



Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

701.232.3242 • FAX 701.232.5043 • Case Plaza Suite 232 • One 2nd Street North • Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807

Email: metrocof@fmmetrocog.org

<http://www.fmmetrocog.org>

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI)
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG)
Date: May 6, 2015
RE: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission Agenda and Correspondence

**2nd Meeting of the
Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission**

May 13, 2015 10:30am-12:00pm

Location: Fargo City Commission Chambers

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Approve Order & Contents of the Overall Agenda
3. Review & Action on Minutes from March 25, 2015 (**Attachment 1**)
4. Process Framework for Opening a Session (**Attachment 2**) – Abby Gold
5. Proposed Issue Identification Process & Discussion (**Attachment 3**) – Adam Altenburg
6. Urban Agriculture Education & Discussion (**Attachment 4**) – Abby Gold
7. Review Organizational Structure of Draft Blueprint – Urban Bees (**Attachment 5**) – Whitney Oxendahl
8. Urban Agriculture Prioritization (**Attachment 6**) – Megan Myrdal
9. Online Community Input (**Attachment 7**) – Kim Lipetzky
10. Public Comment Opportunity (**Attachment 8**)
11. Commission Roundtable
12. Commission Action Steps – Megan Myrdal
13. Adjournment

Questions, comments, or concerns prior to the meeting can be directed to Adam Altenburg (701.232.3242 x34; altenburg@fmmetrocog.org).

People with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and need special arrangements should contact Kate Wurtzler at Metro COG (701.232.3242 Ext. 31), at least two days before the meeting to make arrangements.

Attachment 1

**1st Meeting of the
Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
March 25th, 2015
Fargo Commission Chambers**

Members Present:

Heidi Durand, Moorhead City Council
Arland Rasmussen, Cass County Commission
Mike Thorstad, West Fargo City Commission
Jenny Mongeau, Clay County Commission
Jim Aasness, Dilworth City Council
Andrea Baumgardner, At-Large Member
Janet Paul, At-Large Member
Jessica Arneson, At-Large Member
Dana Rieth, At-Large Member
Jon Evert, At-Large Member

Members Absent:

Mike Williams, Fargo City Commission

Others Present:

Megan Myrdal, Interim Chair
Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health
Noelle Harden, University of Minnesota Extension
Deb Haugen, Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative
Whitney Oxendahl, Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative
Adam Altenburg, Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Chair Myrdal called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

2. Approve Appointment of Commission Chair

Mr. Altenburg informed the Commission that the provision of a Chair for future meetings may be selected in of two ways: a non-jurisdictional member appointed biannually by a majority vote of the Commission; or rotated annually amongst current jurisdictional members. Mr. Altenburg stated that the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee has recommended that the Chair be rotated amongst jurisdictional, beginning with the member from the City of Moorhead, Ms. Durand, for the remainder of 2015. Mr. Altenburg explained that the member from Cass County, Mr. Rasmussen, would be slated to fill-in as Chair if the City of Moorhead representative is unable to be in attendance at a meeting.

A motion to recommend approval of the appointment of Ms. Durand as the 2015 Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission Chair was made by Ms. Mongeau and seconded by Mr. Aasness. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

3. Approve Appointment of At-Large Members

Chair Myrdal and Mr. Altenburg provided information to the Commission that, in addition to the six (6) appointed jurisdiction members, the Commission would also include five (5) additional at-large members with varied expertise as it relates to food systems issues. Chair Myrdal

explained that the Steering Committee would be responsible for selecting possible candidates which would serve on the Commission, each for a two (2) year term.

Chair Myrdal provided background information on five candidates the Steering Committee was recommending for appointment. These candidates included: Andrea Baumgardner, Janet Paul, Jessica Arneson, Dana Rieth, and Jon Evert. Ms. Baumgardner is a culinary-trained chef and restaurant owner who has sourced and utilized local food, developed relationships with local producers, and helps a nonprofit agency which researches and develops health and nutrition initiatives. Ms. Paul is the Director of Dining Services at Concordia College in Moorhead, MN, with 27 years of hospitality management experience. Ms. Arneson works as the Agency Relations Manager for the Great Plains Food Bank and has worked to raise support and awareness for a more local, regional, and global food system. Ms. Rieth is a registered dietitian with Lakes Country Service Cooperatives and has provided consultation services to K-12 food service programs in west-central Minnesota. Mr. Evert is a retired farmer and former Clay County Commissioner who has served on numerous boards and committees related to farming, hunger advocacy, local foods, and economic development.

Mr. Thorstad asked if terms for at-large members would be staggered. Mr. Altenburg stated that it would be the intention of the Commission and the Steering Committee to stagger terms after the terms of the first appointed at-large members.

Mr. Rasmussen asked if at-large members would be able to serve multiple terms or if term limits would be placed. Mr. Altenburg stated that it would be at the discretion of the Commission on whether to approve consecutive terms and that at-large members would not be subject to term limits.

A motion to approve the five (5) at-large members was made by Ms. Durand and seconded by Ms. Mongeau. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

4. Review Purpose and Powers of the Commission

Mr. Altenburg described that the Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission is the culmination of a Joint Powers Agreement signed between the City of Fargo and Clay, representing the entities responsible for public health in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Mr. Altenburg explained that, as laid out in the Joint Powers Agreement, the purpose of the Commission is to advise policy makers and elected officials in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area on how to assure that residents have access to safe, nutritious, and affordable foods. Mr. Altenburg spoke about the activities that the Commission would pursue including, amongst others, assessing the food system in the area, educating policy makers on food systems issues, proposing recommendations on improvements to the food system, cultivating partnerships and community input, and overseeing the implementation of the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan.

Mr. Altenburg clarified that the powers of the Commission were limited to the coordination of planning efforts, the ability to enter into agreements with entities, and the ability to expend funds received in accordance with any and all stipulations.

Mr. Altenburg reminded the Commission and the general public that the Commission consists of members appointed by the Cities of Fargo, Moorhead, West Fargo, and Dilworth, Cass and Clay Counties, and five (5) at-large members recommended by the Steering Committee and agreed upon by a majority of appointed Commission members. Mr. Altenburg also stated that ex-officio membership would be extended to Fargo Cass Public Health, Clay County Public Health, the Steering Committee, and the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments.

