Topical Discussions Agendas and Summaries

Growing and Zoning Friday, July 23rd 1 to 2:30PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss what potential zoning changes the Urban Agriculture Plan might recommend that could reduce barrier to growing food in our city.

1:00 – 1:15	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
1:15 – 1:30	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Principal Planner
1:30 – 1:40	Description of existing zoning regulations – Aly Pennucci, City Planner
1:40 – 2:20	Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be – All
2:20 – 2:30	Wrap up/Next steps

Other upcoming discussions:

Market Gardens and Other Commercial Efforts and Zoning Monday, July 26, 1 – 2:30 PM Sabathani Community Center, Room J

Food Production and New Development/Innovative Design Monday, July 26, 3 – 4:30PM Sabathani Community Center, Room J

Green Roofs/Garden Roofs
Thursday, July 29th, 1- 2:30PM
Sabathani Community Center, Room D1/D2

A discussion about farmers markets is still being planned.

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN Zoning and GrowingTopical Discussion July 23, 2010 1:00-2:30 PM Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, June Mathiowetz, Kirsten Saylor, Starr Carpenter, Jesse Eustis, Aly Pennucci, and Amanda Arnold.

Introductions and Overview

Robin explained that the purpose of the discussion was to inform the urban agriculture plan. By discussing the issues, there will be better informed recommendations in the plan. He also explained that all of the comments would be included in the plan appendices. He reminded people that today's conversation shouldn't focus on specific projects but instead focus on themes, ideas, and issues.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda explained the urban agriculture plan will address and further explore several recommendations that came out of the Homegrown Minneapolis process. That process recommended that the City: "Review, and revise when necessary, city zoning codes to support local food production and distribution, including urban agricultural land uses and related infrastructure".

Robin reviewed the timeline for drafting of the plan, the adoption of the plan, and potential implementation.

Description of existing zoning regulations

Aly explained the existing zoning regulations that apply to community gardens and growing in yards. She reviewed a handout about community gardens (attached).

There was a general discussion about why the City regulated what can be built in a set back. Aly explained that neighborhood character is a driver behind the many of the zoning regulations. Some people suggested that what's allowed should be based more on the context of an individual site (for example, neighbors could weigh in on individual proposals and/or unique elements such as sight lines could be considered). Aly explained that consistent enforcement is a concern for the City. Others suggested that a change in mindset and aesthetic values about this is coming.

Discussion of issues people are facing and what options their might be

Attendees felt raised beds should be allowed in the required setbacks (particularly in the required front yard). Currently only certain elements listed in the zoning code are allowed in front yards. There was a discussion about height and the group felt that 3' could be an appropriate maximum height for raised beds in a required front yard.

There was a discussion about trellises. Trellises are allowed in required yards subject to the same standards as a fence

There was a discussion about signage for community gardens. The existing regulation limits size to four square feet. Kirsten explained that many community garden signs are very attractive and larger size is needed to describe the garden and offer information in a variety of languages. Aly explained that the City has an interest in keeping all signage consistent in size (it is difficult to allow a garden to have a larger sign and not another operation, particularly in residential zoning districts). Also, it is difficulty for the City to regulate the quality of sign, so size is one way of ensuring that a sign isn't an eyesore. There was a discussion about whether a larger sign could be allowed within the interior of the garden (outside of required yards).

There was a discussion about hoop houses. Hoop houses would currently be considered an accessory structure, and accessory structures can't be larger than 120 square feet without the requirement of building permits. There

was a general discussion about the length of time that hoop houses are used. Cold frames and high tunnels were also discussed. There was a question about when a hoop house would be considered a primary structure on a lot where no other structures exist?

Kirstin explained that parking is an issue at some gardens. Aly explained that two parking spaces outside of an enclosed building are allowed at a community garden, which is what is allowed for residential uses. Many if not most gardens are located in residential areas. Aly responded to questions about if a variance could be requested if a garden organization wants more and went over some of the required findings that must be met.

A question was raised about whether or not the sale of produce could take place at community gardens. Aly explained that retail sales of produce could be approved as a temporary use if the activity will not occur in a residence or office resident district unless located on institutional or public uses sites or on zoning lots of not less than 20,000 sq. ft, but some issues could arise if sales took place regularly. In essence a commercial operation would be taking place in a residential district in many cases. That said, the plan will explore options for allowing more commercial growing.

There was a question about the existing composting regulations. Aly explained that compost containers have to be stored 20' from any dwelling. The regulations related to active composting were not known. Amanda said she'd follow up on those rules.

There was a question about whether growing produce in the boulevards (the space between the sidewalk and the curb) was allowed. Staff thought that Public Works regulations prohibited that because of sight lines and the potential to create dirty sidewalks. Amanda said she'd follow up on this.

