

Urban Food Zoning Code Update: Summary of Concept Report Questionnaire

Prepared by the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
October 2011

This paper summarizes the results of over 800 questionnaires collected as part of the public review of the Urban Food Zoning Code Update Concept Report. The purpose of the questionnaire was to test the ideas and regulatory “direction” presented in the Concept Report. Although very valuable information was collected, this survey is not representative of all residents of Portland because it was a self-selected group. Inclusion in the summary that follows does not indicate project staff support.

General comments that crossed all topic areas are presented first followed by comments received on the five individual topic areas; market gardens, community gardens, farmers markets, food membership distribution sites, and animals/bees.

General Comments

There was widespread support for the types of food cultivation and distribution discussed in this report. The overwhelming majority of those who commented cited benefits of locally grown produce, whether it was homegrown or purchased. Benefits mentioned included health, affordability and community-building effects. Many of these benefits were also cited for food buying clubs, community supported agriculture (CSA) and raising animals and bees.



Concerns about over-regulation. Many comments—in all the topic areas—raised concerns about over-regulation, or about any regulation at all. A number of comments suggested that decisions be made by neighborhood associations or those living close to an activity. Problems with the complaint driven system of code enforcement for animals and bees was also mentioned.

Market Gardens

Market Gardens are gardens or orchards where food is grown to be sold. It may be sold directly to consumers, restaurants, and stores. Market gardens tend to be more intensively cultivated and smaller scale than typical farms. A market garden can be the primary use on a property or an accessory use to a primary use such as a house or an office building.

Direction: Allow market gardens in more locations, including institutional sites (schools, religious organizations, medical centers). Ensure compatibility with residential areas by limiting the size to 5,000 square feet. This number was chosen because a typical Portland city lot is 50 x 100 ft.

1. Is this the right direction?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		83.7%	612
No		16.3%	119

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

Most, if not all who responded “no” actually supported the direction but did not agree with a size limitation of 5,000 sq. ft. for market allowed by right in residential areas.

“Community garden” was used in several written responses suggesting there may have been some confusion about the definitions.



Most were supportive of allowing market gardens—and not limiting the size—for many of the same reasons people supported community gardens:

- Access to food nearby saves transportation money and energy
- Growing food on vacant lots/yards is a good use of land
- Increases access to food
- Good for school children to learn about growing food
- Supports local economy
- Healthier
- Brings communities together
- Helps institutions financially

A number of people suggested limiting spraying, requiring organic practices, limiting use of heavy machinery and testing for soil contamination.

There were also mentions of the need for a buffer between a market garden and houses, as well as traffic/parking issues and vermin.

2. Is 5,000 sq. ft. the right size for market gardens in residential areas?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		52.8%	361
No		47.2%	323

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’






People who said “yes” thought 5,000 sq. ft. seemed to be the right size to allow enough space for food to be grown, but not interfere with the residential character of neighborhoods, generate a lot of traffic, etc. There were some references to market gardens as quasi-commercial operations. Some respondents were concerned about the Urban Growth Boundary and impact on housing costs.

Larger size may be appropriate in other situations, such as institutions; some comments encouraged a permit system for larger sites.

Those who thought there should be a limit, but 5,000 sq. ft. was too small, supported maximums from 10,000 sq. ft. to one acre.

People who said “no” thought there should not be limits on size; market gardens are compatible with residential uses. Also, many areas of city have larger lots and institutions have larger sites.

3. What types of areas do you think market gardens should be allowed?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Open Space (i.e.parks, golf courses)		89.8%	650
Single-Dwelling Areas, such as Sellwood, Laurelhurst and Council Crest neighborhoods		95.9%	694
Mutli-Dwelling Areas, such as along major streets like SE122nd Avenue and the North Interstate Light Rail Corridor		93.5%	677
Commercial Areas		82.9%	600
Areas where there is light industry		74.2%	537



Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

Most said that market gardens should be allowed in all zones, but many added the caveat that they should not be near pollution causing activities. Several kinds of pollution were mentioned frequently: Pollution from proximity to busy streets, from proximity to industry, and, especially from toxins already in the soil. The most frequent concern was about soils in industrial areas, followed by general concern about the need for soil testing generally.

The reasons for supporting the direction to locate Market Gardens in all or most zones were the same as the reasons for supporting Market Gardens in general—access to food, use of vacant land, economic development, etc.

Some felt parks should remain open to all, used for recreation, natural areas or, perhaps, community gardens and not be used for personal profit.

4. In residential areas, do you think produce should be sold on site, as at a farm stand?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		88.4%	620
No		11.6%	81

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

A number of people read the question as whether we should require on-site sales, rather than allowing it.

A lot of the “yes” responses were "yes, but with limitations." Many of the “no” responses were actually “yes's.”

Most common concerns mentioned were traffic, parking and hours of operation. Other concerns included size and appearance of the stands, noise, signage and that they should only be able to sell what was grown on site.

Almost all those firmly opposed to on-site sales said it was because the sales would turn the area into a commercial area or that sales were incompatible with residential areas. "Same reason we don't allow business with customers to set up shop in a neighborhood," was one comment.

Reasons to support included energy efficiency (not transporting food out of neighborhood or having to drive to get produce); community-building by creating opportunities for neighbors to interact; helping people learn the source of their food; and increased access to healthful food. A number of people support farm stands as a way for the sellers to make money with little investment/overhead.

Other comments included:

- Several noted that farm stands are unlikely to generate much traffic, especially if limited to produce grown on site. Others noted that the more farm stands there are, the less likely people will have to drive to get their produce.
- Several said sales should be limited to produce and products such as eggs; others thought additional products, such as jellies, honey, etc. should be allowed.
- Some favored co-op sites where several farmers could sell, or selling only where people already gather.
- Several mentioned health standards.

5. What types of impacts concern you the most?

Many wrote about CSA drop-offs, food-buying clubs and their positive impacts of increased access to healthy food, community-building, and use of vacant land.

Most common concerns related to:

- Increased car traffic, congestion and parking
- Toxins, including those already in the soil, pesticides/fertilizers/etc. applied to plants and those from air pollution. Many say they would like to require organic practices. Concerns are about the toxicity of the food and the effect of the toxins on groundwater, surrounding property/people.
- Over-regulation
- Hours of operation of farm stands

Other concerns included:

- Vermin
- Smells from poorly-run compost systems, animals, use of manure
- Use of heavy equipment
- Cleanliness/food safety
- Noise
- Visual blight/poor maintenance
- Level of activity/timing of activity
- Vandalism of garden spaces
- People growing pot



Community Gardens

Community Gardens are gardens where any kind of plant is grown—including flowers—and several individuals or households work at the site. The site may be divided into small plots, or gardeners may work together to cultivate the entire property. The land may be publicly owned, as in the Portland Parks and Recreation Community Gardens Program or may be privately owned. The garden might be on the site of a religious institution, a school, corporate park, or medical center.

As with market gardens, community gardens tend to be more intensively cultivated and at a smaller scale than typical farms and they can be a primary or secondary use on a property. The significant distinction between Market and Community Gardens is that food is grown for sale on the former while food from Community Gardens is used for personal consumption and/or donation.

Direction: Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood.

6. Is this the right direction?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		79.7%	546
No		20.3%	139

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

Almost everyone who answered “no” supported community gardens but had concerns about who was going to define “beneficial” and “well integrated.” Many wrote that all community gardens were beneficial to the neighborhood and didn’t want to see a few unhappy neighbors define “well integrated” in such a way that it made community gardens harder to establish and maintain.

Most comments provided clear support for allowing community gardens in most areas/situations in the City and benefits included:

- Access to affordable, healthful food for all Portland residents
- Community building activity
- Educational opportunities to teach people about vegetable gardening and better environmental principles

Other comments included:

- Access to land for community gardens. In particular, there was concern for those who cannot afford land, live in housing without garden space, or live in areas without community garden plots available.
- The hope that this project can help address Portland's unmet demand for community gardens by making it easier to start community gardens everywhere in the city including outside of the city's community garden program.
- A desire to see neighborhood input about the design and location of community gardens to ensure their support.

7. What types of impacts concern you the most?

Most common concerns related to:

- Many people commented that noise, odor and traffic provisions should be created that are congruent with adjacent existing land uses.
- Toxins, including those already in the soil, pesticides/fertilizers/etc. applied to plants, and those from air pollution. Many say they would like to require organic practices. Concerns are about the toxicity of the food grown there, and also the effect of the toxins on groundwater and surrounding property and residents.

Other concerns included:



- Traffic and parking
- Vandalism and theft
- Water accessibility
- Sanitation and food safety
- Visual blight/poor maintenance
- Vandalism of garden spaces
- Vermin

Farmers Markets

Farmers markets are events that occur on a regular basis in the same location. Markets may occur only during the growing season or year-round. Market vendors are farmers, ranchers and other agricultural producers who sell food and added-value products, such as jams and jellies they have grown, raised or produced. A few markets allow a limited number of craft vendors who sell hand-made products with materials from Oregon.

Direction: Develop regulations to ensure ample opportunities for farmers markets to occur at appropriate locations throughout the city. Determining appropriate locations includes consideration of traffic, noise and characteristics of the market (i.e. size, duration, customer base)

8. Is this the right direction?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		79.6%	537
No		20.4%	138

Summary of Responses to “Why”

Almost everyone who answered “no” supported farmers markets but had concerns about regulations that would restrict farmers markets.

In addition to general support for farmers markets, there was also support for smaller-scale farmers markets and farm tables/stands in the neighborhood, such as at churches and schools.

Markets should be close to residential neighborhoods with good access to transit.

9. What types of impacts concern you the most?

The major concerns were related to parking and traffic. Other common concerns were noise during set set-up/break down, and litter. Some felt that large commercial operations should not be allowed in residential neighborhoods.

Other concerns included:

- Concern that regulations will inhibit growth of markets or favor larger markets with more political and financial resources
- Large commercial enterprises shouldn't be in residential neighborhoods
- Oversaturation, authenticity of growers



Food Membership Distribution Sites

Food membership distribution sites fall into two categories:

- **Community Supported Agriculture** allows people to buy a "share" of a farm, which entitles them to future produce, meat, eggs, etc. The farmer delivers the "share"—a box or bag of food, usually once a week. In many cases, the farmer delivers multiple shares to one location and individuals go to that distribution site to pick up their shares.
- **Food Buying Clubs** allow people to pool their resources to buy food directly from wholesalers, distributors, or growers, usually at significant savings. While most of the items purchased are bulk or processed foods with a long shelf life, fresh fruits and vegetables can also be included. The growers or distributors typically make deliveries to a single location or distribution point. The club then relies on the volunteer efforts of its members to divide up the food for the participants.

Direction: Allow food membership distribution sites in commercial zones and areas where light industry is allowed. Consider allowing small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas.

10. Is this the right direction?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		54.3%	372
No		45.7%	313

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

Most respondents were supportive of food buying clubs and CSA drop offs. Those who responded “yes” wrote about the benefits of these food membership distribution activities; those who responded “no” were concerned about limiting their size in residential areas and open spaces.

The many benefits of food buying clubs were described as:

- a cost effective way for people to pool their resources to afford more healthful, high quality food
- support for local farmers/producers
- community building activities
- increases food security and reduces reliance on the corporate food provision system
- often provide information on cooking seasonal and/or bulk foods

Food buying clubs and CSA drop-off sites need to be in residential areas because it is convenient for members to walk, ride, or drive short distances. Space in non-residential zones would be prohibitively expensive.

There are many food buying clubs in Portland and they tend to self-regulate their size based on how easily they can operate in the neighborhood. Organizers/hosts are generally considerate of the surrounding area because they want to maintain a good relationship with their neighbors.

There was a variety of ideas about how to regulate the size of distribution sites including: setting a number of days each month that pick-ups can occur at any location (10 days a month max); limiting number of people coming for a pick-up (ideas ranged from 25 to 75); requiring longer pick up windows so traffic is more spread out (ideas ranged from four hours to a number of days).

Clubs should be regulated on the number of people allowed to participate in a “buy” not the total number of members (base it on number of people actually coming to pick-up site).

There are so many different models of how to run food buying clubs and CSA distribution sites that there shouldn't be one-size-fits-all regulations.

Guidelines for reducing impacts to surrounding areas could be available to people hosting pick-ups with the general sentiment that people can resolve issues that arise on a case by case situation and don't need regulations to get along with their neighbors.

11. What types of impacts concern you the most?

The most common responses were:



- The frequency and size of delivery trucks in the neighborhood (most frequently mentioned)
- Traffic and parking in the neighborhood
- A few respondents had concerns about the commercial aspect of this activity in a residential area

Animals and Bees

The animals/bees topic area includes raising bees and a variety of animals in residential areas; the purpose is to harvest food such as honey, eggs, milk, and chickens. Many animals—including chickens, goats, ducks, and rabbits—can be accommodated in residential areas and are increasingly common.

Direction: Clarify and resolve minor problems with existing regulations; consider modifying the neighbor ‘sign-off’ requirement for beekeeping, and consider increasing the number of animals allowed from three to four for good husbandry practices.

12. Is this the right direction?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		91.0%	607
No		9.0%	60

Summary of responses to ‘WHY’

Almost all respondents were supportive of keeping animals and bees in the city. The majority of those who responded “no” had concerns about additional regulations. Only about 25% of those who responded “no” had significant concerns about livestock in the city.

A number of people cited the role honey bees play in our eco and food systems as well as the benefits to raising one’s own food and many provided information on details of beekeeping and animal husbandry.

Many were concerned about the condition of animals and stressed the importance of good husbandry practices.

Education about animals/bees is needed; both for people taking on these activities, as well as for neighbors to understand impacts (behavior of bees and health concerns).

Almost all supported reducing—or eliminating—the 100% neighbor sign-off for beekeeping. There are equity issues with this approach. Two similarly situated individuals would be treated differently simply based on who their neighbor is. Discrimination based on race, gender, etc. could come into play.

Almost all supported increasing number of chickens allowed without a permit from three to four. Many thought even more would be okay, particularly if one had a large lot.

13. What types of impacts concern you the most?

The major concerns were related to animal noises and smells and livestock attracting rats, raccoons and other nuisance wildlife into the neighborhood, and concern for those with severe allergies to bee stings.

Other concerns included:

- Neighbors impact on their enjoyment of their yard and house (if animals/bees were too close)
- Health issues including diseases and sensitivity to bee stings.
- People not having the skills to maintain safe, clean, environment for animals that minimize negative impacts to surrounding area (vermin, smells, animals getting out of pens and wandering into street and neighboring yards)



URBAN FOOD ZONING CODE UPDATE CONCEPT REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE



Please use this questionnaire to provide your comments on the Concept Report. The report provides a framework for discussing the regulations that apply to growing, selling and purchasing healthful food. Below, each topic area includes a project direction and set of questions; the directions are still conceptual and will guide the development of the actual Zoning Code language. Are we on the right track? Your input is very important!

The questionnaire is also available online at www.portlandonline.com/bps/foodcode. To be included in the public review summary, comments must be received by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, August 15, 2011. Send your questionnaire or other written comments to:

Julia Gisler, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201
julia.gisler@portlandoregon.gov



1. Market Gardens are gardens or orchards where food is grown to be sold. It may be sold directly to consumers, restaurants, and stores. Market gardens tend to be more intensively cultivated and smaller scale than typical farms. A market garden can be the primary use on a property or an accessory use to a primary use such as a house or an office building.

Direction: Allow market gardens in more locations, including the sites of institutions (schools, religious organizations, medical centers). Ensure compatibility with residential areas by limiting the size to 5,000 square feet. This number was chosen because typical Portland city lots are 50 x 100 ft.

1. Is this the right direction? (mark one)

Yes No

Why? _____

2. Is 5,000 sq. ft. the right size for market gardens in residential areas? (check one)

Yes No

Why? _____

3. Check the types of areas where you think market gardens should be allowed:

- Open Space (i.e. parks, golf courses)
- Single-Dwelling Areas, such as Sellwood, Laurelhurst and Council Crest neighborhoods
- Mutli-Dwelling Areas, such as along major streets like SE122nd Avenue and the North Interstate Light Rail Corridor
- Commercial Areas
- Areas where there is light industry

4. In residential areas, do you think produce should be sold on site, as at a farm stand? (check one)

Yes No

Why? _____

5. What types of impacts concern you the most?

2. Community Gardens are gardens where any kind of plant is grown—including flowers—and several individuals or households work at the site. The site may be divided into small plots, or gardeners may work together to cultivate the entire site. The land may be publicly owned, as in the Portland Parks and Recreation Community Gardens Program or may be privately owned. The garden might be on the site of a religious institution, a school, corporate park, or medical center.

As with market gardens, community gardens tend to be more intensively cultivated and at a smaller scale than typical farms and they can be a primary or accessory use. The significant distinction between Market and Community Gardens is that food is grown for sale on the former while food from Community Gardens is used for personal consumption and/or donation.

Direction: Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood.

6. Is this the right direction? (check one)

Yes No

Why? _____

7. What types of impacts concern you the most?

The Concept Report is available online at www.portlandonline.com/bps/foodcode and at the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at 1900 SW 4th Avenue, 7th floor. Call 503-823-7700 to have a copy mailed to you.



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

City of Portland, Oregon
Sam Adams, Mayor • Susan Anderson, Director



TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 1: Allow market gardens in more locations, including the sites of institutions (schools, religious organizations, medical centers). Ensure compatibility with residential areas by limiting the size to 5,000 square feet. This number was chosen because typical Portland city lots are 50 x 100 ft - Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"

18th / 19th century European paradigm was energy efficient.

a size limit is most enforceable and most reasonable rather than spatial limitation (1 per x-foot/mile radius)

Absolutely. They can be a wonderful asset to a neighborhood's livability. Provide a close connection with nature and growing plants.

Access to healthy, affordable vegetables outside of stores and brings neighbors together to meet and pick up veggies

Access to locally grown produce!

Accessibility to locally grown food is vitally important for many reasons, including supporting a vibrant urban culture.

Allow market gardens in more locations but not sure why size must be limited.

Allow more and more locations.

Allow more. Land is becoming scarcer, food more expensive and transportation difficult. Having access to food close to where we live is just sensible.

Allowing a wider variety of locations is absolutely the right thing to do. A size limit is unnecessary - market conditions should drive the size. If they are not popular they will remain smaller, if they are very popular they should be allowed to expand.

Allowing for more market gardens certainly seems right! Not sure about the size...

Allowing market gardens allows for food to be obtained in an easier fashion while knowing who and where it comes from

Allowing market gardens in a variety of settings throughout the city will increase our local food security, decrease dependence on fossil fuels for transportation, strengthen communities, and bring healthy food to communities who may not already have access to fresh foods.

Allowing market gardens in more locations has the potential to increase citizen access to fresh produce as well as increase responsible stewardship of Portland property

Allowing market gardens makes productive use of the land, particularly if a market garden is cultivated on an otherwise empty lot.

allowing market gardens, yes. limiting their size, no.

Allowing more areas to be market gardens is good for communities. I don't like the idea of putting limits on the size.

Allowing more locations would be extremely beneficial to the city and its residents.

Allowing more market gardens is a great idea. The more access farmers/gardeners have to land, the more secure Portland and its residents will be.

Allows "vacant" lots to be used in new, beneficial ways. Contains potential gardens from being too unwieldy.

Allows fresh local food to be accessible in more areas. Helps organizations find more purposeful activities for members.

Allows more access to affordable, healthy food. I'm not sure about size - seems like there shouldn't be a need to limit the size. My one concern would be the use of pesticides and potential runoff to water table and the rivers. I would like to see organic practices encouraged.

And allow bigger so long as loud equipment is somehow excluded.

Any available piece of ground should be a potential garden of any kind, if a person is willing to work that ground. There is no sound reason to limit gardens to a specific area of a city, especially Portland.

Any way to increase access to locally grown food is a step in the right direction.

anyone should be able to have one that wants one!

As a city, we should be removing barriers to local food production of all types.

As the price of fuel continues to increase, the cost of transportation of food to urban centers where it is primarily needed and consumed will become increasingly expensive. In the future, food will need to be grown more within urban areas, or immediate surroundings, in order to support increasing population and limit increasing cost. It will become more prohibitive to ship food across the country, so we will need an increasing variety of food grown and sold here in Portland.
Bad question. Should allow more gardens and NOT allow the size. Why limit the size of the source of your food?
Because it is vital that we grow more food closer to where Portland's citizens live as the industrial food system continues to fail with declining energy.
Because of rising food costs, poor economy, and an overabundance of unhealthy food, it's important to allow Portland residents to either grow their own food and collaborate with other residents to grow food together.
Because we all need to eat local, healthy food rather than de-vitalized, corporatized, agro-business products.
Because we live in America
Because we need to enhance access to local food options and support localvore philosophy.
Because we need to grow more food in our urban environment.
Because we should eat food that was grown as locally as possible. I especially like the idea of kids learning to grow food in school.
better access to healthy food
Better utilization of land
But - if an area has room for more than one market can more be added? Spacing?
But a limit is not needed. If there is somehow more land, amazingly available, please let people create food, flowers, livestock. A market garden whether small raised beds or a larger lot enhances a neighborhood and makes people happy, which is more than compatible. Especially other institutions should have no size limit.
But I don't think there should be a limit to the size of the garden.
but I feel more in support of the institution sites than residential sites - many variables to consider that could disrupt normal residential settings
Certainly market gardens should be allowed. Why are they restricted in the first place? If all the vacant lots in the city were converted to gardens or orchards the air would be cleaner and we would be closer to supporting our needs as a city within our own borders.
Definitely allow these gardens anywhere possible. Market gardens are definitely nicer to look at than overgrown lots. Teaching people to grow their own food is good for the people, community, and city as a whole because fresh vegetables equal healthy people that are more involved.
Don't put a limit on size that small
Encourage urban farming/gardening for health and education.
Encourages and explicitly allows gardens, with an established "normal" size.
Encourages eating local or home grown, sustains local economy, healthier, reasonable.
Encouraging localized food production reduces use of energy for transportation, allows greater diversity in food options and healthier options as well. At the same time, it is important to keep such activities appropriate for residential settings.
Encouraging more gardens is great but why does the city need to get involved? Let consumer demand determine where and how these markets develop.
facilitation of more food producing land
Feeding people food that is healthy and grown where they can see and interact with it is important. One of the best places to do that is in schools. Children get hands-on experience with all phases of food production and get to eat the end results. Another thing that happens is when people grow their own food they remember their connection to the land and all its bounty. We've forgotten that connection to our detriment.
Food production is a great use of underutilized land which will increase the visibility of local food production and promote healthy food choices. It also also increases entrepreneurial options in the city.
Food security is increased by market gardens.
Food security will be increased by having more food produced within the city. Any disruption to our supply of imported food, through terrorists or natural disasters can be partially mitigated through a strong local food system

<p>Fresh, local produce should be made available to as many people as possible. As fossil fuel consumption, obesity rates and chronic weight-related diseases have plagued our country in recent years, it is evident that what we put in our mouths - and where it comes from - is one of the most crucial issues on the table.</p>
<p>gardens should be everywhere</p>
<p>Giving schools, religious organizations and medical centers broad permission to begin market gardens reduces food deserts, diversifies the food supply, tackles obesity, encourages environmental sustainability and enables financial self-sufficiency. While bringing communities together!</p>
<p>Great to have a market garden. Allow for adjacent 5k plots depending on the situation. Orchards should be able to spread naturally - priority should not be given to cars (a road can easily be made into a one-way in order to make sure the perimeter of the garden isn't getting too much pounding close by.</p>
<p>Greater accessibility to food in the neighborhood is always a good thing</p>
<p>Group buying is a sustainable practice. It is more affordable, it creates community and it allows us to have a smaller footprint on the earth.</p>
<p>Grow small business, buy local, sustain communities</p>
<p>Having a connection to our food is critical for long term sustainability.</p>
<p>Healthy food should be grown throughout the city in as many places as possible.</p>
<p>hospitals and schools and all places with worthless expanses of grass currently is being sadly underutilized. There should be some encouragement towards making unused spaces productive.</p>
<p>However, I would not limit the size to 50 x 100ft.</p>
<p>I agree with specifically allowing institutions to have market gardens. I agree soil testing should be required.</p>
<p>I agree with the proliferation of market gardens for reasons of food security, education and livability. However, I don't think it is necessary to explicitly LIMIT their size, if Portland zoning provides a de facto limit, and if larger gardens are not hazardous.</p>
<p>I agree, but think that the space allowed for the market gardens should be larger. Many lots are larger than 50x100 ft, especially in E Portland or in church lots. These spaces would be ideal for market gardens and I would hate to see them shutdown because they are too large.</p>
<p>I believe that these gardens make the neighborhood appealing and encourage small garden businesses</p>
<p>I don't think we should limit the size</p>
<p>I feel we need to create more fresh produce options for the community. This can also be good for the general health of the local population, providing access to more nutritious and lower cost foods.</p>
<p>I like the idea of allowing market gardens in more locations, but I don't see any reason to limit the size to 5,000 square feet. There are several double lots and other irregularly sized parcels of land that might be larger than 5,000 sq ft, but great for market gardens.</p>
<p>I love the small farmers markets that have sprung up all over the city, every day of the week. Have more fresh food in all of our neighborhoods is a good thing. People seeing small scale farming as an economic opportunity is a good thing.</p>
<p>I support both an increase in market gardens as an alternative to commercially-produced food, and as a means of increasing urban visibility of alternative food sources.</p>
<p>I think if we have fertile soil in the city, and people are willing to create a market garden, this will allow our children to actually see how food is created, giving them access to healthier choices in their diet!</p>
<p>I think it is important for more people to connect with where their food comes from and it is an innovative opportunity for education and helping the community. I am concerned by the potential for the added use of chemicals and pesticides and what that means for quality of life.</p>
<p>I think market gardens are a great idea. I think they are wonderful learning tools for schools and can also be integrated into healthier school lunches. I definitely think allowing these in more locations is a good idea.</p>
<p>I would explicitly add "residences" to the list of locations. For example, some apartment complexes may be excellent sites for market gardens.</p>
<p>I would like to see the limit per sq.ft. double though, to 10,000 sq ft</p>
<p>If soil testing is done</p>
<p>In addition to making more local food available and providing some income for growers, it adds texture and interest to neighborhoods, provides ways for neighbors to meet and talk, and teaches by example.</p>

