

**Madison Urban Agriculture Ordinance Meeting
(9/26/08)**

Attendance: Chris Anderson, Bob Gragson, Jerry Kaufman, Robert Pierce, John Bell, Leslie Schroeder, Joe Mathers, Bryant Moroder, Greg Rosenberg (host)

1. Brainstorm – challenges in trying to do urban agriculture in Madison

- a. access to land, rental or ownership, has always been a problem – and what you can do when you are there
 - i. Neighbors don't want compost
 - ii. Urban well protection
 - iii. Cost and availability
 - iv. Security of tenure
 - v. Security of operation (stuff walking away) – crops, tools
 - vi. Toxics – brownfield – trying to do organic farming, and if you are near anyone else doing farming they are using chemicals
 - vii. Access to water
 - viii. Neighborhood esthetics
- b. Urban Wildlife
 - i. Not much you can do about it
 - 1. DNR: peanut butter trap, electric fence
 - 2. Can't hunt them – no deer hunting, unless DNR contracted sharpshooters
 - a. Very expensive and hard to get
 - ii. Examples
 - 1. Deer
 - 2. Ground hogs
 - 3. Turkeys
 - 4. Raccoons
 - 5. Mice/voles
 - 6. Rabbits (the least of our troubles)
 - 7. Coyotes (if you have chickens)
- c. Livestock
 - i. Restrictions
 - 1. Chickens
 - a. 4 per household
 - i. TG – that really limits
 - b. can do 1 or 2 family structures
 - ii. Bees
 - 1. Current restrictions?? Neighbors see this as concern number one (sting the kids). Problem with kids playing with them
 - iii. Goats – 5 acre minimum site to do that
 - iv. Sheep
 - v. Cows (closest in is Voit Farm)

- vi. Rabbits
 - 1. For food
 - 2. Great for compost (manure)
- vii. Fish – aquaculture
 - 1. Indoor or outdoor setting (see infrastucture)
- viii. Worms -- vermaculture
- d. Infrastucture
 - i. Temporary
 - 1. Hoop houses – grow stuff through winter
 - a. Movable structure with poles
 - i. Barriers:
 - 1. Alder
 - 2. No recognition of it in zoning ord or building code
 - b. Chicago example
 - i. Did them as temporary structure
 - c. In McFarland
 - i. Required \$65 for permit for new ones
 - ii. Wanting him to cement support poles into the ground
 - ii. Permanent
 - 1. Green house
 - a. CGW greenhouse project now \$40,000 to \$100,000 to comply with local building codes
 - b. Prohibitively expensive
 - iii. Utilities/Services
 - 1. Water: could be permanent or temporary
 - a. Community gardens: water utility wants a service – RPZ valves which community gardens pay for or lease on an annual basis
 - b. wells
 - 2. Electricity
 - a. Renewable energy as an option
 - iv. Fencing
 - 1. Standards
 - 2. Types
 - 3. Current requirements
 - a. 6 foot limit
 - i. Troy is 8 feet – no neighbor to object
 - v. Roads
 - 1. Issue at Troy: delicate dance to avoid paving requirement
 - a. Paving
 - b. Fire protection
- e. Run-off from other sites
 - i. Urban ag gets left-over sites

