



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: January 8, 2016
RE: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission Agenda and Correspondence

6th Meeting of the Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission

January 13, 2016 10:30 am – 12:00 pm

Location: Fargo City Commission Chambers

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 10:30 am | 1. Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Approve Order & Contents of the Overall Agendab. Review & Action on Minutes from November 4, 2015 (Attachment 1) |
| 10:35 am | 2. Urban Chickens <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Urban Chickens Education (Attachment 2) – Megan Myrdalb. Urban Chickens Blueprint (Attachment 3) – Noelle Hardenc. Public Inputd. Commission Discussion |
| 11:00 am | 3. Growing Together – Jack Wood |
| 11:10 am | 4. Meeting with Metro-Area Planners – Adam Altenburg |
| 11:20 am | 5. Meeting with Twin Cities Food Systems Consultant – Noelle Harden |
| 11:25 am | 6. NDSU Masters of Public Health Student Projects (Attachments 4a, 4b, & 4c) – Megan Myrdal |
| 11:30 am | 7. Online Community Input (Attachment 5) – Kim Lipetzky |
| 11:35 am | 8. Public Comment Opportunity – Chair Durand |
| 11:40 am | 9. Commission & Steering Committee Roundtable |
| 11:50 am | 10. Commission Action Steps
Next Meeting – March 9, 2016 |
| 12:00 pm | 11. Adjournment |

Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission meetings are taped and rebroadcast on cable channel TV Fargo 56 each Friday at 11:00 am.

People with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and need special accommodations should contact Nakhaly Swearengin at Metro COG at 701.232.3242 x31. Please contact us at least 48 hours before the meeting to give our staff adequate time to make arrangements.

Meeting minutes are available on the City of Fargo Let's Eat Local website at www.letseatlocal.org and Metro COG's website at www.fmmetrocog.org.

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

A PLANNING ORGANIZATION SERVING

FARGO, WEST FARGO, CASS COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA AND MOORHEAD, DILWORTH, CLAY COUNTY, MINNESOTA

Attachment 1

**5th Meeting of the
Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
November 4th, 2015
Fargo Commission Chambers**

Members Present:

Arland Rasmussen, Interim Chair
Jenny Mongeau, Clay County Commission
Jim Aasness, Dilworth City Council
Andrea Baumgardner, At-Large Member
Jon Evert, At-Large Member

Members Absent:

Heidi Durand, Moorhead City Council
Mike Thorstad, West Fargo City Commission
Mike Williams, Fargo City Commission
Jessica Arneson, At-Large Member
Janet Paul, At-Large Member
Dana Rieth, At-Large Member

Others Present:

Megan Myrdal, Project Coordinator
Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health
Gina Nolte, Clay County Public Health/PartnerSHIP4Health
Whitney Oxendahl, Cass-Clay Food Systems Initiative
Adam Altenburg, Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Mr. Rasmussen called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM.

1(a). Approve Order and Contents of the Overall Agenda

A motion to approve the order and contents of the overall agenda was made by Mr. Evert and seconded by Mr. Aasness. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

1(b). Review and Action on Minutes from September 9, 2015

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms. Mongeau and seconded by Ms. Baumgardner. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

2(a). Ugly Food of the North: Urban Agriculture

Ms. Myrdal informed the Commission that on October 19, the organization Ugly Food of the North held a community conversation event on urban agriculture at the Rourke Art Gallery Museum in Moorhead. Ms. Myrdal explained that this event was tailored to allow community members to bring questions and opinions about urban agriculture in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Ms. Myrdal stated that a panel comprised Abby Gold (NDSU School of Public Health), Noelle Harden (University of Minnesota Extension), Travis Luthi (Three Beers Honey Co.), Whitney Oxendahl (Cass Clay Food Systems Initiative Steering Committee), and Kayle Pridmore (Woodchuck Community Farms) were available to answer questions.

2(b). Urban Agriculture Community Interest Survey

Ms. Myrdal reminded the Commission that in June and July of 2015, a survey was sent out the community that asked residents interest in urban agriculture. Ms. Myrdal stated that urban growing came across as the most important topic from the community. Ms. Myrdal explained that this survey helped to inform the direction of the Steering Committee on the development of blueprints before the Commission.

Ms. Myrdal asked the Commission for a more comprehensive survey of the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area to get a better sense of what the community's thoughts and interests are with regard to urban agriculture and to try to get a larger representation of area residents. Ms. Myrdal stated that the survey completed in June and July was online only and that this survey would include a postage-paid hard copy of the survey through Metro COG.

Mr. Evert asked if people would need to make a request in order to take a hard copy of the survey. Ms. Myrdal stated that the survey would be strongly promoted in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area and that it would be similar in nature to the recent survey by the City of Fargo on single-sort recycling.

A motion to approve the urban agriculture community interest survey was made by Mr. Aasness and seconded by Ms. Mongeau. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

3(a). Urban Chickens Education

Ms. Myrdal reminded the Commission and community members that no action was being taken with regard to allowing urban chickens in the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Ms. Myrdal stated that the purpose of the discussion was to give a baseline understanding of what the issue is, how it can be evaluated, information on what other regional jurisdictions are doing, and best practices throughout the United States.

Ms. Myrdal explained that the interest in backyard chickens may be attributable to the growing interest in people wanting to know where their food comes from, how it is grown or raised, and also being able to have a closer connection to their food. Ms. Myrdal stated that chickens provide a food source for a family, with one hen being able to provide three to four eggs a week. Ms. Myrdal stated that chickens may be viewed as companion animals and a source of comfort. Ms. Myrdal explained that backyard chickens may also be a way to teach children about nature, agriculture, and how to responsibly care for animals. Ms. Myrdal concluded that chickens are omnivores and are able to help with food waste reduction.

Ms. Myrdal stated that there are many different breeds of chickens that are available and are adaptable to a backyard environment. Ms. Myrdal explained that breeds often used in an urban setting have been bred to have a mellow temperament, good long-term egg laying production, and northern climate tolerance. Ms. Myrdal provided several examples of heavier breeds including the Buff Orpington, Ameraucanas, and the Speckled Sussex.

Ms. Myrdal explained that a proper diet and fresh water are important for backyard chickens. Ms. Myrdal stated that chickens will eat grains, fruits, vegetables, and insects, as well as kitchen and garden scraps. Ms. Myrdal stated that feed requirements may increase in the winter and decrease in the summer due to metabolic changes. Ms. Myrdal explained that chickens need to be let out of their coops each morning and put inside their coops at dusk, and that their eggs need to be picked up twice a day.

Ms. Myrdal stated that hens begin egg production at around six months and can continue for five to ten years. Ms. Myrdal explained that peak production occurs in the first two years and drops each year

as hens molt, or replace their feathers in the early fall, and also as daylight hours are lost. Ms. Myrdal stated that hens need at least 12 to 14 hours of daylight each day to continue laying eggs and that a regular light bulb inside coops is sufficient to supply this light.

Ms. Myrdal explained that a quality coop is essential for egg production, including nest boxes – one per four to five birds. Ms. Myrdal stated that chickens also like to be up high and a place to roost is important. Ms. Myrdal stated that coops must provide protection from weather and predators and be well-insulated. Ms. Myrdal also stated that coops should have a light bulb or heat lamp for winter months, as well as ventilation for fresh air. Ms. Myrdal stated that it is recommended that coops have a minimum three to five square feet per bird. Ms. Myrdal explained that another component called the run is important to provide chickens a fenced, protected area while they are outside.

Ms. Myrdal explained that chickens raised in backyard settings generally stay healthy and are not easily susceptible to diseases. Ms. Myrdal stated that monitoring changes in a chicken's personality or energy level is important in monitoring a chicken's health. Ms. Myrdal also stated that sanitation is vital and that coops and outdoor areas should be cleaned weekly or as needed to control manure and odor build-up. Ms. Myrdal explained that feeders and waterers should be cleaned and disinfected regularly, and that thorough cleaning of the coop and yard is done once a year. Ms. Myrdal stated that cleaning before the introduction of new birds is important to limit the spread of disease.

Ms. Myrdal informed the Commission of common concerns that are expressed with raising backyard chickens and how they may be addressed or debunked. Ms. Myrdal explained one concern is that roosters are loud and that allowing chickens in an urban setting is a nuisance. Ms. Myrdal stated that egg-laying hens are female while roosters are male and that most urban settings ban roosters. Ms. Myrdal explained that hens at their loudest speak at the same decibel level as human conversation.

Ms. Myrdal stated that another common concern is that birds carry diseases, including salmonella, and that people will get sick from backyard chickens. Ms. Myrdal explained that live poultry may have salmonella germs in their droppings and on their bodies and that people become infected with salmonella when they put their hands on areas that have been in contact with feces in or around their mouth. Ms. Myrdal provided information from the Centers for Disease Control on guidelines to reduce salmonella infections from live poultry including: washing hands thoroughly with soap and water, thoroughly cooking eggs, and cleaning any equipment or materials associated with raising or caring for live poultry. Ms. Myrdal stated that most outbreaks of salmonella have been linked with people bringing live poultry into their homes.

Ms. Myrdal explained that another common concern is that urban chickens attract unwanted pests such as flies. Ms. Myrdal stated that flies and other pests lay their eggs in droppings because of the moisture content and that waste should be removed every four to five days. Ms. Myrdal also stated that proper bedding care is important to prevent pest breeding.

Ms. Myrdal stated that an increased presence of predators such as rats, raccoons, and hawks has also been listed as a common concern. Ms. Myrdal explained that chickens should not attract urban predators more than a cat or dog. Ms. Myrdal stated that most predators are nocturnal while chickens are active during the day, and that enclosing chickens at night should prevent predators from accessing them.

Ms. Myrdal addressed another final common concern in which the egg-laying potential of chickens is limited to only a few years and concerns with what to do with chickens after that period. Ms. Myrdal explained that hens do outlive their ability to produce eggs but that there are options to do after that period including: slaughtering and processing options in the region, donating to local producers, or choosing to keep birds as companion animals regardless of egg production.

3(b). Urban Chickens Blueprint

Ms. Oxendahl informed the Commission that hundreds of local jurisdictions in the United States, including approximately twenty in Minnesota, that allow backyard chicken keeping. Ms. Oxendahl listed a number of common issues addressed in local ordinances on urban chickens including: number of birds permitted per household, permit and fee processes, regulation of roosters, enclosure and containment restrictions, location and setback restrictions, written consent by neighbors, and slaughtering restrictions. Ms. Oxendahl stated that within the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area, chicken keeping is permitted in Cass County, Clay County as an accessory use, and Fargo with conditions.

Ms. Oxendahl explained the framework for evaluating urban chickens including health, environment, economic, and social aspects. Ms. Oxendahl explained a health benefit of urban chicken includes an increased access to nutritious food source, while a concern would be disease risk. Ms. Oxendahl stated that environmental benefits include keeping yards clean of bugs, pests, and weeds, utilizing chicken droppings as fertilizer, and reducing overall food waste, while a concern may be the attraction of unwanted predators. Ms. Oxendahl explained that economic benefits include possible financial relief for low-income families and the potential for individuals to sell backyard chicken eggs, while concerns may be cost of permitting fees and costs associated with setting up a coop along with concerns about disposal of dead birds. Ms. Oxendahl stated that social benefits include regarding chickens as companion animals and increasing awareness of the food cycle, while concerns may include noise, odor, visual worries, and difficulty in keeping chickens in winter.

Ms. Oxendahl addressed further concerns for backyard chickens including: disease, pest attraction, predator attraction, costs to low-income families, disposal, noise, smell, and winter keeping. Ms. Mongeau provided additional information on animal disposal services offered by North Dakota State University.

Ms. Oxendahl informed the Commission that several regional jurisdictions allow backyard chicken keeping including: Duluth, MN, Lincoln, NE, Rochester, MN, and Sioux Falls, SD. Ms. Oxendahl stated that an additional jurisdiction, Mankato, MN, passed a temporary ordinance in 2010 allowing urban chicken keeping but no one applied during the two-year period and the ordinance expired. Ms. Oxendahl stated that Bismarck, ND and Grand Forks, ND do not allow backyard chickens.