In an larger urban area such as Portland, one of the toughest challenges (in looking to a future of declining oil production and taking action again global warming) is going to be how to grow more the food we need close to where we live. We need to enable citizens to grow food everywhere they would like to and ensure that knowledge on how to grow food gets spread. We'll be much more able to cope with a difficult future if many of us re-learn to grow (even a portion of) our own food. Yes, institutions often have unused "grassy" areas that aren't all that aesthetic either. What better use than growing food in those places for local consumption and potentially as a learning too.
In this era of increasing food insecurity and and high transportation costs, it is important to cultivate and supply the demand for local food
Increased urban food production has a wide range of benefits. I understand the reasoning behind limiting size to 5,000 sq ft, but I don't think it should be a hard-fast rule. There are plenty of examples of larger market gardens that serve a range of other needs (Learning Gardens, CROPS farm, etc.). Denser urban areas should have smaller market gardens, but don't limit opportunities for larger market gardens.
Increasing access is a good thing!
Increasing access to locally grown food benefits the buying public who has interest in buying locally grown food.
Increasing food security is important NOW, before the price of transporting food becomes excessive.
Is the size restriction necessary?
It allow open space to be used for agraculture . Small business to make a prophet with little over head . If you farm you only have a few months to make money .
it allows people to be closer to their food
It codifies what should be an acceptable use of land.
It creates community, reduces food transportation cost & protects more green spaces
It IS important to ensure compatibility with residential areas.
It is part of what Portland is made of. It's aesthetically pleasant. It is not up to the city to make ordinances that have nothing to do with hurting oneself, another, or their property.
It is so important for families to have every opportunity to purchase local food from growers they can meet face to face.
It makes a good use of the land -- our current food system is unsustainable. Fresh, locally grown food is an important part of making it so.
It makes our community more tight-knit, uniting producers and consumers and contributes significantly to the general livability of Portland.
It tends to humanize.
it would allow more people to help their neighbors and themselves with fresher produce, eggs, flowers etc. to keep building healthier lives and living conditions.
it's a good thing!
It's healthy for the community, builds friendships and friendliness. helps you help your neighbor and visa versa. provides top quality foods fresh and in season. gives us more freedom.
it's more green space.
Keeping food production as local and available as possible is the most sustainable path for our communities to acquire fresh food while supporting local economy as well as decreasing fuel and shipping costs.
kids and grownups alike need to know that food comes from fields and orchards and does not arrive in trucks at the corner market magically
Land is otherwise wasted when it can be used for production and community activity.
Let's make fresh, local food more easily accessible.
Local foods are better for many reasons like freshness equals better taste and less gas, etc is used
Localizing, downsizing, and diversifying food production are all important goals. Market gardens should be encouraged.
Locally grown food stimulates the economy
Locally produced food is good for all of us.
Locally producing food is a great way to build resilience into our city, support local economies, provide food efficiently unlike the current centralized system where the average food item is from over 1000 miles away and provided by large, heavily subsidized corporations.

Lovely to look at for the neighbors, as well as more likely to be organic or low-spray.
Many institutions are poorly or under funded. Allowing them to use their gardens as market gardens would help ensure a more solid financial future.
Market gardens are a low-impact, low-overhead method of increasing the sustainability and livability of neighborhoods, particularly those located in areas with low current access to fresh produce ("food deserts").
Market gardens are a non-polluting source of revenue for neighborhoods which will also make healthy fresh food accessible to more urban residents.
Market gardens are an important part of a sustainable, local, food economy.
Market gardens can provide jobs, help cool the city
Market gardens should be allowed in "more locations".
May consider an even larger size than 5000 sq ft
More access to garden produce within our neighborhoods. I would allow them to be bigger if needed.
More food production within city limits is absolutely essential. The Portland area population is expected to double by 2050 so we need to establish and develop areas of local food production now to ensure they will exist and provide for the urban residents as the city becomes more densely populated.
More fresh food in more places --sounds like a great idea to me.
more fresh, local food is a great idea!!!
more garden infill is good
More gardens can only be good for the city - it means more people eating fresh, local foods and relying less on food that is trucked in from elsewhere.
More gardens mean an increase in biodiversity as well as food security.
More gardens means greater access
More gardens means healthier living for portland residents, and I'm all for healthier living.
More gardens means more people getting back to the land and more happy people.
More gardens the better!
More local food, less fossil fuels, more jobs for locals, more green areas, opportunity for community education about food systems and nutrition.
more locations a good idea, have to grow more food locally for future of the planet, not sure about siz
More locations, yes. Limiting the size, NO.
More market gardens = yes!
more market gardens are a great idea! When people experience more where food comes from it increases healthy decisions.
More market gardens mean more food for more people, and more knowledge about how food is grown for more people.
More market gardens should be allowed. Growing our own food rather than relying on farm intensive areas outside the city is much more sustainable and gentle on the landscape (if done right)
More options for local foods, grown by local people, helps keep money in the community .
More people will be able to access the market
--More productive land use than lawns --Reduces food insecurity --Possibility of creating income-producing work
More urban spaces allowed to grow food for sale means even people who don't have time or space to garden can still eat locally grown food.
Moving toward Food Self Sufficiency has many positive enefits, not the least is that we don't have to depend on 1500 - 3000 mile supply lines.
Must be organic. Can be a temporary use. If permanent, then there should be limits on structures and design standards.
Need to make it easier to produce as much food locally as possible, using low-impact (i.e. non-chemical) methods.
No limit.
no size limit, the bigger the better
Opening up as much underutilized space that could be suitable for farming to that use is crucial to address local food and local self sufficiency concerns.
People need to be more aware of their food source to be happy.
People should be able to grow food on residential property & sell it.

Plenty of potential, small plots in Portland that could be utilized for this.
Prevalent market gardens teach people about the ecological and physical health of the community.
Right direction - but size limitation seems short-sighted.
Seems like a practical way to get more community involved, local food.
Seems to be a good temporary use for under-utilized lots within the City.
Should be a cheap and easy process to get variance to increase size of garden--esp for orchards. I can imagine a large orchard built on 3 lots where dilapidated buildings were torn down. This would be an attractive asset
Should not be limited in size. There are waiting lists for community garden plots. What "compatibility" are you worried about? Why arbitrarily limit food growing capacity?
Size is appropriate, use is well-defined.
Small, local production is good.
Startup costs for any business can be substantial. Taking this direction can foster educational and vocational opportunities for more people with the gardens, and also show people how to capitalize on their work by taking the product to the marketplace.
Stronger communities, better access to real, fresh food in those areas with fewer grocery stores, increased cost of gas, etc.
Supports local food and a a diverse food supply. Overall it supports greater food security.
Sustainability and minimizing our use of carbon producing fuels requires that we develop many sites in the urban environment. Also, people love to see food growing, it lifts the spirit.
The activity's size should follow the general pattern of the housing around it. 5,000 square feet is the size of lots in the R5 zone.
The closer food can be grown to where it is eaten, the more sustainable the food is. People should be able to have fresh food within walking distance.
The closer people are to the food they consume the better.
the cost of shipping drives up the cost of food.
the more access to local food the better!
The more easier access in a neighborhood, the better (to reduce traffic and encourage walking as well as developing community relationships)
The more food gardens there are in the city the better. However, I do not think the size should be limited to 5000 sq ft. They should be able to be as large as the lot allows.
The more food we can grow for ourselves, the less need we have for outside food sources which are usually less nutritious, less sustainable(food miles) and less risk of contamination (knowing your farmer heightens awareness of food safety and production)
The more gardens the better!
The more gardens, the better! Especially at the sites of institutions--like schools--both ones where it can be integrated with students attending and at those sites where the school facility has been closed and the school just sits there, wasted space.
the more local food we can grow for the residents, the better
The more markets, the better.
The more opportunities to grow food and potentially make income the better.
The more outlets we have, the more local food we can bring to all areas - especially the "food deserts" that the urban poot live in.
The more the better, I think.
The more urban land used for food production the better.
The young are the most concern because they are the legacy for tomorrow .Also to change the family perspective or orientation we need to start by the Kids. The change can impact all if the young ,kids have been involvement at the biginning...
There are not enough farms in and very close to Portland to provide all the fresh local produce that people living in Portland wish to consume. It is important for sustainability to have as much local produce grown within the city as possible.
There should not be a 5,000 square foot limit.
They are doing this exact thing in Seattle and it is working great!

This decision will increase the city of Portland's potential for self-sustaining food production.
This is an acceptable size for such an endeavor, not so large as to be overwhelming and not so small the proposed activity would be rendered ridiculous to attempt.
This is headed in the right direction, but not far enough. Here in the Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood we have numerous large tillable lots juxtaposed to higher density housing. In an area where nearly 80% of David Douglass students are on free or reduced lunch, we would go a long way in meeting food security needs by having closer access to fresh fruits and vegetables.
This makes good use of vacant sites, it pleasing to see, and allows for residents to grow their own food (relying less on foods that must be transported into the city).
This seems like this would be enough allowable space to have a plot for many people.
this type of use should be allowed in residential areas as well as other areas in the city
This will allow more organizations to become self-sufficient and sustainable.
To encourage more people to grow their own food. This will help make it convenient and easy.
To me, restricting market gardens in any way is contrary to what is needed in these difficult times.
Urban agriculture is one sensible method of addressing community food needs.
urban gardening and production of food ultra locally is important for creating a self reliant sustainable local food economy.
Utilization of space, connection with food system, beautify city/urban areas
We absolutely need more cultivation but should NOT limit the size!!!
We all need to reduce our dependence on oil and growing food locally is a great way to do that; also, it will encourage children, etc. to eat more healthily and learn where their food comes from. In addition, it could become an income source for the many un- and underemployed people, while satisfying the increasing community demand for local produce.
We can acquire a number of lots in the area to produce more food if needed. 5000 ft is perfect.
We don't have enough good fresh food available at reasonable prices that are healthy for us.
we have a flower grower in our neighborhood and it has a wonderful impact on the neighborhood
We have a ugly vacant home on a 3rd of an acre across the street, The neighbors would love to see garden there
we have to begin to feed ourselves and stop trucking food from other countries.
We must increase the amount of food we produce locally!
We need more local food. There is no better direction to go. Good job!
We need more market gardens, but residents don't need a lot of traffic.
We need more options for locally grown food. This helps the economics of the farmers, and helps the health of the consumer. This is definitely the way to go.
We need more sources of good cheap vegetables and we need to make good use of property.
We need more super-local food production. Having many smaller gardens increases food security and shrinks the environmental footprint of production and distribution.
We need policies that do not separate us further from the food we eat. Living amidst orchards and gardens would not only add beauty to our community, but would encourage a more healthy consumption of food.
We need to be developing food infrastructure close to where we live.
We need to encourage more local production of food and rely less on transporting food long distances. This will help to reduce greenhouse emissions as well as provide income to local people.
We need to focus on local foods availability.
We need to further localize our food production.
We need to have more sustainably and independent business esin agriculture in Portland.
We need to promote more local production of foods.
We need to start producing more locally grown food. It's fresher and overall costs less.
we need to take our lives back
we should do something!
We've been part of gardens at schools and through Parks and both have been great assets to the community and community-builders.
Why have a limit on the size?

why not allow more gardens? Our young kids need to be taught how to work the soil. I wasn't taught as a child and I spent a lot of time trying to learn as an adult.
With operating standards to mitigate pesticides and soil contamination.
With the increase of harmful additives in commercially produced food, there is a great need for people to be able to have access to safely grown local food - whether from their own gardens, market gardens or similar.
Yes allowing more market gardens in more locations will increase our access to fresh & local foods, which will in turn help sustain our local economy & the health of our community.
yes and no. allow market gardens in more locations. Residents decide on compatabilty "issues" - no regulation of size
Yes and no. Allow the gardens in more locations, but don't limit the size based on a lot size. If there is a double lot that can be a market garden, there is no reason to restrict it in the name of "compatibility". I'd be happy to see a small farm in my North Portland neighborhood.
Yes but let the gardens be bigger. Some of us have lots bigger than 50x100.
Yes! Definitely! There is so much urban land that can grow vegies. We need this for health, economy, and many other interconnecting food needs.
Yes, although size shouldn't necessarily be limited to 5,000 square feet. There are many larger lots (e.g. in the Cully neighborhood) where individuals as well as the local community would benefit from the implementation of larger market gardens.
yes, but there should not be ANY limit of the size and this should include residences.
Yes, I think it is good policy to encourage agriculture in the city, because of environmental benefits (clean air, less transportation) and to expose more city dwellers to the process of growing and producing crops.
Yes, it is the right direction. Please make legal what is already happening all over the city.
Yes, micro farms (market gardens) are better for the environment than large farms and a make great, viable small business!
Yes, more food grown by more people on smaller scale is a great way to keep us all healthy and happy!
YES, most commercial food is not as nutritious as that available fresh and picked ripe not green
Zoning regulations should be generally relaxed to allow more urban agriculture under more conditions.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 1: Allow market gardens in more locations, including the sites of institutions (schools, religious organizations, medical centers). Ensure compatibility with residential areas by limiting the size to 5,000 square feet. This number was chosen because typical Portland city lots are 50 x 100 ft - Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "NO"

Accommodate double lots, like Arindne (sp?) Garden.

Allow market gardens in more locations: residences, roadside stands. or businesses I pick up produce at a CSA site which is a residence.

Arbitrary 5000 ft limit, some locales have much larger lots.

At this size just for personal use

because if an institution wants to participate they may have a larger plot of land. Anyone should be able to produce food for themselves or sale at any level.

Churches and a number of collective yards are on larger spaces. I don't see any real reason for that number and it seems randomly chosen.

closer food to the consumer means less shipping, greater diversity, and better flavor.

Community gardens would be limited in size and not allow them to grow for multiple families. As hard times fall on all of us it is important that we can feed ourselves and our neighbors.

Cultivation of food is more important than a pristine lawn.

DO allow market gardens in all locations. Do NOT limit size to 5000 sq. feet. Many lots in outer Portland are 1 acre or more. Many schools and institutions have much more space than this and could use more food than what is grown on 5000 sq. ft.

Do not limit the market garden. Planning for a typical lot is like planning for the typical child, no two are just alike.

Do not limit the peoples capacity to grow food.

Don't limit size

Don't limit the size.

don't put a limit on size - rather, adopt a buffer system depending on the size of the lot

Dont think there should be restrictions on residential areas.

Don't want those limitations

Efficiency of scale will improve with larger sizes of gardens. This kind of restriction pre-stifles innovation before there are any problems to solve or work-around.

First of all, why limit the maximum size in the first place? If there's 40 acres that are empty in the city, are there good reasons a farm shouldn't occupy it? 2nd, if there is going to be a maximum, 5,000 sq ft is way too small. For vegetable operations, which is my field of experience, I'd say about 1 acre is the minimum to steadily employ 1 person full time and actually have that person make some sort of living. So I'd recommend increasing the maximum or getting rid of the maximum all together. There should be other ways of regulating farms in urban areas.

for livability in our city the unique oversized properties give us opportunity to enhance our land usage.

Good intentions, but frankly, the city needs to quit trying to regulated everything and everyone to death.

Grant exceptions to 5000 ft.

Green space shouldn't be so limited, locally grown food is extremely important for the health and well being of Portland's residents.

I agree that there should be more gardens, however, limiting the space to 5000 sq feet is a restriction that is unnecessary.

I agree with allowing market gardens in more locations but I don't think the size limit is realistic. If the institution has more space, it would be great to have larger garden = more produce, more chance at being economically viable

I am in support of allowing market gardens in more locations, but don't necessarily see the logic in limiting the size. If a private party or institution has the space and inclination to turn their lot into a garden or orchard, this can certainly positively impact a community- more plants, more local food. Win-win.

I believe allowing for-profit sale will seriously impact actual farmers.

I don't believe that market gardens are necessarily gardened more intensively.

I don't know why there is a limit - how about people who have larger lots, etc.?

I don't see a reason to limit green spaces, especially when they are functional.

I don't see any need to limit the size of gardens in residential areas. The rest seems fine--allowing them in more places is good.
I farm lots that are larger and smaller than 5000 sq ft. Limiting the size will minimize the number of urban farms.
I think we need to allow smaller sites to make fresh food more available to more consumers. In Lents we want more urban farm lands so the urban farmer may supplement their income, and sell at a farmer's market. We'd also like more access to yard sharing, and a possible economy built around growing and supplying neighbors with fresh produce.
I want more and larger gardens and farms in residential areas. this measure will limit rather than expand them.
I wholeheartedly say yes to allowing market gardens in more locations including those examples listed. However, the 5,000 square feet rule seems somewhat arbitrary and there may be exceptions for those with bigger lots. I wouldn't want to arbitrarily restrict size if it would mean possibly less dedicated growing space allowed. I am in favor of as much land as people want to dedicate to growing food and other goods be allowed. I am unsure of what a satisfactory alternative to this direction might sound like or why size is of such a concern. I will say though that if the choice is to NOT allow more entities to have market gardens unless a limit on size is placed, I would support this rule with reservations rather than continue to <u>limit locations where it is allowed.</u>
I would say 1 acre or less makes sense.
If there are larger lots larger sizes should be permitted. There is little impact from the vegetables. If smells or traffic need to be controlled that is a different issue.
If there is a double lot why not fill it with safe, healthy food?
If there there multi lot or opportunities, they will be missed here.
Im my opinion, our country is over regulated. Growing of produce and having some animals should not be regulated by goverment. Laws in place now and fees charges and licenses required are enough. In fact many should be reversed.
I'm not sure what the purpose is of limiting the lot size? What if a school parking lot is bigger than 5000sqft? Would that mean no market garden?
Individuals with 2 lots should be able to use both for a market garden
It is absurd to limit their size to 5,000 square feet. I could understand limiting the use of heavy machinery, as this is obnoxious. But that's an argument to limit the use of heavy machinery in an urban environment (why do road and construction crews get cut so much slack, anyway?) Surely an intensely cultivated garden could grow larger than 5,000 square feet? In a neighborhood that has more than one city lot left empty *adjacent to another* I'm sure it would be a <u>welcome addition. A neighborhood with that many empty lots needs all the help it can get.</u>
It seems contradictory to say less than 5,000 SF -- and then talk about promoting market gardens at schools, religious orgs, or medical centers that would likely have many more than 5,000 SF of space available, if they desired to create market gardens.
Lack of oversight results in decreased sanitation. Neighbor's chickens equals my rats.
larger gardens may be necessary.
Limiting the size to 5,000 square feet continues to right code for inner Portland lots when the City now has numerous areas with much larger than 5,000 square feet who will be further burdened with limitations on their property. If we truly wish to be sustainable, we must be able to grow food in all parts of the City.
Limits should not be placed upon the size of a market garden. If this type of garden is successful in a specific area, it should have the ability to expand based upon the demand of its consumers.
Many city lots available for garden use are odd-shaped and more than the standard lot size. Why use outdated zoning standards for a non-construction project (gardens)? This limit is unnecessary over-regulation. Allow flexibility to suite the neighborhood and lot.
Markets should be allowed to meet demand at the location
more locations =good idea limiting size=unnecessary
Most lots are already limited by existing buildings. I think larger consideration than size for impact is if they are going to be using fertilizer and pesticides. Unused land around schools or hospitals should be used to produce food, I think it is something to be encouraged as long as the chemicals they are planning to use are limited.
Much too big
Need to allow for larger garden size. At least a double lot in heavily residential areas. Larger yet in places like East Portland.

No restriction.
NO, they are not headed in the right direction. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic
Owners should have the freedom to do what ever they want to do with their own land. This still is America.
people should be able to garden and share their foods with other with NO restriction.
People should be able to grow food wherever there is space. Growing food is a good use of space, much better than just growing lawns.
Please do not impose regulations on Portland citizens ability to purchase food directly from local farmers. It is working fine as is. Any regulations you undertake will involve perhaps unintended but harmful side-effects and will chill the relationship we have with the local farmers whose healthful food we need for the nourishment of our families.
see below
Setting an upper size limit will prevent gardeners from utilizing land on larger lots in R-7, R10 and R20. Larger areas are more viable for growing usefull quantities of food for the community. Agriculture is allowed outright in RF and R20 zones; consider expanding this to R10 and R7 with conditional use in other residential zones(R1, R2 R2.5, etc).
Should allow larger sizes if a lot already exists in excess of 5000 sq ft.
Should not limit to 5,000 sq ft.
Size is only one issue. No problem with the 5000 sqaure foot dimension. Language also needs to include necessity of complying with Dept of Ag standards for agricultural activity (soil samples, etc) and other regulatory bodies that insure safe food handling, etc. Since this is commercial activity, some tie-in to traffic and availability of parking for growers is advisable. A commercial activity should not interfere with primary residential purpose of a neighbor.
Size should not be limited
Some lots are larger than 5,000 sq feet. Could limit farmers leasing/renting from multiple people. 5000 sq feet can be used to feed just one family not including off farm sales
That doesn't seem like enough space for a market garden.
The city should be encouraging everybody everywhere to grow as much food as possible, so allowing more locations for market gardens is good. Organic food gardening is intrinsically compatible with residential areas on any scale. The only restrictions should be on the use of pesticides, herbicides and other chemicals that are NEVER compatible with residential areas. There should be no size limit to organic market gardens.
The direction is right BUT the limitation of 5,000 sq ft is too limiting (too small). For example orchards often can be best served by larger areas. Other people's backyards are larger than that. The limitation should not be based on size.
The direction of allowing more market gardens is the correct direction. But why limit the size to 5,000 sq ft if someone or an organization has a larger lot? I would limit the market gardens to organic only as pesticide/herbicide use could impact neighbors negatively.
The gardens should be larger than 5,000 especially on institutional sites
The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.
The site should *not* be limited to 5,000 square feet as lots at 4,600 would be disadvantaged. No limit should be in place until it's proven a problem. Otherwise, improving accessibility to LOCAL food should be the goal.
The size limit may be too restrictive. There is a scale at which the market garden makes sense, that size may be too small.
The size limitation is too small. It would be more intuitive to limit market gardens to lots larger than a certain size (such as 2,500 square feet). In several zones (such as RF, R20, R10, R7), larger lots are present. These lots are often not further dividable, and few uses of these properties are allowed. Agricultural use and sales are a high use for these properties, and should be allowed outright in these zones. Limiting the size of market gardens to 5,000 may make implementation of market gardening within Portland financially not feasible.