- f. Other issues
 - i. Vertical farming
 - ii. Intense clustering of hoop houses (20 on an acre)
 - iii. Housing adjacent to agriculture – new developments having a new food production integrated
 - iv. Shade structures
 - v. Vegetable processes
 - vi. Fruit trees – in public areas
 - vii. Putting up a farm stand (don't need a permit??)
 - 1. Some threshold in terms of income generated (see USDA standards)
 - 2. No enforcement if there are permit requirements – if selling food, no permit requirement (unprepared raw)
- 2. Urban Ag Ordinance – how can it enhance/protect community gardens**
 - a. Hand-cultivated agriculture – to distinguish from big guys
 - b. Long-term or protection of community gardens
 - i. Being in parkland means the parkland is protected – though not necessarily for agriculture
 - c. What's driving us is zoning rewrite (Jerry)
 - i. Task force report --- extended leases for community gardens
 - 1. Look at other ways that government can intervene to protect community gardens
 - a. Zoning lays out uses – doesn't necessarily protect??
 - d. Community gardens in city parks are subject to a 5 year lease
 - e. CDA – all month to month right now
 - f. Making community gardens a permitted use (instead of conditional use)
 - g. This can go beyond zoning
 - h. Current ordinances – piece meal
 - i. Chickens
 - ii. Community gardens as conditional use
 - i. Community gardens restrict to non-commercial uses
 - i. Lease arrangement with City Parks Department/Real Estate sets the restrictions
 - ii. Mix of opinions on whether this should change
 - j. Need to be clear on our definitions
 - i. Urban agriculture as the tent
 - 1. Commercial
 - 2. Noncommercial
 - ii. Some situations where they overlap
 - 1. Community gardens where they want some revenue generating activity
 - a. Not for individuals – but to benefit an organization (nonprofit)
 - b. Allow some commercial activity – a hybrid model
 - i. Primary use
 - ii. Secondary use

- iii. If sell food --- has property tax implication, licensing implications for sale of food (as a business)

3. Getting Involved in Rewrite of Madsen Zoning Code Process

- a. Bryant Moroder (ED of Sustain Dane) has advocated for zoning consultants to have good understanding of sustainability issues, and as a result was asked to play more active role in zoning code rewrite to coordinate input around sustainability issues. He is hoping to gather a set of ideas from this group and others and combine together into set of recommendations around sustainability
 - i. Staff working on the zoning code revision process
 - 1. Rick Roll -- we should invite him to this group to provide overview of process, and talk about how we might get involved in the discussion
 - ii. One model that has been put together by Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute – good place to start by educating ourselves
- b. Jerry Kaufman:
 - i. Look at area of urban agriculture from inside
 - ii. Can look at it through larger sustainability tent – struck by interest in sustainability as broad societal interest
 - iii. This is good opportunity to integrate urban ag into sustainability model – in particular Natural Step
- c. Structure – three areas for input (and not clear where final decisions are being made)
 - i. Consultants
 - ii. Committee
 - iii. Rewrite process
 - iv. Plan Commission – key role played by Nan Fey (who is co-chair of community gardens committee)
 - 1. John Bell: Nan says it’s better to offer something that can be amended later but can be put together more quickly – than to take too long
- d. Joe: does City has a “climate protection plan”
 - i. Bryant – have a plan – adopted quite a while ago

4. Next Steps

- a. Invite Rick Roll to come to next meeting
 - i. Jerry Kaufman’s former student – he’ll follow up
- b. Review other ordinances
 - i. Cleveland (special district for community gardens)
 - ii. Grand Rapids
 - iii. Rocky Mountain (that gets at broader sustainability stuff)
 - 1. Get from Bryant
 - iv. Providence
 - v. Portland(?)
- c. Review other programs – tells us what kind of activities our ordinance should enable
 - i. Pea Patch – city-run program in Seattle

1. 1 community garden per 2500 persons
 - ii. Neighbor Space (nonprofit)
 - iii. Growing Power (nonprofit)
 - d. Madison review
 - i. Madison Comprehensive Plan
 1. Provisions in there specifically tied to urban ag.
 - a. 2006 Comprehensive Plan
 - b. Chris will find and email to Greg
 - e. Other people to invite to these meetings
 - i. Jack Kloppenburg (still at UW)
 - ii. People who were invited
 1. Nan
 2. Alice Anderson (would like to come)
 3. Martin
 4. Miriam (REAP)
 5. Anne Reynolds
 - f. Deadlines
 - i. Need to submit some kind of language by mid-November
 - ii. Next Meeting Times
 1. Oct 10th, 3 – 4:30 PM (Madison Area CLT)
 2. Oct 22nd, 3:30 – 5 PM (Madison Area CLT)
 3. November 4th, 3:30 – 5 PM (Madison Area CLT)