There were some questions about liability insurance, conservation easements, and taxation. Robin suggested we arrange a separate conversation about those issues.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin pointed out that there were other topical discussions coming up.

Zoning and Commercial Growing Monday, July 26th 1 to 2:30PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss what potential zoning changes the Urban Agriculture Plan might recommend that could reduce barrier to growing food commercially in our city.

1:00 – 1:15	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
1:15 – 1:30	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Principal Planner
1:30 – 1:40	Description of existing zoning regulations – Aly Pennucci, City Planner
1:40 – 2:20	Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be – All
2:20 – 2:30	Wrap up/Next steps

Other upcoming discussions:

Food Production and New Development/Innovative Design Monday, July 26, 3 – 4:30PM Sabathani Community Center, Room J

Green Roofs/Garden Roofs Thursday, July 29th, 1- 2:30PM Sabathani Community Center, Room D1/D2

A discussion about farmers markets is still being planned.

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Zoning and Commercial Growing Topical Discussion
July 26, 2010
1:00-2:30 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, Starr Carpenter, David Motzenbecker, Collie Graddlock, Jeremy McAdams, Jeanette Lieberman, Julie Aponte, Nate Waters, JoAnne Berkenkamp, Elizabeth Wieland, Aly Pennucci, Amanda Arnold

Introductions and Overview

Robin explained that the purpose of the discussion was to inform the urban agriculture plan. By discussing the issues, there will be better informed recommendations in the plan. He also explained that all of the comments would be included in the plan appendices. He reminded people that today's conversation shouldn't focus on specific projects but instead focus on themes, ideas, and issues.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda explained the urban agriculture plan will address and further explore several recommendations that came out of the Homegrown Minneapolis process. That process recommended that the City "review, and revise when necessary, city zoning codes to support local food production and distribution, including urban agricultural land uses and related infrastructure".

Amanda reviewed the timeline for drafting of the plan, the adoption of the plan, and potential implementation.

Description of existing zoning regulations

Aly gave an overview of the structure of the zoning code. She explained that there isn't much guidance in the zoning code related to commercial growing. This creates issues that generally fall into the following three situations:

- Greenhouses and community gardens are uses listed in the code, but outdoor commercial operations (other than farmers' markets) are not described. Thus, zoning staff has had to make case by case interpretations.
- The home occupation regulations (those that govern commercial businesses in homes) require that the
 retail activity take place inside a structure, making growing not compatible with home occupation
 standards.
- Commercial operations (other than home occupations) are prohibited in Residential districts. Since most community gardens are in residential zones, the sale of produce from the garden is prohibited.

Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be

The discussion began with conversation about how commercial growing should be defined. One person suggested that "farming" should be used rather than "growing" or "gardening" because "farming" indicates a certain tax status and is used in State Department of Agriculture regulations. There was then a conversation about the scale of operations that people are interested in pursuing. The individuals in the group were interested in various scales and types of commercial operations.

A few people indicated that they're not particularly interested in selling on the same site that they grow produce because they need space for cleaning and processing, which is regulated by other ordinances. Someone pointed out that the way a sales operation in marketed can influence the impacts it has (i.e. selling a few tomatoes verses having a farmers market and farm together).

There was a conversation about accessory structures. Aly explained that the scale of accessory structures is regulated. Then the group discussed the permanency or lack of permanency of hoop houses.

While discussing the appropriate location for and interaction between residential and commercial uses, one person pointed out that if you own your house and want to start a business of growing produce, it seems strange to have to purchase or rent a commercial property to do so.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin thanked everyone for their comments and explained that the urban agriculture plan would analyze potential zoning changes related to where urban farming could and should be located, how commercial growing might be made more compatible with home occupation regulations, and how selling on non-commercial parcels might be accommodated. He also suggested that more analysis of the processing issues should be explored.

Urban Agriculture and Innovative Design Monday, July 26th 3 to 4:30 PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss how the to integrate urban agriculture into the fabric of the community, particularly in new development

3:00 – 3:15	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon David Motzenbecker, President of the City Planning Commission
3:15 – 3:30	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Principal Planner
3:30 – 4:15	Discussion of what options there might be – All
4:15 – 4:30	Wrap up/Next steps

Other upcoming discussions:

Green Roofs/Garden Roofs Thursday, July 29th, 1- 2:30PM Sabathani Community Center, Room D1/D2

A discussion about farmers markets is still being planned.