5. Presentation

Chair Myrdal and Ms. Lipetzky gave a presentation on the history of the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) and the national “Good Food Movement.” Ms. Lipetzky explained that in late 2010, members from Fargo Cass Public Health, Clay County Public Health, and North Dakota State University and the University of Minnesota Extension Services came together as a response to a national movement as more people became interested in increasing access to healthy and local food and more interest in knowing where food came from. Ms. Lipetzky described that a planning group made up of dozens of representatives with various food system backgrounds helped to form the structure and goals of the CCFSI, assisted with public input and education, and helped create different task forces to better understand local food system issues.

Chair Myrdal transitioned to the “State of Food” in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Chair Myrdal highlighted three key topic areas including: food security, overweight/obesity issues, and economic development.

Chair Myrdal explained that in terms of food security in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area, 28,130 individuals were served through the Great Plains Food Bank in 2014 which was approximately one in 10 individuals in the area, 38 percent of which were children. Chair Myrdal provided information on emerging food deserts and the effect that limited access to affordable and nutritious food has. Chair Myrdal spoke of food systems indicators including farmers markets, produce stands, community-supported agriculture, and community gardens and that the Commission may want to look at encouraging Senior Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP), Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Nutrition Program, and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participation at farmer’s markets.

Chair Myrdal provided information on health indicators in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area which showed that 36.6 percent of adults were overweight and 25.1 percent of adults were obese, while 11.7 percent of youth were overweight and 14.8 percent of youth were obese in Cass County and between 18 percent and 27 percent of youth in Clay County were overweight or obese. Chair Myrdal spoke of the influence of the food environment, encompassing the proximity to fast food restaurants and grocery stores among other factors, and its effect on people being able to make healthy food choices. Chair Myrdal explained the phenomena in the public health community of people being overfed and undernourished, where people can be both overweight and food insecure.

Chair Myrdal talked about the impact of economic development and direct-to-consumer and local food purchasing, with local food sales estimated at \$4.8 billion in 2008. Chair Myrdal spoke of shoppers’ perception of local food purchasing including obtaining foods of superior quality, learning more about farming practices, and supporting agriculture in their local communities. Chair Myrdal explained that, looking at price comparisons between farmers markets and mainline grocery stores, average farmers market price per pound are generally less than grocery markets. Chair Myrdal talked of the important of millennials and food demand and how food systems considerations should be taken into account.

Chair Myrdal provided the Commission with a sample of small-scale growers and producers in the Red River Valley and their conversations with the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) about the challenges and potential solutions to increase their ability to bring more product to market in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. These included: Larsen Farm, Yellow Bird Organics in Prosper, ND, Legacy Gardens in Moorhead, MN, Woodchuck Community Farm in Moorhead, MN, Plain State Farm in Dilworth, MN, Gram’s Produce in Embden, ND, Heart and

Soil Farm in Grandin, ND, and Freedom Rangers in Vergas, MN. Chair Myrdal discussed several perspectives of local producers including a campaign to raise awareness of local food, support of a more robust and inclusive farmers market, support of a food hub facility to alleviate infrastructure limitations, and potentially establishing a city-wide rating or star system for buyers who purchase a certain amount of local produce on an annual basis.

Chair Myrdal transitioned to information on economic development and small-scale growers with examples of farmers markets in the region. Chair Myrdal explained that the Town Square Farmers Market in Grand Forks, ND had an annual market attendance of approximately 35,000 with an estimated \$500,000 spent in 2008. Chair Myrdal iterated that farmers markets in Bemidji, Fergus Falls, and Baudette, MN have also all experienced rapid financial success in recent years.

Ms. Lipetzky provided information to the Commission on the three working task forces established by the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI): Urban Agriculture, Food Access/Outreach and Education, and Food Infrastructure/Economic Development. Ms. Lipetzky provided examples of the activities that task forces have been involved in through recent years including: the “One Vegetable, One Community” annual program that promotes the growing, preparation, and community education of a single vegetable, the “GardensAlive!” initiative to inspire the community to become involved in gardening through the one million square feet challenge and an educational mobile garden, community gardening workshops, grower/buyer networking meetings, and other activities including the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan, the Minnesota Food Charter, and the Fargo GO 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Myrdal concluded the presentation with examples of food policy councils and food systems commissions in other parts of the United States. Chair Myrdal spoke of Homegrown Minneapolis, a government-appointed advisory body that has taken a closer look at urban agriculture issues (gardening, land use, and zoning) and healthy food access including SNAP incentives and healthy vending. Chair Myrdal provided information on the Puget Sound Regional Food Policy Council, a government-appointed advisory body under a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that has prioritized a food policy action plan, agricultural preservation, model policies for local governments, regional benchmarks, and education and outreach on food system issues. Chair Myrdal finished with the Douglas County Food Policy Council, a government-appointed advisory body in Lawrence, Kansas with notable achievements including a food hub feasibility study, expanding urban agriculture and community garden programs, a SNAP dollar-for-dollar matching program, and a land leasing program which leases city-owned vacant properties for food production.

Ms. Durand asked whether, in regard to the significant new American population in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area, representation had been afforded to these communities in the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) and if there were current food system/safety outreach programs. Ms. Lipetzky stated that the CCFSI planning committee did include representation from new American populations and has involved different new American communities in community gardening programs. Ms. Baumgardner stated that the Family HealthCare Center also provides classes on food safety to new American populations.

Ms. Mongeau asked, in regard to the 28,130 individuals served through the Great Plains Food Bank in 2014, whether there has been an increase in the number of people seeking assistance and whether there has been communication between the food assistance programs in Cass County and Clay County so that individuals are unduplicated. Ms. Arneson stated that there has been a considerable uptick and expressed she would provide additional statistics at the next meeting. Ms. Arneson explained that the Great Plains Food Bank is a warehouse, providing

assistance to a charitable food network of over 300 food programs in North Dakota and Clay County, MN. Ms. Arneson stated that that numbers are unduplicated from partnerships but that it may not account for people taking advantage of two or more food pantries.

Ms. Mongeau asked if individuals with SNAP and/or WIC benefits are counted in these numbers. Ms. Lipetzky stated that number may or may not include individuals with food assistance benefits, especially elderly populations. Ms. Arneson stated that North Dakota has the highest percentage of people eligible for SNAP benefits who do not take them.

Ms. Paul asked if the increase in individuals seeking assistance through the Great Plains Food Bank correlates with a percentage increase in population size. Ms. Lipetzky answered that two years ago, one in 11 people in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area sought food assistance and that currently the number is one in 10.

6. Public Comment Opportunity

Chair Myrdal informed the Commission that 15 minutes would be allotted for public comments.