3(c). Public Input

Ryan Pierson, dietetic intern for Fargo Cass Public Health, provided a written statement on behalf of Laura Devick. Ms. Devick stated that for the past six year, her family has enjoyed keeping backyard chickens and have shared the experience with friends, neighbors, and extended family. Ms. Devick explained that the benefits include: utilizing droppings as a high-nitrogen fertilizer, companion animals with unique personalities, fresh eggs, building responsibility and stewardship, and being able to feed food waste to the chickens. Ms. Devick voiced support for an ordinance allowing backyard chickens for those residents who would want them.

Cole Hooey, north Fargo resident, stated that he and his wife had spoken of having chickens but were concerned about the gray area on whether chickens are allowed or not. Mr. Hooey stated that he would like there to be a clearer answer on whether urban chickens are allowed. Mr. Hooey explained it would also be better to think of chickens along the same lines as other companion animals such as cats or dogs.

Erin Mayer stated that she has done research on raising chickens as humanely as possible and has begun raising three chickens earlier in the summer. Ms. Mayer gave an account of all the details involved in raising chickens and the practices she utilized.

Donna Hinton of Fargo gave an account of an autistic family member who had connected with a chicken and how it helped the family member to overcome some of their social anxieties. Ms. Hinton stated that it was her belief that chickens have strong benefits as companion animals.

Rick Hall stated that he and his wife, Verna Kragnes, are CSA farmers and have been farming for more than 25 years. Mr. Hall stated that many children would come to his farm on educational trips and that chickens were an important component of those trips. Mr. Hall explained that he and his wife also worked with people with disabilities and that chickens were a great way to connect to those people. Mr. Hall stated that, as a Moorhead resident, he would love to be able to have backyard chickens to continue that tradition.

Kathy Gohl of Fargo stated that she had strong reservations about the allowance of urban chickens. Ms. Gohl stated that she had a neighbor who had chickens and that on one occasion, the chickens had gotten out of their coops and had roamed on her property. Ms. Gohl also stated concerns that chickens attract pests and predators such as chicken hawks. Ms. Gohl expressed her views that regulating chickens could be difficult.

3(d). Commission Discussion

Mr. Evert stated that he appreciated all of the input and discussion from the public. Mr. Evert asked if chickens need both light and darkness and whether lights inside chicken coops should have timers or not. Tyne Stormo and Ben Kragnes of Kragnes Farms stated that it was good to have a timer for light and that chickens do indeed require both light and dark.

Mr. Rasmussen asked how many residents have chickens in Fargo. Ms. Lipetzky answered that there currently is no permitting process and that she wasn't sure how many families in the Fargo-area have backyard chickens.

Mr. Rasmussen stated this was the right venue to discuss the issues brought up during the public input and that the jurisdictions would need to consider the impacts allow backyard chickens. Ms. Baumgardner iterated Mr. Rasmussen's comments that this was the right process.

Ms. Mongeau expressed that the Commission may need to be more proactive in dealing with continued gray areas concerning the allowance of urban chickens.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that discussion of urban chickens would continue at the next Commission meeting to allow for more comments from absent members.

4. 2016 Communications Plan

Ms. Myrdal informed the Commission that NDSU students would be helping to develop the 2016 Communication Plan and that Commission members could be expected to be contacted in the coming weeks.

5. Online Community Input

Ms. Lipetzky explained that community members who may not be able to attend Commission meetings are able to submit public comments through the City of Fargo Let's Eat Local website. Ms. Lipetzky stated that two public comments had been received between September and October 2015. Ms. Lipetzky stated that one commenter, an NDSU student studying dietetics, would like to see a small, student-run grocery store to address the lack of food options in downtown Fargo. Ms. Lipetzky stated that another commenter was interested in winter vegetable production and other local production opportunities.

6. Public Comment Opportunity

Mr. Rasmussen informed the Commission that time would be allotted for public comments.

7. Commission and Steering Committee Roundtable

Mr. Rasmussen asked for the Commission and the Steering Committee to share any additional updates.

8. 2016 Commission Chair Appointment

Mr. Altenburg stated that earlier in 2015, the Commission approved a rotation schedule determining the Commission Chair and alternate amongst jurisdictions, with the Commission Chair rotated annually amongst jurisdictions. Mr. Altenburg explained that it had been recommended to the Steering Committee to allow for Chair Durand to continue on as Chair for 2016. Mr. Altenburg stated that this would be permissible according to the stipulations of the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) which established the Commission.

A motion to approve the reappointment of Ms. Durand as Commission Chair and Mr. Rasmussen as alternate for 2016 was made by Mr. Evert and seconded by Ms. Aasness. The motion was voted on and unanimously approved.

9. Commission Action Steps

Ms. Myrdal stated that the next meeting would be held on January 13, 2016 and that the 2016 schedule was included in each of the packets.

Mr. Rasmussen adjourned the meeting at 11:51 AM.

URBAN CHICKENS

*Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory
Commission*

**January 13, 2016
Fargo City Hall**

Desire for Backyard Chickens

- Raising one's own food/access to nutritious food
 - One hen provides 3-4 eggs per week
 - “The pets that makes you breakfast”
- Companionship
- A way to teach children about nature, agriculture, and how to responsibly care for an animal
- Food waste reduction

Breeds of Chickens

- Many breeds are adaptable for a backyard setting
 - Mellow temperament
 - Good egg laying (longer term production)
 - Climate tolerance



Daily Care & Diets

- Chickens need to be fed and water changed daily
 - Omnivores – grains, fruits, vegetables, as well as insects
 - Eat fruit and vegetable scraps from the kitchen
 - Garden scraps
 - Feed requirements can increase in the winter & decrease in the summer heat
- Need continual access to clean, fresh water
- Need to be let out of coop each morning & put in coop at dusk
- Pick up eggs twice a day

Egg Production

- **Begin laying around 6 months**
- **Can continue for 5-10 years**
 - **Peak production occurs in the first 2 years**
- **Require 12-14 hours of light each day to continue laying eggs**

Housing (Coops) & Runs



Economic Development

- Conversation with Fleet Farm Corporate – Chicken Seed & Supplies Farm Buyer
 - Backyard Chicken Keeping - A trend they have been closely watching increase across the country for about 5 years
 - Poultry Clinics
 - Nine (9) in 2015
 - Twenty (20) scheduled for 2016 – Fargo is on the schedule – Date TBD
 - Equipment investment for a backyard operation - ~\$500 minimum

Keeping Chickens Healthy

- Chickens raised in backyard settings generally stay healthy and are not easily susceptible to diseases.
 - Know your birds.
 - **Sanitation** is key!
 - **Manure** must be **managed**.
 - Coop cleaning
 - Pasturing the chickens/movable shelters
 - Composting
 - Note: Composting standards can be addressed in an ordinance

Addressing Common Concerns:

Concern: Roosters are loud. Allowing chickens in an urban setting will be a nuisance.

Addressed: A hen is a female (egg layer) while a rooster is a male (non-egg layer). Nearly all urban places that allow backyard chickens ban roosters. Hens “talking” at their loudest speak at the same decibel level as human conversation (about 60 decibels). This is also personality-based; some hens are more “talkative” than others. Roosters crow at about the same decibel level as a barking dog (90 decibels).

Addressing Common Concerns

Concern: Birds carry diseases (particular concern is salmonella). Will people get sick from backyard chickens.

Addressed: *Salmonella* is a type of germ that naturally lives in the intestines of poultry and many other animals. Live poultry may have *Salmonella* germs in their droppings and on their bodies (feathers, feet, and beaks) even when they appear healthy and clean. People become infected with *Salmonella* when they put their hands or other things that have been in contact with feces in or around their mouth.

CDC Guidelines to Reduce *Salmonella* Infections from Live Poultry

DO

- Wash hands thoroughly with soap and water
- If you collect eggs from the hens, thoroughly cook them
- Clean any equipment or materials associated with raising or caring for live poultry

DON'T

- Let children younger than 5 years of age, older adults, or people with weak immune systems handle or touch chicks, ducklings, or other live poultry.
- Eat or drink in the area where the birds live or roam.
- Let live poultry inside the house
 - In recent outbreaks of *Salmonella* infections linked to contact with live poultry, ill people reported bringing live poultry into their homes.

Source: CDC, Keeping Backyard Poultry.

<http://www.cdc.gov/features/salmonellapoultry/>

Addressing Common Concerns

Concern: Will allowing urban chickens attract unwanted pests?

Addressed: Fly control is one of the largest problems. Flies and other pests lay their eggs in droppings because they like moisture. Waste should be removed at least every 4- to 5-days, and proper bedding care and moisture control are important to prevent pest breeding.

Addressing Common Concerns

Concern: What about predators like rats, raccoons, and hawks?

Addressed: Chickens should not attract urban predators more than a cat or dog. With the exception of hawks, most predators are nocturnal while chickens are active during the day. Enclosing chickens at night should prevent predators from accessing the chickens.

Addressing Common Concerns:

- **Concern:** People don't realize that chickens lay eggs for only a few years of their lives. They are put on Craigslist when they don't lay anymore. They're dumped frequently.
- **Addressed:** Laying hens do outlive their ability to produce eggs. Ideas:
 - Slaughtering options in the region: Lakes Processing in Detroit Lakes, Manock Meats in Great Bend and several Amish communities
 - Local producers may be willing to take abandoned hens for slaughter
 - Some chose to keep their birds as companion pets, regardless of egg production

Conclusion

- People desire to keep backyard chickens for *a number of reasons*.
- Many communities across the country & in our region have changed ordinances to allow for a certain number of backyard hens with defined *guidelines and restrictions*.
- Education is key to understanding all the necessities of keeping *healthy* backyard chickens & maintaining a practice that's *compatible* with an urban setting.

Backyard Chickens

This issue brief will provide background information related to urban chickens, 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. Appendices have been provided to share how regional jurisdictions are addressing backyard chickens as well as example policy language from other jurisdictions.

Background

Hundreds of cities across the U.S. and at least 20 communities in Minnesota, including Fergus Falls, have permitted urban chicken keeping. People have a desire for urban chickens for a number of reasons, including companionship, teaching children about agriculture, and the ability to raise one's own food (one hen provides on average 3-4 eggs per week). After setting up the coop and the initial learning curve, urban chicken farmers say a small flock can be as easy to raise as a dog.

The following are common issues addressed in local ordinances:

- Number of birds permitted per household
- Permit and fee process
- Regulation of roosters
- Enclosure/containment restrictions
- Distance of coop from other homes/property line (setback)
- Location on the lot (e.g. backyard)
- Nuisance clause
- Requiring written consent by neighbors
- Storing chicken feed in rat-proof containers
- Slaughtering restrictions
- Number of chickens based on property size
- Restrictions of chickens in multi-family areas
- Zoning
- Violation or penalty
- If eggs can be bought/sold or only consumed by owner

Table 1. Summary of chicken keeping approval in local jurisdictions (as of March 2015)

Moorhead	Dilworth	Clay County	Fargo	West Fargo	Cass County
Prohibited	Prohibited	Permitted as accessory use*	Permitted with conditions**	Prohibited	Permitted***

* For Residential Parcels: Minimum parcel size of two acres. A maximum of one animal unit per fenced acre of usable area (one chicken=0.01 animal unit). Fences should be located at least 10 ft from adjoining property lines. All manure shall be properly disposed of. Note: feedlots have different standards

***Fowl cannot run at large. The enclosures must be at least 75 ft away from neighboring dwellings, unless written consent is signed by the neighbor. If an animal is deemed a nuisance, either by odor, noise, attracting vermin or danger to the health of neighbors, it must be kept at least 200 feet from neighboring dwellings. Resident must abate any nuisance within 10 days of notice. Permitted as an accessory use in the Agricultural district only.*

****Requires a 250 foot buffer zone and individual townships may have their own zoning regulations.*

Table 2. Framework for evaluating urban chicken keeping

DOMAIN	BENEFIT	CONCERN
Health	Increases access to nutritious food source	Disease risk ¹
Environment	Keeps yard clean by eating bugs, pests, and weeds Chicken droppings can be composted and used as fertilizer, as long as safe composting practices are used Reduces food waste going into the garbage by feeding it to chickens instead Sustainable way to raise food in an urban environment (i.e. less energy used for transportation)	Attraction of unwanted pests or predators
Economic	Possible financial relief for low-income families Potential for individuals to sell backyard chicken eggs (if permitted) Reduces kitchen waste in municipal trash collection system	Cost of permitting fee, setting up a coop and the equipment may be cost prohibitive for low-income families Jurisdiction cost of monitoring and addressing issues Disposal of dead birds can be expensive for individuals if the only disposal option is a vet's office
Social	Can be regarded as pets and allows for positive social, cognitive, physical and emotional connection Increases awareness of the food cycle and connection to agriculture Can bring neighbors together Provides companionship Provides a positive family activity	Possibility of noise nuisance If not properly cared for, possibility of odor or not visually appealing Can be difficult to keep in winter