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Urban Agriculture and Innovative Design Topical Discussion
July 26, 2010
3:00 – 4:30 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, David Motzenbecker, David Graham, Rosemary Dolata, Joshua Foss, John Slack, Starr Carpenter, Jeanette Lieberman, Ben Hertz, Stephanie Grotta, Julie Snow, Mary Springer, Joby Lynn Sassily James, Aly Pennucci, Amanda Arnold

Introductions and Overview

Robin explained that the purpose of the discussion was to inform the urban agriculture plan. By discussing the issues, there will be better informed recommendations in the plan. He also explained that all of the comments would be included in the plan appendices.

David Motzenbecker welcomed everyone and explained that as a member of the urban agriculture plan steering committee, a landscape architect, and President of the Planning Commission, he's particularly interested in hearing from designers and developers about innovative ideas they have related urban agriculture.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda explained the urban agriculture plan will address and further explore several recommendations that came out of the Homegrown Minneapolis process. That process recommended that the City "identify policies and incentives to encourage/require developers to include space for food production and distribution and composting in new developments". In addition, the steering committee for the plan has expressed an interest in other design options. Amanda mentioned briefly that the recent updates to the Planned Unit Development chapter of the zoning code provide some incentives for providing food production on site, but that hasn't been tested yet.

Amanda reviewed the timeline for drafting of the plan, the adoption of the plan, and potential implementation.

Discussion of ideas and options

The discussion began a mention of using produce as part of the required landscape in new developments. Ben Hertz explained that the Cornerstone Group has done that in Richfield and they've found the customers linger longer and check out the produce. Ideas like using apple trees, trained against a building, as both a decorative and functional landscape were discussed.

It was mentioned that produce doesn't have to be in the ground, rather in can be grown in and on a structure. It was mentioned that vertical gardens on parking ramps can be more productive than gardens on the ground.

Someone inquired about the possibility of using rights-of-way, utility easements, and shoreland areas for growing produce.

It was suggested that food production in housing should be standard. Ben said Cornerstone Group has incorporated growing space into one of their St.Paul development with great success.

There was a discussion about growing on rooftops. Someone pointed out that many modern, mid-sized projects are stick frame construction and this could create a problem with rooftop growing because the structure might not be strong enough. It was mentioned that the taller a building is the tougher it is to farm on top of it. Cost was discussed and it was suggested that a new metric of the value of food production (to offset costs) is needed. David Graham stressed that we are losing an opportunity by not taking advantage of all of our rooftops.

Someone asked if there was an overarching organization that could take the lead on or support creative endeavors/pilot projects. Robin explained that a group is studying what kind of entity could carry on the vision

after Homegrown Minneapolis ends. It was suggested that such a group could coordinate the adoption of land, the donation of materials, and provide information on dealing with contaminants.

There was a conversation about the whether or not surplus school property could be a resource. In addition, open schools could be coordinated/schedule so that school and the growing session could benefit each other and not conflict.

The importance of corporate gardens was mentioned. These could/should be encouraged more. Ben mentioned that one company considers the time an employee spends gardening a public garden as volunteer time.

The amount of vacant land in North Minneapolis was mentioned as an opportunity for a unique growing project.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin thanked everyone for their comments and asked people to stay involved with the planning process.

Rooftop Farming Thursday, July 29th 1 to 2:30PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss what potential zoning changes the Urban Agriculture Plan might recommend that could reduce barrier to growing food on roof tops.

1:00 – 1:15	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
1:15 – 1:30	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Principal Planner
1:30 – 2:20	Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be – All
2:20 – 2:30	Wrap up/Next steps

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN Rooftop Gardens/Farming Topical Discussion July 29, 2010 1:00-2:30 PM Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, Dayna Burtness, Ben Hertz, Aly Pennucci, Amanda Arnold

Introductions and Overview

Robin explained that the purpose of the discussion was to inform the urban agriculture plan. By discussing the issues, there will be better informed recommendations in the plan. He also explained that all of the comments would be included in the plan appendices. He reminded people that today's conversation shouldn't focus on specific projects but instead focus on themes, ideas, and issues.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda explained the urban agriculture plan will address and further explore several recommendations that came out of the Homegrown Minneapolis process. That process recommended that the City "identify additional policies and incentives to encourage the establishment of new green roof and the adaptation of existing roofs for food production."

Amanda reviewed the timeline for drafting of the plan, the adoption of the plan, and potential implementation.

Discussion of Issues Faced

Robin started the conversation by asking Ben about his existing rooftop farm and Dayna about her planned farm (agricultural roof).

Ben explained that the Kensington Place rooftop farm:

- Is a modular test model.
- Has a control farm on the ground. The rooftop is producing more than the ground.
- Would break even at 10,000 s.f., but he wants to do more.
- Is producing 40 to 100 lbs of food a week for Luca's restaurant.