The size limitation!
The size of market gardens should be limited only by the resources of the farmer. The bigger, the better.
The square footage restriction is too stringent and does not allow for better use of large lots in outer East Portland or good adaptive reuse of closed school sites and other similar facilities.
The typical city lot maybe 5000 SF, but that has no relationship to the size of school and medical center parking lots.
There are larger lots and also multiple lots that are undeveloped that may be a perfect place for an urban market garden.
There are many lots larger than 5000sf (like in the Cully neighborhood), or double lots. I don't see why this makes sense.
There are plenty of sites/city lots that are much larger than 5,000 square feet. We currently grow on a neighbors property (10,000 sq. ft.) and at an elementary school we grow 1/2 an acre. It is imperative that we are allowed to grow in backyards, schoolyards, church yards and any other place that was currently not growing food no matter the size. In order for a market garden to be productive and profitable you cannot put restrictions and regulations on size. Then you are forcing those of us who are trying to make a living growing local food for our community even more difficult than it already is. If we could only grow on 5,000 sq. ft. pieces of property that would mean growers like us would have to find more locations, most likely further away from where we live, and that makes our operations much less efficient and unsustainable. We should be encouraging local farmers and market growers to grow on more land, not less. Our community has enough of a problem with food deserts and lack of access to locally grown food and we also have a shortage of young local farmers that want to
There are so many people on waiting lists for garden space, the target should be larger areas in unused commercial OR residential areas.
There needs to be a buffer between the market gardens and homes, so large campuses sound like a good fit as well as light industrial areas.
there should be no limit as to size whether is be plus minus 5k sq ft
There should be no limit of square footage on market garden sites.
there should be no restriction on growing food in the city.
There should be no size limit to the market gardens. What's the purpose of that? If someone has a double lot and wants to convert to a garden, why should you prevent that??
This could lead to liability when water consumption requirements dictate water conservation measures are needed. The municipal water supply should not be used for irrigation unless a progressive water usage structure is put in place to expand the utility's supply capability.
To small to make a difference.
too limiting in size. more locations good limiting size--bad
Too restrictive. Let's USE this land we have for local food. If there are a couple or 3 or 10 lots together that can't support development as housing, lets eat out of them.
we should allow market gardens in more locations, including sites of institutions. However, we should not limit size to 5,000 sq ft.
What about areas like Parkrose, with a plethora of lots that are 3-5 times that. Overly restrictive.
What benefit is there to limiting the size of an urban market garden? This is a solution in search of a problem
what to do with irregular lot sizes or old lots with current market/small business gardens?
Why can't a market garden be larger, if needed? I think that market gardens should be on private land, not public property
Why create a fairly arbitray limit like 5000 ft? That's actually a relatively small space. If someone can create a garden that's bigger (and doesn't need to be serviced by heavy equipment like a tractor), why limit it?
Why do you feel you need to regulate size? The City has more important jobs to work on.
why limit it
Why limit the size to 5,000 square feet? Surely there are lots in the city that are larger than that.
Why limit the size?
Why limit the size? Gardens look better than lawns.
Why place a limit on the size of market gardens if you're talking about using the "sites of institutions (schools, religious organizations, medical centers)?" That is not congruent with the quoted statement.
Why place a limit. There are folks who have larger lots and want to grow more than 5000 sq. ft.

Yes and no, some people have double and triple lots, I don't think there should be a limit on the size of the gardens
Yes, Market Gardens add to our community fabric and make our city more livable.
You are assuming that a garden will be grown in an average-size lot. If you notice the gardens around town, this is rarely the case; they are usually grown in double or much bigger lots. There is also no need to limit or regulate anything -- people can grow their gardens just fine.
You need to allow larger lots to be used.
Yes and no. Let the farmers farm as much land as possible so they can MAKE A LIVING!!
Agree with more locations. Allow larger lot size for areas like Cully with larger than standard lots.
Allowing in more locations = good. Distinction between market and community gardens = not good.
Ideally I'd see market gardens on plots with less area than 5000 square feet. If not possible then % to ensure gardens with affordable housing.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 2: Is 5,000 sq. ft. the right size for market gardens in residential areas? ANSWERED "YES"

5,000sq.ft. seems to me like a size that is large enough to produce enough food to return the farmers' investment, but small enough to preclude commercial exploitation.

5000 sq ft is a good start. But I think smaller and larger as well.

A lot can be grown in 5000 Sq Ft

A lot of food and agricultural products can be grown on this scale, but I do not agree with capping the size limit at 5,000 sq. ft.

A market doesn't need 12 tomato vendors. 500 sq feet is enough to offer an array of produce without turning the market into a circus of popcorn and body adornment booths.

A process for appealing for larger space, in places where available, should be prepared.

a single city lot is a good size, but i don't think it should be limited to that. what about out in cully, where lots are bigger? should that not be allowed?

Actually do not know.

Adequate space for walking areas, tents, booths without overwhelming neighborhood

Although there should be some ability for that number to change in relation to the total available land at a particular property. Additionally there should be some consideration for permaculture practices of food forestry and mixed orchard/market garden arrangements.

Average size of tiny Portland lots.

Because this is the average size of a residential lot.

Because this would align with current Portland city lot size.

But in some areas they could be larger; why not, if the site will support it? Again, the more food security built into the system, the better.

But in some parts of town, lots are larger than 50x100. There should be a process for exemption to this rule.

But, the option for more space should be allowed.

By aligning it with the typical lot size, you increase the chances that the production will stay small scale which is more sustainable. You might also consider a permit system for larger gardens as they may be appropriate in some situations- but it should be the exception rather than the rule.

By limiting the size, you are providing opportunities for more small vendors to compete.

Compatible with residential scale.

Cuz they fit

Doesn't overwhelm the neighborhoods

Doesn't change nature of a block - but larger should be ok with approval of neighbors.

Doesn't have to be big. Just needs variety to address as many wants as possible.

Don't really have a feel. Can it support a farmer at that site?

Even bigger would be fine. 10,000 sq feet, if it is filled with green vegetation, would provide a nice rest for the eyes and provide a peaceful scene.

for a single entity yes, but group usage would need larger spaces.

Gardens are an aesthetically appealing use of space as well as stimulating to the local economy

generally, but why limit?

--good scale --good use of "empty" lots

Honestly- I am not totally sure about this but it sounds like plenty of space.

How does this account for lots that are larger than 5000 ft², and can support a larger garden?

how much can one take care of?

I actually have no idea what the right size should be

I actually have no idea; perhaps this is a question for the market garden providers?

I checked "yes" as a starting point. As food becomes more difficult to obtain (for whatever reason), it seems to me that either increasing the square footage or increasing the number of gardens will be critical.

I don't know that there should be a "limit", per se. What if there's an abandoned lot that someone gets permission to "farm", and it's larger? Better use of space than a junk-attracting lot or just letting it sit empty. What is the purpose behind trying to limit the size? To keep out "big Ag"? They won't be farming in the suburbs in the first place.
I don't think market gardens need to be bigger. If that size makes it easier to build more of them, then go for it.
I don't think there should be restraints on the size - small or large.
I don't think they should be limited to 5,000 sq. ft., as plenty of lots are bigger than that, and there's no reason those lots should be disqualified from market garden use.
I say yes but I can imagine situations where allowing larger would be the right thing (large lots, particularly those associated with schools and churches, and neighborhoods with very large lots, like Cully.)
I think for me is the matter of starting ! After making the first step you can be able to make the second step, which will depend on the commitment you have and the determination you have to make the change. Always think about the growing...
I think it sounds appropriate
I think it's a good amount of space for most people to maintain, but what would be the problem for a larger space say for individuals with double lots? I think as long as nothing is being misused or is detrimental to the environment, then perhaps more space should be allowed.
I think larger is fine too. I think this kind of use has a lot of benefit to its surrounding neighborhood, from greenspace to more birds and insects, to creating community and encouraging others to garden.
I think so. If someone had a double lot, it seems like he/she could farm half of it without causing much disruption to the neighbors.
I think they could be larger, perhaps 2 or 3 lots together.
I will say yes, although I can't see the problem with someone working a double lot if he chooses.
I would like the number to be flexible. There are lots in Portland that are bigger than average and the size of a garden could be bigger. Maybe the size could be flexible in the way of a percentage of a lot.
I would love to see a larger number if the lot is larger, say 1/3 of an acre density or more.
I would support larger market gardens in non-residential areas.
If 5,000 sq ft is the normal property size, then yes it is the right size.
If it fits in with the neighborhood.
If that is the average lot size, it seems to make sense.
If that is the size of typical lot then yes. there is a part of me that thinks it should be doubled for anyone who owns a double lot.
If we are talking about the individual neighborhoods within the Portland City limits.
If you plant properly it should do for a few markets
I'm not opposed to the idea of larger farm plots, but the 5,000 sq. ft. limit seems to be more compatible with existing residential neighborhoods given the size of most urban plots.
I'm not sure it makes a difference. I'd rather have gardens than lawns, which I consider a poor use of space.
Is the question here if it should be allowed to go larger than 5000? What if two lots were right next to each other, could both be used as market gardens? I'd think so. If you want to limit the size for one person's market garden permit, 5000 could work.
It allows maximum growing space on a lot while respecting the neighborhood's residential character.
It is a standard city lot size and seems a reasonable size limit
It is fine to limit this designation to gardens of this size or smaller. However, There should be an appropriate regulatory designation to allow for larger gardens and which addresses any additional concerns for gardens of that size. Or in potentially contaminated areas)
It is your property - as long as what you are doing is not illegal (drugs) you should be able to use all of your land
It seems the right size, as you mentioned in the intro, but if more size is available on a large lot, use it.
it should be the same standards as other types of lots
It will be a common only available size throughout neighborhoods
It will fit in well with the surrounding area, and will be more easily managed by a small farmer-group.
It's a good-size garden that can sustain a family or two, but is still a manageable size and can be worked by the family that eats from it.

It's big enough to grow a good little crop on, but small enough to not completely change the character of a neighborhood.
its not too big, it won't impose that much on neighbors
Keeps it organized.
Kind of an arbitrary number really.
likely that an unused or vacant lot here and there may be available at the typical 50x100 dimension.
lot size okay.
Makes sense given standard lot size
Manageable and realistic
Many underutilized parking lots exist in residential areas.
Maybe, depends on the grower's needs and the residential area as well. This is site specific.
More double
most will be smaller, but if someone has access to a vacant lot let them plant it
multiple lots in one area/neighborhood mean larger equipment...
No limit is needed as property tax should cause indirect control by essentially taxing these gardens out of developing urban areas.
No opinion, really. As long as there is no suggestion that market gardens should be no smaller than 5000 sq. Ft I'm sure you'd get my vote.
not industrial size.
not really sure but seems like a good place to starts
Opinion based, if it is a typical lot size it should be adequate space without being over bearing in the area
or less? I don't know.
R5 is, I think, the smallest detached house residential size. The proposed size is reasonable within the code. I would also be comfortable with a percent size for R10 or larger lots.
Restricting to "size of lot" makes sense, but not all lots are as small as 50X100, to larger sizes should be allowed than 5,000 SF.
Seems reasonable. Provision should be made for larger gardens where appropriate.
Setting a 5000sf size limit on the garden limits the income potential for urban agriculture. For profit farmers are more productive and focused than not-for-profit gardeners. If food production is a goal, the 5000 sf is counter-productive As long as the farmer/gardener adheres to noise ordinances and other city code there will be few conflicts with neighbors regardless of the size of the garden.
Since it is the same size as most Portland lots it will blend in to neighborhoods.
sounds manageable.
Taking the use of a typical residential lot seems appropriate; I wonder about the impact of setbacks on market gardens?
That is an adequate size to grow a rich, sustainable garden without having traffic, equipment, etc., become a nuisance.
The typical lot size is a nice size and seems like it would keep it at an appropriate scale that might otherwise become too intensive.
there are growers who could better answer this than I can, but I would think yes
These are mainly for the benefit of a limited number of people, not for broader community benefit. Should be limited in size.
They could be bigger - look at Brooklyn who has put actual small farms within the city
This is a qualified yes on my part. I'm not sure exactly what 5,000 sq. ft looks like. But it is a start and I believe we should start out smaller rather than larger. These are residential neighborhoods and not farmlands. So start with 5,000 sq ft and see what happens.
This is an acceptable size for such an endeavor, not so large as to be overwhelming and not so small the proposed activity would be rendered ridiculous to attempt
This is not too big. If more space were available in one location I think it should be up for petition or appeal. It ultimately depends on the neighborhood. If the interest and space is available, it should be decided case by case.
this seems like a small enough area that can be cultivated without the use of large machinery and vehicles
This seems like ample room to grow a lot of food.

This seems reasonable, but I would like to see an appeal process if a community has a good reason to create a larger garden.
This seems to make sense, given the typical Portland city lot size.
This size encourages residential participation while protecting the livability of residential areas from quasi-commercial operations.
This size will limit the temptation to farm with larger equipment and ensure the garden remains a garden.
This will conform with city lots.
though i think there should be a way for people with double lots to have market gardens on both lots.
To circumvent competition with increasing housing property values in Portland. Most lots in Portland are 5000 or smaller. Food and housing would come in direct competition for space where the lot is larger. The urban growth boundary already seperates farmland from development land, which supports housing values in the city, but taking away development land in the city, say 10,000 or more sq feet, and setting it aside for farming would further drive up land values and price more people out. <u>It should stay the same size of the typical urban lot.</u>
Typical city lot size.
typical lot
Vertical gardens are also something to consider. In Portland a company, Root Pouch (RootPouch.com) is available to provide additional gardening support with Vertical gardens for more solution for the community.
why not?
Yes for residential.
Yes, but easements should be allowed if neighbors could OK a larger lot if it is not causing any problems for them.
Yes, I see why this makes sense, but I think exceptions should be allowed.
Yes. Will reuse of unimproved streets fit this measurement? Gardens may not be exclusively in a residential lot.
You want to maintain the character of a neighborhood. Vacant plots are great locations for urban gardens without being so invasive or monumental that they overwhelm the neighborhood.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 2: Is 5,000 sq. ft. the right size for market gardens in residential areas? ANSWERED "NO"

"...because typical Portland city lots are 50 x 100 ft."

5,000 may be OK in small-lot zoned areas, but there needs to be provision for larger gardens in low-density SFR, higher-density MFR and commercial areas, as well as an ability to have larger gardens in SFR areas through a variance process.

5,000 SF is too small to legitimately produce food for profit. Most urban farmers are concentrating on obtaining larger lots, specifically double lots in residential areas. Given a choice I think San Francisco's 1-acre cap before requiring a conditional use permit would be more appropriate.

5,000 sq feet is only a little more than a tenth of an acre, too small!!

5,000 sq feet may be too restrictive.

5000sq ft is fine but why not allow larger where a suitable plot exists?

a DOUBLE lot should also be allowed!

A site might offer more space if it is associated with an institution, in a brownfield, etc. Don't limit the market garden zone strictly to Portland's small residential lot sizes.

A size limit is unnecessary - market conditions should drive the size. If they are not popular they will remain smaller, if they are very popular they should be allowed to expand.

A slightly larger area may be more appropriate, given the occasional availability of double lots (10,000 ft.), which may also facilitate perfectly functional and attractive planting areas.

Actually, I'm on the fence about this. It really depends on who the producer's customer is, as well as how much is the demand. If someone has a 6000sf lot that is all usable and they are able to sell their product and earn money for their family or organization, then who's to say that is too much space? I think that so long as one is conducting business in a manner that respects their neighbors, treating the garden with care and respect, and creating self-sufficiency, then it may or may not be the right amount of space.

Again, you need to allow larger parcels of land to be used for food, flowers etc to support local demand.

All available arable land should be allowed for use barring reasonable reasons to restrict size.

Allow bigger as well...double lots, etc.

Allow farmed double or quad lots - gardens are great for neighborhoods.

Allow for double lot gardens. I'd recommend 10,000 sq feet

Although typical lots are 50 x 100 ft, 5000 ft2 does not take into account the variability of lot sizes.

any size

any size should be fine

any size-the more,the better

Anyone regardless of lot size should be allowed.

ariadne garden, portlands first sustainable land trust is on two lots and grows a lot of food and really adds to the neighborhood. why not make it two lots, but most people will only have one lot available anyway, since developers are snatching up a lot of lots.

As a general idea that's fine. But there are patches of ground that would feed people that are bigger than that. Let the land feed us in these hard times.

As stated above I am unsure why 5,000 is the limit. In situations where more land could be dedicated, I am in favor of more land being dedicated. To be clear I am not opposed to 5,000 sq ft being allowed, I just want to make sure that if there are situations where more land is available and desired to be used for growing that that be allowed without more restriction.

Because of economies of scale, larger farms have fewer relative expenses. It is less expensive per sq ft to irrigate a large plot, than a small plot because the fixed costs of the header and faucet are spread over the whole. While 5,000 sq ft is not too small a plot to produce meaningful amounts of food, it is not necessary to limit the size, if larger lots can be found or several lots can be combined.

because schools and churches might be able to accomodate larger gardens with little to no impact on the neighborhood.

Why limit them to what they can grow in an arbitrary manner like that?

Bigger 10,000 or more

Bigger or smaller should be fine.

By equating allowable "market gardens" to equal average lot size, it'll likely restrict the availability of affordable housing
Can't grow enough in that small an area
Certainly allow market gardens in more spaces, but why limit their size? The more gardens, the better. I don't think there should be an arbitrary limit to the size of a typical Portland city lot. city lots are pretty small. The more vegetables being produced within city limits, the more people who are supporting themselves and growing their own vegetables and even enough to sell or support their congregations or groups, the better.
Consider no size limit, as in the case where 2 adjacent city lots may be under cultivation by the same gardeners.
Could be larger - depends if it is temporary or permanent.
Could be larger without a problem, like double lots or fruit trees that surround a larger lot used for other purposes.
Creating an outright limit would curtail garden market activities in spaces that could possibly host much more area, thus providing a benefit to any nonprofit with arable land. NPOs are hurting enough from cutbacks due to the economic crisis. Let's give them a chance to proactively prosper self sustainably.
Don't limit the size of the gardens. Some areas may be larger.
Don't restrict the size at all, even in apartments they can grow many things in their windows that may be intensively cultivated of a single crop say mint leaves to market as tea.
Drop the arbitrary limit and let the market gardens grow.
Expand it! I don't like the idea of limiting the size of things we so desperately need.
food grown in the city trumps everything. we are at a crossroads when it comes to food production. we need a new model. if a limit is allowed there should be a way to get variances with the neighborhood's approval.
Food growth freedom!
for the most part, it's probably the right size. but some (if few) city lots in residential areas are larger, and i think it would be wrong to limit food production simply because the size is limited.
good if easy exceptions...we have "victory gardens" in empty condo lot next to our condo with over 60 smaller box plots..great flowers, growth of community connections and looks fantastic..bigger than 5,000.. so good first shot but allow easy way for exceptions based on actual situation that doesn't impose on some other project or pathway. Community is best protection in stress times.
How is it even remotely consitutional to LIMIT THE SIZE of citizens' gardens?? It wasn't many decades ago that the government was asking us to grow VICTORY GARDENS. You do NOT need to limit garden size of any variety at all.
I am not sure what the right size would be in residential areas, I think it should be up to the residents that are involved in their community to decide. If the space is not being utilized and there is a want for gardens then, yes, I think 5,000 sq. or more is good.
I do not think size needs to be limited. What if the lot is larger than "typical" size? I'm sure a school lot or even a church or medical center lot would be much larger than a "typical" city lot. Don't limit the size. These gardens are beautiful and help us be healthier as a community.
I dont believe the size should be limited
I don't really see a need to limit the size.
I don't see any reason they can't be bigger.
I dont see why it couldnt be bigger if the space was available.
I don't think a limit should be made. Lot sizes vary, room should be made for that.
I don't think it should be limited, as long as the neighbors agree on size.
I don't think putting a limit on the size of the garden is correct. There are varied properties, people and circumstances. There should be varied garden sizes.
I don't think the size should be limited.
I don't think the space should be limited... maybe evaluated per garden or area there are many spaces bigger than one lot.
I don't think there should be a limit on the size of market gardens. If someone is able to turn the whole lot they have into one they should be able to. It would be so much better for the city than all the lawns we have now.
I don't think there should be a restriction on size. if a gardener has a large area (3-5 city lots) it is not a bad thing at all. I don't see the problem with it.

I don't think there should be any limit on size. If there is available land, why shouldn't people be growing food on it?
I don't think there should be any limits on what is too large or too small. Generally, any area can be made productive regardless of space. Even the space between the road and sidewalks could be potentially used to grow fruit trees, which could be used to feed low income residents or just residents in general.
I don't think they should be limited. Will people really complain because there is too much growing on?
I don't think they should be limited. If the space is available.
I don't think we should limit the space to a certain square footage. It puts restrictions on where we can access local food. I think the priority should be "easy access" within walking/biking reach.
I don't think you should limit size. There will be a natural limit based on undeveloped land and cost of land.
I feel that limiting the size will cause problems in the future. Perhaps a group of individuals want to buy up several lots in the inner city to develop for food production for low income housing. How does limiting the size of their space help with production? Why is it important to limit the size?
I have no idea - why shouldn't people be able to use their entire yard if they so choose, regardless of the size?
I know many lots that are under the 5000 sq ft. Limit and think this number is arbitrary.
I see no reason to limit the size.
I see nothing wrong with allowing any size lot, even larger than 5000 sq ft to be used for food production
I suspect that the point of limiting size is to limit the negative externalities that come along with food production. Larger market gardens demand more workers and more equipment, possibly including machinery. Limit the use of heavy machinery, not the size of the garden.
I think 10000 sf would be acceptable so double lots would also qualify
I think a double lot, up to 10,000 sq feet, would be fine where there is that large of an area already.
I think if more space is available it should be used.
I think it should allow larger lots
I think it should be larger to accommodate larger lots in neighborhoods like Cully. Or create a low-income exception for larger lots owned by low income people who meet certain income thresholds.
I think it would be ok to allow larger sites in residential areas. This would likely be limited in actual use, but if possible, you shouldn't make them jump through administrative hoops - allow outright.
I think that bigger would be OK, I would use 20,000 square feet
I think that if someone has the space, they should be allowed to have as a large a garden as practical.
I think the size of the property and the amount of arable land should determine how big the garden is, not a one-size-fits-all number.
I think there should be some flexibility for larger gardens on larger sites. If there is concern about appearance, develop a standard for screening. If it is traffic generation, consider limiting sales times.
I think they could be bigger than 5000sf without any problem.
I think they should be allowed to be at least the size of an R10 lot (10,000 sq ft) or possibly with neighbor acquiescence, two or even three R10 lots (e.g. up to 30,000 sq ft)
I think they should be as big as can be worked.
I think two city lots would be a better restriction, if there should be one at all, which I'm not convinced of.
I think when one comes to discussions of limiting size things become tricky. Why should the size be limited at all? What if someone has a 6000 sq. ft. lot? How would the use be by "divided" or "zoned" so it could be used but not a "violation"? With property values as they are, I think size would limit itself. I don't see any factory farms popping up anywhere in the city in the near future! I think the best place to deal with size is at a community level, if and when a time comes that the situation should arise. Too many limiting zoning rules could squelch something positive before it even starts.
I think you're correct for strictly residential areas: the lot size can dictate the max. But exceptions should be made for facilities like church property, parks, municipal buildings, etc, that may have larger pieces of property that could be used for market gardens or small agricultural projects.
I think, given the size of some hospitals, universities and the like, and the drain they place on the food supply, a full city block makes much more sense than a single 5,000sqft lot. For smaller schools, it does, so smaller lots should be encouraged where practical.

I understand that the scale of market gardens is important in the context of residential neighborhoods. Further, I think that a single market gardener can grow food on 1/4 to 1/2 acre by him/herself with minimal "equipment", while still having minimal negative neighborhood impact. I also believe it is important that we push the limit of our comfort zone in this area, as fewer barriers (no need for land use review) will allow more local food to be grown near where it will be consumed, further adding to our resiliency as a city in the tough times that may lie ahead. I would error on the side of allowing larger plots (10,000-15,000sqft) [also, seattle allows 1 acre as the concept report indicates], and use or craft other local legislation to help curb any issues that might arise due to size on a case by case basis. At any scale, market gardening needs to be performed with an awareness and sensitivity for any residential neighborhood that it may be in.
I wish you had a "not sure" section. If someone has a 10,000 sq. ft. lot, I don't see how it would be a problem for neighbors. I'd rather live next to a market garden than a backyard mechanic!
I would allow bigger, but this is better than nothing.
I would like them to be able to be larger. What about 10,000 feet, the size of a double lot?
I would like to see that limit raised higher, the more local food we grow the better
I would like to see that size limitation tripled, at least. The neighborhood home where I pick berries has a larger plot of land than this and I want to be able to purchase produce the same way.
I would say yes, except I don't see why this would need to be an inflexible limit - perhaps, as a guideline with variances granted if no problems exist with larger gardens.
I wouldn't limit the size because I think commercial property values will ultimately limit the size and location of these urban gardens. Setting size limits will prevent growers from taking advantage of larger parcels that are temporarily available due to the economy.
If a homeowner has a larger lot (like my lot-and-a-half at 7500 sq ft, or my neighbor's 4 lots together at 20000 sq ft) why should any part of our lot be given over to grass or paving? Why should not every bit be made useful and beautiful?
If an organization owns the land, why must the size be limited?
If communities want to create a market garden together (especially people who do not have a lot of financial backing) they may need more square feet.
If someone can get a double lot, more power to them.
If someone has a larger lot and can manage it agriculturally, they should be allowed to do so.
If someone has a larger lot, there should be no limit on the size of garden.
If there is space for a larger garden, say two lots together, they should be utilized this way. This grows community and provides very local food and would be much better than an empty, dirty lot not being used at all.
If there is the possibility for more green space I believe that is a positive direction.
If you allow a person to grow food in their yard to sell to their neighbors, they will have a better chance of feeding themselves, and provide an income for their family.
I'm not sure about this one. 5,000 sounds reasonable - if someone has space and wants to plant more food, seems like they should be allowed. Why is a restriction on size needed?
I'm not sure about this one. Would anyone really mind living next to a bigger than city lot garden?
I'm not sure I understand the reason for placing a limit on the size; if a person has a larger lot, why should they be limited to a 5,000 sq ft garden? I don't understand how "compatibility with residential areas" is an issue when we're talking about a garden, not livestock production for example. I would think that a large market garden would be a boon to the surrounding neighborhood, regardless of its size. perhaps there could be a provision to allow a person to apply for a permit for a larger market garden.
I'm not sure that there is a need to limit the size.
In places that have larger, unused or unimproved spaces, the appropriate amount of space allowed should be based on beautification, acceptability and impact on the surrounding immediate blocks.
In some cases, there might be the opportunity for larger area. Let's maximize!
Increase the size.
Insignificant.
is a limit on size really necessary?
It depends on the configuration of the lot and skill of the cultivator; therefore, not the cities business.