Cheryl Stetz, Fargo Cass Public Health and contact for the Whistle Stop Park Farmers Market through the City of Dilworth Park Board, said she would like to see the Commission provide assistance on updating urban agriculture ordinances and also help support smaller farmers markets, such as the one in Dilworth, MN, with finding and sustaining vendors.

Patrick Hollister, Active Living Planner for PartnerSHIP 4 Health, informed the Commission of the third biannual SHIP/Certs/GreenStep Summit (GreenSHIP 2015) on Friday, May 15 from 9:00 AM to 3:30 PM at Lakes County Service Cooperative in Fergus Falls, MN. Mr. Hollister explained this is an event would focus on the intersection of transportation and healthy local foods, with a tour of the Fresh Connect Food Hub.

Brad Fricson spoke of the need for more resilience in the food supply. Mr. Fricson explained that the average American city has enough food on its grocery shelves for three days. Mr. Fricson explained that if there were fuel shortages or other disruptions in the food supply chain, these could become serious issues for cities. Fr. Fricson posited that he would be interested for the Commission to examine these “what if...” situations.

Dean Huse suggested a program or private-public partnership that could look into harvesting surplus apples in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan area. Mr. Holst also suggested that, with possible future water shortages, it may be beneficial to look at xeriscaping in future developments that could also incorporate edible shrubs.

Mara Solberg of Solberg Farms and Prairie Roots Co-op asked if it would be possible for the co-op to have representation on the Commission. Ms. Solberg spoke of the desire for one single large farmers market that is both visible and accessible.

Mindy Grant, citizen from West Fargo, iterated the point that poverty and food security are not the same issue and that local production and access to local foods is security for everyone regardless of poverty status. Ms. Grant stated that it would be beneficial to look at the food desert map as part of the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan when planning for a potential larger farmers market.

7. Commission Action Steps

Ms. Oxendahl explained that, as part of the initial efforts of the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee, a series of draft blueprints have been created to address

current possible gaps and needs with regard to food system issues in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Ms. Oxendahl stated that two draft blueprints addressing urban agriculture have been compiled to date, one looking at the issue of backyard chickens and the other addressing urban beekeeping. Ms. Oxendahl explained that each blueprint will include background information, benefits and concerns as they relate to the evaluation framework (health, environment, economic, and social perspectives), common concerns, and examples of policies and ordinances in other jurisdictions in the United States.

Chair Myrdal asked the Commission to consider additional food system issues to review at the next Commission in meeting as well as review the implementation strategies as laid out in the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan.

Chair Myrdal stated that four additional meeting dates have been set for 1:00 PM on May 13, July 8, September 9, and November 4. Chair Myrdal asked if any Commission members would have a conflict with any of the proposed dates. Mr. Thorstad stated that he may have a conflict with the proposed dates as they would conflict with his meetings on the Fargo-Moorhead Flood Diversion Board. Chair Myrdal stated the Steering Committee would review possible alternative dates and/or times.

Chair Myrdal asked Commission and Steering Committee members to stay for a photograph following adjournment of the meeting.

Chair Myrdal adjourned the meeting at 2:12 PM.

Attachment 2

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Abby Gold, North Dakota State University Extension
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Process Framework Discussion*

As part of the second meeting of the Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission, Commission members will be taking part in a process framework discussion. This discussion is intended to better help understand how the Commission may be able to bring about effective change regarding food systems issues in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area and how it may better achieve its purpose of assuring that residents have access to safe, nutritious, and affordable foods.

Prior to the meeting, Commission members will be paired up with one elected member and one at-large member and asked to discuss the following two questions:

- 1. *Think about this Commission. What words would you use to describe the group and its purpose?***
- 2. *What is one area of agreement that this Commission could use to build a foundation for moving food systems work forward?***

When finished, Commission members will be asked to share their thoughts with the group.

Attachment 3

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Adam Altenburg, Metro COG
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Proposed Issue Identification Process*

Following the first meeting of the Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission in March 2015 and subsequent meetings with the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee, the following issue identification process has been refined to help the Commission with its stated purpose of assessing the food system in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area and proposing recommendations on ways that the food system may be improved. The four-step process developed by the Steering Committee is outlined below:

1. Steering Committee identifies issues to be considered by the Commission based on the following criteria:
 - a. Aligns with the needs and implementation strategies identified in the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan
 - b. Task Force/CCFSI input
 - c. Public input at Commission meetings
 - d. Online community input
 - e. Commission/jurisdiction input
2. Blueprint created on the proposed issue to provide
 - a. Background/introduction to the issue
 - b. Current code/zoning/policy information
 - c. A framework for evaluating the benefits and concerns from health, environment, economic, and social perspectives
 - d. Other areas as recommended by the Commission
3. Issue and blueprint presented to the Commission. Blueprint published on the Let's Eat Local website for community education and consideration.
4. Commission discussion and recommended action(s) to move the issue forward within the respective jurisdictions.

The Steering Committee asks that the Commission review the proposed issue identification process and bring forward any thoughts or concerns with the process outlined.

Attachment 4

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Abby Gold, North Dakota State University Extension
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Urban Agricultural Review*

Urban agriculture is the growing, processing, and distributing of food and food products through intensive plant cultivation and animal husbandry in and around cities. Urban agriculture includes, but is not limited to the following areas:

- Urban growing;
- Urban animal keeping;
- Farming practices;
- Sales; and
- Food safety/processing

Urban Growing

Urban growing includes not just home gardens but gardens of all types:

- Community/neighborhood community
- Residential gardens
- Apartment gardens
- Market gardens
- Boulevard gardens
- Roof top gardens
- Parkland gardens

Urban Animals

Urban animal keeping is the raising of livestock within or around cities for products like milk, eggs, manure, and for companionship. These animals may be:

- Pigs
- Ducks
- Rabbits
- Pygmy goats
- Chickens
- Bees
- Other

Farming Practices

- Greenhouses/hoop houses/structures/high tunnels
- Rainwater harvesting/rain barrels/rain barrels on public buildings/rain gardens/ water reclamation
- Soil safety
- Composting/Curbside recycling
- Hydroponics
- Aquaculture and aquaponics/urban hydroponic operations

Sales

- Farmers Markets
- Farm Stands
- Direct sales out of garden
- Community-Supported Agriculture (CSAs)

Food Safety/Processing

- General food safety
- Post-harvest handling
- Valley Added Products and Cottage Food Law

Attachment 5

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Whitney Oxendahl, Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Review Organizational Structure of Draft Blueprint – Urban Bees*

As discussed at the previous Food Systems Advisory Commission in March 2015, it is envisioned that a series of blueprints will be developed to address current possible gaps and needs with regard to food system issues in the area. These blueprint documents are intended to provide much of the information and guidance on key food system issues relevant to the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area.