¹ Human Health Concerns about Raising Poultry. Illinois Dept of Public Health. Accessed 2015 January 21. <http://www.idph.state.il.us/health/infect/Poultry.htm>

Table 3. Common urban chicken keeping concerns addressed

CONCERN	MORE INFORMATION	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
Disease	<p>Contracting a communicable disease, like the flu or respiratory illness is negligible for urban poultry farming because of the size of the flock. This is a larger concern in industrial farming.</p> <p>Bacteria, like <i>Salmonella</i>, can be found in poultry droppings.</p>	<p>The hazards of bacterial infections can be mitigated by education regarding how to handle and care for poultry, including washing hands after returning indoors, and how to properly compost droppings for fertilizer. This can easily be addressed by educating urban chicken farmers with printed materials or offering classes.</p>
Attracting pests	<p>Flies and other pests lay their eggs in droppings because they like moisture.</p>	<p>Pests can be minimized through proper bedding care, and the chickens help by eating pests.</p>
Attracting predators	<p>Chickens should not attract urban predators any more than a cat or dog.</p>	<p>With the exception of hawks, most predators are nocturnal while chickens are diurnal (active during the day). Enclosing the chickens at night should prevent predators from accessing the chickens.</p>
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 non-profit, to cover the startup costs.</p>
Disposal		<p>For a fee, the Vet Diagnostic Lab at NDSU will provide dead animal disposal.*</p> <p>Other communities have offered these options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City provides dead animal pick-up free of charge 2. Buried on property at least two feet down 3. Closed securely in a plastic bag and placed in the municipal trash
Noise	<p>Hens “talking” at their loudest, speak at the same decibel level as human conversation (about 60 decibels). This is also personality-based; some hens are more talkative than others. Roosters crow at about the same decibel level as a barking dog (90 decibels).</p>	<p>A majority of urban ordinances ban roosters, because of their loud crowing.</p>
Smell	<p>Chicken manure is high in nitrogen, which can lead to an ammonia smell if not properly cared for.</p>	<p>Adding carbon material, like dried leaves and straw, to the bedding will get rid of the smell; it is all about carbon to nitrogen ratio. Odor can be remedied through quality bedding.</p>

Winter keeping		Proper education can reduce the impact of winter poultry farming: make sure to keep combs warm and use a heat lamp when the temperature gets below 20 degrees.
----------------	--	--

Resources

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

*NDSU Veterinarian Diagnostic Lab: <http://www.vdl.ndsu.edu/tests/general-investigation>

DRAFT

Appendix A: Backyard Chicken Keeping in Regional Jurisdictions

Bismarck, ND

Urban chicken keeping is not permitted.

Duluth, MN

Allows for backyard chickens with common restrictions (must have a license, no more than five hens, no roosters, no slaughtering, coop requirements, fenced yard, etc.).

Grand Forks, ND

Urban chicken keeping is not permitted.

Lincoln, NE

Allows for backyard chickens with common restrictions (must have a permit, number of chickens based upon property and shelter size, no roosters, sanitation requirements, etc.).

Mankato, MN

In 2010, the city passed a temporary ordinance allowing urban chicken keeping, but no one applied in the two-year period. (The ordinance expired as of 2012.) If there was more interest from residents, it is likely that their city council would pass another ordinance allowing urban chicken keeping.

Rochester, MN

Allows for backyard chickens with common restrictions (must have a permit, no more than three hens, no roosters, coop requirements, sanitation requirements, etc.).

Sioux Falls, SD

Urban chicken keeping is permitted with common restrictions (must have license, no more than six hens, no roosters, nuisance clause, etc.).

Appendix B: Example Ordinances

Ann Arbor, MI (population 117,025)

Chapter 107 (Animals) - 9:42. Keeping of Chickens

(1) Any person who keeps chickens in the City of Ann Arbor shall obtain a permit from the City prior to acquiring the chickens. No permit shall be issued to a person, by the City, and no chickens shall be allowed to be kept unless the owners of all residentially zoned adjacent properties (as defined below in subsection 3 (j)) consent in writing to the permit and this consent is presented along with an application for a permit. Written statements waiving the distance requirement in subsection (3) below shall also be submitted at the time of application and become a part of the permit if issued. Application shall be made to the City Clerk and the fee for the permit shall be as determined by Council resolution.

Permits expire and become invalid five (5) years after the date of issuance. A person who wishes to continue keeping chickens shall have obtained a new permit on or before the expiration date of the previous permit. Application for a new permit shall be pursuant to the procedures and requirements that are applicable at the time the person applies for a new permit.

(2) Notwithstanding the issuance of a permit by the City, private restrictions on the use of property shall remain enforceable and take precedence over a permit. Private restrictions include but are not limited to deed restrictions, condominium master deed restrictions, neighborhood association by-laws, and covenant deeds. A permit issued to a person whose property is subject to private restrictions that prohibit the keeping of chickens is void. The interpretation and enforcement of the private restriction is the sole responsibility of the private parties involved.

(3) A person who keeps or houses chickens on his or her property shall comply with all of the following requirements:

- a. Have been issued the permit required under subsection (1) of this section.
- b. Keep no more than four (4) chickens.

- c. The principal use of the person's property is for a single-family dwelling or two-family dwelling.
 - d. No person shall keep any rooster.
 - e. No person shall slaughter any chickens.
 - f. The chickens shall be provided with a covered enclosure and must be kept in the covered enclosure or a fenced enclosure at all times. Fenced enclosures are subject to all provisions of Chapter 104 (Fences).
 - g. A person shall not keep chickens in any location on the property other than in the backyard. For purposes of this section, "backyard" means that portion of a lot enclosed by the property's rear lot line and the side lot lines to the points where the side lot lines intersect with an imaginary line established by the property's rear lot line and the side lot lines to the points where the side lot lines intersect with an imaginary line established by the rear of the single-family or two family structure and extending to the side lot lines.
 - h. No covered enclosure or fenced enclosure shall be located closer than ten (10) feet to any property line of an adjacent property;
 - i. All enclosures for the keeping of chickens shall be so constructed or repaired as to prevent rats, mice, or other rodents from being harbored underneath, within, or within the walls of the enclosure. A covered enclosure or fenced enclosure shall not be located closer than forty (40) feet to any residential structure on an adjacent property provided, however, this requirement can be waived as follows:
 - (i) If the principal use of applicant's property is for a single-family dwelling, to obtain such a waiver the applicant shall present at the time of applying for a permit the written statements of all adjacent landowners that there is no objection to the issuance of the permit.
 - (ii) If the principal use of the applicant's property is for a two-family dwelling, to obtain such a waiver the applicant shall present at the time of applying for a permit the written statements of all adjacent landowners and of the occupants of the other dwelling stating that there is no objection to the issuance of the permit.
 - j. For purposes of this section, adjacent property means all parcels of property that the applicant's property comes into contact with at one or more points, except for parcels that are legally adjacent to but are in fact separated from the applicant's property by a public or private street.
 - k. All enclosures for the keeping of chickens shall be so constructed or repaired as to prevent rats, mice, or other rodents from being harbored underneath, within, or within the walls of the enclosure.
 - l. All feed and other items associated with the keeping of chickens that are likely to attract or to become infested with or infected by rats, mice, or other rodents shall be protected so as to prevent rats, mice, or other rodents from gaining access to or coming into contact with them.
 - m. If the above requirements are not complied with, the City may revoke any permit granted under this section and/or initiate prosecution for a civil infraction violation.
- (4) A person who has been issued a permit shall submit it for examination upon demand by any police officer or code enforcement officer.

Boston, MA (population 645,966)

SECTION 89-9. Accessory Keeping of Hens.

- 1. Use Regulations. 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 Hens unless the following conditions are met.
 - (d) The maximum number of adult Hens in all Districts and Subdistricts not covered under the Base Code shall be six (6) per Lot.
 - (e) The maximum number of non-egg-laying replacement Chicks or Pullets in all Districts and Subdistricts not covered under the Base Code shall be six (6) per Lot.
 - (f) Roosters are expressly Forbidden.
 - (g) The on-site slaughtering of Hens is prohibited.
- 2. Dimensional Regulations.
 - (a) Maximum Height.
 - i. Coop. Enclosed Coop space shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height.
 - ii. Run. Runs shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height.
 - (b) Size.

i. Coop. Coop space must allow a minimum of two (2) square feet per Hen and one (1) nest box per three (3) Hens within, and shall not exceed a maximum size of eight (8) feet by six (6) feet.

ii. Run. Runs must allow a minimum of four (4) square feet per Hen, but in no case shall occupy more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the rear yard.

(c) Setbacks.

i. Subject to Article 10 (Accessory Uses), Coops and Runs shall be set back five (5) feet from all property lines in all Districts and Subdistricts unless there is a solid, opaque barrier such as a wall of fence along the property line.

ii. Coops and Runs 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. Coops and Runs shall not be within a fifteen (15) foot buffer of habitable structures on adjacent properties in all residential Districts and Subdistricts unless prior permission is granted in writing by the neighboring property owner(s).

(d) Materials.

i. All Coops shall be made of washable and sanitizable material such as fiberglass reinforced plastic.

ii. All Runs shall have a securely built frame, preferably wooden; shall be covered in wire mesh material such as hardware cloth; and designed to be predator proof.

(e) Screening.

i. Any portion of the Coop or Run directly visible from a street at any distance shall be screened by either a fence that is constructed to be at least sixty percent (60%) opaque or a landscaped buffer of at least four (4) feet in height.

(f) Free Ranging.

i. Free-ranging of adult egg-laying Hens shall be supervised and is allowed exclusively in fenced yards with consent of all residents and property owners who have legal access to the premises.

Fergus Falls, MN (population 13,351)

(F) Keeping of Chickens.

(1) Chickens permitted. It is unlawful for any person to own, control, keep, maintain or harbor chickens on any premises within the City unless issued a permit to do so as provided in this section. No permit shall be issued for the keeping or harboring of more than four (4) female chickens or hens on any premises. The keeping or harboring of male chickens or roosters is prohibited.

(2) Definitions. For the purpose of this paragraph, the following definitions shall apply unless the context clearly indicates or requires a different meaning.

“CHICKEN” means a female chicken or hen.

“AT LARGE” means a chicken out of its chicken run, off the premises or not under the custody and control of the owner.

“CHICKEN COOP” means a structure for housing chickens made of wood or other similar materials that provides shelter from the elements.

“CHICKEN RUN” means an enclosed outside yard for keeping chickens.

“PERSON” means the resident, property owner, custodian, or keeper or of any chicken.

“PREMISES” means any platted lot or group of contiguous lots, parcels or tracts of land and is located within the city.