Dayna explained that her plans involve:

- A non-modular system (like a green roof instead)
- A need for 40,000 s.f. of uninterrupted space.
- A system like one being used in New York.
- Would serve restaurants and cafés.

Then there was a conversation about the ideal type of building to put a rooftop garden on. Both Dayna and Ben are interested in new and old buildings. Building built between 1920 and 1955 are most ideal. Older buildings present potential preservation issues.

Aly talked briefly about the lack of a clear zoning definition for commercial growing. There was a discussion about whether or not a rooftop farm should be considered a commercial operation if the sales were to take place off site. The group discussed whether or not a rooftop farm would be considered a building component or an economic activity.

Robin pointed out that he's bee researching rooftop farms in other cities. Dayna handed out a summary (attached) of what she sees as the regulatory barriers.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

The group talked about what influence the urban agriculture plan could have since it can change the building code. A variety of potential follow up meetings were discussed.

Robin said he'd contact the building officials in other cities and set up a follow meeting with Minneapolis' building officials.

Barriers to Agricultural Green Roofs in Minneapolis

Prepared by Dayna Burtness, Sky High Harvest LLC, 7/28/2010

Summary

An agricultural green roof (AGR) is a type of intensive green roof used to grow fresh vegetables, herbs, and flowers for local consumption. AGRs create green jobs, provide the ecological benefits of green roofs, and increase local food production while leaving vacant urban land available for development. Since occupancy type for AGRs is currently undefined, there are two serious barriers to starting AGRs: requirements for elevator access and two exits. Two AGRs in NYC and one rooftop garden in Chicago operate safely and successfully without elevator access and two of the three only have one exit staircase. AGR employees' tasks would be similar to those done by green roof technicians, yet green roofs like the Target Center don't have these accessibility requirements. Given these circumstances, the City of Minneapolis should provide building inspectors with clear guidelines that identify AGRs as temporary use occupancies like green roofs, not employee work spaces. This isn't a matter of changing the MN Building Code—it's making sure that it is interpreted in a reasonable way in order to support this innovative form of small enterprise urban agriculture.

Barriers to AGRs in Minneapolis

In my conversations (see Appendix A) with Pat Higgins and Dan Callahan—two very helpful and patient City of Minneapolis staff—two main barriers to AGRs surfaced, both of which seem to be rooted in the lack of clear guidelines for building inspectors to follow when determining the occupancy type of AGRs.

Green roofs are categorized as temporary use occupancy and do not need to meet ADA requirements even though maintenance workers routinely access the roof. For instance, Sky High Harvest employees would do the same types of maintenance activities—watering, weeding, etc.—that a green roof tech might do on the Target Center green roof, but the Target Center roof isn't ADA compliant. Even though an AGR is essentially a green roof, the building inspectors interpreted the occupancy as an "employee work area," triggering the following extremely problematic requirements:

- Elevator Access: The inspectors said that installing an AGR would mean that the occupancy type would change from a temporary use to an employee work space, which would require it to be accessible via elevator per ADA rules. Requiring elevator access would effectively eliminate the potential for AGRs in Minneapolis because there are virtually no open roofs with elevator access; those with elevator access are already used for bars or patios. Adding elevator access would be prohibitively expensive.
- Exiting: Changing the occupancy type from temporary use to an employee work space would require the roof to have two exits. Requiring two exits would greatly reduce the number of rooftops available for AGRs since the majority of rooftops only have one exit.

Mr. Higgins and Mr. Callahan also noted the following non-problematic requirements that would be addressed in the Preliminary Design Review:

- 42" guard rail perimeter
- Proof that the structure can support the weight of the AGR

Successful and Safe AGRs and Rooftop Gardens in NYC and Chicago

It's important to note that two AGRs in NYC and one rooftop garden in Chicago have shown that AGRs can be open to the public and operated safely and successfully without elevator access and only one exit. All three are open to the public, have interns, employees and volunteers, and regularly host a variety of popular urban ag workshops.

Eagle Street Rooftop Farm, NYC (<u>www.rooftopfarms.org</u>): The Eagle Street Rooftop Farm is a 6,000 square foot AGR that was founded in the spring of 2009. It has only one staircase exit and no elevator access.

Brooklyn Grange Rooftop Farm, NYC (<u>www.brooklyngrangefarm.com</u>): Brooklyn Grange is a 40,000 square foot AGR that was founded in the spring of 2010. It has two staircase exits but no elevator access.

Uncommon Ground Rooftop Farm, Chicago (uncommonground.com): Uncommon Ground is a local foods restaurant that operates its own 2,500 square foot rooftop garden (raised beds, not an AGR). It has one staircase exit and no elevator access. The City of Chicago fully supported the creation of the farm and even paid for a significant portion of the construction costs.