Attachment 5a is an example draft blueprint that has already been created to address the urban agriculture topic of urban bees. The draft blueprint highlights background information, benefits and concerns as they relate to the evaluation framework (health, environment, economic and social perspectives), common concerns, and examples of policies and ordinances in other jurisdictions in the United States.

It is asked that the Commission review and provide any additional comments on the overall organizational structure of the draft blueprint, including comments that may help strengthen this and future blueprints before potentially moving forward to area jurisdictions for review and discussion.

Attachment 5a

Urban Bees

This issue brief will provide background information related to urban beekeeping, and address the common concerns and benefits from a health, environment, social, and economic standpoint. The brief will also address how each concern can be remedied through ordinance language and education. An appendix has been provided to share example policy language from other jurisdictions.

Background

In 2014, the USDA issued a report declaring we are in a “critical time for efforts” to support our honeybee populations, since these populations have been in decline for decades. The bee colonies in the U.S have decreased from 6 million in 1947 to 2.5 million today.¹ No one knows the reason for the sharp decline, although some suspect colony collapse disorder (CCD) caused by a combination of environmental stressors such as bacteria, viruses, parasites, and pesticides.²

Beekeepers and citizens are concerned about colony collapse since bees are responsible for up to one-third of the food eaten by U.S. consumers.³ With concerns about CCD, encouraging new research suggests that bees are thriving in urban environments due to the diversity plants in urban areas compared to farmland, where much of it consist of large swaths of a single crop (known as monocropping).⁴

The popularity of urban beekeeping has grown rapidly, and in the past few years, cities such as Chicago, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Duluth, MN have begun issuing permits for backyard hives.

The following are common issues addressed in local ordinances:

- Number of hives permitted
- Permit and fee process
- Hive restrictions
- Location on the lot (e.g. backyard)
- Removal of beekeeping equipment and bee combs from apiary* grounds to prevent robbing**
- Equipment requirements (e.g. hives with removable frames and in sound condition)
- Flyway barriers***
- Source of fresh water
- Setback distances
- Minimum lot size
- Rooftop considerations
- Nuisance clause
- Re-queening an aggressive colony

¹ USDA [online]. 2014. USDA Provides \$8 Million to Help Boost Declining Honey Bee Population. Accessed 2015 January 21. <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentid=2014/06/0130.xml>

² Bartholomew, D. 2014. Los Angeles Daily News [online]. Accessed 2015 January 21. <http://www.dailynews.com/environment-and-nature/20140308/los-angeles-may-join-other-cities-allowing-backyard-beekeeping>

³ Roach, J. 2004. Bee Decline May Spell End of Some Fruits, Vegetables. National Geographic [online]. Accessed 2015 January 21. http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2004/10/1005_041005_honeybees.html

⁴ University of Bristol. 2015. Study shows urban habitats provide haven for UK bees [online]. Cabot Institute. Accessed 2015 Feb 23. <http://www.bris.ac.uk/cabot/news/2015/urban-haven.html>.

- Hive clearly marked with owner's contact information/permit number
- Hive disposal
- Educational requirements (e.g. beginner beekeeping class)
- Violation or penalty
- If honey and other products can be bought/sold or only consumed by owner

**Apiary: place where honeybee hives or colonies are kept*

***Robbing: pilfering of honey from a weak colony by other honeybees or insects*

****Flyway barrier: an obstacle like a fence, wall, or vegetation used to force bees to fly upwards when they leave the hive to avoid contact with people and reduce the risk of stinging*

Beekeeping is not addressed in Fargo*, Moorhead**, Dilworth, West Fargo, Cass County, or Clay County ordinances.

**Bees are not addressed in the Fargo ordinances, although the city attorney's opinion is that bees would be illegal in the city*

***Moorhead ordinances were recently reviewed by a city attorney who ruled that bees are not allowed since bees are not addressed as an accessory use*

Table 1. Framework for evaluating urban beekeeping

DOMAIN	BENEFIT	CONCERN
Health	Increases easy access to nutritious food source	Allergies to bee stings
Environment	More fruitful gardens and plants due to increased bee pollination Increase in biodiversity Helps support dwindling honeybee populations	
Economic	Furnish individuals and families with honey, wax and other useful products Potential for individuals to sell honey Increased pollination of food crops	Cost of permitting fee, setting up a hive and the equipment may be cost prohibitive for low-income families Jurisdiction cost of monitoring and addressing issues
Social	Increased awareness of the food cycle and connection to agriculture Provide a positive family activity	Fear of getting stung Nuisances include occasional stinging when they feel threatened, swarming, and gravitating to nearby shallow bodies of water

Table 2. Common urban beekeeping concerns addressed

CONCERN	MORE INFORMATION	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
Bee sting	<p>One of the key concerns regarding urban beekeeping is the fear of being stung. We have a handout that addresses common misconceptions about bee stings and may be a useful resource for citizens and beekeepers.</p> <p>Yellow jackets are the most aggressive and prone to stinging. Honeybees, by contrast, are the least likely to attack because honeybee strains have been bred for traits like gentleness and reduced swarming.</p> <p>A majority of individuals are allergic to yellow jackets, not honeybees.</p>	<p>Public education is crucial to minimizing the fear of stinging.</p> <p>Most ordinances require a six-foot tall flyway barrier at the hive exit which forces bees to fly up and away, reducing their contact with humans. Many ordinances have requirements, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The barrier be located a certain number of feet from the hive (e.g. 3-5 ft.) 2. It extends anywhere from 2-10 feet on either side of the colony 3. No barrier required if the hive is a certain number of feet (e.g. 15-30 ft.) from the property line or located on porches or balconies at least 10 feet high and five feet from the property line.
Cost for low-income families		<p>Part of the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan is addressing issues of food access, possible barrier reduction could include funding and management from outside sources, like a nonprofit, to cover the startup costs</p>
Gravitating toward bodies of water		<p>Most ordinances require urban beekeepers to provide a water source for their colonies during the non-dormant period to minimize the nuisance to surrounding property owners.</p>

Resource

If you have questions, please contact Kim Lipetzky with the Fargo Cass Public Health Office at 701-241-8195 or klipetzky@cityoffargo.com.