It is a good start, but I wouldn't want a market garden to be limited to 5,000 sq ft if there was an opportunity for the market garden to exist on a larger lot at some point.
It may be too-large or too-small, depending on the neighborhood, crops, resource availability, land available.
It seems arbitrary to me. If a lot has room for more than 5000 sq ft of garden, there is no reason I can think of that it shouldn't be larger.
It seems arbitrary--why do we need a limit?
It seems feasible that growers would want to farm a double lot or possibly up to an acre (43,000 sq ft.). I think there should not be a cap on the size of the market garden but on limiting the type and frequency of equipment used as well as size of trucks picking up produce, fruits, nuts ect.
It seems like it could be as large as a block without having too much too much of a negative impact. A school could probably easily want a garden to be larger than 5,000 sq ft.
It seems too limiting. I have seen larger lots devoted to intensive farming that seem to fit well into the neighborhood.
It seems unnecessary and harmful to limit the size.
it should be more in line with the size of the lot, perhaps some things could grow with less space than others OR some one may have a bigger lot. I don't think an arbitrary number is a good idea.
it would be nice if the markets were larger, like twice the size, for more variety and abundance.
It's too small for market gardens. see above comments.
Larger lots in East and NE Portland.
Larger sizes should be allowed depending on the size of the lot
Larger spaces should be considered because larger scale operations can be more efficient. Imagine having a limited space for your office and having to go across the street or to a different neighborhood to send a fax, or use the printer or staple something.
Larger would actually be better. There are still many lots in Portland bigger than the "typical" size that people could more fully utilize.
Larger would be fine as well.
Let each neighborhood decide. They live and work there and can make their own decisions.
Let people grow as much food as they can, let it be distributed out of homes. Having Azure come into neighborhoods provides people with fresh, organic food.
Lots could be irregular or growers might own more than one lot adjacent to each other.
Makes no sense to limit the size of a market garden. if someone has a double lot or even a quadruple lot that they want in production, a size limit isnt going to stop anyone. Please, lets avoid paltry rules that people won't abide by anyway.
Many 10,000 square foot lots could easily support a 7,500-8,500 square foot market garden with little impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Schools, colleges and other institutional properties could easily support much larger gardens as well.
Many institutions have more than 5,000 square feet available for a market garden. If the limit is 5,000 sq ft, they would have to go through a conditional use process which is time-consuming and has costs. Increase the size to 7,500 sq ft
Many lots are much bigger, people should be able to use what they have (or can rent), our city lot is 12,000 square feet. While I have not intention of creating a market garden, one of my neighbors may. Better than the wasteful lawns that currently plague our neighborhoods!
Many lots in outer Portland are 1 acre or more. Many schools and institutions have much more space than this and could use more food than what is grown on 5000 sq. ft.
Many Portland lots, especially in outer SE where I live, are larger than this. They are left over from when small farms & orchards were more common. They provide ideal properties for someone to have a market garden, but this regulation would prohibit that. Gardening on a larger lot (10,000 - 15,000 ft) is more efficient than on a 5,000 ft lot.
Many urban farmers specifically seek out homes on larger-than-typical lots to maximize growing space.
Market gardens are attractive and more people need to be involved in making them happen. They should be at least double this size and maybe a full block (one acre). And they should be protected from development pressures.

market gardens can be all different sizes
Market gardens could be larger, especially if they are short term gardens
Market gardens should be larger, to accommodate and promote more low-impact and sustainable gardening methods, such as composting, fallowing land, and on-site organic pest control.
Maybe in some instances a larger garden would be welcomed
Maybe not. A farm has to be big enough to survive commercially if that is its intent.
My answer is really yes and no. Please see my response above.
My opinion is that any market garden over 10,000 square feet should require a permit. Powellhurst-Gilbert is a historically poor and undermined area, and yet a prime spot for market gardens. Allowing market gardens up to 10,000 square feet in this area would encourage entrepreneurial spirit and create opportunities for employment and self-sufficiency. The presence of market gardens would actually enhance the character of our neighborhood.
need larger space
No - I'm sure there are exceptions. I wouldn't limit it to 5,000
No limitations - some people can work bigger areas just fine
NO NO NO, we should be able to have a garden as big as we want. If you have space for it, you should be able to do what you want.
NO restriction on size. A garden is not going to detract from a neighborhood in any way.
No restrictionsa
No size limit please. If you have it, use it. A pot of tomatoes on an apartment balcony is a start. If my front yard is the only place with enough sun for a garden, then I will have to turn my soil there. If I have an estate with immense areas of lawn that someone would like to cultivate, then I want to let 'em do it.
no size minimum/maximum
NO. Market gardens should be allowed in as many places as we can safely (taking into account soil contamination) put them. Why restrict the size? There are many lots that are larger than the "typical" Portland R5 that would be ideal for growing. These restrictions would exclude much of the West side, which needs access to fresh food just as well as the East side. Many people here value and welcome fresh food (my neighbors love and support our Hillsdale Farmer's Market).
Not big enough.
not sure, do we have to decide on a size?
Or larger
Our current garden, Ariadne Garden (owned by OSALT, Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust) is 10,000 square feet. It is run by volunteers. We aren't a market garden since the volunteers consume most of the food. I would guess it's impossible to make a market garden profitable on 5000 square feet. Certainly ours is not, on 10,000 square feet! You probably need to check with current CSA (community sponsored agriculture) owners/managers.
Owners should be able to choose to use all of their property.
People should be able to grow food out of a pot on their balcony and sell it if they want. The amount of traffic this would create is completely negligible. Having a small lot = less traffic. No need to restrict this.
People should be allowed to grow and sell food on any sized area.
Persons should be able to grow what ever they wish on their property without regulation.
Please reference my answer from question 1.
Prefer 1 seller per 5000 sq ft vs. size limit. Why limit the size? Could people have two market gardens side by side?
Reduce size to require a minimum 10 ft. setback around planting areas.
Residential areas have many size options; stand alone houses, apartments, mid to high rise condominiums. Since a market garden could have multiple users, it would be an artificial constraint that could limit participation
same as above
Say someone has 1/3 acre and wants go grow larger than 5000 sq feet?
See above, restricts unduly those with larger lots for arbitrary reason.
See above. No size limit necessary.
See comment in section 1. A limit is not needed for a market garden. Spaces larger than that are rare, but if available, let it be fully used! :))

seems somewhat arbitrary. what if someone owned two adjacent lots and had a passion for market gardening? also what about churches and schools? they will likely have much more than 5,000 sq ft to devote to this type of cause, so why limit their ability to produce food? this limit does not benefit our communities.
Several existing gardens are larger, and are well-integrated into the neighborhoods (Project Grow, eg.)
Should allow larger sizes if a lot is bigger, particularly in neighborhoods with big lots (I.e. Cully).
Should be a little smaller. It's common to have lots in city that are 45X90 too (for example, in inner SE; many lots in my neighborhood near 35th and Hawthorne are smaller than 5000 sq ft)
should be allowed to be bigger
Should be allowed to be bigger if needed. Plants take up a lot of space. They are beautiful, so larger than 5K is okay.
Should be at least a double lot (10,000 square feet) in dense residential areas. Larger yet in places like East Portland where there is lots of available land for growing food.
Should be bigger.
Should be more flexible. This could be the default starting point.
Should be up to 1 acre. We live in Outer East... many residential lots have significant growing capacity. If needed, food use of land can transition into other use (development). It doesn't work the other way around. Food growing does not limit other eventual uses.
Should encourage local food growth on the land that is available without arbitrary limits of 5000 sq ft. If the land is there and someone wants to initiate a market garden, let them. Feel free to limit lawns that require a high level of chemicals and water and provide no benefit to the community.
Should not be limited in size. There are waiting lists for community garden plots. What "compatibility" are you worried about? Why arbitrarily limit food growing capacity?
Site-specific concerns should determine size.
Size limitation is too small.
size should not be limited
Size shouldn't necessarily be limited to 5,000 square feet. There are many larger lots (e.g. in the Cully neighborhood) where individuals as well as the local community would benefit from the implementation of larger market gardens.
Smaller areas would allow for rooftop production as well.
Smaller sites should be allowed.
Some areas can support more area than this, so it seems more logical to ALLOW ALL such gardens up to a certain size AND provide options for variances larger than this (similar to the "three chicken policy").
Some have more acreage.
Some lots are larger than 5,000 sq feet. Could limit farmers leasing/renting from multiple people.5000 sq feet can be used to feed just one family not including off farm sales
Some lots are larger, and allowing for a larger lot size would allow more individuals and institutions to have gardens.
Some lots will be larger than this and should be allowed to maximize their space. We are part of a church community garden that would like to expand if needed. This could put us beyond a 5,000 sq ft space. Maybe allowing for a permit to exceed the limit would allow for exclusions.
some people have bigger lots, and should be allowed to grow on them.
Sometimes a larger lot is present. Do not restrict using a larger lot for a market garden/orchard.
Stay open to other sizes
Suppose someone has a double lot.
The areas should be larger to account for double lots like our own.
The City is being invasive into our private lives.
The farmer that I know would not even be able to farm his own yard in entirety. As I see it, urban farms only enhance our lives.
The limit could be twice that - there are still double lots in Portland that could have a garden on site as a secondary use.
The limit is too small, and does not account for 'non-typical' lots.
The maximum should be two adjacent 5,000 sq. ft lots because this would make some enterprises more economic.

The size of a market garden in any particular area should be dependent upon the community which it serves. Larger residential areas may require a larger market garden to meet its community needs. Restrictions placed upon garden sizes should be offset by increasing the number of gardens in a particular area.
The size of gardens is not the main problem. Learning to manage gardens is important. Garden management is learned by experience.
The size should be dependent upon the lot itself and should not be limited.
The size should be left to the community to manage as the property owner see fit.
The size should only be limited by the resources of the farmer(s).
The space allowed for the market gardens should be larger. Many lots are larger than 50x100 ft, especially in E Portland or in church lots. These spaces would be ideal for market gardens and I would hate to see them shutdown because they are too large; likewise, I would hate to see the space under-utilized as much of it is now..
There are brown fields and odd sized lots that could be turned to market gardens.
there are certainly a fair number of double lots that would be ideal for such a project and should not be excluded. I would allow at least 10,000 sq ft
There are larger lots and also multiple lots that are undeveloped that may be a perfect place for an urban market garden.
There are many areas larger than this where gardens and fields have integrated well in residential areas
There are many residential areas with lots larger than 50x100, these areas are often more suitable for market gardens than the denser areas that have smaller lots. It think the allowed size of the garden should be larger in areas with larger lots.
There are much bigger empty lots that could be used and this restriction seems unnecessary. More food production is better by far than empty lots! And in some neighborhoods, we have a lot of empty space.
There are often larger lots for community residences, churches, etc., that shouldn't be excluded.
There are some larger lots in residential areas and it would be a huge shame to not be able to use these spaces. Why limit the size? Size is not the issue that would make a market garden incompatible with a residential area. It seems that incompatibility would stem more from unsightliness or ordor issues- which can be a problem at any scale.
There is no don't know choice. Market gardens would probably want to be split up into plots, depends on the area. A larger garden taking up a larger portion of a block could even take over an unused portion of paved street, wouldn't that be beautiful.
There is no legitimate rationale, in my opinion, to have a 5,000 sq ft limit to gardens.
There is no need to place a limit on size. If one wanted to turn several urban lots into market gardens, then that should be allowed. Let people do what they want with their lots if they don't infringe on the rights of others.
There might be opportunities to utilize/convert larger pieces of underused or abandoned properties that could potentially be excluded because of size limits
There should be no limit set. The size of gardens should relate to actual conditions and no size limits should be set. Individual cases where size becomes an issue should be solved on a neighborhood/community level.
There should be no limit to the size of the gardens!
There should be no limit.
There should be no limit. Gardens are a benefit to all and the size of garden should be determined by the space available not by city code.
there should be no maximum
There should be NO size limit. What would be the reasons against a larger plot of garden within the city, say for instance one-city block? How could that be a problem??
There should be no size restrictions on market gardens in residential areas. The use of pesticides, fungicides and herbicides should be strictly forbidden. Limitations should be placed on the use of toxic chemicals and genetically modified plants, which are not compatible with the people or animals that live in residential areas, not the SIZE of a garden that feeds the people. Market gardens have always been and always will be compatible with the places where people live. It is absurd to think that the people in the homes and the gardens that feed the people in the homes are not compatible. All Portlanders benefit from easy access to fresh, local food grown in their own neighborhood.
There should not be a limit to the size, especially for schools or larger organizations with larger lots.

There should not be a limit. All arable land should be available for market gardens.
There should not be a set limit
These two questions should be separated. The direction of allowing more market gardens is the correct direction. The size shouldn't be limited.
They should be allowed to have more space if they have the space to grow.
They should be as big as possible.
They should be bigger as there are often more than one empty lot in congruence.
This excludes lots larger than the standard 50 x 100. There may be larger lots such as these that would allow for larger market gardens in neighborhoods such as those in outer NE/SE Portland where lots are bigger, incomes are lower, and access to fresh local foods is limited.
This is an arbitrary size. If the city is trying to encourage market gardens at institutional sites, perhaps more land is available. Also, not sure if 5000 sq ' is viable for all types of crops.
This is the wrong question. You are on the wrong track. This kind of thinking and desire to regulate will hurt people who are trying to continue relationships with local farmers. The best course of action is to stand down and let local people and local farmers figure it out. We are doing this already and it is working fine.
This is too small. For efficient economy of scale for urban food production, most market gardeners seek sites that are larger than the average city lot, and there are many such sites in Portland. I know a good number of 'urban farmers' with market gardens, and nearly all of them are on over-sized lots. Ranging from 8,000 and 30,000 square feet. The maximum should be at least 10,000 square feet, but 20,000 would be most appropriate. This is still a small enough scale that hand-cultivation techniques are appropriate, and large machinery or other high-impact methods or inputs are very unlikely.
This limit seems rather arbitrary. I would imagine the economic pressure exerted by the value of large contiguous space would serve as a consequential constraint. Also, if the land is not valuable enough to develop for other purposes, I'd rather see it used for gardening space instead of kept fallow.
This limitation would disallow larger plots to utilize their full size. Many lots in my neighborhood are larger.
This should be at the discretion of the owner--it has nothing to do with government.
This should not be the limit on garden sites because it rules out effective use of double and larger lots as well as compromises the ability of neighborhoods to rethink their layout, as with homeowners combining backyard space to create larger gardens- something that has been explored in cities like San Francisco.
This size limitation may make market gardening in Portland not feasible. In order to have a financially viable market garden, several small plots would be required. The farmer would have to move equipment and materials between sites. This would significantly increase the carbon footprint and environmental impact of the farming operation. Purchase of land in R5 and higher zones is far more expensive than purchase of land in RF, R20, R10, R7 and other lower zones. In order to promote feasibility of land purchase for farming, agriculture should be allowed outright in the lower zones. I believe agricultural use should also be allowed in the R5 zone.
too limiting and restrictive. gardens are sprawling and should be unencumbered.
Too limiting.
Too limiting. Why does there need to be a limit?
Too prescriptive. More flexibility. Cully has large lots and so do areas of outer SE Portland
Too rigid -- should be larger.
Too small! Lots in outer SE Portland tend to be much larger. Increase it to 10,000.
Too small! Take it to 15,000 sq ft.
Too small! The max ought to be four times a usual city lot.
Too small, and arbitrary. Why limit it at all? I don't see the point of limiting it since these gardens don't adversely affect their neighborhood. If anything they make their neighborhood better, more community-friendly and livable. Plus, if the concern is prohibiting large, commercial farms from operating within city limits, this is not a legitimate concern since there are no plots of land large enough for such farms available within the city. If you really wanted to draw the line to prevent this, then make the limit 50,000 sq. ft or so. But personally, I don't see a problem with having even large farms in the city. I think it would be kind of cool, and make Portland even more unique.
Typical lot sizes are bigger than 50 x 100 outside of inner Portland, where a large part of the gardens are. Also, it would restrict areas where multiple people want to pool land, or at institutions that would have more land. Unless there is a case-by-case exception, it would impact some current gardens.

We are in favor of having no size restraints on market gardens in residential areas.
We should not limit the size of food/ medicine growing spaces in the event that the time comes that it will be necessary to provide more of our own food. Also, there is ample evidence that healthier and larger plants are grown in less crowded conditions- important when growing in cooler, damper environments or where irrigation is, or may become, an issue.
What I said at #1 covers this one.
what if a family has a double-lot?
What if two lots are together? If someone is farming two lots, I think they should be allowed to do so.
whatever size is available is fine.
While 5,000 square feet is a good place to begin, some sites might be able to support a larger garden, and this should be anticipated and allowed for in those places.
While I think most would probably be 5,000 (or less!!!!!!), I'd hate to see an institution blessed w/extra land limited by that. (What happens if an institution has 6,000sqft and a demonstrable need for the extra food produced, for example)
While I understand the 5,000 sq. ft. size for compatibility with certain residential areas, many urban farms required much more space than this to function effectively. In order to better bridge the gap between small-scale farming and residential gardening, there needs to be more realistic (larger) access to land for those wanting to cultivate for market purposes.
Why 5,000 sf? Why not 10,000 or 15,000 sf? 5,000 sf seems arbitrarily small to me. Just because it is the size of a standard city lot does not necessarily mean it is appropriate for limiting the size of a market garden in the city. A bigger issue than size is the use of agricultural chemicals like fertilizers and pesticides and the impacts these could have on neighboring properties.
Why does it need to have a limit? There are a lot of big, weedy open lots on Vancouver/Williams & MLK that would be fabulous as Market Gardens.
why have limit at all? The more unused space that gets used for gardens the better for ALL!
Why limit it . If a lot is not being or acreage is not being used allow some one to farm it . Farm produces are based on volume . The more you grow the cheaper the price . I would be happy to sell you a \$10 tomato , what do you think , would you pay that ? Another good reason to not limit the size of the lot is that , property would be maintain by the farmer and not left two fallow
Why limit it?
Why limit size to only 5000 feet?
why limit size to small lot size. Some neighborhoods have historically larger lots, adjust to fit character of specific areas.
Why limit the size when it has such a positive impact on our community.
Why limit the size. The very nature of the neighborhood will limit the size.
Why limit the size?
Why limit the size? Gardens look better than lawns.
Why limit the size? Larger operations can still be local and sustainable. That size may cut out important farmers just outside the limits.
Why limit the size? Some folks have double lots, and churches or schools have more room than that available too. Growing food within the city for people in the city to consume strengthens our food security and eliminates the need for long-distance transport, which has countless benefits. It's local and sustainable.
Why limit the size? There are going to be too many frustrating exceptions.
Why limit the source of food?
Why not allow bigger? If there happens to be a vacant 1 acre lot, I think this should be fair game for people to grow on. 5,000 sq. ft. might be too restrictive.
why not allow larger sizes.
Why not be able to have a garden on a larger lot? Some of the unused city blocks would make wonderful gardens. At least having 10,000 sq. ft. available, the size of a double lot, would be great. I don't think this would create any disturbances - gardens tend to be fairly calm areas compared to all the other industries in the city.
why not bigger lots, too?
why not even smaller lots? like for Sunnyside where much is 33 x 100

Why not larger, say if the property is a double lot. More planted space in my dense SE neighborhood would lead to more wildlife, less heat build up (from concrete) - a win for me. So, I vote that larger would be OK.
Why not larger? Some lots are bigger than 50x100, so why limit it?
Why place a limit? If there is a larger space why not use it?
Why put a limit on it? Why waste city money to go manage and measure green space?
Why should there be a restriction on size? Why not put a restriction on toxics (pesticides) use instead?
why should there be any limit? It should be based on the site-owners property size
Why should there even be a limit? If a private entity has more than one lot, they should be able to have a connective market garden.
Why the limit?
Why use outdated zoning standards for a non-construction project (gardens)? This limit is unnecessary over-regulation. Allow flexibility to suite the neighborhood and lot.
Why would you limit the size? Institutions, by and large, are not on 50x100 lots.
Would it mean that current market or small business gardens are grandfathered in?
You may want it to be larger. We have larger gardens and orchards in our neighborhood. It adds to the area in many ways-- providing food, less congestion, and aesthetically the mix of residential and gardens/farming is great.
You need to allow larger. there are some really great concepots where these gardens are used to raise food for homeless shelters for example. Encourage green and not building
5000 sq. ft. is not too bad, but I think larger would also be fine, especially if larger sites were allowed in non-close in neighborhoods such as East Portland which often still have larger lots.
A concern I have is lack of space within UGB, driving up home prices and increasing gentrification.
don't know
don't know
don't know
Don't think it should be limited to that size necessarily, but not much larger. Probably not more than 2 or 3 lots.
I don't know much about this area, so I'll leave it to the experts.
I object to market gardens in residential areas due to incompatibility.
I wonder if zoning laws are the proper tool to determine the maximum allowable size for market gardens. Considering the huge carbon footprint of most food consumed in urban areas, it seems that limiting the size of market gardens to one city lot is ill advised. If a 10,000 sq. ft. double lot market garden is economically viable, I don't believe it should be disallowed. A well-managed market garden will provide a neighborhood with food, beauty, and a venue for community interaction. Limiting its size to one city lot may prove an obstacle to sustainability.
not sure
Not sure
not sure
Not sure about the size limitation - this seems like a good basic size. There could be exceptions.
not sure what size would be best. maybe available lots too?
This site-specific zoning will need to be flexible based on context.
Unsure. In some cases, more may space may be appropriate.
Why does there need to be a size limit? If have a large residential lot, then should be able to use that lot.
Why does there need to be a size limit? If have a large residential lot, then should be able to use that lot.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS					
Question 3: Check the types of areas where you think market gardnes should be allowed					
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-dwelling	Commercial	Light Industry	Why?
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Would prefer not to have market gardens in open spaces due to the community use nature of open spaces. (Not to be used for food that will be sold. Community gardens that are in open spaces, where residents pay for a plot, are okay - they are for person not market use)
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			would be wary of areas of light industry because of possible contamination
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Would be fine in most privately owned areas...perhaps not public parks or industry areas due to competing interests, and the intensive use may harm park space .
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	With the severe shortage of access to good, healthy, locally grown food in our country and community we should be strongly advocating any unused land in our community to be used to grow food. There are so many people we have met that when faced with the choice to buy a fresh piece of fruit or veg over a fast food hamburger, they are going to choose the fast food because they can get more calories for the dollar, meaning a fuller stomach. Even planting fruit trees in sidewalk medians means more food for people who otherwise have to make the difficult choice to feed their family horrible, processed, unhealthy food because it's all they can afford and all the have access to.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				Why would we want to limit the possibility of feeding ourselves at all? Of course, there should be some agreements about who is taking responsibility- maybe there would be jobs created for growers growing in public spaces, but anywhere that isn't near fumes or known toxins should be legally available for food production- this could be very important if shipping costs reduce food options for local people (as is already happening.)