Proposed Solution

For AGRs to be successfully implemented in Minneapolis, clear guidelines for building inspectors must be established. This isn't a matter of changing the MN Building Code—it's making sure that it is interpreted in a reasonable way in order to support this innovative form of small enterprise urban agriculture. Since AGRs are green roofs and employees of AGRs do similar tasks as green roof maintenance workers, AGRs should be considered temporary use occupancy and should only be required to have one staircase exit. AGRs should not be required to have elevator access.

Contact Information:



Dayna Burtness info@skyhighharvest.com
Cell: 612-812-1923
www.skyhighharvest.com

Appendix A: Email correspondence with Dan Callahan

From: dayna.burtness@gmail.com [mailto:dayna.burtness@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Dayna Burtness, Sky High

Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 12:27 PM

To: Callahan, Daniel T.

Subject: Rooftop farming -- Robin Garwood gave me your contact info

Hi Dan,

My name is Dayna Burtness and I'm the rooftop farmer that Robin has probably told you about! In case he hasn't, my business--Sky High Harvest LLC--is working on building the first commercial scale rooftop farm in the

Midwest right here in Minneapolis. It will essentially be a green roof like the one on the Target Center except 8" of soil instead of a couple!

Right now we're trying to find the right roof that is load-bearing and big enough, but there were a few issues Robin raised that I'm trying to get to the bottom of, namely if the rooftop farm needs to have elevator access and then how many means of egress there needs to be. I sent him the following thoughts. Can you weigh in since you're the expert? I would greatly, *greatly* appreciate your thoughts since the future of this business hangs in the balance!

Here's what Robin said: "Dan from MDR/Building Inspections came on the tour, and reiterated his interpretation that rooftop farms would require two stair accesses and an elevator access, and that any soil put on the roof would have to be part of a green roof-style membrane system, or in a modular system of some kind."

Requiring a green roof style system: Not a problem. Sky High Harvest will use a green roof drainage system with engineered green roof media. Essentially this is the same system as the Target Center green roof except with 8" of soil instead of 2" or 3".

Elevator access: I'm particularly confused about the elevator access piece--is that an ADA compliance issue? Requiring elevator access will effectively kill any plans for rooftop farms. It's my understanding that as long as the rooftop farm isn't a "public accommodation" as defined by the ADA rules it doesn't need elevator access. Also, I've found plenty of ADA-related cases in which elevators aren't required because A) the building is under three stories and/or B) the cost of installing an elevator exceeds 20% of the installation. (Sources: http://www.ada.gov/taman3.html, http://www.ada.gov/qandaeng.htm#Anchor-Public-49575)

Two stair accesses: It's my understanding that the required number of exits is determined by Occupancy Load which is set by the MN Fire Code. Table 1004.1.1 of the MN Fire Code doesn't define OL for rooftop farms of course, but OL for warehouses, industrial areas, and agricultural buildings sets the floor area per occupant at anywhere from 100 sf to 500 sf. According to this document

(http://www.minneapolismn.gov/fire/MFDPolicy10-5-Occupant-Load.pdf) published by the Mpls Fire Department, a space with one exit can have an OL of up to 49 people. Using the numbers from the MN Fire Code (49 people x 500 sf each), a rooftop farm of up to 24,500 sf could be legally served by one exit. To be honest, I can't see a reason why I'd ever need 49 people on the roof (especially since 70% of the roof will be in raised beds, the equivalent of a table or something else that a person can't stand on), so in order to be served by one staircase a building official could set a lower OL (Section 1004.1.1 of the Fire Code allows this).

I submit these thoughts as a hopeful agripreneur who is certain that rooftop farming is safe, beneficial to people/environment/economy, and a concept that will propel Minneapolis to the forefront of urban ag in the Midwest. (If anyone doubts my dedication to the concept, I'll show them the receipt for my \$89 copy of the fire code!) :)

Please get in touch with me when you can--email works fine or give me a call at 612-812-1923.

All the best Dan!

Dayna Burtness Sky High Harvest, LLC skyhighharvest.com

Facebook: http://bit.ly/azqaNN

Twitter: http://twitter.com/SkyHighHarvest

From: Callahan, Daniel T. <Dan.Callahan@ci.minneapolis.mn.us>

Date: Thu, Jun 17, 2010 at 2:54 PM

Subject: RE: Rooftop farming -- Robin Garwood gave me your contact info To: "Dayna Burtness, Sky High Harvest" <info@skyhighharvest.com> Cc: "Higgins, Patrick J." <Patrick.Higgins@ci.minneapolis.mn.us>

Dayna,

I don't know if you have enlisted the help of an architect/engineer yet, but they provide the code work (and plans) showing us how the code will be met. I understand you may be waiting to find potential sites before doing so, but just to let you know in advance that this is a requirement. Our role in plan review is to review their plans for building code compliance rather than provide them a list of what we think the code requires. That being said, I can point out the main issues as I see them in the building code (and they will look to address).

