transfer tunnel has been excavated and the cast-in-place walls have been installed and backfilled. Although the project did not originally call for it, the project team approved the use of quartz aggregate in the concrete for the transfer tunnel floor. This aggregate will be used on the tipping floor to improve the floor's abrasion resistance. The quartz aggregate absorbs water in a manner that can make it difficult to work, so the transfer tunnel floor pour offered an opportunity for the contractor to gain familiarity with the material before the critical tipping floor pours take place during the week of October 12.

In September, the pre-engineered metal building (PEMB) was delivered to the site. Once the tipping floor concrete has been poured, work will commence on erecting the building. The erection will closely follow the tipping floor slab pours to expedite the erection process. It is expected that structural steel can be erected and the roof installed by approximately Thanksgiving, with wall enclosure completed by the end of December.

FREEL DRIVE PAVING:

Freel Drive paving is underway adjacent to the R3C campus. A significant challenge with this project is that the flat terrain limits the ability to convey stormwater. The approach being used to address this is a combination of piping and percolation. The stormwater intakes collect water in vaults that have several dozen holes in them. These are then surrounded by rock, creating chambers where stormwater can percolate into the soil. The excess stormwater then flows out through pipes to the south.

Paving was completed last week on the southernmost portion of street. The paving will progress to the north as fall continues and will coordinate closely with work on the R3C site. The R3C has three driveways, which will allow for continuous access during construction regardless of which phase of the Freel Drive paving is underway.

R3C COMPLETION STRATEGY:

The City Council has awarded contracts to procure the necessary semi-trucks and most of the trailers needed for the transfer operations. Delivery is anticipated this winter. Due to the higher than anticipated cost for the trailers, the City Council approved the purchase of seven of the ten desired trailers. An RFP is currently out, soliciting proposals for the purchase of up to three used trailers to round out the fleet.

As the construction project progresses, staff is focusing on completion of the components that are essential to commence solid waste transfer operations. Other project components, such as finishes in the office area or commissioning of the processing equipment, may be timed to complete after the transfer operations have begun. It is anticipated that transfer operations will be able to begin in May 2027.

Staff has met with the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to ensure permitting and operational requirements are met so the facility can begin transfer of solid waste once the construction is complete. Additionally, staff has been in close coordination with the Carroll County Sanitary Landfill as they prepare to receive waste from the R3C in 2027. Resource Recovery staff will be utilizing the fall Power Plant outage (currently underway) to tour and collaborate with the Carroll County Landfill, including performing test runs at the landfill site to ensure staff is familiar with the operations at the landfill.

PROJECT BUDGET:

The R3C project utilizes 11 separate prime contractors. The original contract total was \$19,619,767. A substantial value engineering process at the time of bid award, plus a variety of change orders during the construction process result in a revised contract total of \$18,261,657.88 (following the Council's October 13 meeting). A few of the change orders to date include modification of the siding on the scale house to match the transfer station, the addition of an ADA accessible bench, and minor field modifications to the paving to allow for better thermal expansion and contraction across larger areas.

There remains a construction contingency of \$337,557. While this represents a small value as compared to the overall construction expense, staff is regularly engaged in the day-to-day construction activities and is keeping a close eye on the project budget.

Recent project photos are attached.



Images of stormwater intake structures and rock infiltration chambers along Freel Drive.



Aerial photo of the R3C site looking east, taken the week of September 30, 2026. The paved area at left is the truck and trailer parking area. At center, where a job trailer is parked, is the future customer convenience area. To the right is the office area of the building. At the rear is the transfer tunnel. Freel Drive is running diagonally near the bottom of the photo. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Aerial photo of the R3C site looking east, taken the week of September 30, 2026. Centered is the office parking lot, with the office behind. At the rear is the transfer tunnel. Freel Drive is running along the bottom of the photo. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Cast-in-place walls for the locker room and elevator shaft. The locker room will serve as a hardened shelter area in the event of severe weather. Looking east.