(3) Permit. No person shall maintain a chicken coop and/or chicken run unless granted a permit by the Animal Control Officer. The Animal Control Officer is authorized to issue a maximum of 12 permits annually for the keeping of chickens. The permit shall be subject to all the terms and conditions of this section and any additional conditions deemed necessary by the Animal Control Officer to protect the public health, safety and welfare. The necessary permit application may be obtained from the City Administrator’s office. Included with the completed application must be a scaled diagram that indicates the location of any chicken coop and/or chicken run, and the approximate size and distance from adjoining structures and property lines, the number and species of chickens to be maintained at the premises, and a statement that the applicant/permittee will at all times keep the chickens in accordance with this ordinance and all the conditions prescribed by the Animal Control Officer, or modification thereof, and failure to obey such conditions will constitute a violation of the provisions of this section and grounds for cancellation of the permit. The applicant shall include written consents/approval of the keeping of chickens on their premises from all abutting property owners, or shall provide proof of the certified mailing of a notice, and copies of said notice(s) to all abutting property owner(s) which advises the abutting property owner(s) the applicant is applying for a permit from the City of Fergus Falls for the keeping of chickens on their premises, the abutting property owner may object to the applicant’s permit application, any objection must be received by the Animal Control Officer within 10 days of the mailing date of

said notice, and failure to provide written objections to the Animal Control Officer within 10 days of the mailing of said notice will authorize the Animal Control Officer to issue a permit for the keeping of chickens to the applicant at their premises. Upon receipt of a permit application, the Animal Control Officer shall determine if the application is complete and contains the required consents/approvals and/or proof of the certified mailing of the required notices. If the application is complete and includes written consents/approval from all abutting property owners, the Animal Control Officer shall issue a permit for the keeping of chickens to the applicant. If the application is complete and includes proof of mailing certified notices to abutting property owner(s) as required by this section, the Animal Control Officer shall issue a permit to the applicant 10 days after receipt of the completed application, unless the Animal Control Officer receives a written objection from an abutting property owner objecting to the applicant's application for the keeping of chickens, in which case no permit shall be issued. No permit shall be issued for an incomplete application or for the keeping of chickens on any rental premises. A permit for the keeping of chickens may be revoked or suspended by the Animal Control Officer for any violation of this section following written notice. The applicant / permittee may appeal the revocation or suspension of their permit by requesting in writing a hearing before the city council within seven (7) days of the notice of revocation or suspension. The request for hearing must be either postmarked or received in the city administrator's office within seven (7) days of the date of the notice. The city council shall hold a hearing on the applicant/permittee's request for hearing within thirty (30) days of the request for hearing. An annual fee will be set by resolution.

(4) Confinement. Every person who owns, controls, keeps, maintains, or harbors chickens must keep them confined at all times in a chicken coop and chicken run and may not allow the chickens to run at large. Any chicken coop and chicken run shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet from any residential structure or any other structures on any adjacent premises.

(5) Chicken Coops and Chicken Runs.

(a) All chicken coops and chicken runs must be located within the rear yard subject to a twenty (20) foot setback from any adjacent premises and be at least twenty-five (25) feet from any residential structure or dwelling or any other structures or dwellings on any adjacent premises. All chicken coops must be a minimum of four (4) square feet per chicken in size, must not exceed ten (10) square feet per chicken in size and must not exceed six (6) feet in total height. Attached fenced-in chicken runs must not exceed 20 square feet per chicken and fencing must not exceed six (6) feet in total height. Chicken runs may be enclosed with wood and/or woven wire materials, and may allow chickens contact with the ground. Chicken feed must be kept in metal predator proof containers. Chicken manure may be placed in yard compost piles.

(b) Chicken coops must either be:

(i) Elevated with a clear open space of at least twenty-four (24) inches between the ground surface and framing/floor of the coop; or,

(ii) The coop floor, foundation and footings must be constructed using rodent resistant construction.

(c) Chicken coops are not allowed to be located in any part of a home and/or garage.

(d) Chickens must be secured in a chicken coop from sunset to sunrise each day.

(6) Conditions and Inspections. No person who owns, controls, keeps, maintains, or harbors chickens shall permit the premises, whether the chickens are kept to be or remain in an unhealthy, unsanitary or noxious condition or to permit the premises to be in such condition that noxious odors are carried to adjacent public or private property. Any chicken coop or chicken run authorized by permit under this section may be inspected at any reasonable time by the Animal Control Officer, Law Enforcement Officer or other agent of the City. A person who has been issued a permit shall submit it for examination upon demand by the Animal Control Officer, Law Enforcement Officer or other agent of the City. Slaughter and breeding of chickens on any premises within the City is prohibited.

(7) Private Restrictions and Covenants on Property. Notwithstanding the issuance of a permit by the City, private restrictions and/or covenants on the use of property shall remain enforceable and take precedence over a permit. Private restrictions include but are not limited to deed restrictions, condominium master deed restrictions, neighborhood association by-laws, covenant declarations and deed restrictions. A permit issued to a person whose premises are subject to private restrictions and/or covenants that prohibit the keeping of chickens is void. The interpretation and enforcement of the private restriction is the sole responsibility of the private parties involved.

(8) Refusal to Grant or Renew Permit. The Animal Control Officer may refuse to grant or renew a permit to keep or maintain chickens for failure to comply with the provisions of this section, submitting an inaccurate or incomplete application, if the conditions of the permit are not met, if a nuisance condition is created, or if the public health and safety would be unreasonably endangered by the granting or renewing of such permit.

(9) Removal of chicken coop and chicken run. Any chicken coop or chicken run constructed or maintained on any premises shall be immediately removed from said premises after the expiration of the permit or shall be removed within thirty (30) days upon ceasing to use the chicken coop and/or chicken run for the keeping of chickens.

(10) Residential Agricultural District. This ordinance does not apply to premises located in a residential agricultural district as that area is defined in this Code.

(11) Prohibited. The keeping of chickens, male or female, is prohibited in R-3, R-4 and R-5 Multiple-Family and Multiple-Residence Districts and all Business and Industrial Districts (B-1 through B-6 and I-1 through I-3) as those areas are defined in this Code.

(12) Violations a Misdemeanor. Any person who owns, controls, keeps, maintains or harbors chickens in the City of Fergus Falls without obtaining or maintaining a current permit or after a permit has been suspended or revoked by Council action shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Minneapolis, MN (population 400,070)

70.10. - Permit required.

(a) No person shall anywhere in the city keep, harbor, or maintain care, custody, or control over any small animal or any fowl such as a chicken, turkey, duck, or pigeon, without obtaining a permit issued by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control.

(b) Minneapolis Animal Care and Control may grant permit pursuant to this section after the applicant has sought the written consent of at least eighty (80) percent of the occupants of the several descriptions of real estate situated within one hundred (100) feet of the applicant's real estate. Such written consent shall be required on the initial application and as often thereafter as Minneapolis Animal Care and Control deems necessary.

(c) No permit shall be granted to keep any animal, fowl, or pigeon within a dwelling unit or part thereof, nor on any real estate which contains three (3) or more dwelling units.

(d) This section shall not apply to dogs, cats, ferrets, or rabbits nor to veterinarians or licensed pet shops or licensed kennels.

(e) Application for permit. Any person desiring a permit under this chapter shall make written application to Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. Approval of application is subject to conditions prescribed by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control. Failure to adhere to conditions is cause for cancellation of the permit and/or result in an administrative fine.

(f) Duration of permit. All permits issued shall expire on January 31 of the following year after its issuance unless sooner revoked. The application fee for such permit shall be fifty dollars (\$50.00) which shall be paid at the time of application. The annual renewal fee thereafter for such permit shall be forty dollars (\$40.00). Minneapolis Animal Care and Control will inspect the premises annually or as deemed necessary.

(g) Five-year permit. The fee for a five-year permit will be one hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00). All five-year permits issued shall expire on January 31 of the year following the fifth year after its issuance unless sooner revoked. Minneapolis Animal Care and Control will inspect the premises annually or as deemed necessary.

(h) Refusal to grant permit. Minneapolis Animal Care and Control may refuse a permit to keep or maintain animals or fowl hereunder for failure to comply with the provisions of this chapter, and shall refuse a permit if such animals or fowl should not be kept upon the premises described in the application for the permit. If any such permit is refused, the fee paid with the application shall be retained by Minneapolis Animal Care and Control.

(i) Enforcement. Minneapolis Animal Care and Control shall enforce the provisions of this chapter.

Park River, ND (population 1,390)

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO CONTROL OF ANIMALS AND POULTRY

Animals and poultry not to be raised or kept in certain areas, penalty. No person or persons shall raise or keep any domestic animals or poultry, or both, of the species of horses, mules, asses, cattle, sheep, goats, swine, geese, chickens, ducks, turkeys, peacocks, guinea hens, or similar livestock or fowl within the city limits of the City of Park River, except as follows:

1. Up to 8 hen chickens (no roosters) will be allowed with a license.

2. Initial license must be approved by 75% of the property owners within 200 feet of the coop.

3. Applicant shall pay an initial license fee of \$25.00 and annual fee of \$5.00.

4. In the event a complaint has been filed with the City of Park River prior to renewal of said license within the past calendar year, the Building Inspector will determine if the license renewal is issued. If no complaints have been filed, the renewal shall be considered extended for all additional year provided payment is received.

5. Slaughtering of chickens on the premises is prohibited.
6. A separate coop and run is required to house the chickens. Coop must be located in the rear and be setback at least five feet from the property lines.
7. All premises on which hens are kept or maintained shall be an enclosed fence and be kept clean from filth, garbage, and any substances which attract rodents. The coop and its surrounding area must be cleaned to control odor so as not to be detectable on another property.
8. All grain and food stored for the use of the hens on premises with a chicken license shall be kept in a rodent proof container.
9. All applicants must notify the owner of the property if the applicant is not the owner.
10. A complaint against any person owning, keeping or harboring chickens may be filed with the City of Park River Building Inspector. If an investigation from the Building Inspector reveals that the use of chickens is in violation of this section or any other section of this Code the City Building Inspector shall have authority to require the owner or user of the property to fix, abate, or alleviate the problem. If the problem is not satisfactorily abated or alleviated the City Building Inspector shall have authority to revoke the license.

Salt Lake City, UT (population 191,180)

8.08.010: DOMESTIC FOWL AND LIVESTOCK; PERMIT REQUIRED:

A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section, it is unlawful for any person to keep within the city any chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, pigeons or other similar domestic fowl, or more than two (2) rabbits, or other similar animals, without first making application for and obtaining a permit from the office of animal services to do so. The fee for such permit shall be five dollars (\$5.00) per animal, but shall not exceed forty dollars (\$40.00) per year.

B. Notwithstanding Subsection A of this section, chickens may be kept in any area zoned as a residential district under Chapter 21A.24 of this code or its successor, subject to the requirements of Section 8.08.065 of this chapter.

SECTION 2. Amending Section 8.08.060. That Section 8.08.060 of the *Salt Lake City Code*, shall be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

8.08.060: HOUSING AND FEEDING OF ANIMALS; LOCATION RESTRICTIONS:

It is unlawful to house, keep, run or feed any of the above mentioned animals within fifty feet (50') of any structure used for human habitation except as provided in Section 8.08.065 of this chapter.

SECTION 3. Enacting Section 8.08.065. That Section 8.08.065 of the *Salt Lake City Code* shall be, and hereby is, enacted to authorize the keeping of chickens in residential districts, subject to certain requirements, as follows:

8.08.065: KEEPING CHICKENS:

A. Subject to the requirements of this section and any other applicable provision of this chapter, fifteen (15) hen chickens (and no roosters) may be kept on a lot or parcel of land in a residential district for the sole purpose of producing eggs. The principal use on the lot or parcel shall be a one-family dwelling, a two-family dwelling, or a multi-family dwelling. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a person who complies with the requirements of Section 8.08.030 of this title may keep chickens as provided in such section.

B. Chickens shall be confined within a secure outdoor enclosed area.

1. The enclosed area shall include a covered, ventilated, and predator-resistant chicken coop.

a. The coop shall have a minimum floor area of at least two (2) square feet per chicken.

b. If chickens are not allowed to roam within an enclosed area outside the coop, the coop shall have a minimum floor area of six (6) square feet per chicken.

2. The coop shall be located in a rear yard at least twenty-five (25) feet from any dwelling located on an adjacent lot.

a. The coop and enclosed area shall be maintained in a neat and sanitary condition and shall be maintained as provided in Section 8.08.070 of this chapter.

b. No chicken shall be permitted to roam outside the coop or enclosed area.

3. Chicken feed shall be stored and dispensed in rodent-proof and predator-proof containers.

C. Chickens shall not be kept on a residential lot or parcel unless the person keeping chickens first obtains a permit as provided in Section 8.08.010 of this chapter.

1. The permittee shall acknowledge the rules set forth in this section and shall, as a condition of permit issuance, agree in writing to comply with such rules.

2. The permit shall be good for one (1) year and may be renewed annually.

D. It shall be unlawful for any person to keep any chicken in a residential district in a manner contrary to the provisions of this section.