Structural

Soil/drainage/roofing system and its installation

Exiting – the code typically requires 2 exits from each level or story of a building. Sometimes only one exit is required from a space, typically to a corridor, but two exits are required from the floor per IBC/MN Table 1019.1.

Accessibility – granted, this is a bit different from uses we have seen. My take is that MN 1341.1103.2.3 (employee work areas) is the issue. Where you are taking space that was not previously occupied and creating an occupancy, rather than the 20% rule, the change in occupancy rules normally apply.

42" height guard requirement for an occupied roof

There will probably be other issues the designers find that need to be addressed. Where there are gray areas in the code or items where the architect does not agree with us there are processes for those as well.

Dan Callahan Supervisor, Plan Review **Construction Code Services** 612-673-5832

Email: dan.callahan@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Farmers' Markets and Land Use August 11th 1 to 2:30PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss how current land use regulations affect farmers' markets

1:00 – 1:15	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
1:15 – 1:20	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan Amanda Arnold, CPED, Principal Planner
1:20 – 1:30	Overview of existing zoning regulations that relate to Farmers' Markets Aly Pennucci and Robb Clarksen, CPED, Zoning Division
1:30 – 1:40	Introduction of the code review that will be done this fall Tim Jenkins, Reg Services, Environmental Management and Safety
1:40 – 2:20	Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be
2:20 – 2:30	Wrap up/Next steps Robin Garwood

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Farmers' Markets and Land Use Topical Discussion
August 11, 2010
1:00-2:30 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, Linda Roberts, Tim Jenkins, Aly Pennucci, Robb Clarksen, Amanda Arnold, June Mathiowetz, Ken Meter, Sarah Claassen, Migdalia Loyola, Jenny Skorupa, Sara Nelson-Pallmeyer, Mariann Carolan, Shaun Ladeu, Aaron Reser, Robin Russell, Martin Brown, Jeanette Lieberman, Christopher Morris, Kate Grout, Amy Behrens, John Brosnan, Brian Jogorsen, Erin Jercebek, Brian Noy, David Nicholson, Madeline Kastler, Sarah Olson, Brian Frederickson, Art Serotoff, Constance Vaughn, Kitty Harris, Steven Brown.

Introductions and Overview

Robin explained that the purpose of the discussion was to inform the urban agriculture plan. By discussing the issues, there will be better informed recommendations in the plan. He also explained that all of the comments would be included in the plan appendices. He reminded people that today's conversation shouldn't focus on specific projects but instead focus on themes, ideas, and issues. We also explained that today's discussion is about land use. A discussion about health regulations will start in the fall.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda explained the urban agriculture plan will address and further explore several recommendations that came out of the Homegrown Minneapolis process. That process recommended that the City "Integrate farmers markets into the City's development plans" and "Identify and help secure 5-6 sites for the permanent establishment of several existing farmers' markets and the additional establishment of a farmers market(s) in an area currently undeserved"

Amanda reviewed the timeline for drafting of the plan, the adoption of the plan, and potential implementation.

Description of existing zoning regulations

Robb Clarksen gave an overview of the structure of the zoning code and described the zoning regulations that affect farmers markets. Tim Jenkins explained that the health code also regulates farmers markets. This fall a review of all ordinances that affect farmers markets will take place.

Discussion of issues people are facing and what options there might be

There was a question about whether there could be a farmers' market zoning district. City staff explained that might limit options more. Right now farmers' markets are allowed in many districts, making them feasible throughout the city.

There was a discussion about the potential benefits of having a farmers' market in a public right of way like a street. Someone asked if farmers markets could be set up in conjunction with special events.

There was a sizable conversation about the mix of products that should be allowed at a farmers' market. Some people felt that farmers' markets need to remain a true farmers' market. Others felt there was a benefit to including products like art.

There was a long discussion about signage. Several people expressed concern that the current regulations limit a market's ability to advertise. Since the markets are not there every day, people felt more advertising was needed and that on premise signs don't do enough. Some people pointed out that many farmers markets come back every year, so signage should be permanent.

There was also a long discussion about parking. Some people had concerns about shoppers getting tickets during farmer's markets and wondered if meters could be hooded or special passes provided.

Robin asked the group if they had suggestions about improving non-motorized access to farmers' markets. A couple of people said that in general the City is doing a lot to improve pedestrian and bike facilities, and that farmers' markets will naturally locate in areas with good access. Someone pointed out that signage and access are linked and that context should be considered with signage.