Aerial photo of the R3C site looking west, taken the week of September 30, 2026. The transfer tunnel is at the bottom of the photo. Trucks will enter from the left, be loaded in the center, and will exit up the ramp at right. The office area is at the back of the photo. In between is the future tipping floor space. Openings at the right will allow commercial haulers to enter and exit the tipping floor. Freel Drive is along the top of the photo. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Transfer tunnel wall being backfilled. This area will be paved with concrete containing quartz aggregate to improve abrasion resistance. Looking south-east.



Aerial photo of the R3C site, taken the week of September 30, 2026. An overhead view of the transfer tunnel. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Looking south through the transfer tunnel.



Aerial photo of the R3C site, taken the week of September 30, 2026. At left is a City vehicle entrance driveway. At center is the office area. Equipment and roll-off box pits are to the left of the future tipping floor. The primary shredder will be situated in one pit; the others will contain boxes to collect ferrous and non-ferrous metals that are removed from the solid waste. The customer convenience area is at right, near the detention basin. To its right is the Z-wall, where self-hauled solid waste will be dumped into large rollofs located below. Freel Drive is along the top of the photo. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Structural steel for the pre-engineered metal building. Building erection begins this month.



Aerial photo of the R3C site looking north-east, taken the week of September 30, 2026. Freel Drive is running diagonally along the left side of the photo. Photo courtesy of Kevin Buck.



Department of Planning & Housing

Memo

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Justin Moore, Planner

DATE: October 13, 2026

SUBJECT: Kwik Star request to initiate Zoning Text changes to signage regulations in the design standards of “CGS” Convenience General Service Zone

City Council recently forwarded the request from Kwik Star to modify the sign regulations in the “CGS” Convenience General Service Zone design standards. **In the attached letter, Kwik Star requested two text amendments, one for extension of special use permits and one for sign changes.** This memorandum addresses the second part of the request. A separate memorandum is included in this packet regarding the request for the other text amendment in the attached letter dealing with the timelapse period for a Special use Permit.

The request specifically asks for a modification of the sign standards in Section 29.810(12) to generally allow for:

- **To allow one additional wall sign,**
- **To allow one additional monument sign,**
- **To allow for additional sign area for incidental signs,**
- **To allow to an electronic message sign as part of a monument sign**

Kwik Star requests specific modifications to the following standards:

Wall Signs- The current code states a limit of a wall sign area for each building, including 16 square feet for a sign and up to 70 square feet for a sign facing an arterial street. The request specifically asks for the number of allowed walls signs on a building to be increased from the current two (2) signs per tenant space to three (3) wall signs. **Kwik Star asks for the cumulative total of 86 feet to then be divided by 3 signs.**

The maximum number of wall signs is to control the appearance of building/wall signage to avoid buildings displaying large excessive amounts of signage in residential areas and to avoid the appearance of a large scale commercial area. In the case of fuel canopy's, signage on the side of a fuel canopy would be categorized as a wall sign as a canopy is classified as a structure. Kwik Star believes the three street frontages are unique and warrant an addition sign. **Staff believes signs on the canopies versus the buildings is not desirable, but could be allowable on a principal building.**

Number of monument signs per lot- The request asks for an increase in the number of allowed monument signs per lot from the current one sign per lot to allow two signs per lot for sites with frontage on two or more arterial or major collector streets.

The current standards aims to control the number of monument signs to one sign per site to avoid the appearance of multiple monument signs on a single site with multiple sign faces that could face or appear in or near a residential neighborhood and replicate the appearance of larger scale commercial areas.

This change would apply to other corner sites in the CGS located along Stange Road. It would permit three properties to have an additional monument sign.

Kwik Star asks that if two monument signs are allowed, that one would be the arterial standard allowance of 12 feet in height and 64 square feet. The second monument would be the standard size of 8 feet in height and 32 square feet.

Cumulative Area of Incidental Signs- Unique to CGS there is a separate category of incidental signs compared to wall and monument signs. Incidental signs are non-illuminated. The current standards restrict to a total cumulative area of 32 square feet of incidental signage per building for wall signs and eight (8) Square feet for ground signs. Kwik Star is requesting the cumulative area of all incidental ground signs not exceed 30 square feet so as to accommodate adequate numbers of 'No Parking' signs and other directional signs.

The restriction on cumulative area of incidental signs is meant to control the number of scattered small signs such as parking and directional signage on a site to avoid the appearance of multiple scattered smaller signs causing a greater commercialized appearance in a residential neighborhood.