SECTION 4. **Amending Section 8.08.080.** That Section 8.08.080 of the *Salt Lake City Code*, shall be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

8.08.080: TRESPASS BY FOWL OR DOMESTIC ANIMALS:

It is unlawful for the owner or any person in charge of domestic fowl, such as turkeys, ducks, geese, chickens or other similar domestic fowls, or domestic animals such as dogs or cats, to permit such fowls or domestic animals to trespass upon the premises of another. It is unlawful for any person to house, keep, run or feed any such fowls within fifty feet (50') of any house used for human habitation except as provided in Section 8.08.065 of this chapter.

DRAFT

Attachment 4a

CASS CLAY FOOD SYSTEMS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Interview of Commission Members

HNES 725

Maggie Carlson, Tasha Peltier, Theresa Will, Calie Craddock

Submitted: December 16, 2015

Introduction

The Cass Clay Food systems Advisory Commission (CCFSAC) is tasked with examining the local food system, and identifying ways to improve access to healthy, local and affordable food for all residents. This group was formed in the fall of 2014 through a Joint Powers Agreement between the City of Fargo and Clay County. Members of the CCFSAC include elected officials from Cass and Clay counties, Fargo, Moorhead, West Fargo and Dilworth, as well as five at-large community members with an interest in, or expertise related to food systems. All meetings are open to the public and are held in the Fargo City Commission Room on the second Wednesday of the odd months from 10:30 a.m.-12 p.m.

The following is a summary of interviews with the ten of the current eleven CCFSAC members. The interview questions were designed to help understand the Commissioner's background, interest & understanding of food system issues, and what their thoughts/ideas are for the Commission moving forward:

Summary of Interviews by Question

1. Why do you think groups like the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission are important?

- Response 1: So often we are able to talk about things within our own groups and we don't get the opportunity to discuss things with the other cities/counties. Therefore, having groups like this are great because it creates a dialogue about what works and what does not work, and allows us to set up parameters to define what is allowed and what isn't.
- Response 2: Having groups like this allows the right stakeholders to come together and discuss issues that are affecting communities, in this case access to healthy food. It is so common that we cannot get the right politicians in the same room to make decisions and get stuff done. That is why groups/commissions like this are so important.
- Response 3: We need active groups that have a common goal that are multijurisdictional that have a wide variety of people involved can help promote healthy food access and education.
- Response 4: The important mission of groups promote accurate education and to be a community resource.
- Response 5: I work at Concordia and have been unsuccessful finding local food options for our food operations. There have been many hurdles such as lack of large food producers, too much variety and not enough quantity within growers' produce, etc. There needs to be a systems approach to be more successful than a one on one approach and contact. The region has producers, but has a limited market and there are no large suppliers for organizations such as mine. The commission is the place to have these conversations and hopefully motivate some change and organization. A food hub is a goal of ours that will hopefully help improve the local food system and economy.

- Response 6: Well our mission is to look at the food system and assure that the residents have access to safe, nutritious and affordable food.
- Response 7: I definitely believe in a strong democracy and I think that the more people that we can have involved in civic engagement, the stronger the communities are. This commission permits the opportunity to gain leadership skills and bring different points of view to the table.
- Response 8: More people want to get back to their roots, raising their own produce, being healthier.
- Response 9: This commission is important for creating broad based awareness for governmental entities as well as providing information to the community.
- Response 10: It is important to be aware of and informed about a variety of issues throughout the community. I'm not sure that this effort requires a 'commission' of metro-wide elected officials, but none the less, the information being discussed is insightful.

2. What food system issue(s) do you think is/are most pressing to the F-M metro/Cass-Clay County communities and why?

- Response 1: Accessibility to grocery stores. I have means to be able to get to a grocery store living 10 miles out of town, but what about the people that do not have the means to do so? We need to be an advocate for those people in ensuring all have access to healthy food.
- Response 2: Right now, I believe access to healthy food is the biggest issue we have the area because we have people that cannot get to grocery stores and/or cannot afford healthy food.
- Response 3: Urban ag, urban animals, and community gardens are all issues that this area faces and the commission has goals set to address.
- Response 4: One of the most important issues is to be a support for local foods and to promote those local food systems to be sustainable and to have a strong local food crop program.
- Response 5: The economy of food is huge. Buyers want to buy, like us at Concordia, so we need to build up the scale of production and make relationships to help promote that economy. There was a survey conducted that found that many local growers did not want to grow at the size that would be productive for large organization relationships. If we can possibly improve the economics of the local system, we can hopefully make things more stable.
- Response 6: Right now we do have a few community gardens around and people would like to grow their own food, have it be affordable and more or less urban growing; have their own little gardens, use the boulevards and anything else to grow their food. Food is expensive.
- Response 7: With ND being an agricultural state, food production has been a central core of our systems and people want to get back to their roots. The need to look at local and natural foods. We need to figure out how to keep our foods nutritious and healthy, yet still be convenient and fast. Having equal access to healthy food.
- Response 8: There are 2 primary issues: 1. Locating space for people who want to grow produce and don't have an area to do that. 2. Raising animals such as chickens, rabbits or bees. People have good intentions but when they get busy or the

novelty of raising produce or animals wears off that they may no longer take care of them. This group (the food commission) needs to provide a basic outline or ideas so that cities have an idea before they get into this. He felt that they will not set or recommend policy, but will only provide education and resources.

Response 9: People's access to fresh and healthy foods is most important. Addressing this issue will include addressing urban agriculture, but this may not be the most effective way to improve access for a large majority of the people needing it. Water and environmental issues are also very important.

Response 10: I don't think we have 'issues' (at least from what has been discussed thus far). 'Issue' to me means there is a problem. There are 'opportunities' to provide additional choices to the citizens to perhaps enhance the livability of the community.

3. How do you propose addressing that/those issue(s)?

Response 1: We are on the right track of providing accessibility to healthy food, but I think it is important that we continue to work on the parameters for what is accepted and what is not before we start advocating. It is important to have a framework in place, so we are not adjusting as we go.

Response 2: I believe that we are addressing it by being on and developing this commission because we have community stakeholders and politicians talking about the issue.

Response 3: The structure of the commission is set in such a way that they are trying to address these issues through a wide variety of experiences. The commission goes off of public input to motivate ideas and directions.

Response 4: Growers need to come together with the commission to start addressing issues through education, local support, and direct support of local crop growers and sellers.

Response 5: Well, I kind of addressed this before, but the conversation is huge. Starting the conversation of what is going on and how we can motivate some change. We have big organizations that are motivated to buy local and creating that conversation.

Response 6: We are a task force and we meet every couple months. We are working on programs, sit down and work on policies for everything from urban growing to chickens in the back yards. You need to set down policy that people will follow.

Response 7: Everything starts with conversations. The forming of this group was a vital step towards coming to some of the creative solutions. With even a few people starting to talk about foods and food systems, in a positive way, a solution focused, problem solving kind of way, I think that attracts that kind of energy. I see the energy around supporting local foods has grown exponentially in the last year or two.

Response 8: Did not answer this question as it was felt the content was covered in question 2.

Response 9: In general, improving access to healthy foods while utilizing local commodities. For example, making healthy foods more accessible for community members in the supermarkets and farmer's markets.

Response 10: Again, I haven't heard anything presented that is an issue. I believe there are some things that can be done to enhance life in the city. Recommendations can be

made, but each government entity has to decide whether it fits their community/county or not.

4. What changes/suggestions would you make to improve the Advisory Commission (if any)?

- Response 1: There is a lot for us to cover and with us all feeling that government moves too slow; I think we need to realize that we are doing good work no matter how fast we are moving. Megan is doing a great job being the spokesperson for our commission, but with us all being on the commission, I think it would be great if we could all be spokespersons. By us being those spokespersons, we could provide our communities with more information about our commission because I feel that more community members would be interested in what we are doing. Therefore, down the road, I would like see us add an educational piece to our commission and get schools involved with our work.
- Response 2: It seems as if we are stuck under the shadow of this urban chicken matter and we are so much more than that. We need to make sure that we are not getting caught up in the little things and make sure we are seeing the bigger picture.
- Response 3: I don't have any, it's so new yet and needs more time to see. It seems to function well and it's structured well.
- Response 4: The group is really well balanced with people on each side of issues that help balance a good conversation that can motivate both policy and education. It helps to have devils advocates on the other side.
- Response 5: I am not a normal kind of member. I am a do-er, not a talk about the issues for a few months kind of person. I wish things moved faster.
- Response 6: We had done a bunch of surveys and may want to do more surveys.
- Response 7: Oh, I think it is a wonderful working committee. We are very much in the infant stages of the committee. We haven't been meeting for even a year yet. March was our first meeting. Being consistent when establishing your foundation is very important. I would hope that there wouldn't be any major changes.
- Response 8: No, it has a good variety of people on it, some are more conservative than others.
- Response 9: Because we are a new entity it is hard to understand what is exactly expected of us as commissioners. What is the best use/purpose of this advisory commission? This is something I would like to better understand. I want make sure that I am not missing out on something I should be doing.
- Response 10: None at this time.

5. What do you think is currently going well for the Commission? What ideas do you have to improve the work of the Commission?

- Response 1: We have jurisdictions that are willing to bounce ideas off each other and brainstorm together, regardless of whether or not we agree.
- Response 2: I think that we are doing well with the conversations that are being had with politicians because it is so often that the right stakeholders are left out of the conversation and then nothing is done. It is great that we can have such a diverse group of people working to increase healthy food accessibility in the Cass and

Clay Counties. I think it is important that we stay on track and not get caught up in the little things, such as the urban chicken dilemma.

- Response 3: We are working on prioritizing areas, building blue prints of policies, setting standards of how we want to move forward, and then hoping to take action. It's a slow process, but we are moving towards those goals.
- Response 4: We really have a great combination of folks on the commission who are on each side of the issues. Some are tough, but it serves for great conversation which is where all of this needs to start. We have people who have different resources, skills, and experiences that help promote food systems, such as from the food bank, government agencies, and others that add their expertise that makes the commission stronger.
- Response 5: We are definitely gaining traction in the public arena. Chickens brought a lot of attention when it ended up on the cover of the Fargo Forum, but public discussion is really how we motivate change in either direction. Public pressure can help change some things, however, urban ag policy cannot be too restrictive. For example, we need education that helps compliment what we are doing as a commission.
- Response 6: A lot of people come to the meetings and give input as far as what they would like to see in policy. We are looking at sales, setting up farmer's markets and stuff. We may have open forums.
- Response 7: Again, I think that the group has definitely surpassed my expectations for a new group. The groundwork and framework that was set up ahead of time to get this committee started, whoever did this, did a phenomenal job. Everyone has been super professional, and super proactive. It has been a really easy group to serve on. The good lasting sustainable change that we are seeking takes time and gentleness. If things change too much, it can be less stable. Keep talking and exploring topics and sharing with the public. The leaders have done a great job of sharing information with the public. The more that we can be inclusive of those voices, the better.
- Response 8: I think that the group is willing to listen and take on different areas. That's our job so that's what we should do.
- Response 9: The research information presented is very helpful. The set-up of meetings is also great, I really like time allotted for open public comments.
- Response 10: Commission has been inclusive allowing both experts and the general public to contribute. I don't know if enough discussion has been held on the 'con' side of a proposal - cons are listed, but little discussion is held.

6. Do you feel that the makeup of the commission is sufficient? Should there be any more stakeholders on this advisory commission? If so, who?

- Response 1: I think that we can always add a little bit. However, I am not sure if we should add more consumer or commercial representation or if we need to just invite those stakeholders in for specific subjects. I do recognize that there is a delicate balance though and there is the possibility of having too many on the commission.

- Response 2: I feel that the makeup of the commission is sufficient. I feel that if we were to add anybody else to the commission, we would have too many people and not get anything done.
- Response 3: We have a good make up and the structure seems to work well.
- Response 4: At some point we will need more people, but starting out we have a good group. But, as we get closer to making change in governments and municipals, we will need more people to help get more people on board. As we scale up, we will need more growers, shippers, buyers that will help make sure the commission is targeting who it needs to.
- Response 5: We have a diverse group from government, Metro-Cog, growers, etc. We are large, but a good size. Time will tell.
- Response 6: We do have quite a few people on the commission, I think we are comfortable with what we have. If you get too many people it might take a while to come to any decision. Most of the at large members are health people and they give advice from their areas of expertise
- Response 7: I think the size is perfect. I think that the size and the way the meetings are organized is a wonderful fit. I think the sectors that are included are very important and very well rounded. I'm not certain if the K-12 school body is represented, if not, that would add value.
- Response 8: Not that I know of.
- Response 9: It is a broad-based commission that is mostly sufficient. I do wonder if we could include representation of new Americans as well as underserved neighborhoods.
- Response 10: I don't believe there is a need to have all of the local governments represented with elected officials. As elected officials we are pulled in a number of directions and are seated on a number of committees or boards. Not saying that this board doesn't have merit, but really it doesn't seem to be of greater importance than other area committees. The board, and all of the elected officials, could still come up with information and recommendations that can be presented to the governing bodies. The park districts in Fargo and West Fargo should have input since some of the proposals involve them and not the city or county on the North Dakota side.