Amanda asked where people see the demand for farmers markets going and where future ones should be located in the city. A grower responded that he didn't support more farmers' market because they spread growers too thin, hurting already narrow profit margins. There was a conversation about whether or not the traits of buyers could be easily tracked or surveyed. There was some debate about the easy and functionality of this type of research. Someone made the point that as there are more markets, they may need to diversify more. Another person pointed out that farmers' markets should be used to gentrify areas, as long as they didn't undermine existing businesses.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin thanked everyone for their comments and encouraged people to stay involved as the plan is drafted.

Cooking and the Local Food System September 1st, 2010 1:30 to 3:00 PM

Meeting Purpose: The City is developing an Urban Agriculture Plan and is interested in speaking with people who prepare and process local foods. We'd like get your input on how the City can support and promote the local food system and local businesses. We're particularly interested in how and where you access produce and how efficiency between growing and processing can be found.

1:30 – 1:40	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon David Motzenbecker, President of the City Planning Commission
1:40 – 1:50	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Principal Planner
1:50 – 2:50	Discussion – All
2:50 - 3:00	Wrap up/Next steps

For more information about the plan go to:

www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban ag plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Cooking and the Food System Topical Discussion
September 1, 2010
1:30-3:00 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, David Motzenbecker, Amanda Arnold, and Scott Pampuch

Introductions and Overview

David introduced Robin and Amanda to Scott who is the chef at the Corner Table restaurant.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda briefly described the urban agriculture plan and the desire to get input on how the City can support and promote the local food system and local businesses.

Discussion

The discussion started with a conversation about the mobile food trucks that have just started up. Scott asked if the food truck area might be expanded and if a preference might be given to business people who provide healthy, whole, and local food. Robin explained that a process would have to be explored for the expansion.

David asked Scott to talk about the supply chain for locally grown food. Scott explained that there is a strong demand for locally grown foods, but that labor, security, and liability are concerns. Restaurant owners can't easily grow their own foods because they are busy running their businesses. Scott feels that if someone could grow and distribute the food there would be a great market. However, distributers need a certain level of commitment and restaurants have to be assured of a certain amount of produce. Scott also mentioned a role for someone who would go to farmers markets on behalf of chefs.

Scott discussed the interest in year round local produce and the need for a system for preserving local food.

Scott talked about transportation being a key issue. He feels there's a need for a "spider network" that allows for efficient distribution in the city.

Scott stressed an interest in the City making land more available for growing and distribution.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

David explained that he'd try to follow up with more chefs and get some additional ideas and perspectives.

Animals and the Local Food System Monday, October 4th 2:30 to 4 PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss role that animals can play in the urban agriculture system

2:30 – 2:35	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
2:35 – 2:40	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan – Amanda Arnold, Community Planning
2:40 – 2:50	Overview of existing animal policies – Lori Olson, Regulatory Services
2:50 - 3:45	Discussion – All
3:45 – 4:00	Wrap up/Next steps

Other upcoming discussions:

Economic Opportunities of Urban Agriculture Oct. 21 from 2 to 3:30 PM Location to be confirmed

For more information about the plan go to: www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Urban Agriculture and Animals Topical Discussion
October 4, 2010
2:30 to 4:00 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, Lori Olsen, Amanda Arnold, Laura Freund, Madeline Kastler, Jeremy McAdams, Wayne Martin

Introductions and Overview

Robin welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the meeting.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda talked about the purpose of the urban agriculture plan and the timeline for completion, review, and adoption. She also handed out a one page summary about the plan.

Overview of existing animal control regulations and concerns

Lori reviewed exiting animal control regulations and talked about some of the challenges her department faces. Lori explained that hoofed animals are not permitted with in the city, but chickens and bees are. Since chickens were first allowed a few years ago, Animal Control has received approximately 150 applications. Animal Control is open to considering allowing hoofed animals, but more analysis would need to be done. The addition of chicken permits has presented new issues related to staff work load and the experience of to deal with foul. In addition, Animal Control's top priority is the welfare of the animal and more information is needed. Some initial concerns are insuring that everyone would treat hoofed animal humanely, that enough space and shelter is provided, and that ground cover and waste disposal are planned for.

Discussion

Participants suggested that educational programs could be set up and that a permit for a hoof animal could be contingent on a person completing the course. They pointed out that St. Paul allows hoofed animals as do Seattle and Portland.

There was a discussion about whether or not people are interested in having animals for butchering or just for dairy production.