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	Why should we be involving ourselves with stopping food production? So long as the growers keep the sites clean I see no reason they should not be allowed a garden, especially on their own property.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not? Who says that farm land must be bucolic?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not? What better use of land than growing food for the community?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not? It makes more sense to put markets near residents, but also allow them in any areas that would attract customers. Again, market forces should drive both size and location.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	why not? If it is open space and not used already, why not use it to produce something? It would beautify an area not already landscaped and make unused areas more useful.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not? I don't see a need to limit where market gardens can be allowed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	WHY NOT? This should not be governed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not? Improves landscape, supplies food, etc. Again, one concern is the use of pesticides. I would like to see a restriction there or organic practices strongly encouraged.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	why not? If someone wants to grow produce for someone else, let them.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not. Persons living in those homes in those areas should be allowed to grow and plant what ever they wish.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not. Land is under-used when it could be feeding people and letting farmers earn livings which we know can't be easy and is largely a labor of love. What? Does Portland have something against vegetables?!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why not use every available space?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why limit them? It's a good use of space.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why limit it? Local food access is important.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Why limit
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	While pollution could be an issue, gardens are beautiful everywhere!
					Wherever soil can be verified as non-contaminated - not a small issue after Oakland's recently reported problems for urban gardeners
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Wherever possible.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Wherever people want them.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Wherever there is a need, why not? I would be concerned about chemicals and pollution and toxic ground in light industry areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Where ever there is availabe space with good soil (some of these sites could contain contaminated earth due to industry, traffic, etc.)
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	When there is a viable lot, we shouldn't limit the possibility of food cultivation.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	What not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	What better use of our fertile land than to grow healthy food
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We will need all the space we can use to grow food, plain and simple. The less we can rely on food imported from outside the city the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	we should make these spaces available for this type of use if the neighbors are in favor. It is great to be able to eat and produce edibles in urban environments.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We should encourage market gardens wherever possible. This will serve to make every option available as it is already difficult to find affordable space to grow food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We should be growing food wherever we can.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We should be growing food wherever and whenever we can.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We should be encouraging more local growers and supporting sustainable growers.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need to cultivate as much land as possible for food security and should not inhibit any endeavor.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need more gardens everywhere but away from heavy traffic is probably safest. We don't need toxins in our veggies.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need more food, more accessibility, more visibility.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need local food NOW.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need food in walkable distance in case of weather or energy emergencies.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We need food and also income opportunities for those willing to grow it.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We have the potential to grow a significant amount of our food right here - from both a carbon footprint AND a maximizing nutrition and health standpoint - WHY WOULDN'T WE?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We don't need to limit it. As long as the person who owns the property is ok with it, why should the government care???
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We can't grow enough food to feed everybody with the space we have currently. Where there is demand, why not allow it?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	We all eat and we all need pollinator friendly flowering plants in our city. We need to tuck in as many of these spaces as land owners, gardeners and urban farmers can work together to create. They also enliven all of these differently zoned areas and spark community interaction and positivity of seeing so much life in spaces where there may otherwise be only non-edible landscaping and not many flowers, little or no other urban livestock.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Vacant land needs to be used.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Use what ever areas are available and make for good gardens. Love the idea of seeing food growing on every corner.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Urban farming helps each of those areas individually: golf courses with market gardens can grow veggies for their club restaurant; in residential areas it can reduce food deserts drastically (and be host to a mini-farmers market in the neighborhood), and in light industry it can reduce particulate pollution, beautify and provide infill on vacant industrial lots.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				Unless we can think of ways to keep car pollution out of the gardens...

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Unless the area is contaminated with industrial waste. Portapotty or other sanitation must be available including a hand washing area
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Typical landscaping for take up energy and resources without providing a practical return. this will give us beauty plus functionality and food security. Why should we allow lawns but not farms?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	try many different places. each proposal can be considered if there are people willing and able to put sweat equity into the planting and maintaining of garden spaces
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	To me, there is no reason to restrict any entity from growing plants that could be used for food. There is much land and resources that could be better utilized in helping to feed our community rather than lying fallow or being used for things such as lawns which require resources and maintenance without yielding much benefit to groups or individuals. I support more individuals and groups being able to supplement their financial needs while supplying the community with more locally grown food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling			light industry	To lessen the amount of pollution, these areas will have less traffic etc.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	This would be a productive use of property that would likely be either vacant, an unproductive lawn, or a weedy mess. Most urban market gardens would be hand scale operations and would not have a negative impact on surrounding residences. In fact noise nuisances (like lawnmowers), chemical usage and visual nuisances (like weedy lots) are likely to be lower on urban agriculture lots. Additionally urban agriculture lots would likely be 4 season gardens to be productive.
Open Space					This is to make sure that all people are supporting it and know how much the organic food can help. Also,because of at those area we can be able to get the information out to many people.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They're good for everything. They bring people together. They manage rainwater and storm drainage. They increase the presence of beneficial plants and insects and pollinators and birds.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They should be encouraged everywhere
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They should be allowed everywhere. The beauty of buying produce from the place where it was grown is that you as the customer can assess if it is safe food or not. You have the power to ask how a thing was grown; to look around you and see that the plants are healthy and thriving. When you meet your farmer face-to-face it is a powerful connection built on trust. Are vegetables trucked in from long distances, harvested by strangers; covered in pesticides, fertilizers and road dust any safer? There is so much land that could be put to use here in the city – why restrict that? Let people use their common sense.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They should be allowed everywhere because if Portland wants to be a green city we need to produce as much food locally as possible.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They should b allowed anywhere and everywhere. It improves community, and is a positive place for people.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	they need to be everywhere we can put them, but they are not for everyone, so people need "play areas" seperate
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They are an asset to any neighborhood and should only be barred from areas with heavy industry
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	They are a benefit to the community and to our food security. Fewer limitations.
			Commercial		These are businesses and need to be contained by rezoning requirements as would a neighborhood grocery store.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling			light industry	These are areas that a garden can be most easily maintained and supervised. Gardens in Multi-dwelling areas and Commercial might create too much congestion and traffic.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		These are all places where people live or work.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	There should not be zoning restrictions on gardens - safety of food concerns (from contamination by petro fumes) can be addressed elsewhere.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	There should be no limitation to the places and spaces utilized for food production. It is an essential need, and with peak oil, food distribution will become more and more expensive and less practical. We will need to provide more locally whether we want to or not and whether we are prepared for it or not. Let's have the foresight to be prepared and not limit where food can be produced within an urban environment.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	There should be no limit on where they're allowed!
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	There is tons of unused vacant spaces tucked between various buildings in all zones. (Resid., Commerc.) Folks could build micro biz and feed ourselves better this way. All for it, wherever it fits.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		There is a use for on site food production almost anywhere except in industrial areas where soils and air may be heavily contaminated and unhealthy.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				there is a lot of unused ground that could be cultivated and the traffic is light enough as to not affect the produce with fumes from vehicles.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling		Commercial		There already is a non-licensed farmer's market near my house on Hawthorne street. We need more markets like that.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The USDA nutritional guidelines say that each human being needs 5 servings of fruits and vegetables per day to sustain health. Yet, according to author Michele Simon (author of Appetite for Profit), there is not enough produce grown in our country to support this directive. In a city that has such a substantial unemployment rate, it would behoove city officials to create opportunities for other to grow more food (and eat it to improve health), increase their income, and expand their marketable skill sets.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The only exception would be areas where the ambient air quality is so bad that the produce would absorb toxins. A soil test for potentially dangerous toxins should also be required
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The ones I have seen are beautiful, so I would like to see more of them throughout the city.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more, the better. It'll build community, allow for teaching opportunities for kids/students in areas that don't have access to gardens currently, and beautify industrial and Commercial.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more the merrier. So people can walk to them.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	the more the merrier!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more the merrier!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more the better. We need to outdo corporate greed and agribusiness!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	the more the better!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	the more the better
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more plants the better. I guess as a consumer though, I would prefer my food not come from industrial. but there are so many flavors of industrial it is hard to make a blanket statement!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more places we can grow food in the city, the better. Think of it as "food infill"
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more places growing and providing local food, the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more market gardens, the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more locations that allow market gardens make it more accessible to the most diverse group of people.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	The more local food the better.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		The more gardens, the more fresh available food, the healthier the populace, the more enriched the citizens, the soil, the water, the air. Do not limit our right to grow our own food. You are essentially saying that unless we do as you say (YOU who clearly don't know much about gardens) we must rely on supermarkets who truck in not-fresh and not-local food that is much less healthy for us to eat.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more gardens the better! We need to start growing as much food as possible in the city, as soon as possible, to get ahead of the pending urban food crisis. Hopefully people will use common sense and not grow food next to major industrial pollution sources, but some regulation around this may be necessary.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more gardens the better!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The more food we grow inside the city, the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The gardens have the potential to help improve a commercial or multi-dwelling area. Market gardens should also be allowed in single dwelling areas as a way to infill, provide sustainable local food, and possibly provide additional income to urban families.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The economic crisis is forcing hard choices about where to spend dwindling dollars. Let's provide an atmosphere in Portland where a victory garden concept can flourish in the 21st century.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The closer we are to our food sources the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	The average home in the United States spends \$8,000 a year on transportation. This is directly a function of our city design. Eight thousand dollars a year. Many families can't afford a car, and those that can don't have a choice. The *need* a car because city planner have turned their communities in to auto dependent nightmares. Why not take measures to save our households \$8,000 a year by making it easier for them to go without a car? Why not design our communities in such a way that food is easily accessible in the economic dead zones of residential areas? Allow market gardens and on site sales all over the city, and watch your lack of planning anything result in more economic activity and cost saving for everyone. Areas like SE 122nd Avenue are exactly where we need more economic activity and more diversity of choice.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		The "Market Garden" concept codifies what should be an acceptable use of land in these areas. There should be a separate designation for gardens grown in potentially contaminated areas which addresses any additional concerns.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Support market gardens, don't limit them.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Soil tests should be required. I have concerns about using industrial areas to produce food based on what pollutants might be in the soil.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Soil testing should be required for all areas--some houses are very "hot" for lead, as I imagine light industrial areas could be. The applicant in a hot area could still garden in such areas, but be limited to raised beds separated from ground soil.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	society must turn agrarian
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	So long as the soil and water supply are safe for food production, there are few nuisances associated with market farming and all of these areas could appreciate the benefits.
Open Space		Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Single dwelling areas usually have limited parking, but around the perimeter is usually a multi-dwelling, commercial area with expanded parking area.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Seriously, the more the better.
		Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	selling of the produce would not be good in a neighborhood unless it was for the residents in that area but is great elsewhere. would only be good for open space if profits went directly to the park
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	see Question 1
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	See my answer to #2
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	See comment in #1.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	See above! Wherever people can grow and provide access to healthy food, they should be encouraged to do so.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	See above - the more gardens, the better for the city and citizens.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	See above
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	see above
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Same as above

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Restrictions on gardening locations based on zoned-use, rather than other factors determining suitability for small-scale intensive agricultural use (sunlight and soil quality, space, public accessibility, neighborhood and community interest, etc.), seems unnecessarily restrictive. The location of market gardens should be based on neighborhood and community interest and support, rather than generalized city zoning ordinances.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Residential and open areas contribute to general pedestrian quality of life and greenspace, but commercial and light industrial areas should be protected for higher-impact activities.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Rather than designating "type of space", define safe and community food production. For example some open space could work well - a community park for a community garden. However if golf courses are open space, this may not work as well for food safety (amount of pesticide used in maintaining lawn) or gardener safety (flying golf balls.) If we made golf courses compatible with gardens (fewer chemicals for maintenance), potentially we would discover new compatibilities. Similarly, a garden sharing space with light industry that's sustainable and non-chemical could be great a great combo. However a garden sharing space with toxic chemicals would not be compatible.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Raising food anywhere there is space is a good idea because it provides food for sale and consumption, puts the land to productive use, and gets people into areas that might otherwise be ignored, such as near Commercial and industry. Makes those areas more human-habitable.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Public places should remain public, not as a place for individual ventures to grow for personal profit.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Producing more food locally strengthens our community, makes us more resilient, able to handle changes or disasters.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Populous
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	People should not be restricted from engaging in non-toxic, non-hazardous activity (micro-farming) wherever they might find it possible and advantageous.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	People should be able to plant gardens wherever they would like. It should be their choice.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		People should be able to grow food for consumption almost anywhere that is not harmful to their health to do so.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	people need to eat. healthy "home" grown is best.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			people need food.

	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			people can grow their own and be involved in the community.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	People are requesting the opportunity, need tood good, reasonable food , it improves land quality and heals eyesore lots.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	People all over the city need access to local and fresh food. As long as the soil has been tested and is safe for growing food, we shouldn't let zoning limit where food is grown.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Owners have a right to use their land any way they want. We don't need Big Brother everywhere.
	Single-Dwelling			light industry	Our open spaces already have too much demand placed on them by recreational leagues and community gardens. We need to leave space for actual park programming like pastoral landscapes, paths and seating. I also checked single dwelling areas - but I think that these should be overaly zones on specific neighborhoods. The neighborhoods cited are really bad examples of good market garden neighborhoods. Neighborhoods like Brentwood Darlington, Powellhurst Gilbert, Parkrose and Cully are much better single dwelling neighborhoods for this type of use.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Open spaces should be preserved for our parks and rec areas unless there is community agreement that a city market is of better use of the land.
		Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Open space should be open to community gardens and other recreation and habitat - not market gardens.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	only concern for commercial and light industrial areas is contamination of soil and whether or not growers are testing soils.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			One size does not fit all. They should be available where access to the garden is safe, healthy, and feasible.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			not sure about commercial/light industry areas--what about pollution to the foods?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Not Commercial unless there can be some assurance of safe soil and groundwater management that is suitable for growing produce.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			North Portland, University Park, St Johns, Cathedral Park should all be on the Single-Dwelling areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	None of these areas has any good reason to disallow food production as long as the growers don't use noxious chemicals or particularly stinky fertilizers.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	No reason to restrict it.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		No golf courses - too many chemicals to make the grass pretty

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	nNEIGHBORHOODS VARY, AND ALL PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO HEALTHY, LOCAL, AFFORDABLE FOOD.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	NE Cully Neighborhood!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			My only concern with light industry and possible major streets in the pollution hazard to the food. If that can be studied and okay'd, I'd be good there too.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	My only concern is that in some areas there may be contaminated soil. Soil testing should be required for market gardens.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		My major concern would be the quality of the soil and potential toxic contamination in the commercial and light industrial areas.
		Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	Multidwelling areas often have few cultivated areas as do light industry areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	most people are unaware of the implications of even a slight disruption in our just in time delivery methods therefore the density of our food production helps to quell lawlessness during crisis because people aren't looting to survive. therefore you will have a smaller percentage of the populace willing to cross that moral line.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More potential to improve quality of life, economic opportunity than to impair it.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More plants= better air quality.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More people have access when there is mixed uses. I don't think there should be limits on where these are, other than potentially contaminated sites.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More local food and productive use of spaces that aren't being used much now would only be a positive thing for our city.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More is better for our environment.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	more green space is better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	more gardens the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	more gardens the better!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			more gardens near where people live the better
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More food production is a good thing as it connects us with nature, promotes sufficiency in our neighborhoods, and contributes to Portland's livability

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More areas means better access and more products available, but ALL R zones should be "allowed" NOT just those along major streets.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	more accessibility to all Portland residents
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	More accessibility
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Market Gardens will most likely be utilized by those in closest proximity. By allowing market gardens in different areas, the needs of many people will be best met.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Market gardens should be allowed where grocery stores aren't
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens should be allowed everywhere - the more market gardens, the less dependence on fruits and vegetables from outside Oregon.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens should be allowed anywhere that people wish to have them.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens create a durable local economy, encourage local business and keeping investments local. More opportunities serve the cause.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens could be an asset in any of these areas. I think the potential for contamination of the foods does exist, but I'd rather eat a locally grown vegetable with some Portland smog on it than one from Chile that has been flown in at tremendous cost.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens could be allowed in any zone as long as the impacts don't interfere with existing community activities. Regulating where market gardens can go based on the scale of their impact as opposed to allowing them outright in every zone make sense.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens can be and should be located in any of these areas. The opportunity for community to increase food-security should not be impeded.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens are not nuisances that would be incompatible with any of the above areas.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Market gardens are appropriate any place where private land or abandoned lots under the city's care is available.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Market gardens are a benefit to the community, children, families, and in creating less need for traveling. This can help our environment in many ways.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Many communities collaborate with groups or businesses to make use of odd-shaped lots, brown fields, community centers, churches, ...parking lot space.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Make use of what we have.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	Make it easy to access healthy food. Not grow where there is heavy pollution.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Locating organic market gardens everywhere increase the availability of fresh, locally grown produce and provides income for families in challenging times. Local market gardens are also an invaluable disaster preparedness resource. Last but by no means least, Beautiful, abundant large organic market gardens make any area more livable and enjoyable and turn the city into a beautiful Garden of Eden. The City should be encouraging large and small organic market gardens WHEREVER there is land to use for this purpose.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Local is good. The more sources of local food we have, the better for everyone.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	local food growing inportant for the future of planet
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Like I said, the more the better. Why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		light industry often includes chemicals, not a good idea.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Light industry areas worry me because of air pollutants on the veggies--not from the perspective of usable land.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Light industry areas might have polluted air, which would be a problem. Depends on the industry.
		Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	light industry and area where there are more people. if there is space for people in mutidwelling areas would not otherwise have space.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	let's make our area as sustainable as possible!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Let people grow food where they want to and where they can. Portland is usually so progressive and yet know we may limit where people can have their business, buying club, CSA etc.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling			light industry	less pollution due to less traffic
Open Space					Keep market gardens away from as many polutants as possible (i.e. car exhaust)
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	its food, if it will grow let it someone will eat it or it will be donated
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It's a great community building exercise, promotes peace and cooperation in neighborhoods, great examples for kids and much more
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	It would have be to evaluated land plot by land plot.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It would be wonderful f every possible space was growing food, local produce and sustainable agriculture are so important.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	It should definitely be available in residential areas
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It is important for people of all incomes to have access to fresh, organic produce.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It is good to farm land that is not otherwise being put to use. And growing things is a wonderful use.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It invites creativity and resourcefulness with what patches of land and light are available. Not all people will want to take the trouble and do the work but let's not restrict those who have vision and ambition.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It breaks up the building and promotes an "Oregonness"
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It all needs to produce. We cant afford to be handcuffed to one area. To many people need this all over.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	It adds to the beauty of the area.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Integration of market gardens in the city fabric allows for easy access for both growers and consumets, less reason to drive to a market, and markets targetted in structure and offerings to their local neighborhood.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Industrial areas would need to be examined closely for contamination before it's allowed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Industrial areas would need to be examined closely for contamination before it's allowed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	In the long run, we can't have too much local food self-reliance.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		In industrial areas there could be problems with contaminants in the ground. Any ground where harmful chemicals or waste are suspected should be tested.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Improving accessibility to LOCAL food should be the goal.
Open Space			Commercial	light industry	Impactts from trucks, traffic etc. no better because it's a "cool idea".
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I'm worried about placing market gardens in areas where soil or air might be polluted (Commercial, light industry?) but am open to seeing more market gardens in any safe place.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	If you overly limit where a market garden could go, then you overly restrict its benefits. A market garden could also be on the roof of a building in all the areas listed above. They have numerous benefits that easily outweigh noise, dust, or aromas.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		If there is space there should be food growing. However I would have concern over the amount of herbicides and pesticides sprayed all over the city.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	If there are hungry people in our city, we should be using every available resource to feed them, especially if it is healthy food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	If the soil is suitable for growing, why not?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	If suitable soils and utilities are available, increased garden spaces possibilities within city limits will offer greater potential for regionally self-sustaining food production.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	If someone has space, knowledge and skill to produce, market and sell something they should be allowed to. Isn't that a large part of the American dream?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	if by parks you mean the community garden type model we currently have. I would not like to see the city leasing public park land to private entities for market gardens. I have concern about pollution in heavy Commercial.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I'd prefer to reserve the open space *as* open space. Also, golf courses in particular are often heavy users of chemicals, and the land there might not be suitable for growing food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I'd like market gardens to be scattered throughout the city, What a boon for the bees and other city wildlife.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I wouldn't support a market where there is industry because of pollution, personally.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would simply be concerned about pollution factors.... as long as that is addressed, I don't see a problem with any of those areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would rather see a garden then a unused parking lot or empty space that can be used for crime.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would only add that there should be requirements to test for pollutants for growing in commercial/industrial areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would like there to be more market gardens, with the main constraints being whether a potential location might have contaminated soil, or on-going air pollution problems.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would highly prefer land to be used for food production instead of ornament, especially as there are many hungry residents with whom food security is an issue.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I would hesitate to have gardens in industrial/Commercial because of the pollution from industry and traffic. Otherwise, I support gardens wherever they can be located.
Open Space			Commercial	light industry	I would have concerns near industry and roadways because of carcinogens

					I would have concerns around industry
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I would be concerned about pollutants in light industry areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				I would be concerned about air pollution (particularly heavy metals from vehicle exhaust) in concentrated commercial and industrial use areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I would allow in all areas, perhaps increasing the minimum size in commercial and light industrial areas to coincide with the typically larger uses in those areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I want to have access to local food close to my home. I want to bike or walk to my market garden and NOT have to drive to a commercial site.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I want to encourage growing food anywhere people feel compelled to grow it.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think they should be allowed everywhere.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think they should be allowed everywhere, but I don't think they should be a barrier to future developments at the same locations. Short term versus Long term considerations, with an incentive to get a garden growing, but also so that it doesn't prevent a better long-term utilization of the space.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think they should be allowed everywhere so that people can be creative about it. They might not chose to have a garden in a commercial or industrial area, but they should have the option to create something that could really benefit the area!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think they should be allowed anywhere. Light industry areas might be a problem if the soil is contaminated.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think they should be allowed any place there is ability to sustain the market and have parking for shoppers.
				light industry	I think these should be present where ever there is a need and want for them and available space that is not being currently occupied. Direct sunlight most of the day is a must!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think the more the merrier. Children can learn a lot from seeing gardens and limiting theareas in which to grow them seems unnecessary.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think that we should grow more food in urban areas as long as we make sure that the soil is not contaminated.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I think that we should allow food to be grown in most places. However, caution to pollutants has to be taken into consideration as well.
					I think that the trickiest part of this is making sure the land is uncontaminated, right? and I'm not the one to judge which land is safe for food for the public. but i would think open space / singledwelling / multidwelling would be okay, but not the commerical/industrial ... probably?

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think that the City of Portland needs as much food grown in the city as possible, to reduce food miles and help the economy of Portland rather than the economy of California. The more flexible the city is in allowing market gardens, the more local food will be grown. There is nothing hazardous or unsightly about a market garden, so they can and should be anywhere they fit.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think that most urban spaces have developed into wasted green spaces. By keeping it open it would only revolutionize those lost areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think new zoning should expand, not limit, people's ability to grow food to sell throughout the city. I noticed the "single dwelling" neighborhoods mentioned are in predominantly whiter, wealthier neighborhoods - why? It is crucial that any new standards expand access for everyone, especially low-income people and/or people of color. How we describe these changes shapes people's perceptions, and Portland leadership has not done an equitable job of framing "neighborhood enhancements" as including low-income people and/or people of color. In this new cycle we have an opportunity to undo, not perpetuate, patterns of gentrification and its negative health impacts.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think market gardens should be allowed everywhere! The more access people have to starting their own small business, the more people can participate in and strengthen our local and regional economy. The only limitation should be that we should preserve some areas only for wildlife and recreation.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think market gardens should be allowed everywhere there is growing space. Why should we truck in produce from hundred's of miles away when we have spare space?
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I think market gardens should be allowed anywhere there is open land AND where the soil has been tested to be safe for growing food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think market gardens are a benifit to any niehborhood. Having healthy food available all over is good for the city.
	Single-Dwelling				I think it would be best if they are not close to automobile exhaust, etc.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think golf courses should be able to be market gardens, but parks would be another issue depending on what the park is used for (e.g., a market garden would not be appropriate in Forest Park).
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think expanding the allowed areas for market gardens can only increase access to locally grown food and improve the urban environment.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think anywhere there is vacant land it should be able to be used for growing healthy food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think anyone should use their available space for whatever use they see fit, and market gardens make more sense than grass plots or gravel.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	i think any place food can be grown should be allowed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think all land uses are potential options, provided that there isn't any danger of pollutants being found in the product that is to be consumed
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think all can be appropriate but making a rule set in stone could be unreasonable in some cases. I am sure some open spaces would be appropriate and some not. Some industry might negatively impact the food and some would not. Making rules that are flexible to me seems the best way to go.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I think agriculture is a good mix with urban land uses unless it involves use of chemicals which might drift into local air or water, or involves heavy equipment that would not otherwise be allowed in the area. I would not artificially limit the types of areas where farming can be done. The cost of urban land and water creates enough of a barrier on agricultural land use in the city.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I see the use of these areas as not only helping achieve localized food goals but also restoring "green" spaces to areas where development has paved over good farmland. I think open spaces need to remain open spaces - they are already under enough stress.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I see no reason to impose limitations on the areas where market gardens are allowed. Usable space is usable space!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	i say put them wherever they fit, provided the soil is good and there isn't too much air pollution from cars and industry.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I really don't think BDS should be limiting where ag can go in the City... However, I do think it may be appropriate to limit ag practices: such as requiring organic certification for all market gardens in the City.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I only question the amount of pollution getting into the food and thus into the people from exhaust, etc.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I love the markets, CSA, and farms that distribute in Portland. It is part of what makes the city a wonderful place to live!
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I like to keep our open spaces semi-natural and recreational. Keep the food where the people are working or living. Light industry use can carry contaminant concerns and traffic is tricky. It's especially important to have food access in multi-dwelling areas since density is a sustainable living choice.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I have some qualms about allowing market gardens in places of light industry, if only because of possible polution concerns. If it could be shown that these were not an issue in a specific locaton, I'd be fine with them.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		I feel we need to look at exploring as many options for the community as possible. To experiment and take the lead for the country.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't understand how a private individual has the right to use public land (parks) for private gain, but apart from that, at least the land would be used for something productive besides grass.
	Single-Dwelling		Commercial		I don't think that industry areas or multi-dwelling are good fits, unless the specific area is not significantly affected by industry or traffic pollution.If the air is clean, have at it!
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't support converting portland parks land to farm use. (golf courses would be fine with me.)
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't see why they should be limited.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't see why any of these spaces would be inappropriate for market gardening and again, we need to encourage the knowledge and practice of growing more food for ourselves in prep for challenging times ahead of us.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	I don't see the reason to be restrictive. In comm'l areas, then there are health issues. If you set too many limits, then it will be set in stone. Other policies depend on complaints....don't ask don't tell.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't see any particular reason to limit it
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I don't see a downside to growing food in any of these places.
					I don't know enough about these matters to speak to this.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			I do not want market gardens along areas that may be contaminated by industry.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I can't imagine any negative impacts to growing food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I believe they can only add value and beauty to almost any area.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		i believe that growing food in all different areas is a good idea, it increases the visibility of such ventures and increases peoples connection with the reality of food production. i hesitate to encourage food to be grow in light industry however because of the potential for industrial accidents that could poison the earth and the food and the likelihood that the ground in those areas is already badly polluted.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I believe people should be able to grow where they want to and are able to. However, if sharing/ selling the food they need to let purchasers know exactly where grown.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I believe market gardens should exist anywhere possible!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	I believe all open space should be allowed to have these gardens (I'm a gardener!)