7. What kind of funding is available to this advisory group to implement programs? What resources, specifically funding opportunities, are available to the smaller communities of Cass and Clay counties?

- Response 1: I am not the person to ask about this, but I do know that there are grants available. Our intention is to look at both the rural areas as much as the urban areas and we are talking about it. However, being that we are such a young group we are still at the 30,000 population level, and we need to figure out where we are at before we can move down to the ground level.
- Response 2: Yes, there is grant money available that we can use to develop programs. However, I do think that it is important that we focus on the metro areas where there are more people, just until we figure out exactly what this commission's role is.
- Response 3: I am not aware of any funding. The steering committee may know more than I do.

- Response 4: I really don't know what funding is here, but the steering committee would know more. Metro-cog has had grants to fund staff and what not, but I'm not sure if it had any direct funding or not. Megan would also be a good one to ask about funding.
- Response 5: I have no idea! Space is gratis but aside from that I have no idea. I'm guessing there must be grants to help pay for some staffing.
- Response 6: I think in the future we will apply for some grants. NDSU helps us out with a lot also as they can do research. I think there will be funding available for all populations.
- Response 7: No funding that I am aware of. The resources will be available for all communities to use, absolutely county wide.
- Response 8: I don't think that there is any funding. Any resources that we develop will be available for all of the communities.
- Response 9: I would hope that there is funding available to implement the actions we are discussing, whether that is private or public. I am definitely willing to assist in acquiring grants etc. for our work.
- Response 10: Any funding request would have to be submitted for consideration by the governing bodies for consideration at their budget time. You will have to ask the counties about funding for outlying communities.

8. We are aware that the Commission is focused on urban agriculture at this time. Do you foresee any policy implications as a result of this work? Are there any other ideas that you have for policy work related to the Cass/Clay county food system?

- Response 1: I do see there being policy changes because right now the policy on urban agriculture says we cannot. What I think is the biggest issue right now is partisanship and I am working on educating people on how urban agriculture is not bad. It is my hope to have some sort of policy framework for urban agriculture within the next 6 months so when it comes time for people to start planting their gardens in the next season they can do so.
- Coming from the county commission side of the food commission I would like to see if we can work on some policies with the food commission to make food availability easier. Therefore, by working on some framework on urban agriculture we can start making access easier.
- Response 2: Yes, I do foresee that we will pass policy allowing urban agriculture someday. One policy that I would like to see passed in my time on the commission is zoning policies so that any empty lots are utilized as community gardens so everyone has access to fresh produce.
- Response 3: We hope for the local communities to adopt the policies that we suggest as a committee. The blue prints are hoping to help with that to show what has been done elsewhere as well as researching other cities, making formal comparisons, and forming a way to present those examples to stakeholders in a way that can help make change more realistic. Hopefully, with those blue prints we can hit the ground running.

- Response 4: Yes, the commission is absolutely working towards policy changes. Right now, the commission is focusing on reviewing the policies of local communities and governments to see what is allowed and not allowed. Also, the commission is focused on looking at what other communities are doing across the country and use that as education for policies locally. We are also looking into other examples of urban ag such as roof top gardens, boulevard gardens, city owned orchards, and urban animals.
- Response 5: We are sure hopeful. Or, at least the commission will help start a conversation that will motivate policy to one side or the other. Hopefully positive, but at least the public will get engaged.
- Response 6: We do have to set up policies so things don't get out of hand. If everyone follows policy things will be fine.
- Response 7: No policy work that I am aware of, we see our role as doing research and providing research to commissions, being a supportive resource. Our intentions are to influence local community policies, but as a guide and a resource, and a research body.
- Response 8: No, we are not going to encourage policy, each commission will be independent and will do what they think is best for their communities. We will be a place for them to go and ask questions about bees, chickens rabbits or whatever, only a resource to provide education. That's my take on it.
- Response 9: The current draft policies will provide opportunity for policies to be implemented. Water and environmental concerns as well as composting could be some other issues to be addressed and are very important to food systems.
- Response 10: No.

9. Are there any community entities that you think the commission should be working with? Why?

- Response 1: Answered this question with the answer for question 6.
- Response 2: I don't think so because I would worry that if we add any more people that we would have too many people on the commission.
- Response 3: I think we are really well connected.
- Response 4: The commission has reached out to so many of the big players locally and has developed some cool networks. We need to do more for immigrants, food safety, and more education.
- Response 5: I would love to see more of the growers involved but, for the most part, I feel that we have our bases well covered.
- Response 6: There are quite a few organic farmers around and some of them offer produce, they deliver to their customers and have input for our meetings.
- Response 7: I think this will vary from issue to issue. If we are talking about urban agriculture the entities that we would reach out to would be different than if we were talking about beekeeping or having chickens in town or capturing rain and water usage. I think everything will be tailored to the topic that we are talking about.
- Response 8: Not at this time
- Response 9: Not specifically. It depends on what the commissions reach is. You have to be really careful because we don't want to bias one community entity vs. another. I

am sure this is something the steering committee is aware of. I am confident that they look at things from a bigger system view.

Response 10: Park Districts - some of the ideas such as community gardens/farmers markets involve them on the North Dakota side. Park Boards are separate entities in North Dakota.

10. Are there many residents in Fargo and Cass County who perhaps do not have access to transportation (such as their own vehicles or a bus line) and live too far from full-service supermarkets to do grocery shopping on foot? What are some other ways to target vulnerable populations concerning access to healthy food?

Response 1: I can't recall if we are specifically working on this, but I know the people that work for public health that are on the commission deal with it every day, I would imagine that we would be working on it. We will continue to look at if food stamps to be able to use it on fresh food at markets, but this issue is so deep.

Response 2: This is such a big issue that it will take a long time to solve this problem in its entirety. However, we are working on addressing the access issue with this commission.

Response 3: Conversation is hoping to bring up these issues to see what is weak and what the role of the commission is in these situation.

Response 4: This is a great question and is one that we don't think of terribly often. We need to review mass transit and make sure times and routes are conducive to populations that have the least amount of food access. We also need to support developers who are willing to build grocery stores in areas that are less desirable and be proactive as urban sprawl grows.

Response 5: If only! If we could solve this, the world would be saved! This is so complex and I really don't have much experience, but look forward to the conversation.

Response 6: No I don't know. Some of the grocery stores even have delivery now. The organic farmers deliver. We may need to look at some local organizations such as scouts, lions or churches to help out with some of that. We need to keep looking at our mission, to increase food awareness and food safety as well as sales of healthy foods. We are learning.

Response 7: That is definitely a topic that we need look at and to do more research.

Response 8: I feel that the commission will not be able to solve the transportation issue, and I compare it to the fact that many likely don't have vehicles to get to their medical appointments as well. I feel that this commission would provide the blueprint that can be used for vulnerable populations as well as any others in the communities.

Response 9: Yes, I do feel there are quite a few people in this situation. One problem that I see is the bus routes are not going to the more "low income" neighborhoods where people are really in need of transportation. Other communities have used mobile markets, this is an example where a multi-sector partnership could address access issues. I feel that there probably really is an access issue in this town.

Response 10: Groceries can be purchased online and delivered. Perhaps this type of service could be provided via phone as well (to the store or through a service agency). Do we know exactly who the vulnerable population is and what their accessibility

challenges are? Are there groups representing or serving them that could be a conduit to help provide for any needs they may have?

Conclusion

We were charged with the task to interview the eleven members of the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission in order to gain perspective and understanding of the commission's goals, the people who make up the commission, and as a way to move forward with research and understanding. Through these interviews, it became clear the passion that members of our local community have to promote food systems and civic involvement. It is our hope that with these interviews, more can be done to further the commission's goals and the public's knowledge of the potential policies moving forward.

Process Deliverable

Our group was tasked with interviewing members of the Cass Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission to further the understanding of the work of the commission as well as learn first hand how policies are created on a grass roots level.

Our group consisted of four members: Maggie, Tasha, Theresa, and Calie and each had specific goals and tasks that ensured this group ran smoothly and on time.

Theresa:

- Acted as group leader
- Coordinating emails and deadlines
- Facilitated meeting times by coordinating with the IVN manager to ensure room space and IVN access after hours
- Wrote introduction for project deliverable
- Interviewed and summarized 3 commission members
- Reviewed final project

Maggie:

- Identified commission members and their contact information
- Facilitated the creation of commission interview questions and submitted them for review with Megan and Kim
- Interviewed and summarized 3 commission members
- Reviewed final project

Tasha:

- Gathered all summarized interviews for proof reading
- Formatted final document and compiled all outside information
- Interviewed and summarized 1 commission member (2nd member interview unsuccessful)
- Submitted final document for grading

Calie:

- Kept track of meeting times, agendas, and duties assigned
- Interviewed and summarized 3 commission members
- Created and submitted the process deliverable
- Reviewed final project

Dates met and goals accomplished:

Nov. 17th-23rd

All group members created 5 questions that could be asked of the commission members. Each commission member was identified and contact information was shared. All group business was discussed via email. A date was reserved to have our first IVN meeting the evening of the 23rd of November.

Nov. 23rd

IVN meeting with all group members in attendance. Narrowed question list from 20 to 10 and were re-written to prepare for submittal to Megan and Kim for review. Duties were assigned for the final deliverable (outlined above) and meeting notes were kept by Calie. Final list of questions were submitted that evening for review.

Nov. 24th-Dec. 6th

All group members were given final list of interview questions and each member interviewed their assigned commission member.

Dec. 7th

All group members were in attendance for a meeting during class. An after class meeting was scheduled, however, the class time was sufficient to complete the outstanding duties of the group. Most interviews were completed at this time and further duties were assigned to ensure timely completion of the final document.

Dec. 8th-Dec 13th

All group members completed interviews during this time, summarized interviews, and submitted them to Tasha for formatting and proofreading. Additional document additives such as introduction, conclusion, and process deliverable were completed and added to final document.

Dec. 14th-16th

All group members finalized the final deliverable by proof reading, making final changes, and preparing for submission. Final document to be submitted by Tasha by Dec. 16th.

Attachment 4b

Final Report - Group 1

Heather Kroeker, Gina Vosberg, Alan Patterson, Elvis Tuffour, & Kabina Chaulagain

HNES 725: Promoting Health through PSE

December 16th, 2015

BACKGROUND AND PLAN

We based our ten messages off of the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan and the six target areas. In our first meeting, we decided to dig deeper into the Cass Clay Food System Initiative by looking at their Facebook page. To gain some insight for more ideas for messages we looked at other published messages used by similar food initiative programs throughout the United States. Our textbook was also used as a guide to develop clear and concise message that identified the issues using value framing.

Value framing played an important role in developing our messages. In order to gain the interest of our community, we developed messages aimed at their values, as well as access, or lack of access, to healthy, local foods. Another part of developing the messages was finding solutions to the problems identified in the Fargo/Moorhead community.

Using value framing and attainable solutions, our messages were developed. Our next group meetings were spent modifying our statements based on feedback from our initial messages. We needed to change the focus of the statements from individual changes to environmental changes. The environmental focus is more efficient at finding ways to provide healthy, local, and easily accessible food for all individuals in our community.

We then developed survey questions to ask the participants in our interviews. These survey questions were developed to get detailed responses on receptiveness, interest, understanding, and motivation to action. See Appendix B for the list of questions asked for each message.

Interviews were conducted at West Acres Mall in south Fargo to gage the effectiveness of each statement. At least 12 people were asked to provide feedback on each of the messages. The

results of the interviews were evaluated to find common themes. Some of the messages were altered based on the results of the interviews in order to make the messages more effective.