Appendix: Example Ordinances

Boston, MA (population 645,966)

SECTION 89-10. Accessory Keeping of Honey Bees.

1. Use Regulations. For proposed ground level or roof level Hives, see Underlying Zoning for applicable use regulations.
 - (a) For all areas covered under the Base Code, see Article 8 – Use No. 76.
 - (b) For all other areas not covered under the Base Code, see Use Regulation Table in specific Article.
 - (c) Where the Accessory Keeping of Animals is a Conditional Use in the applicable Underlying Zoning, the Board of Appeal shall not grant a Conditional Use Permit for the Accessory Keeping of Honey Bees unless the following conditions are met.
2. Maximum Number of Hives.
 - (a) The maximum number of Hives on any given Lot or roof for personal consumption of Honey Bee products shall be two (2).
3. Maximum Height and Size.
 - (a) No Hive shall exceed five (5) feet in height and twenty (20) cubic feet in size on any Lot or roof.
4. Specific Ground Level Beekeeping Requirements.
 - (a) Setbacks.
 - i. Where there is a wall, fence or similar barrier between the subject property and adjacent property, no setback from the property line is required. Where there is no wall, fence or similar barrier between subject property and adjacent property, Hives shall be set back five (5) feet from the property line.
 - ii. Hives shall not be located in the front yard or in a side yard that abuts a street in all residential and commercial Districts and Subdistricts.
 - iii. No Hive shall be located closer than ten (10) feet from a public sidewalk.
 - (b) Hive Placement and Flyways.
 - i. For any ground level Hive that is within twenty (20) feet of the doors and/or windows of the principal building on an abutting Lot, either of the following conditions must exist:
 - a. The Hive opening must face away from doors and/or windows; or
 - b. A flyway of at least six (6) feet in height comprising of a lattice fence, dense hedge or similar barrier must be established in front of the opening of the Hive such that the Honey Bees fly upward and away from neighboring properties. The flyway shall be located within three (3) feet of the entrance to the Hive and shall extend at least two (2) feet in width on either side of the Hive opening.
5. Specific Rooftop Beekeeping Requirements.
 - (a) Setbacks.
 - i. Hives shall be set back six (6) feet from the edge of the roof.
 - (b) Hive Placement and Flyways.
 - i. For any roof level Hive that is within twenty (20) feet of the doors and/or windows of the principal building on an abutting Lot, either of the following conditions must exist:
 - a. The Hive opening must face away from doors and/or windows; or
 - b. A flyway of at least six (6) feet in height comprising of a lattice fence, dense hedge or similar barrier must be established in front of the opening of the Hive such that the Honey Bees fly upward and away from neighboring properties. The flyway shall be located within three (3) feet of the entrance to the Hive and shall extend at least two (2) feet in width on either side of the Hive opening.
6. Compliance with State and Local Laws.
 - (a) All beekeeping shall comply with applicable State and local laws and regulations.

Duluth, MN (population 86,128)

Sec. 6-80.1. Keeping of honeybees.

- (a) Each person holding a license to keep honeybees within the city of Duluth shall comply with the following
 - (1) No more than five hives may be located on a lot;
 - (2) No hive shall exceed 20 cubic feet in volume
 - (3) A constant supply of water shall be provided for all hives, except during the dormant period;
 - (4) No ground hive shall be located closer than five feet from any property line;

- (5) No ground hive shall be located closer than 15 feet from a public sidewalk or 30 feet from a principal building on an abutting lot;
- (6) A flyway barrier at least six feet in height shall shield any part of a property line that is within 30 feet of a ground hive. The flyway barrier shall consist of a wall, fence, dense vegetation or combination thereof and it shall be positioned to transect both legs of a triangle extending from an apex to each end point of the part of the property line to be shielded;
- (7) Rooftop apiaries are allowed but shall not be located closer than 15 feet from a principal building on an abutting lot.

Minneapolis, MN (population 400,070)

74.80. - Keeping of honeybees.

- (a) No person shall keep, maintain, or allow to be kept any hive or other facility for the housing of honeybees on or in any property in the City of Minneapolis without a permit.
- (b) The number and location of hives, colonies and/or facilities for the housing of honeybees permitted by this section shall be determined by a permit issued by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. The permit shall specify any restrictions, limitations, conditions or prohibitions required by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control as necessary to safeguard public health and the general welfare. Subject to a hearing to be held by a committee of the council or other designated hearing examiner, if requested within five (5) days of the notification, Minneapolis Animal Care and Control may deny, suspend, or revoke any permit applied for or granted pursuant to this section if any condition or requirement is violated or if the keeping of honeybees becomes a public nuisance.
- (c) Minneapolis Animal Care and Control may grant a permit pursuant to this section only after the applicant has met any educational requirements as established and published by the manager and has provided evidence of notification to all immediately adjacent property owners, in a format supplied by or approved by and to the satisfaction of Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. If the applicant is a renter, approval from the property owner will be required. Neighbor notification will be the responsibility of the property owner, though it may be carried out by the applicant.
- (d) Any person desiring a permit for the keeping of honeybees shall make application to Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. Approval of the application is subject to reasonable conditions prescribed by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. All permits issued shall expire on January thirty-first of the year following issuance unless sooner revoked. The application fee for such permit shall be one hundred dollars (\$100.00) which shall be paid at the time of application. There shall be no fee for annual renewal but the permit must be renewed annually for administrative tracking and notification purposes in a format supplied by or approved by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. Failure to provide such renewal may result in an inspection and penalties including citation and revocation of permit. Minneapolis Animal Care and Control shall inspect the premises as deemed necessary. Should the permit be refused, denied or revoked, the fee paid with the application shall be retained by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control.
- (e) Minneapolis Animal Care and Control shall enforce the provisions of this section.
- (f) Definitions. As used in this section:
 - (1) Apiary means the assembly of one (1) or more colonies of honeybees at a single location.
 - (2) Beekeeper means a person who owns or has charge of one (1) or more colonies of honeybees.
 - (3) Beekeeping equipment means anything used in the operation of an apiary, such as hive bodies, supers, frames, top and bottom boards and extractors.
 - (4) Colony means an aggregate of honeybees consisting principally of workers, but having, when perfect, one (1) queen and at times drones, brood, combs, and honey.
 - (5) Hive means the receptacle inhabited by a colony that is manufactured for that purpose.
 - (6) Honeybee means all life stages of the common domestic honeybee, *Apis mellifera* species of European origin.
 - (7) Lot means a contiguous parcel of land under common ownership.
 - (8) Nucleus colony means a small quantity of honeybees with a queen housed in a smaller than usual hive box designed for a particular purpose.
 - (9) Undeveloped property means any idle land that is not improved or actually in the process of being improved with residential, commercial, industrial, church, park, school or governmental facilities or other structures or improvements intended for human occupancy and the grounds maintained in associations therewith. The term shall be deemed to include property developed exclusively as a street or highway or property used for commercial agricultural purposes.