					I am concerned about the environmental health of commercial and environmental areas. While I'd like to see those wasted lots be used for urban agriculture, I think there need to be measures in place to test them for pollutants (including deposits via air). This could be a great chance to partner with small soil remediation companies!
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Having gardens to produce food locally should not be restricted.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Growing things is great for the environment...provides oxygen/carbon exchange, looks nice, provides habitat for animals and forage for pollinators. Growing things that feed people is even better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Growing our own food is becoming more and more important. I would love to see more of it happening in Portland.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	grow food everywhere! say no to GMO
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Golf courses pose hazzards for farmers, and they use pesticides. Parks maybe, but keeping the playful nature of the park is paramount.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Given the scale of the economic crisis that is already upon us, there should be a focus on building a simple platform for accelerating a local food economy. Limiting the types or areas of gardens is inconsistent with the reality of our current situation and almost certain future.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Given a suitable site in any of these areas, work can be created, and food produced. This benefits the community.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Generally, market gardening is not a highly profitable venture. Lands that are ready to be developed to a higher use will likely be developed once market forces make market gardening on the property economically disadvantageous. Until market forces move the properties to higher uses, agriculture should be allowed. Apparent examples of this might be found along N Williams. In this area there are many vacant, weedy, unused properties. Several of these sites are being used as gardens, the presence of which invigorates and beautifies the neighborhood. Construction and development is proximal to these properties. Because gardens require such a relatively small capital expenditure to start, it is likely that they would transition to "higher" uses once market forces acted. City ordnance already addresses many issues such as noise, and these issues can be dealt with by enforcement of existing code.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Gardens should be allowed everywhere.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Gardens are opportunities to use vacant land, which can occur in any zone, and even in industrial areas can be treated with bio remediation to ensure clean soil.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Gardens are a nice amenity to urban areas and seem like a mostly compatible use.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Gardens are a net benefit, adding habitat for bees, and providing more green growing things for people to look at, and of course to eat!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Gardening directly enhances the viability and diversity of urban landscapes. Polluted areas can be remediated by successive growth over seasons, however the first few crops may not be safe for consumption.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Garden location should not be limited in residential zone locations. Some locations will work nicely others may be poorly managed and not work.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling		light industry	FREEDOM
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				Food would grow best near nature, I.e. Birds, bees and other pollinators. That said, places like the roof of Noble Rot should not be limited.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	food should be grown wherever possible by whomever is willing to do it.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	food is our greatest need next to water. the more local food the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Food is beautiful.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	food and other plants growing anywhere is beautiful and perfect.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Food access is important to all and market gardens make food more accessible. Market gardens will increase food access the most in open spaces, single-dwelling areas and multi-dwelling areas, but commercial and light industry areas also offer options for people near their place of employment.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Focus on traffic levels vs. parking etc. Address distinctions between foot, car and bike traffic.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Feeding ourselves is CRITICAL. Imagine gas at \$10 a gallon.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Farming is a low income profession and use of the land. Market forces will push the farmers aside as the land becomes more valuable for other development. Gardens can create a valuable short term infill in neglected neighborhoods with unutilized land. Concerns such as noise, smells and appearance are already addressed in city code; there is no reason that urban agriculture cannot comply with code and be a good fit in residential areas listed above.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	facilitation of more food producing land

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	everywhere, rooves. dig up any asphalt that is not needed, as well. speak with Depave. We should be depaving as much as possible NOW.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Everywhere please.
					Everywhere gardens are allowed.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	everyone should be able to have a market garden regardless of where they live. food security is more important than maintaining neighborhood distinctions at least in this regard.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Everyone needs to eat. most kids/employees, people in general love to watch something grow that they have a part in so it seems like it would be a benefit everywhere.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Every bit of land counts and accessibility for as many people as possible is important.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Every available space that can be used should be used (unless, of course, it's been made toxic by industrial use). Quality, affordable food should be in sight of and available to all people.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Encourage urban farming/gardening for health and education, increase access to healthy food for urban dwellers.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Easy access; walking distance to/from home/work
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Each type of area will have available space and should be capable of being utilized where appropriate.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Each of these types of areas will have some space available for market gardens. Allowing them in all of these spaces will increase local food production in all areas of the city and therefore more easily bring fresh local produce to all neighborhoods.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	During a disaster (matter of time, not when) we will need food and we will need folks who know how to do it....by hand, preferably.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Due to the ever-increasing distances between urban and suburban areas, allowing more markets in more areas reduces the need for excessive automobile use.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Diversity of market gardens will bring a diversity of benefits to a broad range of people.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Diversifying our food sources and our access to food has become and will become more imparitive as our country continues to explore mono-agriculture practices for fuels and industry not directed towards food supplies.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Definately at parks and open spaces, with Parks approval. Limited in SFR zones (size and hours/days)

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Consideration should be given to previous use of each individual site and its proximity to vehicle emissions. A good reason for reducing auto / truck use. Also reduce the probability of vandalism and theft.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling		Commercial		Concerns about environmental health hazards- it's unclear if/ how these concerns can be addressed through zoning codes though.
		Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Compatible activities.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Community-building, economic growth, buy-in to our communities
			Commercial	light industry	Community Gardens should be in the denser residential areas
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Commercial and industrial land only if there is regulation that would prevent pollution or contamination of food, soil and water.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Commercial and industrial areas might cause pollution which would get into the food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	By having food where we live, it increases the connection we have to the food supply chain and where our food comes from.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	BUT - in residential areas (single- & multi-dwelling) they should be kept to institutional lots.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Bringing food production closer to people reducing food cost (less transportation) and improves the livability of all of these areas
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	bio-reclamation, C02 absorption, food access, increased focus on vegetables and production... the list goes on.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	better than pavement and especially in this economy where an empty space can equal despair or crime it would help to lower that.
		Mutli-Dwelling			Better access for those who may want to use them - without affecting space for affordable single family dwellings
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Because the restrictions should be based on presence on toxins not on definition of "type of area"
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Because people need more access to convenient local food options.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	because not only is food life but by having these gardens you will teach sustainability and personal responsibility for the land and the food that is injected
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Because locally grown produce is extremely important for the health and well being of Portland's residents. Also, growing lots of Portland's produce within Portland city limits is EXTREMELY MARKETABLE in this day and age, not to mention much more sustainable than the current food transportation system.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Because if someone wants to beautify an area with a garden, as well as improve and increase our area's access to local food, they should not be limited, and should be able to grow things wherever land is available.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Because having gardens interspersed with multiple uses only enhances the urban experience.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Avoid as many potential land contaminants as possible
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		As much as as possible, we should utilize urban space for growing crops, unless it is in an area where contamination is likely.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	As long as there is not soil contamination.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	As long as there is no soil, water or air pollution.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		As long as the soil is proven to be healthy and with a low level of toxins, I think market gardens will only benefit the areas they inhabit. Most times those that need access to fresh food the most are those living in more densely urban areas such as multi-family dwelling units and places focused more on business and commercial development than on residential wellness.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	As long as the gardens are not subject to toxins, the more flexibility for gardening the better.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	As long as soil is tested for contaminants, farms should be allowed anywhere.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	As long as it is safe to access the site, I believe we should take advantage of every available plot of land. Creating even tiny eco-cultures is good in every way and has no drawbacks, in my opinion.
Open Space		Mutli-Dwelling			Areas where people gather or pass by in a less hurried pace or in larger quantities.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere. People should be encouraged to grow food, not limited.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere where there is currently a vacant lot. I would also require some soil safety testing.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere they are, they make the neighborhood better. Don't prohibit them anywhere. Come on now, this is Portland, be as progressive as you like to think of you are as planners.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere that people can grow food increases community interaction, beautifies our city, increases activity in families, lessens the pressure of impoverished families on food stamps and increases the health of our communities. This is a progressive and active way we can help ourselves and set an example for other cities.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere that food could be grown for local consumption should be utilized, especially if the alternatives are impermeable surfaces like pavement or landscape gardens that require water and resources but do not produce edibles.

Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere soil is uncontaminated and people want to grow food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Anywhere people live or congregate is appropriate...
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anywhere can work
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Anything we can do to make small-scale food growing easier and more widespread is good for Portland.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	anything to boost the local food availability
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any way we can achieve gardens is a positive move for the health and well being of our society.
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	any unused, uncontaminated space should be considered an option
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Any place where soil is good or buildable and far enough away from pollutants should be utilized.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any place that there is space to grow food should be considered.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any place that people are willing to garden should be ok. It is important for as many people as possiblr to be connected to the growing of thir food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any open spaces should be considered for gardens, if someone or some group is willing to take responsibility for it. I cannot see a downside to this.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any open space deemed safe for growing food with minimal effort to create safe space.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any of these areas would benefit from having local access to market gardens.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any ground that is safe to use can be beautified, and the cost of its care justified, by making it produce food. (In Portland, at least. In a desert, the cost of water alone would make agriculture uneconomical.)
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any available, arable land would be put to better use with food/flower growing.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any area that wants a garden should have one, though it would be good to be mindful of pollution and heavy metals in commercial and industrial areas.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any area that can be gardened should be allowed to be gardened in the search for healthier options for our citizens. Bring back the victory garden!
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Any area is fine for a garden of any type...it uses land that is otherwise just sitting fallow.

	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Allowing people to shop close to home, work, or other primary shopping areas is great in many respects (keeps dollars local, fosters a connection to neighborhoods, reduces driving, etc)
	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial		Allow in limited open space to preserve natural settings; limit in industrial (light or heavy) unless soil is tested.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	all people should have easy access to market gardens
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	All of these spaces are partially or fully public spaces and urban agriculture is compatible with these activities.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	All of the above, if there are adequate provisions for traffic, regulation of agricultural practices and food safety. Organic, non-GMO practices are a must. No commercial grower should be allowed to pollute land, air or water with chemicals.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	all available should be available to use for agriculture
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	All available arable land should be allowed for use barring reasonable reasons to restrict location.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	All arable land should be available for market gardens.
					Again, the very notion of allowing or disallowing where people grow gardens is antithetical to the ethos of Portland.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Again, more gardens mean an increase in biodiversity as well as food security. But along major streets there should ideally be some kind of barrier between gardens and traffic (eg non-edible foliage), and in areas which are currently or have previously been used by industry, there needs to be a process for ensuring that the environment is healthy and free of toxic pollutants.
Open Space		Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Again depends on context not across the board zoning regulation.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	Access to locally produced food needs to be easy for both the farmer and the buyer. It keeps the cost down, and helps develop community. Restricting the access to only commercial or light industrial areas puts people back into their cars to travel further, creates more cost, and depersonalizes the whole process. Removing access from the neighborhood would, in effect, undo the qualities that make this attempt to localize and minimize our personal footprint work.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling			Access to gardening and it will help people to normalized eating fresh food.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	A mix of some & all of the above assures accessibility to everyone.

					A healthy, local food culture is important to everyone--whether they know it or not! We all have to eat! If there was some kind of large scale catastrophe (with our nation's centralized food supply), having smaller scale agriculture would certainly reduce the impact to Portland. Plus, it allows more people the opportunity to try their hand at farming in all different kinds of settings. Growing food in commercial or areas of light industry could encourage better stewardship of the area by surrounding businesses and people.
Open Space	Single-Dwelling	Mutli-Dwelling	Commercial	light industry	
Open Space	Single-Dwelling				

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 4: In residential areas, do you think produce should be sold on site, as at a farm stand? ANSWERED "NO"

A co-op or gathering of farmers makes more sense for the whole community. Centralize the traffic, meeting place and people works for the farmer and the neighborhood.

A cooperative stand perhaps but not individual stands.

All hours would be disruptive to neighborhood. Once a week pick up is not.

Allow it but do not require it.

as I mention above, this could be disruptive to a residential area

Because that turns it into a commercial area.

Commerce needs to be directed to the neighborhood commercial areas. Farm stands need to be there. The traffic impacts of customer traffic are not suited to neighborhoods.

congestion

CSA-type pick-up, yes, Farm stand, no. Having a structure that with the facilities to keep food at the proper temperature, free of dust & vermin, etc. is pretty costly and the scale of operation described here would not support it

Delay until decision made to eliminate basic concepts of residential quality. Is this outdated, bourgeois value or not?

Difficult to regulate quality and price. Also, parking may be an issue.

Disrupting to neighbours

Flexibility is needed. We sell our produce on site but I would hesitate to limit it to this if some other venue is possible.

I don't think it should be limited to on-site sales.

I think "could" may be more appropriate word, then my answer would be "yes"; I see it more as neighbors buying from neighbors, possibly w/out a stand.

I think on-site should be an option, but not all good growing spaces are in good marketing areas. Growers should be allowed to take their produce to farmer's markets and other venues in addition to being able to sell on site.

I think that's one option but it shouldn't be limited to that.

I think there shouldn't be a prohibition but it shouldn't be required.

I think you should be able to deliver but not make monetary transactions.

I worry about individuals buying wholesale from farms outside of the city and reselling as "home grown". However the creation of public farmers markets would allow all sorts of gardeners to sell and barter surplus crops.

I would like to suggest neighborhood market spaces like Farmer's Markets in Parks, Church lots, etc. Having competing stands at individual sites could blight our neighbor hoods. Having areas close enough to be served by hand carts or bike trailers would be good.

I would worry about increased traffic & limited availability of parking in my neighborhood.

I'm okay with selling in a residential area, but not necessarily from a residential property. Allowing permits to sell in common areas of institutional uses would seem to be better than turning homes into commercial centers.

In a mixed commercial and residential area I would be comfortable with farm stands, but if it were purely residential, I think that would turn the area into a commercial one.

In addition to the farm stand, we need increase accessibility to local produce

It depends

it then becomes a commercial zone

Its a question of fairness. For most of the year and for most crops that grow in Oregon there are appropriate areas nearby.

It's residential, not commercial

Limiting to on-site sales does not leverage other distribution channels such as FMarkets, co-ops, CSA's, etcetera maybe yes, maybe no. I'd like to hear other's ideas

No farm stands - but yes to CSA type model or delivery to other parts of town

No, but a flower stand would be okay as is often done in rural areas with self pay stations.

Not compatible with residential use. Clearly a commercial use.

not only...what about farms stand corners like we have food cart corners now.

Not sold, but delivery would be OK. A one time a week pick up location is much less traffic than an all day, every day farm stand. If the sales and negotiation of it was done elsewhere, it would be less concerning to the residents.

Only in cases in which a farm is in a residential area. In the case of a smallish market garden, there are LOTS of farmers markets in the City of Portland which market gardeners can bring their produce to.
parking
Parking issues in some areas, increased foot traffic, noise & privacy concerns for neighbors
Please let the local CSA and buying clubs do what they are doing. I joined one about a year and a half ago. Since then, I only go to the store about once a month, my family is eating healthier organic food and my grocery will have been cut in half.
Potential parking problems
Product should be ALLOWED to be sold on site, but not required. Allow groups of neighbors to congregate and sell in 1 location - lower carbon impact than having customers make multiple stops.
Residential areas are NOT and should NOT be commercial areas - it'll easily get out of control with non-produce type items being sold
Retail activity - on a daily basis - is not appropriate in R-5 zones. It's no different than yard sales which are limited and rightly so. Traffic, noise and all the other negative impacts to livability are justification for excluding such sales. Farmers Markets are the appropriate venues; they are affordably priced.
Sales should be in commercial areas
Same reason we don't allow business with customers to set up shop in a neighborhood.
See below.
sell it wherever whenever :)
there should be a choice in where the produce can be sold and it should not be restricted to on site only.
They should be able to deliver and sell at farmers markets.
This blurs the lines between commercial and residential and would probably necessitate permitting. There should be another option - cooperative selling on a local scale should be made easier
Too much additional traffic and parking congestion.
too much room for unwanted commercial activity. Families can trade food from their own gardens informally. Wouldn't want money trading hands in neighborhood.
traffic problems, children in streets, etc
What about farmers' markets? Deliveries to restaurants? Why would it have to be sold on site?
Depends on traffic, noise and other considerations.
don't know
If the neighborhood can support it, it's to the good.
I'm not sure on this one...
It could be.
It would depend.
Maybe, depends on the neighborhood.
Maybe. I think traffic considerations could impact on-site sales. Portland does have a number of farmer's markets. so I think it would be OK to limit on-site sales in residential areas.
Maybe..... it depends on what quality, and the behavior of the sellers.
No sure about that one
Not sure
Not sure
Not sure. I'm inclined to think traffic would be a problem, but a blanket ban seems excessive.
See note on question 3.
should be sold at an offsite stand
the wording of this question is confusing. Should or could? Why would it only have to be sold on site?
They should be allowe to sell on and off site.
Unsure. It would draw traffic, so that's a drawback. But saves the farmer having to schlepp heavy stuff to farmer's markets, etc.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 4: In residential areas, do you think produce should be sold on site, as at a farm stand? ANSWERED "YES"

"Should" as in "should be allowed", not as in a legal requirement or mandate.

...as an option, not a condition. That way customers can see where it's coming from, and as long as it's not too big, the impact on other residents won't be negative.

10-minute neighborhoods!

A family that grows more food than they can eat should be able to share that with others, and be compensated for their time, effort, and expense. Additionally, if people can buy local produce close to where they live, they will eat more of it and it will cost less.

a way to limit number of retail farms in residential areas and a way to encourage selling produce on-site rather than transport to another site.

Absolutely! That way the folks living in proximity to the farm/market gardens can have easy access to buying produce, and the growers can cut down on transportation costs--both environmental and financial.

Again, local produce needs to be promoted.

Again, the more access we can provide to healthy, fresh, local food, the better for all of Portland's people.

Again, we all eat. Every day. The more people are able to sell goods that are labor intensive to produce and do not make much money, from the place they grew them, the better they can sustain themselves and their neighbors. The lower the overhead and traveling the better.

All types of products, whether agricultural or hand-crafted, should be allowed to be sold in an effort to meet the needs of its community.

allowing food to be passed directly from farmer to consumer is a good thing.

Allowing for local produce vendors would only help the economy and create community. Such community and economic growth makes the city stronger and more desirable to live in.

Allowing produce to be sold on site will minimize costs to producers, thereby offering the potential for more affordable produce to consumers. The option will continue to localize and stabilize the Portland foodshed and allow for micro-foodshed development within neighborhoods.

Allowing the urban farmers to sell produce on site makes it easier for people to start up this kind of endeavor, ensuring that more lots be converted into market garden use.

Allows best access for local residents.

Allows locals to easily access food in their neighborhoods

Allows people the opportunity to connect with others in their area, greater access to locally grown food, creating more neighborhood connectedness

Although depending on traffic, parking, congestion, etc. my opinion may change.

America's economy is based on small business ownership. We are at a turning point in our history, where the general population needs to be re-introduced to the value of small business, and learn to recognize it as a value added to the community, rather than as a nuisance because traffic has increased, lack of bike racks or similar reasons. Those who are motivated to grow healthy food and make it accessible to the local community should be supported in their efforts.

And also at Framer's Markets. Increase access to healthy food for urban dwellers.

another source of good produce

As local as possible!

As long as there are health code regulations to follow and proper licensing.

As long as there is adequate parking

As long as they share exactly where they are growing the food.

at the discretion of the homeowner

Because having a local, convenient point of access closer to home/preparation site avoids the need to use car. It also supports neighborhood development by building community familiarity.

because then you can see who is growing what instead of some nameless corporation

Because trucking food out of neighborhoods is a waste of fuel if there is a market right there for it.

been happening at ariadne for years. lots of people in the neighborhood get their produce there. how much more local can you get?

Before starting such an enterprise, it would be good to talk to the neighbors, to discuss potential impacts.

better availability of healthy food to encourage better eating.

Both
Both farm stand and in the store would be fine.
Bring food to the people.
Bring produce to where people are, especially where they gather in larger numbers such as at churches, schools, community centers and non-profits
Bring the food closer. Redefine farmer and bring him/her closer so we can look at the land.
Bringing social, non-industrial transactions, especially around small farm and artisan products can socially enliven neighborhoods and raise neighborhood and community involvement.
brings the food closer to the eaters and provides the neighborhood a community activity and education on growing food
but limited to produce grown on that site.
but no restricted to farm stands.
but not limited to on-site markets.
But only if traffic and parking issues are addressed.
But with caveats. In areas where parking is difficult, or where walking access is not good, it might be an issue. If someone can park in a driveway, cool. I can't imagine little farm stands will be so busy they'd overcrowd the world...we allow garage sales, right? They don't impact the universe in crazy ways. Neither would this.
Community-building aspect of gathering neighbors to a local site.
Community-building. Getting neighbors out to meet neighbors.
Convenience.
could be not necessarily Should be. i like the stands at the side of the road near where produce is grown.
Could be useful for home-bound and low-income.
Depending on the amount of regulations, it wouldn't matter if they did. However, if extensive (expensive) moderators were required to keep tabs on the trade, it may be prohibitively expensive for taxpayers
DEPENDS (kind of polarizing choices...) on the site (traffic, hours, potential use conflicts, etc.). Residential neighborhood sites should be carefully thought out for hours, traffic, noise and other concerns.
Depends on set up, visual care, and traffic. We have farm stand in park area in South water front, works well and is well cared for. In financial crunch important to allow outlets. If direct neighbors do not object.
Depends on the area and what the people in that area want. It would be great to pick up fresh fruit and veggies on the morning walk with the dogs.
depends on the size/amount being sold and if the traffic is only from people not living in that area
Don't know - level of activity is the main issue.
Easy access=More availability=healthier choices
Easy access for local neighbors. PLEASE don't take that away from us
Either. Selling on site could be very convenient for the neighborhood, but requiring on-site sales could be a burden for the farmer. A farm stand with limited hours (or self-serve honors system) could be a good compromise.
Eliminates the need to have an additional retail space for the farmers. Allows neighbors to have a visible face of the farm and benefit from the produce being grown.
Enables small producers to sell at various levels of formality (like a lemonade stand, but eggs, for examp.) without onerous overhead costs.
Encourages buying local / seasonal. Convenient for residents.
Encourages production and neighbor-to-neighbor sales.
Especially in the RF and other lower zones, it seems logical to allow farm stand sales. Perhaps a permit application process might be advisable in order to evaluate neighbor sentiment, scale of operation, and traffic concerns. I would suggest CSA pick-up locations might be allowed outright without a permit application process.
Everyone should have access to healthy, fresh food in their neighborhood. The more fresh produce available within walking distance will allow people to make healthy food choices which in turn may help lower obesity rates and decrease medical expenses across our city.
Farm direct is a great way to go.
Farm direct sales provide the most benefit to the grower, while bringing fresh food into residential neighborhoods, lowering the amount of vehicle trips to stores.
Farm stands are also are a benefit to the community and to our food security. We are in favor of fewer limitations for small-scale and organic local food producers.