Typically these signs are not accounted for separately, staff has no concerns about these types of incidental and directional signage since they are nonilluminated.

Electronic Message Signs - Kwik Star is requesting that the standards governing Electronic Message Signs in CGS be modified.

Currently, "Computerized Digital Scrolling signs" are permitted if the lot on which it is located abuts an arterial street and the digital scrolling sign faces the arterial street. However, this description also conflicts with the sign lighting standards that prohibit internal illumination and requires a dark background. Staff believes the scrolling types of digital signs are meant to be traditional "letter only" style signs that display only letters or numbers that were common in the early 2000's, i.e. "time and temp signs".

Kwik Star requests to allow for contemporary electronic signs for digital display of wording and images in a modern format. Kwik Star has this type of sign in place at their other locations for comparison.

The request specifically proposes to allow Electronic Message Center (EMC) Signs and for the brightness to be allowed at 8,000 nits during the day and 320 nits at night. Nits are a unit of measurement for light output on electronic message boards. The higher the nits the more intense the light output, especially in concentrated spaces. Digital Lighting elements present a major

sensitivity issue in areas that are intended to be residential and can often be incompatible with residential neighborhoods. **This request is the most sensitive of the requested changes.**

CGS intends for no internally lit signs, but has confusing language compared to modern sign terms. Electronic Message Signs are allowed in other zoning districts and only controlled by the Sign Code for message display time without lighting or brightness controls. Staff recently highlighted this same issue in regards to the HOPE Church request for signs in residential areas.

Staff has concerns that an entire monument sign could be an EMC. The level of brightness proposed is at the upper end of an allowance that may not be compatible in some settings with residential from staff's limited experience with the issue.

Options

Option 1-Initiate changes to CGS zoning standards (Kwik Star request). This would allow Kwik Star to apply for text amendment as requested. Staff would draft amendments addressing the application and proceed to P&Z for review and then Council. This project process would likely occur over the next 2-3 months.

Option 2- Initiate a limited number of changes to the CGS standards with the exception of allowing for an electronic message sign. Kwik Star would apply for text amendment and the staff then would draft changes and remove any reference to scrolling signs.

Option 3 -Take No Action. This option would elect to keep the existing standards as they are and not proceed with any action to amend the CGS sign standards.

Option 4 – Take No Action, but direct staff to address the electronic message sign standards and eliminate the scrolling sign allowance in CGS, regardless of the requests by Kwik Star.

Staff Comments

Staff believes that some of the requests for changes to the Sign standards in CGS can be found to be reasonable, while others are not consistent with the original intent of the standards. The CGS zone and associated design standards were developed to create compatibility within or very near residential areas in a neighborhood setting.

This item should be placed on a future agenda for future discussion if there is any interest in proceeding with any, or all, of the requests. If the project is initiated as a text amendment, staff would require 2-3 months to address the changes and fit it into current workloads.

Council Request Letter



Travis Small
Real Estate

PHONE 712-254-2213
EMAIL tsmall@kwiktrip.com

1626 Oak St., P.O. Box 2107
La Crosse, WI 54602

www.kwiktrip.com

September 1st, 2026

City of Ames, IA
515 Clark Avenue
Ames, IA 50010

RE: Text Amendment Request - Signage - Special Use - Computerized/Digital Scrolling - A portion of 3220 Cameron School Road and George Washington Carver Ave.

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

We respectfully submit this letter requesting revisions and amendments to Special Use Permit Section 29.1503, Subsection 6, and the Convenience General Services (CGS) Zone Development Standards related to signage in Section 12. Specifically, we ask that the City and Council consider modifying the standards to allow for the requested revisions.

Special Use Permit Section 29.1503 (6) Lapse of Approval. All Special Use Permits shall lapse 12 months after the date of issuance unless the use is undertaken, or a building permit has been issued and actual construction started. Where unusual circumstances may prevent compliance with this time requirement, the Zoning Board of Adjustment may, upon written request by the affected permittee, extend the time for required start of construction an additional 60 days. Excavation shall not be considered construction for the purpose of enforcing this Section.