(g) Standards of practice. Any person obtaining a permit pursuant to this section shall comply with the following standards of practice:

- (1) Honeybee colonies shall be kept in hives with removable frames, which shall be kept in sound and usable condition.
- (2) Each beekeeper shall ensure that a convenient source of water is available to the colony prior to and so long as colonies remain active outside of the hive.
- (3) Each beekeeper shall ensure that no wax comb or other material that might encourage robbing by other bees are left upon the grounds of the apiary lot. Such materials once removed from the site shall be handled and stored in sealed containers, or placed within a building or other insect-proof container.
- (4) For each colony permitted to be maintained under this article, there may also be maintained upon the same apiary lot, one (1) nucleus colony in a hive structure not to exceed one (1) standard nine and five-eighths-inch depth ten-frame hive body with no supers.
- (5) Each beekeeper shall maintain his beekeeping equipment in good condition, including keeping the hives painted, and securing unused equipment from weather, potential theft or vandalism and occupancy by swarms. It shall be a violation of this section for any beekeeper's unused equipment to attract a swarm, even if the beekeeper is not intentionally keeping honeybees.
- (6) Each beekeeper shall enclose their property and/or the apiary with a latching fence. A fence shall not be required if the hives are approved to be located on a rooftop so as to be inaccessible to the general public so that bee movements to and from the hive do not interfere with the ordinary movements of persons on adjacent properties or the public right-of-way.
- (7) Each beekeeper shall, if unable or unwilling to continue to maintain their permitted hives, promptly notify Minneapolis Animal Care and Control so that the hives may be made available to an approved honeybee rescue entity, or, if necessary, disposed of by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. There shall be a fifty dollar (\$50.00) fee for disposal of hives.

(h) Colony density. Any person obtaining a permit pursuant to this section shall comply with the following restrictions on colony density:

- (1) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, in each instance where a colony is kept less than twenty-five (25) feet from a property line of the lot upon which the apiary is located, as measured from the nearest point on the hive to the property line, and any entrances to the hive faces that lot line, the beekeeper shall establish and maintain a flyway barrier at least six (6) feet in height. The flyway barrier may consist of a wall, fence, dense vegetation or a combination thereof, such that honeybees will fly over rather than through the material to reach the colony. If a flyway barrier of dense vegetation is used, the initial planting may be four (4) feet in height, so long as the vegetation normally reaches six (6) feet in height or higher. The flyway barrier must continue parallel to the apiary lot line for ten (10) feet in either direction from the hive. All other sides of the area encompassing the colonies shall consist of fencing, a wall, dense vegetation or combination of at least four (4) feet tall. The area encompassing the colonies need not entail the entire property. A flyway barrier is not required if the property adjoining the apiary lot line is undeveloped, or is zoned agricultural or industrial, or is a wildlife management area or naturalistic park land with no horse or foot trails located within twenty-five (25) feet of the apiary lot line. A flyway barrier is not required if the hives are located on the roof of a structure containing at least one (1) full story if all hives are located at least five (5) feet from the side of the structure and at least fifteen (15) feet from any adjacent and occupied structure.
- (2) No person is permitted to keep more than the following numbers of colonies on any lot within the city, based upon the size or configuration of the apiary lot:
 - a. One-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) acre or smaller lot: Two (2) colonies;
 - b. Larger than one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) acre but smaller than three-quarter ($\frac{3}{4}$) acre lot: Four (4) colonies;
 - c. Larger than three-quarter ($\frac{3}{4}$) acre lot but smaller than one (1) acre lot: Six (6) colonies;
 - d. One (1) acre but smaller than five (5) acres: Eight (8) colonies;
 - e. Larger than five (5) acres: As determined by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control.
- (3) Regardless of lot size, so long as all lots within a radius of at least two hundred (200) feet from any hive, measured from any point on the front of the hive, remain undeveloped, the maximum number of colonies may be increased by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. No grandfathering rights shall accrue under this subsection.
- (4) If a beekeeper serves the community by removing a swarm or swarms of honeybees from locations where they are not desired, a beekeeper shall not be considered in violation of the portion of this section limiting the number of colonies while temporarily housing the swarm on the apiary lot in compliance with the standards of practice

established pursuant to this section if the swarm is so housed for no more than thirty (30) days from the date acquired.

(i) Pursuant to section 244.2000(a) of this Code, any rental dwelling license holder notified by an immediately adjacent property owner of the intent to house beehives on the immediately adjacent owner's property shall post said notice in a common area of the rental property or, if a single-family home, the rental license holder shall provide said notice to the tenant by means of mail, hand delivery, or posting. Said notice shall be provided by the rental license holder to each new tenant thereafter for as long as the adjacent property continues to house beehives.

Salt Lake City, UT (population 191,180)

Chapter 8.10 BEEKEEPING

8.10.010: PURPOSE:

The purpose of this chapter is to authorize beekeeping subject to certain requirements intended to avoid problems that may otherwise be associated with beekeeping in populated areas.

8.10.020: CERTAIN CONDUCT UNLAWFUL:

Notwithstanding compliance with the various requirements of this chapter, it shall be unlawful for any person to maintain an apiary or to keep any colony on any property in a manner that threatens public health or safety, or creates a nuisance.

8.10.030: HIVES ON RESIDENTIAL LOTS:

A. As provided in this chapter, and notwithstanding any contrary provision in Title 21A of this code, an apiary, consisting of not more than five (5) hives or an equivalent capacity, may be maintained in a side yard or the rear yard of any residential lot. On a residential lot which is larger one-half (0.5) acre or larger, the number of hives located on the lot may be increased to ten (10) hives.

B. A person shall not locate or allow a hive on property owned or occupied by another person without first obtaining written permission from the owner or occupant.

8.10.040: BEEKEEPER REGISTRATION:

Each beekeeper shall be registered with the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food as provided in the Utah Bee Inspection Act set forth in Title 4, Chapter 11 of the Utah Code, as amended.