Farm stands based on market gardens (rather than from large-scale agricultural production) seem unlikely to increase land-use impact, given the limits of small-scale gardening. Increased noise, pollution, or traffic seems unlikely. It does seem reasonable for city ordinances to limit the hours of operation for on-site produce sales (for example, limiting business hours to daylight hours) to offset what little negative impact (such as from noise) there may be.
Farm stands should be allowed in residential areas, yet there should be boundaries on size of stand and allowable traffic.
Food is essential to life, why regulate it to only commercial zones? People should be able to grow and purchase food where they live. To relegate produce sales to only commercial or industrial areas will increase emissions and pollution by moving the food around too much.
Food security is increased when the buyer can have direct contact with the grower, and even more so when they can see where the food is coming from!
Food should be made accessible wherever it is grown.
Freshness and immediate availability.
Giving buyers the opportunity to see and support an individual site (such as one in their neighborhood, or on the property where they work or shop) builds community.
Giving growers the ability to sell direct to the public without having to pay additional rent is incredibly important to having a viable business
Giving residents the opportunity to grow, or buy their produce right on their block would be great. Especially for young parents, the elderly, the mobility challenged. Nutritious food for all!
Good idea for people to become aware of how their food is grown. They may look at the garden; at the people who are growing it; and ask questions. However, issues such as parking and the noise of possible machinery being used should be addressed.
Good neighborly relations.
good way to encourage locally grown, contribute to sense of community. Maybe limit to produce grown on site (rather than combined with trucked in produce as well) keeps large scale operations from overtaking- keeps truck traffic out of neighbor hoods.
Great for the neighborhood.
Greater access leads to greater
Growing up in a place that does this, in BC, it allowed neighbors to interact and help each other.
Heck yes! If local neighbors are worried about farm stand traffic, that's an opportunity for crafting a neighborhood approach.
Help with food deserts
honestly, i'm on the fence on this one. while i don't think the size of market gardens should be limited, i do think the size of farm stands should be limited in residential areas. small stands would be fine. but if the business grows and the farm stands grow, what happens with cars and bicyclists interfering with pedestrians, kids playing, and the general walkability and livability of the neighborhood?
How wonderful to be able to buy food nearby.
However the keeper of the site would like to sell his/her food.
I am in favor of produce being sold on site if possible or desired by the people who grew it. The less food has to travel potentially utilizing resources such as fossil fuels or packaging materials the better. Produce sold on site could decrease the amount of transport and resources used while increasing the amount of fresh food available to residents within walking/biking distance in a community.
I believe the more accessible produce is, the more likely people are to consume it. If you could walk one block to pick up produce instead of driving to a more centralized location, you are more likely to do it and you are reducing your dependency on things like fossil fuels.
I could conveniently buy it
I do not see why this would be a problem.
I do think there needs to be some consideration about excessive added motor vehicle traffic.
I don't know that it matters where or how that produce is sold.

I don't like this question as worded. I think if someone has a garden at their home, they should be allowed to have a table set up to sell their goods (it should not be an overly regulated "code specific" structure with precise measurements, etc). I'm from Ohio and people have these all over the place! Small stands where people can drive/walk/bike up and buy produce grown on site (by places both larger and smaller), some even on the honor system. I think this would be great, and encourage people to get to know others in their neighborhood, and keep money in the neighborhoods. If a person grows bunches of produce, perhaps they would want to take it to a farmer's market or the like, so they also shouldn't HAVE to sell it on site.
I don't see an issue with small scale home-based sales. It will allow people to make extra money on a small scale
I don't think it should be mandatory, but it would be interesting to try permitting it. I think it would depend on the block and the neighbors.
I enjoy purchasing from neighborhood farms.
I grew up in New England where this is common. It was GREAT and I often have commented how much I miss having a neighbor selling beans or whatever. I realize folks worry about traffic, but it tends to be very low volume and, when it becomes common enough, people walk to their neighbor's stand so in fact drive LESS.
I like buying from local growers, and it's usually cheaper than farmer's market.
I like the idea, but it should be regulated so that the stands contribute to the beauty of a neighborhood. The should look better, for example, than the jumbles of food pods/carts on the corner of Hawthorne and 12th. Yuck. The food stand should attract visitors, not make customers question the items for sale.
I like the informality of neighbors "cross-referencing" what they have. Important criteria would be: only produce/products (ie, eggs) grown on that site; relatively unobtrusive "farm stand" structure
I like to live in neighborhoods where you know the people who provide your food.
I love our local Kruger Farm Stand that also hosts other vendors on occasion. I am able to walk to various stores and food stands from my house thus eliminating my carbon foot print. I also bulk buy from a group sharing spot and I belong to a CSA. These are all healthy practices for our environment and our community!
I love the idea of old fashioned farm stands where you can just wander over to your neighbors and buy his excess corn and tomatoes etc.
I miss more fresh vegetables and fruit being available in my Portland area (Kerns). I want to be able to buy local by being able to walk to a stand.
I say yes with limitations: Follow ODA farmstand guidelines 1. only produce you grow. 2. Limited hours, daylight hours, days of week, something like that. 3. Income limited. ODA has limited the prepared foods made by farmers to \$20,000 in sales. The City should consider a similar restriction. 4. Standards for stand to prevent/limit attracting animals to the food.
I think both on site and off site sales should be allowed. Selling on site gives the farmer and his/her neighbors a chance to create community. The customers can easily visit and even be a part of the farm and they can influence what the farmer plants so that their food needs are more easily met.
I think healthy food should be able to be sold anywhere. Everyone in every neighborhood should have a corner market stand.
I think if the neighbors don't have a problem with it, who is the county to say that we shouldn't be able to have a farm stand.
I think it can be valuable in building communities and in making locally grown food more affordable and easily accessible to families.
i think it COULD be sold on site, but don't believe it should be restricted to only being sold there as the question seems to imply to me.
I think it should be able to be sold on site AND should be allowed to be sold elsewhere as well.
I think it should be an option.
I think it will encourage more local commerce; i.e. neighbors buying from each other. I think that producers should also be free to sell at markets.
I think it's beneficial for people to see where their food comes from. This also allows people in the neighborhood or nearby to walk or bike to pick up their food. If you make it too far away, then it can be hard for some people to get transportation there. Having it be sold right there, can create a more connected community. Also, the produce should be allowed to be sold other places as well.

I think people should be able to have small enterprises out of their homes. If they have a large garden and want to sell their surplus to people who walk by, it is a great way for them to make a few needed \$\$\$ without making a large investment. This kind of activity will encourage more people to interact with their neighbors, which reduces crime and builds strong communities. At these types of stands, only something grown at that site should be allowed on that site.
I think that should be an option.
I think that's fine, but there should be some regulations on space and size of the stand.
I think the neighbors should have a say in this, but if the location is appropriate, then yes.
I think they should be allowed to sell on site.
I think they should have time limits, such as not before 9 am or after 7 pm. Other than that I think unless there are complaints it should be allowed. You could have a rule that if there are three or more complaints then they have to move somewhere else. Most stands are only for a short window anyway while their produce is in season and then it is not an issue for another year.
I think this would be fine. Not necessary, but quite reasonable
I think we should see who we are buying our produce from and where it's being curated. I don't think having a stand does anything except involve an unnecessary step.
I want to have access to local food close to my home. I want to bike or walk to my market garden and NOT have to drive to a commercial site.
I wish you had a choice, 'It depends.' Certain residential streets could handle it, others could not.
I would like to have some kind of hours of operation rules, as I do appreciate peace and quiet. Not as if my neighbors respect that anyways, but adding a farmers market at every house that's growing food might make things less peaceful.
I would love to buy food from my neighbors. If this sort of activity draws concerns of congestion in neighborhoods, that is a sign of a greater problem: we need better access to good foods! That shouldn't mean we should eliminate people selling food, but rather make it more diversified and prevalent. You could encourage vendors to have discounts for people purchasing from within the neighborhood and a higher price for people outside the neighborhood. You could vie for each neighborhood to have farm stands to provide to the demanding public eliminating peoples need to travel outside of their neighborhood for farm stand produce.
I would love to buy my food where it is grown, can't get more local than that.
If a co-op among neighborhood residents, a distribution center would be beneficial to keeping everything manageable. And it's not as if a stand would be the equivalent of a food cart, which would affect traffic in a neighborhood much more than a residential garden.
If farmers in rural areas can operate farm stands, then on-site sales should occur at urban market gardens.
If fresh fruits and vegetables are not being sold or made available to the public, I do not understand the purpose of the market.
if it is an occasional event---OK but not every week. For example: I buy produce at the neighbor farmers market, BUT I purchase my dahlias from a neighborhood grower--Old House Dahlias-- I believe he holds his show and purchasing event once a year---I go every year and to me it doesn't make a huge impact on this neighbors, since it is once a year but if it was every week, if I was a neighbor it would grow old fast !!
If it is good stuff, I would buy it. Better than going to supermarket
If it is grown in the neighborhood, it should be sold in the neighborhood if the farmer desires to do so. This will make it easier for the residents to acquire fresh, local food and will reduce their need to drive to other parts of the city.
if licensed. support community agriculture, community structure. if proceeds help neighborhood
If neighbors don't object and there is sufficient parking for customers so as not disrupt neighborhood street uses.
if no one buys it then they will leave. If people buy then the people want it. This assumes they still need a business license of some sort.
If someone wants to sell a product they have grown, they should be able to use their growing area. It will encourage more people to learn about how food is grown as well as giving the grower the safety net of being able to be overseen and "inspected" by the purchasers. This = transparency.
If someone wishes to go to the trouble to grow good food locally, they should be allowed to sell it as well.
if the "manager" of the garden feels that they need financial compensation-- or just give he veggies away to passer by neighbors
If the resident has sufficient space for a farm stand, I see it as a positive thing for the neighborhood.

If these are business farms for servicing areas apart from the local neighborhood they should be considered a zoning violation per the requirement suggested in the answer to #3 above.
If they want to, the government should stay out of it!!!
If you are producing highly perishable items, storage and preservation requirements will limit your ability to sell your goods, especially if you can only sell once a week at a market. I see this as an opportunity to build community
If you grow it or want to open a farm stand, go for it. Support the local businesses that spend their money locally.
I'm not sure many folks will do that, but I think a lot of people will opt for a non-staffed honesty system with a locked pay box.
I'm not sure what the other option is.
I'm sort of torn on this one; my general sense is that people should be able to make money from their produce. Quality control is an issue, but as we've seen recently, even farm stands can have issues...don't want to over-regulate, but some form of regulation may be necessary.
Improving accessibility to LOCAL food should be the goal.
In certain situations. For example, a resident who sells produce from the back garden to neighbors is different from a large-volume stand, selling goods grown on other sites in the middle of a residential street.
In limited quantities.
in this economy the presence of grass roots income and using local product is a win win for the community.
Increase access to neighbors as long as traffic is not a problem.
Increases a sense of community when you know your farmer.
Increases access to fresh produce especially in areas where there may not be grocery stores or markets that sell much in the way of fresh produce.
Increases the "localness" of the food and neighbors' ability to access the food. I also think the farmer/grower should be able to sell the produce off site.
Increasing access to healthy food should be a priority in this process. Neighborhood farm stands are a great way to increase access and provide direct farm to consumer contact.
It brings the food source closer to the community, improving access to fresh wholesome foods to more people.
it builds local community
It can be. It brings neighbors together and promotes respectable gardens.
It fosters community and increases the direct income to the farmer.
It gives the neighbors a fantastic way to interact and eat food that is directly connected to their neighborhood
It is a way for local farmers to keep money local and stimulate our local economy. It allows small local farmers to directly meet the consumers most interested in these products. If not, basically the barriers of economy of scale begin to edge our local farmers out
It is very important for people to connect with where their food comes from. If they don't buy from someone growing in an area where there are pollutants that sends a message. Just as buying from your neighbor on the corner builds community.
It keeps the food available within the local area. People will be able to walk to buy fresh produce, eggs, etc. It fits right in with green and sustainable planning for the future.
It should at least be an option.
It should be allowed but not required. If someone wants to take their produce off-site then fine.
It should be an available option for growers, though not the required site.
It will encourage small businesses. Using your OWN land to provide a food source and/or an income should not fall under state control other than income and property taxes which are basics. My land and within the already basic standards of "use rights" people should be able to grow food or flowers if they choose. It is far more productive and attractive than the "junk yards" that seem to go un-regulated. Buying food products from ANY location has the potential for contamination, so I don't think that is a logical argument for regulating or stopping small farms.
It works fine in places like Vashon Island. No reason it can't work anywhere.
It would be lovely to have a farm stand in my neighborhood.
It would help each area. Produce would not have to be hauled and kept for days to a different place from where it was grown. The closer you purchase the food to the places it's grown the better quality of foods you get.
it's done already, I don't think it's that big of a deal. I do like that it is mostly discrete at this point though. There's no need to be tacky about it.

It's good for people to be able to walk conveniently to a place in their neighborhood to buy healthy affordable food. You may have some parking issues, yet, but you're more likely to get local foot traffic. Which is good, right?
It's good for people to know where their food comes from.
It's local and resource conserving. Lets keep the people out of the car and in the neighborhood.
It's more convenient to be able to walk to buy your produce, and in SW, it is impossible.
it's wonderful to have fresh produce easily available.
I've always enjoyed buying truly locally on visits to Maui or CA, or rural Oregon. Many people are struggling economically and would benefit, even if the amounts were only at the "pin money" scale
Keep the access barriers as low as possible. Another option is to sell the market garden produce at organized community markets (mini-farmer's markets).
Less carbon impact. Very fresh produce. Strengthening sense of neighborliness and community.
Less transport and storage costs.
Let them sell it where ever they want. Let people be more connected to the land, be it urban or rural. Buying from your neighbor seems right neighborly to me. I wish it would happen in my neighborhood.
Limited amounts
Limiting sales to keeping below a certain dollar amount per month/quarter/year could serve as a constraint on size.
local equals fresh..no shipping equals less expensive...it would be nice to be able to go for a walk around the neighborhood and get breakfast etc.
local is key. it gets people out, including elderly. provide good sidewalk or locate appropriately
local local local. and walkability. if you could buy your produce on your way home from the bus stop, that would be GREAT.
Local neighbors can buy it that way and less gas spent trucking it around.
lowers gas emissions for driving to get x, y, z item and helps diversity and create a neighborhood!
Making the best use of the land
maybe with time restrictions for traffic concerns
meet your neighbors, strengthen community, diversify the area's food supply (If I grow 15 tomato plants, then the guy next door doesn't need too, without having to go to a stand the consumer can just walk or bike their neighbor hood and barter or trade for their produce.
Mixed-use areas do better commercially, encourage quality of life, promote safety through engaging more "eyes on the street" and part of basic vibrancy in city life.
More access to fresh produce is always a good thing!
more access to produce is great.
more local the better
More produce will be made and consumed. Neighbors selling produce will help encourage other neighbors to eat, and teach them how to prepare, fresh vegetables.
More residential locations also mean more people will walk or bike
most efficient
Most farm stands operate with limited hours. The impact should be minimal.
Need some consistent health standards in place to lower risk of possible diseases, otherwise gives local growers an opportunity to sell, trade, barter, or donate leftover produce to neighbors who don't have time or energy to grow.
Neighborhood food buying clubs work well in residential areas because with controlled memberships there is no parking congestion.
Note that this is on site and not a farm stand away from the growing site.
OK, if there is adequate parking.
On site yes, it will use the least amount of energy. From the ground to the sales stand.
Once again, why restrict it? I think the grower should be allowed to do what they want as long as it doesn't harm anyone.
Or given away
People already have garage sales, partly to get to know neighbors and to know who may be challenged by health issues. One of my neighbors is organizing to help a family where the young mother is going through debilitating cancer treatment.
people live in residential areas. people need food. food should be available in residential areas.
People should be able to buy local food in the location where it is raised/sold.

People should be able to sell produce to neighbors if they want to and people are willing to buy it. The city should not be in the business of controlling and regulating these types of activities.
people should have the ability to buy and sell food that is produced
people should have the right to sell food grown on their property.
People should see exactly where the food is coming from. Also, it would be way more convenient for farmers to be able to sell directly from their land, rather than finding other labor-intensive avenues to sell through.
People will likely eat higher quantities of nutritious food if they have some sort of connection to it, such as seeing the location it was grown
Perhaps a variance, requiring a small fee and neighbor notification, would be a good solution. This is similar to variances for keeping more than 3 poultry in the city limits.
PLEASE take out the word "should" -- how about, "could" or "is allowable"
Plus more options for u-pick!
Possible limitations on auto-oriented sales in certain areas, depending on density, availability of nearby parking, etc.
potentially easier access to fresh produce for residents
Private property rights.
Probably not a farm stand. It would be better to pre-market the produce to near-by residents and let them pay by helping with the work. Some places farm stands may be a good option.
Produce should be allowed to be sold on site or off site. Selling on site allows the neighborhood most affected by the market garden to benefit from the garden without having to go to a store.
Produce should be freely sold in any manner the seller sees fit, either on or off site.
Produce will be fresher and there is less hassle for the grower.
Producers should be able to sell from their sites in urban areas, the same way farmers have farm stands at the end of their driveways. It is an undue burden on a very small (micro) producer to travel in order to sell.
Property is not cheap thanks to all that have moved here , and two have a commercial lot would make sense . Having they advantage to sell ware you live save money , Let me say it again farming is seasonal .
provide access to fresh produce where it is being grown and reduce emissions related to transporting of produce off-site.
Provided the owner of the stand provides adequate parking, direct-to-consumer sales are fantastic!
Reduce traffic at weekly farmer's markets, encourages local, potential for less vehicle traffic in neighborhoods
Reduces transportation cost and allows purchasers to see where their food is coming from.
Reducing travel brings business directly to the source.
Residential areas and farm vendors can be a great fit.
Residential areas are economic dead zones. The reason for this is zoning. Let's build strong, vibrant communities and allow for the sale of produce on site. Let's stimulate economic activity!
Residents should be able to sell to their neighbors. Limit size of sale area so as to discourage a business setup
Residents should have the ability to sell on site, at a Farmers Market, or to local restaurants.
Restrictions should apply - design standards - locally grown.
safe, easy, beneficial
Sales of food at market gardens promotes community interaction and helps to lower carbon footprint by bringing food closer to urban peoples.
same as above.
saves on gas and pollution because individuals will need to drive less also for us in low income areas it will save money and help insure children are getting healthier food.
See #3
see the above: local food means better access to food.
Seems like a reasonable allowance. Food security! One cannot claim to be a proponent of food security and then limit production and access of fresh nutritious produce/value added products.
Seems to me it would be great if folks were able to have a small stand for the neighbors to come and purchase. there may have to be rules about how many visitors you are allowed in a day. Too many could make it dangerous on residential streets etc.
Sell it to your neighbors, YES!
Selling produce on site provides the neighborhood with the freshest, most nutritional food possible, encourages interaction between neighbors and increases awareness of neighborhood needs and activities. It helps to localize food, reduces food costs, and decreases fuel use, thus pollution.

Should be able to but should be able to sell elsewhere, too.
Situated to keep traffic at a minimum.
Small farm stands are fine with me
Small production market gardens should be able to sell on site. More locally grown produce available in our nabes is a good thing.
So buyers know exactly who is producing the food.
so long as the garden is limited in size, I don't see the impact being bad. Once a threshold is reached in terms of customer traffic, then selling should be restricted to commercial zones.
So long as there are clear and enforced conditions for sales in residential areas that does not erode livability (inappropriate signs, operating hours, etc.).
So people can see where their food is coming from.
So residents can walk/bike to the source and get the freshest food possible. Restrict the cars if you think traffic will be a problem but don't restrict the food because you think auto traffic will be a problem!
Sure it could be sold on-site. That would make it easy and close for neighbors to get fresh vegies. However it shouldn't be required to be sold on site - perhaps someone is growing for a local restaurant.
Sure! That would be wonderful. I wouldn't want it to be restricted to only this, though.
Sure, if they have adequate parking and the stand is attractive. It's nice for the consumer to see first hand where their food is being raised.
Sure, it can, but growers should also be able to market their produce to other outlets.
Sure, why not? Sell it wherever/whenever.
sure. continue the back to basics movement. why not barter, too.
Sure. If someone can make a few dollars that's okay. It helps provide access to fresh produce. I would think it should be organic though or labeled otherwise.
sure. who doesn't love fresh fruits and vegetables
Sure. Why not? Can you think of one good reason this should not happen? Do you want to regulate neighbors off-loading their extra zucchini and cukes? Is that your business? I don't think it is. I am a responsible smart citizen and I am able to use my judgment as to where and when to buy my food.
Sure. Access to produce is important. Increasing access has no down side, in my opinion.
That doesn't have to be an exclusive rule, since many people would be disinclined to not get all their shopping done in one stop.
That should be allowed or disallowed by individual neighborhood associations or other more local body. What is appropriate in my neighborhood would not work elsewhere.
That would be FABULOUS for the local residents! It could help solve the problem of food deserts in lower-income areas, and add value to middle-income areas. I would adore having such a thing in my middle-class neighborhood. Currently we have no market/grocery store we can walk to.
That would be fantastic! Again, it goes back to helping families and organizations be more self-sustaining/reliant. It gives people
That would be so awesome!
That's how neighbors can quickly benefit from the food being grown right next to them. This also lowers VMT as people can walk instead of say drive to get produce.
That's okay, would be temporal.
That's where people live, which makes it accessible. Also, local purchase points are easier to walk or bike to, making traffic less of an issue.
The attraction of a market garden in a residential area is to have close access to food. Selling off-site would undo that goal.
The CSA home pick up location is working well.
The grower is directly accountable to their community.
the money used on site supports the site & keeps it productive
The more encouragement to grow food - especially if money can be made the better. Increase food security.
The more local and accessible, the less impact as far as traffic and fuel are concerned.
The produce would be available to more people.
The selling of food should be allowed so long as proper health standereds are kept.
The space of the garden area should have a site allotted to sell the produce as well.
There could be a stand made available for every neighborhood to share and host together- maybe in a park or some common intersection

These gardens would be small enough that they might not produce enough to be sold to stores or restaurants
These urban gardens won't grow enough produce traffic to cause problems at associated farm stands. Farm stands would be a good fit in most neighborhoods and could be a good place for neighbors to meet and share ideas.
This allows the consumer, us, to have access to fresh and locally grown produce along with the connection to the producer of our food.
This allows the food to be very local and allows residents to directly see the result and output of the gardens.
This doesn't bother me - builds community and better access to affordable food. I know aesthetics is an issue with some, but I have more of a problem with aesthetics of old boats and junk in peoples yards, and those yards over run by weeds and blackberries.
This gives the farmer a chance to stay close to his/her work.
This I would qualify...I think larger quantities, or longer hours, would be better managed at a church or community center, or even on a street corner. Unfortunately, community centers charge stunning amounts of money for use of the space. Selling direct from home allows the grower to keep prices down. One answer to this is allowing urban gardeners to get low-cost permits to sell in public spaces, much as the city provides low-cost permits to street performers.
This is a fairly benign form of small business. In these days, we shouldn't be reducing beneficial income opportunities if we can avoid it.
This is a great community building tool. Traffic is conceivably an issue for a very successful stand, but would likely serve only the neighborhood. As such farm stands proliferate and are available within walking distance for everyone, the traffic issue will vanish.
This is a great way to bring communities together, create connections between neighbors, encourage neighborhood walking, and increase micro-economies.
This is one of the best ways to get local food.
This is the least amount of work for the farmer, which allows them to spend more time growing things and less time transporting things. It also allows for the freshest produce to get to the eater. It also can save energy if the produce is harvested that day because it doesnt need extra refrigeration in a store or at the farm.
This is typical on the east coast
This should be possible but not required.
This type of sales has a very low impact, about the same as selling Mary Kay cosmetics from your home.
this will create neighborhood vibrance and community. we can take a walk though the hood and see what each cottage has to offer. it is a lot of work for a farmer to have to pack up and go to market, when they can sell most locally right from their own farmette (see the film "the power of community"). i would also like to see farmers be able to sell "value-added" products made in their home kitchens. adding value can make all the difference in making a farm economically sustainable.
This will invigorate neighborhoods, provide residents with hyper-local sources of nutritious food at the very peak of ripeness, and just plain makes sense to do in a big way.
This would allow growers to make their produce available to the neighborhood more easily, with the minimum expenditure of energy.
This would allow local neighbors access to the food grown near where they live and/or work, and this easy access would cut down on transportation costs and the environmental impact of transportation.
This would be a great opportunity for the buyer to meet the grower and to see the area where their food is grown. It connects the consumer more closely to the origin of their food. It makes it more profitable for the grower if they can sell on their site- less packaging, less gas for transportation, and would allow the busy grower more time simply by keeping him or her on their site where they could tend to multiple duties at once.
This would make fresh local produce available to more people in the city on a regular basis.
This would potentially provide better access to local fresh food. But the code should allow food to be sold at other market locations as well, such as retail stores or farmer's markets.
This would promote walking and biking and reduce car trips, and promote social interactions within neighborhoods. I think it would be great for our city.
To encourage buying truly local. Also, many neighborhoods are fresh food deserts.
To increase the availability of fresh local food
To keep food safe...
to make garden produce more accessible to all
To reduce the amount of handling of the food. To provide a fresher product to the consumer.

