

Urban Agriculture Text Amendment Ordinance Sunset Date Public Hearing before the Planning Commission Oct 11 2017

Pima County Food Alliance basic goals are good. To allow and encourage local agriculture which this city was based on. They do admit that "We could undoubtedly say and do more on this issue". A large number of comments contained desires to have chickens which was allowed for in this ordinance along with gardening. However, it continues to be very restrictive on other forms of poultry seemingly based on some arbitrary bases (one duck equals two chickens when ducks often are the same size as chickens and more hardy). What this ordinance does lack is allowances for some other bigger farm animals which have traditionally been a mainstay of Tucson agriculture. Instead it limits which farm animals and that they must be miniatures. The good comments that are attributed to chickens equally or even more so relate to the other farm animals. People should have the opportunities to experience them as well. This ordinance does not allow that. This is a weakness in the ordinance.

There apparently has not been any research done on how these measures have effected long time Ag feed stores businesses. For instance, have noted that ACE now sells chicks and chicken feed which has been one of the seasonal cash making sales of local feed stores. Also, feed stores depend on people buying for all kinds of farm and domestic animals. With the city clamping down more on what kinds of animals can be raised in the city and the city having the largest population of people in the county, that surely must have effect on the bottom line of locally owned feed store businesses. Businesses which employ people. This needs to be evaluated or assumed and the ordinance be less restrictive about keeping larger diversity of farm animals .

For the chicken people this ordinance has been somewhat beneficial even as it puts unrealistic limits on the numbers of chickens needed to be self sustaining for a family. As it is written now most people can not have a functioning farm.

Apparently it has finally educated people that they are not suppose to have roosters in the city, which were about half the complaints in the statistics of the past thus seeing complaint numbers go down. It certainly has scared people into not having any livestock which cuts into businesses such as feed stores that depends on people having livestock. And by people not being able to have sustainable numbers of livestock or chickens it does not really fulfill the goals of having people be able to feed themselves through diverse farming, which includes the natural cycles of animal waste feeding the soils that feed the plants that feed the people.

Questions:

Has it fixed the problems with the other animals or just driven them more under ground?

Why can people not have a dairy or meat goat but must only have pygmy goats which due to size do not provide as much food to people?

Why are not other farm animals allowed that are traditional part of the food chain or were the backbone of nearly all civilizations like the sheep.

Can the chicken and gardening part be allowed to move into permanent code while the rest has a new sunset to work out how to have more diversity in farm animals allowed?

This ordinance needs far more sustainability written into it before it becomes a permanent part of city codes. It was a request two years ago and agreed to by the city and after one meeting was never followed up on. Therefore, am asking that a new sunset date be applied to this ordinance while the issues have questioned are addressed. This request would not harm the people that are for the ordinance and would allow time to create an even more food sustaining ordinance for the future needs of society based on the growing awareness that people need to get back to the basic of food growing which includes all domestic farm animals.

Beryl Baker
farmer since left WA Ag school