8.10.050: HIVES:

A. Honeybee colonies shall be kept in hives with removable frames which shall be kept in sound and usable condition.

B. Hives shall be placed at least five (5) feet from any property line and six (6) inches above the ground, as measured from the ground to the lowest portion of the hive; provided, however, that this requirement may be waived in writing by the adjoining property owner.

C. Hives shall be operated and maintained as provided in the Utah Bee Inspection Act.

D. Each hive shall be conspicuously marked with the owner's name, address, telephone number, and state registration number.

8.10.060: FLYWAYS:

A hive shall be placed on property so the general flight pattern of bees is in a direction that will deter bee contact with humans and domesticated animals. If any portion of a hive is located within fifteen (15) feet from an area which provides public access or from a property line on the lot where an apiary is located, as measured from the nearest point on the hive to the property line, a flyway barrier at least six (6) feet in height shall be established and maintained around the hive except as needed to allow access. Such flyway, if located along the property line or within five (5) feet of the property line, shall consist of a solid wall, fence, dense vegetation, or a combination thereof, which extends at least ten (10) feet beyond the hive in each direction so that bees are forced to fly to an elevation of at least six (6) feet above ground level over property lines in the vicinity of the apiary.

8.10.070: WATER:

Each beekeeper shall ensure that a convenient source of water is available to the colony continuously between March 1 and October 31 of each year. The water shall be in a location that minimizes any nuisance created by bees seeking water on neighboring property.

8.10.080: BEEKEEPING EQUIPMENT:

Each beekeeper shall ensure that no bee comb or other beekeeping equipment is left upon the grounds of an apiary site. Upon removal from a hive, all such equipment shall promptly be disposed of in a sealed container or placed within a building or other bee-proof enclosure.

8.10.090: CONFLICT WITH COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS:

In the event of a conflict between any regulation set forth in this chapter and honeybee management regulations adopted by the Salt Lake Valley Health Department, the most restrictive regulations shall apply.

8.10.100: VIOLATIONS:

A violation of this chapter may be remedied as provided in Sections 8.04.500, 8.04.510, and 8.04.520 of this title. When a violation of this chapter is committed, and provided it is not charged in conjunction with another criminal offense and does not constitute a fourth or succeeding notice of violation within a twenty-four (24) month period, an authorized agent of the City shall issue a civil notice of violation to such violator in lieu of a misdemeanor citation.

Littleton, CO (excerpt from ordinance)

(G) Queens: In any instance in which a colony exhibits usually aggressive characteristics by stinging or attempting to sting without due provocation or exhibits an unusual disposition towards swarming, it shall be the duty of the beekeeper to requeen the colony. Queens shall be selected from stock bred for gentleness and nonswarming characteristics.

DRAFT

Attachment 6

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Megan Myrdal, Project Coordinator
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Urban Agriculture Prioritization*

Following information presented at the initial meeting of the Food Systems Advisory Commission in March 2015, one of the first tasks of the Commission as recommended by the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee will be the prioritization of research of different urban agriculture practices. The recommendations of the Commission will be used in the development of future blueprints through the end of 2015 and beyond. Urban agriculture has been divided into five broad categories which include:

- Urban growing;
- Urban animals;
- Farming practices;
- Sales; and
- Food safety/processing.

Attachment 6a contains a list of these five categories and subcategories for prioritization. It is asked that Commission members take time to rank what they see as the most beneficial urban agriculture areas for the Steering Committee to research in the coming months.

Attachment 6a

Urban Growing

- Community/neighborhood community _____
- Residential gardens _____
- Apartment gardens _____
- Market gardens _____
- Boulevard gardens _____
- Roof top gardens _____
- Parkland gardens _____

Urban Animals

- Pigs _____
- Ducks _____
- Rabbits _____
- Pygmy goats _____
- Chickens _____
- Bees _____
- Other _____

Farming Practices

- Greenhouses/hoop houses/structures/high tunnels _____
- Rainwater harvesting/rain barrels/rain barrels on public buildings/rain gardens/ water reclamation _____
- Soil safety _____
- Composting/Curbside recycling _____
- Hydroponics _____
- Aquaculture & aquaponics/urban hydroponic operations _____

Sales

- Farmers Markets _____
- Farm Stands _____
- Direct sales out of garden _____
- Community-Supported Agriculture (CSAs) _____

Food Safety/Processing

- General food safety _____
- Post-harvest handling _____
- Valley Added Products and Cottage Food Law _____

Attachment 7

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Discussion on Received Community Comments Regarding Food Systems Issues*

In order to keep the Food Systems Advisory Commission apprised of various issues and inquiries raised by the community, the Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative (CCFSI) Steering Committee will keep a record of questions and comments received on behalf of the public and will review them with Commission members on a continuing basis. These will include public comments received through the City of Fargo *Let's Eat Local* website (LetsEatLocal.org) and other venues.

Attachment 7a includes questions and comments regarding food systems issues submitted to the City of Fargo and Fargo Cass Public Health from September 2014 to April 2015. Names have been redacted to ensure the privacy of each of the individuals.

Attachment 7a

Emails

3/30/2015: Hi! My name is XXXXX. I recently moved to the Fargo/Moorhead area and I am trying to get information on how to get involved in starting a community garden or working with a garden in the city. I have been active in the community garden scene for a few years. I was a member and gardener for the Red Barn Community Farm in Everett, WA, we where a non-profit to help support Everett Food Bank through Volunteers of America. Before I moved to Fargo in August of 2014 for a job with Untied Technologies in Jamestown. I currently live on the border of West Fargo and Fargo. I was hoping that there would be a community garden near my home, but with all of the development and open land being swallowed up by new construction. I have had no luck, I am trying to get more information on whether City Fargo has vacant land that they would be willing to share, for a start up community farm, that is sustainable, eye-appealing and great for the community. I hope that you could help guide me to the right folks. Thanks for your time.

04/14/2015: Thank you Kim for the reply. I'm really hoping that there will be future plans to develop of some community gardens within Fargo/Moorhead. I have reached out to West Fargo, but I not sure they are focusing on items or initiatives at this time, due to the expansive growth in the area. I am a strong advocate on inserting community garden in cities future expansion and development. Living in the Seattle area, where there healthy life style is prevalent. Community gardens and urban agriculture is taking off by leaps and bounds.

One other question I had was school gardens in the Fargo school district. Please let me know of any events or community discussions. I would to attend and listened to ideas. Thanks for your time.