Kwik Trip request that all Special Use Permits shall lapse 24 months after the date of issuance. The anticipated construction and completion of the roundabout at George Washington Carver Avenue and Cameron School Road will extend the project's development timeline, necessitating additional time beyond the standard permit period.

(12) Signage

(d) Number

- (i) **The number of wall-mounted signs shall not exceed two (2) signs per tenant space, including lettering on awnings.**

Kwik Trip requests that this be increased to three wall signs, as its site has frontage on three public streets. In no case shall the three signs comprise a combined total of more than 86 square feet. (CGS would currently allow signage of 86 sq.ft., but only on two signs, one of which must front on an arterial street to gain the additional square footage). A wall sign facing a local road may be no larger than 16 square feet. (On the Kwik Trip site, this would mean the wall sign facing south; such verbiage would prevent another CGS-zoned site in the future from installing a large sign along a local classification street, which is more likely to have residential uses.)

OUR MISSION

To serve our customers and community more effectively than anyone else by treating our customers, coworkers and suppliers as we, personally, would like to be treated, and to make a difference in someone's life.

(ii) Only one monument sign is permitted for each principal building on a lot. A monument sign is not permitted on a lot that is not the site of a principal building.

Kwik Trip requests that sites with frontage on two or more arterial or major collector streets be permitted two monument signs per site. Such signs shall only be permitted to front on the arterial/major collector street frontages. Only one monument sign shall be permitted on each arterial/major collector frontage, and the monument signs on site shall be separated by a minimum of 150'.

(iii) The cumulative area of all incidental signs shall not exceed 32 square feet per building for wall signs and shall not exceed eight square feet per site for ground signs, except that incidental signage on the rear façade of a building that does not face a public right-of-way shall not be included in the maximum incidental sign area.

Kwik Trip requests the cumulative area of all incidental signs shall not exceed 30 square feet per site for ground signs, since parking duration/no parking signs are included in this group. The parking signs are critical to prevent the store from becoming a park-and-ride lot and keep people from parking for long periods, such as on football weekends (we've faced the issue of people attempting to camp at stores). For the same reasons, Kwik Trip is installing several parking signs at Stores #1768 (S. 16th and S. Grand) and #1770 (South Dakota and Mortensen).

(e) Height restrictions. The maximum permissible height for a monument sign is eight feet, including the sign base; that is, the top of a monument sign shall be no more than eight feet above the grade of the site on which it is erected. However, the height of a monument sign, including the base, may be up to twelve feet if the sign is erected on a lot that abuts on an arterial street.

Kwik Trip requests that the two monument signs are allowed to be:

- 12' tall/64 square feet
- 8' tall/32 square feet

These dimensions are similar to current CGS code standards in terms of sign height/sign area.

(i) Computerized/digital scrolling signs are only permitted if the lot on which it is located abuts an arterial street, and the computerized/digital scrolling sign faces the arterial street.

Kwik Trip proposes that an Electronic Message Sign/EMC be permitted in CGS, subject to reasonable lighting standards. The EMC Kwik Trip proposes for use is programmed by the manufacturer to operate at 8,000 nits during the day and, when displaying all-white content, measure 320 nits (four percent brightness) at night, meaning most content would measure less than 320 nits. The EMC is equipped with a photosensor to adjust brightness in relation to ambient light.

No changes are requested to Sec. 21.131. ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS. The EMC Kwik Trip proposes would comply with the current standards of 21.131.

Allowing these amendments would enable Kwik Trip to implement signage that is consistent with our standard sign package implemented at stores across the Upper Midwest. Consistent signage helps customers easily identify a Kwik Trip/Kwik Star store, enhances wayfinding on site, and reinforces the strong brand recognition that Kwik Trip has established within the communities we serve. While often recognized as a convenience store, Kwik Trip also serves as a neighborhood destination for groceries, fresh food, and much more.

Please consider these amendments to better accommodate development and retail signage while preserving the character and appearance of the community. Thank you for your time and consideration of this request. We appreciate the City's continued efforts to ensure that local regulations remain practical, forward-looking, and supportive of economic development. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this proposal further or provide additional information if helpful.

Sincerely,


Travis Small

Real Estate Development Manager