Summary of Messages

Statement 1: Nutritious food should be made easily accessible and affordable to everyone in our community. Convenience stores and retail pharmacy stores should offer the sale of affordable and nutritious foods.

Most people responded that this message was clear and easy to understand. However, perceptions of what qualified as nutritious food differed for each individual. Most people thought fruits and vegetables were nutritious foods, and should be available in all convenience stores, food courts, and even the small, less frequented grocery stores in our community. Some suggested we should include messages about ways to make out-of-season fruits and vegetables more affordable. Many participants expressed concerns about time-management, and lack of time to eat and prepare nutritious food. As a result, many participants said they preferred to purchase pre-packaged foods, which are easier to prepare and supposedly meets daily nutrition needs. Price was identified as another issue. Almost all the respondents thought that if prices were decreased, they would be able to afford more nutritious food. This message was received well, and no changes were needed.

Statement 2: Our children are our future; we value their good health. Let's adopt evidence-based curriculum that teaches our children healthy lifestyle skills.

This response caught the attention of many respondents, because it was a value message about children. Many participants said they believed children should learn healthier lifestyles. However, most participants seemed concerned about how this could be implemented in public schools compared to private schools. The term "healthy lifestyle" brought up confusion as some

participants thought this meant only physical activity and sex education, while others thought it was about healthy food and risk behaviors. We decided to make the message more precise, because we wanted the focus to be on local food production and accessibility, not sexual and reproductive health. Also, most participants did not know what “evidence-based” means. Due to the confusion caused by the terms “healthy lifestyle” and “evidence-based”, the message was modified. The modified statement can be found in Appendix A.

Statement 3. Eating healthy is important to living a healthy life. Let’s create a community where everyone has access to healthy, affordable food.

We received positive responses for this message. Most people thought that healthy foods were expensive. They all understood the importance of eating healthy, and liked how this message talks about making it accessible and affordable to all. Some people brought up issues of having to travel miles from the farm where they grew up to buy healthy food. There were comments made about opening more grocery stores nearby these farms. Also, some mentioned opening more organic stores, such as Natural Grocers, in the Fargo/Moorhead area. Overall, this message was received well, and it motivated people to think about access to healthy foods in our community.

Statement 4. All farmer’s markets should accept SNAP benefits. We need to streamline the licensing for farmers to use SNAP benefits in order to increase the access of local food to those who need it the most.

In general, there was a positive response to this statement. One respondent expressed his opinion that beneficiaries of the SNAP program are needy, and that if he had the power, he would pass a law to enforce the general acceptability of this program. Another respondent who agreed to this statement suggested the SNAP program promote healthier messages than they are

currently promoting. Another respondent suggested there should be some form of financial incentive for farmers who patronize the SNAP program, such a tax waiver. Due to the good reception of this message, it was not modified.

Statement 5. Learning to cook is a great way to eat healthier. Let's make healthy food skills a priority in our K-12 curriculum.

In regards to this statement, there was a great response from all interviewees. Additionally, some of the respondents suggested healthy food skills must be taught at home as well. Skills learned in school would then supplement the skills learned at home. Another person suggested that there be mandatory classes to ensure this, especially at the high school level. In doing this, students would be awarded credits for participating in these classes. One respondent suggested cooking skills should be merged into an already existing program, such as BOCES. According to him, BOCES is an ongoing program in New York State that allows high school freshmen through seniors to learn a trade. Additionally, another respondent suggested students be taught cooking skills in elementary or middle school, however, the focus should be on high school students. This respondent also recommended there should be general courses for healthy eating and fitness, because obesity is a concern among students in the Fargo/Moorhead area. Since this message was received so well, no changes were made.

Statement 6. Identify open, vacant spaces in our community that could be future sites of community gardens - places where all members of our community can gather to grow healthy, local food.

There was a lot of positive feedback on this message. A majority of the participants said that they agree with this statement, and actually tried to identify potential areas during the interviews. Community gardens were viewed as a great way to increase access to healthy foods.

Many people also brought up the health benefits of community gardens. Surprisingly, there was a lot of feedback on benefits of community gardens besides increasing health and access.

Community gardens were thought of as a way to “beautify the city” and create a “better style of living.” They were thought of as “places to hang out, relax, and meet other people,” as well as a way to “bring families together.” One unintended outcome was how many people thought of community gardens as charity for the poor. One participant said they liked the idea of community gardens, because they provide those who cannot afford healthy food options other than junk food. They said that the poor can pay for the fruits and vegetables from the garden not with money, but with labor in the gardens. Someone else identified community gardens as a great way to feed the homeless. Working in community gardens was thought of as “providing a helping hand” and “taking care of the community, while giving back.” This statement was revised to indicate the benefits for all people, not just those who cannot afford healthy foods. The revised statement can be found in Appendix A.

Statement 7. MATbus has several routes available to grocery stores, but not everyone has equal access. Let’s continue to improve public transportation to give all F-M residents access to healthy, affordable food.

This statement affected everyone similarly, as they all wanted to improve public transportation. Residents of the Fargo/Moorhead area strongly agreed that the MATbus and public transportation in their respective cities are beneficial assets to their communities. Most respondents were familiar with the bus system and were in favor of any improvement to the structure and function of how the buses are operated. Some individuals felt passionate about offering free or reduced bus fares, especially to those that need it the most, such as low income and impoverished residents. To a few respondents, this message represented the low access of

MATbus to some community members, such as the elderly or disabled who still need to travel two or three blocks in order to reach a bus stop. The MATbus and other public transportation systems need to have routes that effectively provide access to the needy. A few respondents felt like this message helps take action to improve the transportation routes and affordability. Looking at our bus system and improving access to healthy, affordable food is a great message for the Cass and Clay County Food Initiative.

Statement 8. Let's identify ways to support and grow our local farmers markets.

Shopping at farmers markets benefits area farmers, keeps more dollars in our community, decreases food miles, and increases freshness.

This message was very effective. Many participants reported that it made them want to shop at farmers markets more often. The most effective part of the message was the emphasis on supporting local farmers. Many participants said they liked the idea of supporting those in the community, and they liked the idea of keeping more money local. The words "increases freshness" were also very important to this statement, as many people identified this as a strength of the message. A lot of participants said that they do not know of any farmers markets in town, so a way to promote farmers markets may be more advertising of the farmers markets that are currently in Fargo-Moorhead in order to raise awareness.

Statement 9. Passing legislation that provides start-up assistance to local farmers is a way to encourage and expand local food production.

Individuals were really focused when they heard this statement. A majority of the responses revolved around the economy. The participants generally agreed that we need to promote more local agriculture and business, but most of them questioned how this would affect the economy, or who would be paying for the start-up assistance. A few people worried about

increases in taxes, or making decisions about a topic they were not educated about. There were also comments made about continuing farmers markets and local food production, but one respondent expressed concerns about how this would help during the winter months. Overall, this statement had a lot of good discussion from our respondents about where the money for the start-up farmers would come from. There were no changes made to this statement.

Statement 10. City officials should lead the way by engaging diverse stakeholders in efforts to promote increased access and consumption of local healthy foods.

When discussing this message with the people of Fargo-Moorhead, individuals were motivated to think about who they elect, and how much the elected officials make a difference in the community. A Moorhead resident responded differently to this statement than Fargo residents did. The Moorhead resident said that Moorhead is lagging behind Fargo. Even though there were differences in opinions about the quality of city officials, most respondents agreed that we need to be mindful about who we elect. City officials are sometimes the only face of the community, and represent individuals and organizations on a larger level. Nearly everyone agreed that the city officials need to lead the way in promoting access and consumption of local healthy foods. Some felt indifferent about this message, while others felt that they do not hear from their city official enough. Most respondents felt that leaders should be the forerunners of healthy food initiatives, so this message was not changed.

Conclusion

Overall, we were very pleased with the way the messages were received. Although a few changes needed to be made, we felt that the messages were very effective. Hopefully these statements will be very beneficial for the Cass Clay Food System Initiative, and will play a role

in increasing local food production and consumption, as well as increasing access to healthy food for everyone in the Fargo-Moorhead area.

APPENDIX A

Final Messages

1. Nutritious food should be made easily accessible and affordable to everyone in our community. Convenience stores and retail pharmacy stores should offer the sale of affordable and nutritious foods.
2. Our children are our future; we value their good health. Let's adopt curriculum that teaches our children about the importance of healthy food and lifestyle skills.
3. Eating healthy is important to living a healthy life. Let's create a community where everyone has access to healthy, affordable food.
4. All farmer's markets should accept SNAP benefits. We need to streamline the licensing for farmers to use SNAP benefits in order to increase the access of local food to those who need it the most.
5. Learning to cook is a great way to eat healthier. Let's make healthy food skills a priority in our K-12 curriculum.
6. Identify open, vacant spaces in our community that could be future sites of community gardens - places where all members of our community can gather to grow and benefit from healthy, local food.
7. MATbus has several routes available to grocery stores but not everyone has equal access. Let's continue to improve public transportation to give all F-M residents access to healthy, affordable food.
8. Let's identify ways to support and grow our local farmers markets. Shopping at farmers markets benefits area farmers, keeps more dollars in our community, decreases food miles, and increases freshness.

9. Passing legislation that provides start-up assistance to local farmers is a way to encourage and expand local food production.
10. City officials should lead the way by engaging diverse stakeholders in efforts to promote increased access and consumption of local healthy foods.

APPENDIX B

Survey for Participants

1. Demographics:
 - a. Gender
 - b. Zip Code
2. Survey Questions:
 - a. What does this message made you think about?
 - b. What do you like or not like about this message?
 - c. How do you interpret this message?
 - d. Does this message make you want to do anything? If so, what?

Attachment 4c

Project 2: Urban Agriculture Key Messaging & Framing

Melissa Olson, Raihan Kabir Khan, Berit Williamschen, and Jaden Witt

HNES 725 Final Report

Background

The goal of this project was to identify and develop key messages and framing around the concept of urban agriculture. We focused on value framing. In order to develop our messages, our group met several times to brainstorm ideas and message framing strategies. We briefly researched each topic to better understand the subject. After gaining an understanding of the topic we brain stormed values that would appeal to residents of the Fargo Moorhead area. We then developed messages and framed them in a manner that appealed to these values and promoted the urban agriculture topics.

Plan

There were four members in the group and each person was responsible for conducting three interviews. A total of 12 people from a variety of demographics were interviewed: all were residents of Fargo, Moorhead or West Fargo and of varying sexes and ages. Six of the people interviewed were known associates, and six were strangers. Our group wanted to test if having some kind of relationship with the interviewer yielded more in-depth responses. The data showed that both group's interviews lasted about 20-minutes, and that for the most part, the responses were thoughtful. This surprised us because we assumed that strangers would be less vested in providing thoughtful responses. Another variable is that 3 of the strangers interviewed were offered a \$5 incentive for their participation: two accepted it to give to the Salvation Army's Red Kettle Campaign and one accepted it. Each interview followed a template we developed and the data was collected using a document we developed (see attached for both documents).

Messages Tested

- 1) Backyard chickens provide opportunity for fresh, organic eggs. Currently, Fargo city ordinance prohibits the ownership of chickens. Everyone deserves the opportunity to provide a sustainable food source for their families.
- 2) Community supported agriculture creates access to fresh, locally grown produce. All North Dakotans should have the right to buy fresh produce directly from local farmers.
- 3) Supporting local farmers through farmers markets is important for our community and the environment. All farmers should have the opportunity to give back to their community.

- 4) Community gardens allow for an easily accessible venue to garden alongside community members. We all have the right to provide our own food to ensure a sustainable, healthy food source for our families.
- 5) Farm stands bring produce into areas of our community that are deprived of fresh foods. All people have the right to fair and convenient access to healthy foods.
- 6) Involving children in growing their own produce through school gardens teaches responsibility and work ethic while rewarding them with healthy food options. Every child in North Dakota has the right to know where their food comes from.
- 7) Honey bees are vital for pollination of plants and foods. All people have the right to help sustain Fargo/Moorhead/West Fargo's local produce through bee keeping.
- 8) Farmers markets provide access to fresh and flavorful foods. All community members should have the right to easily find and buy healthy produce.
- 9) Public rooftop gardens provide an area to grow fresh produce while creating green spaces throughout the city. Cities should be built to encourage common spaces for people to gather, thereby establishing a sense of community.
- 10) Boulevard gardens promote appreciation of nature among children and community members. The upcoming generation needs to value conservation and the role it plays in sustaining North Dakota's natural environment.