3/26/2015: Hi. I am an urban chicken keeper in Fargo. This is my 3 year anniversary as a chicken keeper. I spoke at the city commission meeting last fall and would definitely like to keep my chickens! And I am also interested in bee keeping as well! Would love to start this summer. Are there minutes or agenda that I can follow to keep up to date? I would love to be able to attend meetings if they are open.

I also have concerns regarding chickens as a "fad" because I have already fostered and placed lost or tossed birds from the city pound on 3 separate occasions. My concern is that animals be kept and disposed of humanely, whether that is as a pet or as groceries, that people be educated and responsible. My own reasons for chicken keeping is cruelty free eggs, or as close as possible. I would, if I was rural, consider raising meat birds as cruelty free as possible but I personally wouldn't make that choice for small scale urban poultry keeping.

3/26/2015: From a local farmer - saw the story on the Food Systems Advisory Commission and they are looking for ways to expand their market in the FM Area.

3/10/2015: Do you have any information on where the downtown Farmers Market is going to relocate to? Thanks

Response: *We are still investigating where the farmer's markets will be this year - I believe some of the vendors that were at the market at the dike in Fargo are joining the West Acres farmers market*

From XXX: That's too bad, we need a Market downtown, anything going in the old US Bank lot?

2/28/15: Hi Kim, We are wondering how the topic of urban agriculture and backyard chickens in Fargo is progressing. We are considering some backyard projects for the summer and realized we should find out if we should include chickens in the plans or not. Thanks for any update.

1/19/2015: Hello. My fiancée and I recently moved to Fargo for school and work. We are young folk, so Fargo is a great place to be! There is a massive community of young people here, many just like us. Unfortunately, as a young person, we are confined to living in an apartment. This is plenty of indoor space for just the two of us, however there is no way for us to grow any of our own food, which we feel would be very beneficial to our health and our bank accounts. We've been looking into renting a plot at a community garden, as we had heard that there are such a thing in many larger cities due to people not being able to have gardens at home. Here in Fargo, there are a few options for community gardens, though they are mostly limited to churches or new immigrants for community building reasons. I think that community gardens would be fantastic for building communities and friendships with other like-minded people, but there are simply none available for a regular young person, especially near the Scheel's arena, where I live. Since there is still plenty of building going on around the Scheel's arena, I've noticed that there is still PLENTY of open space. Just a block down from my apartment building, there is the Brandt Crossing Dog Park, which is across the street from a playground and a huge amount of open grass area. Obviously, I feel that a dog park and playground are fantastic things to have in a community as well, but wouldn't it be great if the huge amount of people living in the big apartment buildings all around here had a place to meet and grow food? I guess what I'm suggesting is that the city had a little bit of the open area around the playground turned into a community garden area. It would be a beautiful addition to the open grass, and it would provide for the massive population of presumably young and able-bodied people to provide for themselves and possibly others. I would be more than willing to personally help take steps to recruit and organize this garden if the city finds that it would be as beneficial to the community as we do. Thanks for reading!

10/27/2014: City of Fargo-- I have no problems with the Public Health Department conducting a survey regarding the raising of chickens in the backyards of people who live in Fargo. Nothing wrong with looking at what's going on in the rest of the country. I think you'll find that across our country there is a growing interest in urban gardening that takes in the raising of small farm animals such as chickens on city lots. Many cities have made provisions for allowing the use of vacant land on which can be grown vegetables. There's also the matter of allotment gardening which is also growing in popularity. I do find it puzzling that Fargo should find chickens worthy of study. They make far less noise than dogs, and when properly cared for, they have little to no odor. They produce eggs, meat, feathers, and contribute manure to compost piles. They also forage for insect pests. As I said, raising chickens and urban farming are two trends that go hand-in-hand in our nation. Why these (or at least one of these) might be seen as a problem and thus should be banned from the city is hard for me to understand. Cats create far more problems in

that some people still allow their pets to roam, killing songbirds, frogs, snakes and other small animals. Recent studies indicate that the average house cat, if allowed to roam freely, kills a huge number of beneficial, smaller animals each year. Why all this interest in chickens when cats do far more damage to our urban environment? IMHO, this a good example of the city of Fargo overreaching, of making a law because it can, not because it should. For what it's worth, you may pass my comment onto the Mayor and the City Commissioners--I truly believe our elected officials have more important issues to spend their time on than worrying about a hundred or so chickens in the backyards of Fargo--like flood control and the monitoring of hazardous chemicals that pass through Fargo as cargo on trains.

9/17/2014: If every noisy dog in the neighborhood could be traded for a chicken I would support that trade in a minute. The dogs begin barking any time after 5 AM disregarding people who would like to sleep another couple of hours. They bark all day and into the evening. Many of these dogs that are the size of small calves are left alone in a house or yard all day.

These dogs leave a mess in our yard and berm that filled a 5 gallon bucket last spring after the owners slyly didn't pick up. These dogs are on leashes that allow them free reign of our yard where they ruin plants and mess on shrubs and flowers. Walking involves crossing the street several times, because the owners don't keep the dogs restricted by their side. The dogs lick and sniff. Disgusting! The owners allow the dogs off their leashes in the park. A Forum article indicated 4 million people a year are bitten by dogs.

Chickens may cluck a little; however, they are restrained to their own yards; and therefore, don't mess in other people's yards. They are not on city sidewalks or in the park. I have never seen an article on human bites or deaths due to deadly chickens.

If there is a decision to restrain the chickens to a part of town I volunteer our part of town. In exchange make a decision to outlaw dogs in a part of town. A beautiful quiet would descend on the neighborhood, sidewalks would be safe to walk and there would be no unsightly messes to pick up.

9/15/2014: Dear Commissioners (Fargo City Commission):

Please allow residents to have 2 hens only (no roosters), so they can raise healthy chickens who give healthy eggs. My husband is a transplant patient and has no immune system. He cannot eat commercially grown eggs due to possible salmonella. We need two chickens allow him guaranteed healthy eggs!

Phone calls – April 2015

- Fargo. Can I plan a vegetable garden in my front yard (not the boulevard but the front yard).
- Lawyer representing homeowner living next to a property owner who houses chickens as family pets. How can his client have a voice and give input.

Attachment 8

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Heidi Durand, Chair
Date: May 6, 2015
Re: *Public Comment Opportunity*

The Public Comment Opportunity is an open forum for the public to provide comments about specific items on this meeting's agenda, as well as any other issues that may pertain to food systems policies, programs, or documents.

Comments to the Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission will be limited to one (1) minute per individual or at the discretion of the Food Systems Advisory Commission Chair.