Lori asked the group about what needs (i.e. exercise, shelter) goats and small pigs have. The group felt that both could be kept on a standard city lot. One member of the group suggested that the City could start by allowing one breed first. Lori pointed out that many animals are currently considered "wild animals" so those definitions would have to be examined.

There was a discussion about shelters and fences for animals. Shelters (structures) and fences are regulated by the zoning code, so that should be examined as part of the urban agriculture plan.

There was a discussion about whether or not animal husbandry could be considered a home occupation. Amanda will look into that issue.

Participant discussed the rules for butchering. Amanda will look into the zoning implications and Lori will double check the animal control codes.

Robin wondered if fish could be raised for food in the city. Amanda will look into that as well. Robin suggested that perhaps some accommodations for the raising of fish should be made in the zoning code.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin thanked everyone for their participation and encouraged them to review the plan when it's released.

Urban Agriculture and Economics Thursday, October 21st 2:00 to 3:30 PM

Meeting Purpose: To discuss economic opportunities and challenges related to urban agriculture with the intent of informing the Urban Agriculture Policy Plan and potential future programs.

2:00 – 2:10	Introductions and Overview Robin Garwood, Policy Aide to Council Member Cam Gordon
2:10 – 2:20	Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan Amanda Arnold, Community Planning
2:20 – 2:30	Overview of CPED business finance efforts Bob Lind, Business Finance
2:30 – 3:25	Discussion – All
3:25 – 3:30	Wrap up/Next steps

For more information about the plan go to:

www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban ag plan.asp

URBAN AGRICULTURE TOPICAL PLAN
Urban Agriculture and Economics Topical Discussion
October 21, 2010
2:00 to 3:30 PM
Sabathani Community Center

MEEETING SUMMARY

In attendance:

Robin Garwood, Jessica Green, Bob Lind, Karin Berkholtz, June Mathiowetz, Amanda Arnold, Maggie Adamek, Julie Ristow.

Introductions and Overview

Robin welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the meeting.

Overview of the Urban Agriculture Plan

Amanda talked about the purpose of the urban agriculture plan and the timeline for completion, review, and adoption.

Overview of CPED business finance efforts

Bob Lind and Jessica Green provide an overview a new program being developed with in the Business Finance section of CPED. A summary of that program follows:

Homegrown Business Development Center

As part of the City's efforts to promote the sustainable agenda of Homegrown Minneapolis, it is proposed that a Homegrown Business Development Center be established to connect food production and small business in a way that supports urban farmers and local food processors.

MCCD's Homegrown Business Development Center will assist current and aspiring small batch manufacturers to develop and expand business ventures that will promote sustainable agriculture and food production.

The Center will provide matching, low-interest loans of up to \$10,000 for businesses based in Minneapolis. Loan recipients will need to match the Center's loans on a dollar for dollar basis with their own funds. In addition to providing financing, the Center will also coordinate a team of technical assistance providers tailors to the individual needs of the business venture.

Loan will be available for business projects that involve the production, distribution, marketing and manufacture of food products that include a minimum of one ingredient grown within 100 miles of Minneapolis.

In order to qualify for the loans, prospective recipients will work with MCCD to develop proposals for the use of funds. MCCD will review the proposal, determine financial viability, and process the loan request.

MCCD is proposing to launch the Homegrown Business Development Center on a pilot basis. During its pilot phase, the Center will provide assistance for up to 24 business projects. The assistance is intended to enable participating business to move their project to the next level of development.

Discussion

There was a general discussion in which the following points and suggestions were made:

- There could be some great opportunities for the match that entrepreneurs would be asked to make. "Slow Money" could be one source. The money could be from non-traditional sources.
- There could be a strong synergy between the City allowing more urban agriculture related land uses and providing financial assistance. The City's role in food regulation could also be synergistic.
- A question was raised about whether the program could fund growers or just processers.

- Technical assistance for growing is a need. The Resource Hubs currently being developed might be able to fill that role.
- The extension office and AURI could be good resources
- There was a discussion about financing of local ingredients verses local businesses. It was generally felt that local businesses have a variety of resources available to them, so this program would be focused on local ingredients.
- A question was raises about whether or not the program could be used to help businesses that are auxiliary to urban agriculture operations.
- A comment was made that some businesses may find benefits in remaining small because of the Pickle Bill which allows them to make \$5000 or less with little regulation.
- It was suggested the business be required to prove that the follow "best practices" (like limited or no use of pesticides). Eventually, perhaps, a Homegrown "seal of approval" could be developed.
- It was suggested that Minneapolis could work with other cities like Seattle or Chicago to develop shared development regulations or guidelines/resources.
- It was suggested that this financing and other Homegrown efforts could lead to a demonstration project.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Robin thanked everyone for their participation.