Responses

- The word “right” was a hot button. For some, they questioned why they didn't have the right to i.e. raise chickens in their backyards. For others, they got pretty heated because “our rights are laid out in the constitution” and “government has no business regulating what i do in my own backyard. Why can't I raise chickens if I want to?” One respondent repeatedly stated that the free market should drive such programs, not the government.
 - For the especially animated interviewees, we had to modify our messages so that instead of the word “right”, we used the word “opportunity” i.e. “...all North Dakotans should have the opportunity to buy fresh produce...”
 - People should have the right to do what they want, may want to get consent from neighbors.
- The word “sustainable” was a hot button for some people as well. They questioned how such programs could be sustained given our winters, as well as typical farming events such as disease, draught, hail, etc. and suggested we better have a secondary source of food or back up plan.
- Some words needed more education:
 - Not everyone knew what a “greenspace” was.
 - “Flavorful” stood out for one respondent

- The concept of “healthy” foods also drew interesting comments. Most of our respondents thought “healthy” was a positive, while four of our respondent didn’t comment about health at all.
 - “Farm stand prices should be fairly priced. Healthier foods shouldn’t cost more.”
 - “Why is it good to choose healthier foods over bad foods?”
- Community Gardens
 - “Where would community garden space come from? Would it impact our taxes?”
 - Community gardens are a good way for people who live in condos and apartments to gain easier access to fresh produce.
 - “Good community partnership idea. I would contribute to a community garden.”
 - “How will we prevent people from stealing the produce?”
- Community Supported Agriculture
 - “Great idea, I would participate!”
 - “CSAs could be used to help food banks, especially around the holidays.”
 - Great way to get more vegetables.
- Farmers’ Markets and Farm Stands
 - “Farm stands could expose people to produce they haven’t had before.”
 - “Farm stands are a great idea!” and “They’d save me time because they’d be closer than a store.”
 - “More farmers’ markets and coops are good ideas, both for the people and the farmer.”
 - “Need to advertise farmers’ markets more such as in social media, etc.”
 - “Need to support our farmers.”
- School gardens
 - Getting kids involved is a great idea. However, the school day is limited due to testing requirements. And kids aren’t in school during the growing months.
 - Where would the funding come from?
 - Can’t force kids to do it. Could there be an opt out option?
 - Kids should understand where our food comes from and have the opportunity to be involved in growing food.
- Backyard chickens and bee keeping seemed to draw the most intense reactions:
 - “People can barely take care of their dogs and cats. How are they going to take care of their chickens, especially in the winter?”
 - “Chickens make noise, they smell and they can cause disease.”
 - “There’s a place for chickens. They’re called chicken farms.”
 - “What are people going to do with the hens when they stop laying eggs?”
 - “Bees in city limits is a bad idea. They fly around and hit windshields.”
 - “People are allergic to bees.”
 - “What are the bees going to eat and how will they pollinate in the city? Automobiles don’t have pollen.”
 - Bee keeping would have to be highly regulated.
- Roof top and boulevard gardens also drew some concerns:
 - Limited access to the rooftops, only owners could utilize them.

- Could everyone in the apartment building use this?
- Liability issue when people are on the roofs.
- Could create unsafe areas because homeless people could congregate there.
- Businesses shouldn't be REQUIRED to do rooftop gardens - this adds to their costs.
- How safe would the produce be from the boulevard garden – winter salt, sand, car exhaust, cigarettes, urine, etc.
- “Who would regulate boulevard gardens? Safety is a huge concern to me.”
- Would boulevard gardens be plants/flowers or produce? How safe would it be?
- Positive comments and themes centered around a sense of community including benefits of green spaces, helping farmers, giving to those in need, ensuring our children value agriculture, etc.:
 - Green spaces do make cities more beautiful and create community connectedness.
 - People should determine if healthy communities are a priority and if so, make that happen.
 - Helping local farmers grow their business is a good thing.
 - Backyard chickens “people have had weirder pets”.
 - Need to support our farmers.
 - “It’s a travesty that the bee population is in such trouble. We need to protect the bee population. People don’t need to be afraid of bees.”
 - Hydroponics is a good idea.
 - “Boulevard gardens can help beautify the city.”
 - “Bees would be ok as long as people are doing them responsibly.”
 - I would like to grow my own herbs.

Recommendations

Overall, messages were received well. However, a few trigger words were brought forth. Several respondents reacted negatively to the word "right". On one hand, the word "right" triggered concern about why they were not able to do this in the first place. Others thought that our rights are in our constitution and many of these topics do not relate to this. Additionally, giving everyone the right to own chickens, for example, would have to be highly regulated. Another recommendation is to provide education regarding many of the topics to our community. Many interviewees had confusion about regulations on chicken and bee keeping, also about who would be responsible for paying for community gardens etc. The concept of "green space" and "sustainable" caused confusion. Many were unsure about the meaning of these words and what they actually meant for the Fargo-Moorhead Community. Another common theme was funding. Questions and concerns about who would provide funding for an urban agriculture initiative and whether tax dollars would be increased. Further education and explanation is needed before our community can fully grasp the concept and benefits of supporting urban agriculture. More advertisements and awareness of farmers markets would be beneficial. Many community members do not get or read newspapers in which farmers markets are advertised. More campaigns and strategies need to be developed to better inform community members about local farmers markets.

Process Deliverable

2015 Meeting Dates & Length	Attendance	Work Performance & Contributions	Meeting Outcome(s)
November 16 (15 minutes)	All members were present	Brainstormed logistics for our first meeting; all members were equally engaged	First meeting date set selected
November 17 (2 hours)	All members were present	Started drafting messages and survey; brainstormed next meeting date; all members were equally engaged	Draft survey and 7 draft messages exist; plan for Megan's review of survey in place; next meeting date selected
November 19 (2 hours)	All members were present	Finalized messages and survey; all members were equally engaged	12 messages are ready to test; 2 nd draft of survey ready for Megan's review; next meeting date selected
November 23 (15 minutes)	All members were present	Reviewed progress; set next meeting date; all members were equally engaged	Confirmed that 12 messages and survey are ready; next meeting set for after Thanksgiving
November 30 (15 minutes)	Melissa was absent, all other members were present	Brainstormed logistics for next meeting; all members were equally engaged	Next meeting date selected and plan to connect Melissa in place
December 2 (15 minutes)	All members were present	Brainstormed message testing strategies; all members were equally engaged	Finalized message collection plan; plan for project clarification from Dr. Larson in place; next meeting date selected
December 7 (1 hour)	All members were present	Reviewed progress; clarified expectations with Dr. Larson; set next meeting date; all members were equally engaged	Next meeting date selected; plan for interview completion in place
December 12 (2.5 hours)	All members were present	Analyzed data, finalized project report, all members equally engaged	Finished project and turned in project report

HNES 725
Interview Template

Survey Intro

- Would you be interested in helping us with our school project? We are students in the NDSU MPH program....
- Do you live in the Fargo/Moorhead/West Fargo area? If yes, continue with the survey. If not, find a new interviewee.
- Our project is to test different messages about urban gardening...
- Urban gardening is the growing, processing, and distributing of food and food products through intensive plant cultivation and animal husbandry in and around cities.
- We'll read X number of messages about specific urban gardening components and then ask you a few questions about them.

Demographics:

- Gender, age in decade, race, zip code (must live in Fargo, Moorhead or West Fargo)

Read Message

Assessment questions:

- After hearing the <enter specific urban garden component>, how do you feel about it?
- What thoughts or questions come to mind?

<Look for positive or negative cues and if we can, assess to what degree they fall i.e. enthusiastic about bees versus i.e. adamantly opposed to chickens.>

Survey Closer

- Thank you for your time. Your information will be used to help the Cass Clay Food Systems Initiative Advisory Commission assess community readiness to urban gardening in the Fargo/Moorhead/West Fargo area.

Survey Collection Tool

Assessment questions:

- After hearing the <enter specific urban agriculture component>, how do you feel about it?
- What thoughts or questions come to mind?
- <Look for positive or negative cues and if we can, assess to what degree they fall i.e. enthusiastic about bees versus i.e. adamantly opposed to chickens.>

Interviewee #1	
Zip Code	
Decade of Life	
Gender	
Race	
Message #1 Responses: •	
Message #2 Responses: •	
Message #3 Responses: •	
Message #4 Responses: •	
Message #5 Responses: •	
Message #6 Responses: •	
Message #7 Responses: •	
Message #8 Responses: •	
Message #9 Responses: •	
Message #10 Responses: •	

Attachment 5

To: Cass-Clay Food Systems Advisory Commission
From: Kim Lipetzky, Fargo Cass Public Health
Date: January 5, 2016
Re: *Online Community Input*

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 (www.letseatlocal.org) and other venues.

Attachment 6a includes questions and comments regarding food systems issues submitted to the City of Fargo and Fargo Cass Public Health from November to December 2015. Names have been redacted to ensure the privacy of each of the individuals.

Requested Action: None

Attachment 5a

Online Public Input

11/25/15 Moorhead

I think that it is actually quite embarrassing that our community still does not allow backyard chickens. Having the right to provide yourself with fresh food that you have no doubt how it was grown is a right we should all have. Also the amount of good just having a couple chickens can do for a family is huge. Children can learn so much from taking care of something that provides them with food and also lead them to be more aware of what they are eating - leading them to grow a healthier generation. There are so many reasons backyard chickens are a good thing for our community.

11/23/15 Glyndon

A short list of topics I wish I had been able to cohere at the meeting (*referring to the November Advisory Commission meeting*). Smell is one of the overriding objections that a neighbor should have the right to address. My approach was around the square feet per day for chickens allowed (approx. 2 ¼) and the USDA requirements for free range chickens (I believe 1 ¾). It would be wise to review the sizes of currently available mobile chicken facilities from local businesses that already provide them (Tractor Supply, Fleet Farm, Menards, Target) before making decision since they have proven successful in other communities. I was surprised to not hear any local business presence at the meeting, beyond the obvious businesses that currently offer poultry supplies at a multitude of home and garden, lifestyle, and pet stores would likely prosper (Baker's Nursery, Holland's, Ole's, Scheels Home & Hardware). A square foot per day per bird type legislation would address simultaneously sanitation and pen size for both mobile and stationary poultry houses when coupled with a two week minimum for overlap. Composted poultry manure should have no scent at arms length when adequately mixed with high carbon organic matter (grass clippings, straw, wood chips). A 2" thick layer of any of these over the pile after each cleaning would certainly alleviate any other concerns. I believe that the best course of action to address the ever present education issue is to form a poultry growers association, the only one I am familiar with is for Whatcom County, Washington and has a \$25 lifetime membership and then lets you borrow butcher equipment for \$10 a day. A growers association will help with bird disposal by providing information and resources. Bird processing is an easy and unobtrusive process that requires minimal equipment and space, comparable space and cleanup requirements of an oil change. Processing small animals is clearly within the parameters of other rights property owners already possess. For the sake of avoiding "traumatic" events, I would suggest mandating killing cones, as opposed to allowing a bird to flop freely, and/or out of public view. Mandating that only poultry grown on the property, and then addressing a minimum number of days it has to reside there, or limiting a monthly process amount would inhibit residents from capitalizing on the state's 1000 bird allotment annually. Sales of eggs from a house flock that would be hard pressed to produce two dozen a week should fall under the same set of regulations a child's lemonade stand serving drinks from a non-certified kitchen follows. The most common answer to home gardener's questions at the Red River Market was their flowers were going unpollinated. Insecticides that kill mosquitoes are indiscriminate towards pollinators, which are necessary for any flower than cannot self pollinate, most notably squash. It would be prudent to address a solution before expanding public garden space within city limits. Vector control is also the main hindrance to urban bee keeping because it puts government employees in a position to do real damage to personal property. An own has invested approximately \$300 in their hive and would be upset at its destruction. Spraying only after dark when bees have returned to the hive would almost eliminate risk, maintaining a posted schedule so owners can cover their hive would absolve responsibility. Fargo-Moorhead will not vote against mosquito control so protection from liability should be considered.