Under a certain scale, it would be okay to sell produce on site.
Unless there was a centrally located area that made it more convenient for folks but don't see any reason to haul it.
Unless you mean "only" sold at a stand, in which case I disagree. It should be allowed to be sold anywhere, including on site.
Very convenient.
Very convenient for people and lowers the cost of the food making it easier for the poor to affordable access healthy food.
Very small entrepreneurship is good. Minimalizing transportation costs is also very good. It is something that Portland should be doing.
We are lucky enough to live in a part of the country where we can have the luxury of bieng locally sustained, we should embrace that.
We are talking about people's choices to buy local, healthful food from a local farmer. This is not illicit activity, such as selling drugs. This is a good thing and need not be regulated. Focus your attention on more pressing issues.
We have many people in Portland who are insecure in the availability of nutritious food, especially the poor and elderly.
We have many successful buying clubs in Portland and Vancouver. It would be a tragedy to not allow this. Many have come to depend on this to feed their families. It is cheaper, and fresher.
We need more access to fresh, locally grown food. The produce at most grocery stores is not that great.
We should make it easy for people to buy local healthy food.
What a great way for neighbors to meet on another, support one another, create community and add to the local economy!
What better way to connect with ones neighbors!
whatever the people who are working the land decide is fine.
When we meet our community members that are eating fast food on a daily basis or feeding their families less than acceptable foods and we talk to them about food, they seem nothing but ignorant, and most couldn't tell you the difference between a potato and tomato. Ignorance is nothing but a lack of access. A lack of access to knowledge and a lack of access to freedom of choice. They choose the fast food not only because it is cheap, but because they don't know any differently and don't think they have any other options. When we put a farm stand up at the school and offer affordable fruit and veg, as well as tools for learning how to use, eat and cook the food they keep coming back for more, they want to eat healthy food and they want to learn more. If people can buy their food from their neighbor down the street instead of driving to the store, we are not only giving our community members the access they need to make good choices but we are also supporting and growing our local economy and we stop putting our hard earned money in the pockets of already wealthy super companies like Fred Myers and Safeway that litter our city and community with false promises of healthy "local" food and r
Why allow local markets and enterprise in the neighborhoods? It is a little bit messier, but that's life. Communities thrive when we know and deal with our neighbors. Chickens in the back yard, herbs in the window sill and veggies at the neighbor with the big lot. I like that kind of town.
why not
Why not, really? If I put in work and effort, why may I not? In a neighborhood, neighbors would appreciate having something in walking distance. It also fosters community connections.
Why not?
Why not?
why not?
Why not?
Why not?
Why not?
Why not?
why not?
Why not? Farmers on rural roads do it.
Why not? I feel that it is a persons business to sell to whom they'd like. Just as it's the customers responsibility to know whom their buying from and the practices of that farm or growing operation.
Why not? Most residential places can't produce enough to cause traffic problems. There are a few places here in Garden Home with flower gardens. There are plant sales once in awhile. They are fun to attend and visit/get to know neighbors who otherwise might be strangers.

Why not? this is not in the same category as a storefront. There should be appropriate regulations designating appropriate setbacks, signage, etc.
why not? as long as the site where the stand is located does not adversely impact traffic or pose a danger to people outside of their vehicles because of high levels of car traffic.
Why not? Especially if the sales were only for what was produced there.
why not? probably not very efficient for bringing consumers to market, but if someone should want to sell and its convenient enough for the buyers to make it worth the seller's time, I think that the seller/farmer should be allowed to sell there.
Why not? The less distance one has to go to get their food, the better for everyone.
Why not? This question is an insult to me. You can buy produce in yard stands in Hawaii. Youth in my area sell berries in front of their home. Any one should be able to sell what they have if they wish.
why not??
Will strengthen neighborhood access and make it more available for people who cannot drive (like seniors) with reasonable limitations as to size of stand, amount of sinage, etc. allowing produce to be sold on-site in residential areas may 1) increase resident access to good food and 2) increase resident's perceived value of market garden, and associated respect, caretaking, etc.
With some limitations on size of the business, since it is a residential area.
with some restrictions/guidelines
With the caveat that the stand is tasteful, is removed when not in use (post-season) and does not impede the safe flow of traffic getting to and pulling away from the stand.
Yes, although there should be some basic parameters in place to ensure the "farm stands" integrate well into the neighborhood - i.e., for only 5 consecutive months of the year, operating during times of day when most residents aren't sleeping, etc.
Yes, but I also think it doesn't have to sell food on site.
Yes, but not required, and only if the local market actually supported it.
yes, but with some caveats. Have to follow similar rules for food safety as grocery stores, etc.
Yes, BUT, I think that also we may find that small markets (where nearby growers can come together to sell in a group) will be more effective in some areas, such as Cully, where this kind of thing is already happening.
Yes, but. I think there should be a limit to the number of customers/pick ups/drop offs etc. on residential streets and areas where parking becomes an issue for other neighbors.
Yes, farm stands are our primary local source for food.
Yes, in most cases I don't see the act of selling produce causing many problems. In fact, I think there are many livability benefits that could come out of the community-oriented activity of selling produce you've grown at your own market garden or home. Neighbors have the opportunity to get to know each other more, which can lead to a greater sense of security in the neighborhood, more sharing & community resiliency. If successful, the garden could attract more car traffic to the farm stand, however, citizens should be encouraged to talk with each other about impacts in order to mitigate them. Some folks are plain grumpy and don't want to interact (it's true, we're not used to engaging with and cooperating with neighbors anymore)... but if they would simply talk with their food-growing neighbor who is the cause of increased traffic, they might find someone willing to work with them. Also, other existing or created legislation may help in addressing problems, if they arise and are not able to be worked out amongst citizens. Overall I don't see this becoming a huge industry with major
Yes, it is community building and reduces carbon footprint.
Yes, of course! So nearby residents can buy them! If they can't, that will reduce their support for them.
Yes, the more available right there for neighbors and not having to be transported the better. I don't think they should be limited to only that, but it should definitely be allowed.
Yes, the more options for healthy fresh food, the better.
Yes, this gives us a chance to REALLY know the farmer - if they're our neighbor!
Yes, unless it is of such size that it creates a traffic problem for the neighborhood. Then it should be sold at local markets such as "famrer's markets".
You can see where it's farmed, and talk to the farmer.
You know the produce you're getting is as fresh as possible and hasn't been trucked even a few miles.

TOPIC AREA 1: MARKET GARDENS

Question 5: What types of impacts concern you the most?

Vermin from failure to keep waste products properly handled. This doesn't require more than current rules and legislation. Traffic is a non-issue, and a certain amount of congestion may be an indication of success (people willing to travel to buy good products).

increased car traffic near my house.

Traffic, pests

I would not want to see any heavy farming equipment or toxic fertilizers in residential areas.

Parking and traffic impacts. Litter, noise.

Safe areas for pedestrians and bicyclists trying to access small farm stands.

The incredibly positive impact of increased food production and ability to sell is very exciting!!

Governmental influence and restrictions placed upon the ability of a community to support itself during an economical time when communities need it most.

I am concerned that the rights of farmers will be taken away if you impose size and location restrictions through city coding.

Respect for neighbors, neighboring property, neighborhood street traffic/parking, and cleanliness of the operations.

Traffic/parking/congestion, but this can be easily addressed with certain times for selling, etc.

No impact concerns.

Heavy use of commercial pesticides getting into groundwater

Safety, congestion, traffic

What concerns me the most is the increase of genetically modified foods, hormone injected foods, overly processed foods, foods from unknown origins and foods laden with pesticides - all from large commercial growers. I see no adverse impact to having greater options for healthy locally grown food.

Pesticide/herbicide and chemical fertilizers concern me. Gardening in high-density residential should be organic or with minimal use of chemicals for health and safety.

Big business and BIG Government (big brother) telling me how to live and breathe

My only concern is limiting the market for small scale farms outside the city limits. Often these farms are not large enough to sell to places such as grocery stores and rely on a CSA for much of their annual income.

Size limitations, zoning.

People parking to go to produce stands in residential neighborhoods. Though I would love a produce stand in my neighborhood.

Folks advertising "organic" but really they aren't sure if the soil they are using is truly organic. The pollution from being close to a freeway or busy street. I like to buy my food from farms that are out in the country and away from urban growth but I don't think we should be afraid of urban gardens.

government getting too big and has too much control of what is grown

Restricting activity where we have dead zones of gardening activity.

government trying yet again to slowly strike down the path of big brotherism

that we are not allowed to have bees if a neighbor complains, and that bee raising is under the vector control oversight.

Any limitation on community agriculture is concerning.

Land value and pricing people out of housing or commercial land as more land in the urban center is set aside for farming. In all I think it's a great idea to consider. I've often wondered if there was no more fuel, how on earth would we manage to feed ourselves, and as you look around there is actually tons of land around, in parks, urban landscaping, backyards, that could be used for growing food. I think this situation is quite likely in our future and it is good that we are thinking about it now.

junk food dealers might go out of business.

Congestion (foot, bike, care), if placed without consideration for traffic flow.

I am most concerned about residual soil toxins and developing urban sites for food growth. I think the best address to this challenge is more support from Multnomah County or the City for soil testing, and remediating steps, such as subsidized soil tests for urban farms.

increased misuse of pesticides resulting in food, air and water contamination, urban gardens should be organic
I am concerned the most about the impacts of individuals who believe horticultural aesthetics are more important than developing a local food economy.
Organic, non-GMO practices Traffic and parking impact on residential areas Proper regulation of growing practices by appropriate other bodies than zoning.
None, really. Gardening is quiet, it's replenishing rather than polluting (most small scale gardeners don't use a lot of heavy pesticides or herbicides), it's attractive and it's a source of food and social contact.
Soil contamination, smell from poorly-run compost systems, visual blight in residential areas.
Noise, parking, maintenance of space.
Potentially living in a city with less and less connections to the soil. Not to sound like one thousand types of watery, hippy twat.....but I like the idea of some small percentage of the food that I eat being generated in my city.
vandalism of garden spaces. theft of produce by people who are broke and just hungry.
Pesticide use.
See previous answer.
Just traffic safety and cleanliness.
Increased traffic which would be diffused if spread out over the city and surrounding area.
if the produce was sold mainly to the residents living in that area then great. but if the majority 75% of the traffic was from people not living in that residential area then it should not be sold there
Level of activity. Timing of activity.
local businesses that complain about the comPetition and lobby to make it difficult.
City intrusion in limiting access to our local food. Please don't do that to us
I don't have any concerns with urban farming. You may also consider allowing functioning farms to supplement their income through agricultural tourism activities. Farming has a very low margin and any potential supplemental income would be beneficial.
Potentially parking and noise, for stands/selling spots that become particularly popular and long-standing. But we want active and sustainable neighborhoods, right? Farm to table right on ordinary residential streets is too good an idea to stifle with misplaced concerns based in a previous model of shopping-center based retail.
I am concerned about regulations that unfairly impact small-scale producers.
Non-site produce/goods sold (there are ad hoc commerical fruit sales now on street parking strips in Irvington that should not be allowed) Also frontage sq footage should be limited for sales.
I would assume that traffic and noise would be of the most concern to neighbors. There could also be concern regarding odor from composting practices and animals and odor or chemical exposure from fertilizer/pesticide application. I believe that allowing agriculture on larger lots would allow farmers to design their systems to better shield neighbors from potential nuisances.
The only concern I have is that contaminated land may be used for a market garden. By testing the soil this may be detected and affected areas will not be used.
Contamination. The City should have a program to aid groups in sampling for heavy metals.
I am most concerned with the impact of City Government over-regulating food-producing gardens and the ability to craft local cottage industries from the produce of our gardens.
pesticides/herbicide application.
N/A
In looking at an increase in market gardens in residential areas, my greatest concern is if these gardeners decide to use chemical fertilizers, herbicides, or pesticides that then contaminate the surrounding area through groundwater or pollenators.
Elimination of green space, excessive city regulations that make good food and gardening inaccessible to everyday people.
The impact of urban pollutants on food crops.
Chemicals being used inappropriately.
I hope that this change will support individual and small-group urban farming projects - Portland has a lot of great larger farms and cooperatives, and I hope this can level the playing field for new urban farmers who may not have the space or capital to even approach farming for profit.
none

none. I think that folks may be concerned that the 'mini-farms' don't conform to their (in my opinion outdated and inappropriate) aesthetic ideals, but they'll need to let those evolve.
With regard to market gardens: pesticides/ herbicides; parking; noise of machinery involved
Having an appropriate plan to deal with unsightly operations that are hazardous to human health (e.g. rats, E.Coli, etc). Food safety is a very important issue that must not be overlooked in this process.
Animal smells and sounds during quiet hours.
Disposal of waste from the markets.
No concerns. This helps everyone and the land.
Illegal growing operations (pot), or noisy equipment (chain saws). I grew up next to an old citrus orchard in SoCal; tractors, smudge pots, turbines, and other equipment. But I also remember the sweet smell of the citrus flowers and ripening fruit. Terrific.
GMO's and Patents on genetic materials in agriculture. I feel that dispersing traffic to residential streets may alleviate arterial traffic.
increased traffic - cars and bikes not stopping for pedestrians
None.
My concern about increasing the areas available for cultivation is primarily that those entities that do grow refrain from using large quantities (preferably none) of pesticides or chemical fertilizers. I am more concerned about best practices in sustainable use of the land than with things like traffic impact on residential areas.
I think Portland should make every effort to ensure the soil food is growing in is not toxic. I think areas of light to heavy industry and areas that have been classified as brown fields should be especially evaluated for soil content and contaminant levels.
excessive added motor vehicle traffic would need to be considered
I am most concerned about whether certain growing areas may be susceptible to toxic accumulation from traffic, radiation or pesticides when in close proximity to areas that might be sources of toxicity. If the foods are sold or distributed, consumers should know whether there might be toxins in their food. Otherwise, if the food is for consumption of the grower, I think it is their right and responsibility to eat what they have grown no matter what
My biggest concerns are too much regulation, quite honestly. Everything may start out with a "good intention" but it is far too easy for regulations to end up having unintended consequences (there is no possible way to plan for everything). If and when problems arise, they should be dealt with on the community level. Every neighborhood is different and I think trying to zone across ALL of them can be detrimental to something that someone may want to try in one neighborhood--that would be well received--but because it wouldn't work somewhere across town, it was "zoned out."
Use of chemicals and noise from machines.
I think having the ability to communicate directly with the "farmer" and know what sprays are being used is an advantage. I also like the idea of food being grown in the area where I am purchasing. In an emergency or for those less fortunate the food is more readily available.
I am not worried!
Poor locations for stands that could cause congestion. Poor soil quality and air quality near industrial or commercial sites. They should be safe for growing food! Farms and stands should be small scale operations, not big commercial growers. The small farmers should be able to obtain a site with a good business plan and then cultivate it as a business with sales to local businesses as a preference.
non-organic farming practices that might drift to the property of those wanting to be organic; traffic density. And food safety (even though I realize that is not relevant to this initiative)
I want there to be lots of agriculture in the form of gardens and farms. I am against restricting their size.
I am concerned that government is interfering with bulk purchasing. Who is sponsoring these road blocks? What is your concern?
Too long of market hours so streets clog up. 4-6 hours in the morning sounds ideal.
Making too many hoops and laws that would make it hard for CSA's etc actually operate. i don't want us to be so concerned about rules that we make sustainable, local and community driven impossible due to operation costs.
Traffic in some neighborhoods could be a real problem. Setting an income limit or a limited hours standard could help.
Storing the food for sale so that animals don't trash the stand is important as well.

I'm most concerned with the impacts of limited access to fresh local foods in all neighborhoods. Market gardens are one of many great solutions.
Any prohibition is just that a prohibition, and prohibition as we've already seen does not work.
It would concern me to hear that the sale of produce (stands, CSA distribution centers, etc.) were being limited to commercial areas because it further alienates what can be (and I think should be) a local, community movement.
my main concern would be poorly written and restrictive code that would actually make it difficult for the growers to grow food and get it to the people eating it. i have no concerns with more food being grown and sold within our city, i think it is a bold and important step towards resiliency.
I am mostly concerned that putting too many restrictions on where it can be sold will limit the growth of market gardens.
There is a vibrant urban farming culture here in Portland. We are at the forefront of the nation in valuing local food, simple lifestyle, and self-sufficiency. We don't want to suddenly impede this movement because some people don't like the idea of their neighbors selling zucchini out of the front yard. For some poor people, this might be a real path to health and even financial independence. Regulate it, yes, but don't limit it.
none
I am concerned that food will not be allowed to be sold in residential areas. I have personally lived in areas without a lot of food options except for high priced "convenience" markets with unhealthy food. People need to be able to access healthy, affordable food within their own community. Having a produce garden and selling this directly from the neighborhood site--or distributing farm shares (or bulk food) within a neighborhood--makes this food MORE accessible and it is much more affordable, fresher, local, and tends to be more organic. Let's keep the money in our community and support each other. My experience in these types of situations helps me get to know neighbors better, feel more connected to the neighborhood and feel safer. This is what we want to support.
Because of zoning, we were unable to hold our neighborhood farmer's market in a church parking lot (with plenty of available parking) for the whole season or entire weekends without paying huge fees just to have the application for a change considered. A community market is not hurting anyone... a few hours mid-morning each weekend of the summer is not something that should be prohibited in residential zones!
Folks going overboard with big signage and large stands
Parking, increased traffic.
I believe it's important to have a food growing culture.
I think we should do all we can to encourage local food sources. You can do much to help make healthy, fresh food available to more people and help some be able to earn a little extra income.
Having the space for gardening purposes and not being utilized.
I think it is important to make local food available in residential neighborhoods, so that people can walk or bike to it. It will eliminate driving and help improving air quality. I associate local food with a healthy life style which includes less driving and more walking/biking. I want my local food close to my home.
Too much traffic during summer, while children are playing. Use of manure for fertilizer. Other neighbors getting upset and creating conflict.
Peace and quiet. I think portland city laws should be flexible enough to allow the pursuit of home food production, but I think communities need to be developed so the space is used with the least negative impact. Plants that are not food plants are also very important for our birds, insects, our medicine, and for simple beauty. The idea of every one destroying their gardens for tomatoes is just too mono-crop for me. think it would be bad.
The impacts that concern me the most are the impacts that fussy neighbors can have on a neighborhood. One neighbor who manages to get one other neighbor on their side to complain about something should not be able to shut down a farm stand or kick out a beekeepers apiary. That is unfair and wrong. A larger discussion needs to be held at that point. Community needs to be fostered within neighborhoods, not the ability to disassociate from each other. That is not what makes city great. It is the combined resources of people that makes things great.
I don't have any.
How much regulation or oversight would there be after establishment? Would the permit be expensive? Would it require a soil test before being allowed in an area? What are the restrictions? What are the requirements? This needs to be accessible to people of little means as well as large institutions or businesses.

1. Traffic/parking issues for the neighbors. Avoided by all markets retaining some type of facility for bikes, and/or offer grocery delivery within x radius. 2. the mix of dogs in a crowded area. Dogs should not be allowed in markets, avoided by having a dog sitter near the market.
biggest concern would be traffic and noise--both big disruptions of neighborhoods
Market gardens getting gentrified and not actually being a good deal
I have none.
none that the market farm would create. more concerned about pollution mitigation for existing soil on residential and urban sites.
Use of poisonous chemicals by non-organic gardeners. I think that organic (or at least sustainable without hazardous chemical sprays) should be required.
Please do not limit the distribution of produce within residential areas (drop sites). First reason, this allows people to participate who might not have the time or want to spend gas driving to a farm, so many people are being green and riding bikes and walking to drop sites. Also this opens up the opportunity for people to buy healthy food, support local growers, and meet the neighbors. These drop sites are usually weekly and thus the added traffic is minimal at best since drop sites operate at a certain time and for only for a few hours. These sites also allow people the chance to 'chat" with local residents about various civic activities affecting their way of life. This would be a great spot for local government officials to meet people who are affected by possible legislation. :)
Limiting people's ability to grow food in their own areas, and limiting the ability for local food to be obtained in neighborhood areas.
Increased traffic would be a concern, but a minor one if the idea were to catch on. The more small market gardens we have in the city, the less distance people have to travel to find good food.
maintenance of the site
There should be a stipulation that these market farms need to follow organic practices. We do not need to add more chemicals to our environment.
Water consumption and disruption of the enjoyment and peace of the owners of surrounding properties.
I think if someone wants to grow some produce and sell it, then they should be able to. If no one wants it, they don't have to buy it. Tax money should be spent on other issues.
Use of pesticides in residential areas.
Traffic and kid safety. When people go to farmers markets with children, I've seen a larger group of parents that just let their children go and run freely around the market. It's scary when you as a vendor see this happen.
I don't see any downside.
As mentioned in #3, pollution on crops.
Not having access to local food. Not being able to WALK to my food distributor. Only having access to chains, be it national or local. I am also concerned about the dwindling sense of community. Having access to local food, shared by neighbors INCREASES one's sense of community, thereby strengthening self, family, neighborhood, city, and state.
Overly strict unwanted city gov't oversight
elimination of vegetation, trees and open space that cause infill and point PDX in the path of too much building.
Using non-organic methods, pest control.
Potential presence of toxins in produce if soil is contaminated from past land uses.
None.
I have concerns about soil, water, and air quality and potential contamination in all areas (residential, commercial and especially light industry). Could there be support for market gardens to test their soil for lead and other contaminants? I'm also concerned about large-scale pesticide use in residential areas. There should be training for proper pesticide application, incentives to garden organically and periodic check-ins with gardens to ensure that regulations are followed.
too much regulation on where and how people access food
parking, but if the stand only operates for less than 4 hours per day, and not more than every other day it should be no problem.
Soil and air contamination. Organic gardening should be encouraged so that are soils and water remain healthy. I think greater access in all areas and for all income levels is crucial.
Loss of the Gardening culture that adds to the beauty inherent in living here

I worry that too many regulations will be put on small farmers/big gardeners for them to make a decent living. I also worry that food will be grown in areas with pollutants without some regulation to make sure there is transparency of growing practices.
I would like the farms to be encouraged to be pesticide free, organic gardens. Farms should not be spraying or applying pesticides in urban areas near where children walk or play, and pets are present. There are many organic pesticides and pest managements that are very available and therefore no real need for heavy applications of chemicals in an urban area where people could be affected and hurt by them.
Neighbors filing complaints about neighbors simply growing food.
If land is used for fruits, veggies, nuts, flowers, etc, then stay out of it. If used for livestock with in city limits, be involved as already. If for medicinal-pot farms, then no way. There would be too much additional crime related to the illegal drug.
How certification for organically grown produce could keep up with the demand with micro farms(market gardens) popping up all over the place.
Food safety and business licensure.
Traffic, parking.
the uneducated use of chemicals and pesticides in our neighborhoods. Adding to pollution, erosion and damaging ground water quality. Especially because we are talking about neighborhoods. Also what negative forms such endeavors could morph into. I can't think of anything at this point but I am sure they are there.
The positive impacts of being able to get health food, conveniently.
If people use a lot of unhealthy chemicals, that would be bad for the quality of the food.
Not enuff veggies.
Noise and congestion in neighborhoods
anything limiting this availability.
I would hope that most producers at small sites would get visits from nearby residents on foot or bicycle. For the larger sites, with year-round production, traffic and parking could be an issue.
Soil erosion, pesticide drift, water usage -- the usual agricultural concerns need to be considered regardless of scale.
the only impact that greatly concerns me is the use of chemical pesticides and herbicides. If they can't be banned outright, then a rigorous program of educating/supporting growers in the use of organic methods is imperative. Food grown organically is more nutritious, protects other living entities in the environment and minimizes the impact on our rivers from runoff.
24/7 "stores." Should be a time and frequency limit, such as once a week between 10 and 5 or something, although "honor system/donation/free" stands that are unattended should be allowed more days, but still limited to daylight hours.
Don't let this city bog down what could be a beautiful thing. Let us set the standard for the rest of the country like we did with the bottle bill and MAX . Let's be awesome! Let's evolve.
Strict government control arbitrarily limiting freedom.
traffic
monsanto and poison
traffic and safety primarily, but with proper planning, it can be well done
I am very concerned about efforts to limit distribution points for CSAs. This would be such a step backwards for Portland, and Portland is in so many ways a leader in sustainability and livability in the U.S. Let's keep moving forward, making it easier for people to participate in CSAs, not more difficult. Most CSA members go to their pick-up locations by bicycle anyway! And even when it does increase car traffic a bit, it's only once a week and is such a small price to pay for easier access to local, family-farmed food. If a bit of increased traffic 3 hours a week is a level of inconvenience/irritation/change to the status quo that is intolerable to us, we are in BIG trouble.
Pesticides should not be allowed in residential areas. Noise regulations may need to be updated.
if these farms use chemicals (especially in residential) how can I know that will not affect my childrens' or mine air quality?
traffic
future food shortages that we could mitigate by acting wisely in this situation

Urban farms should strive for net-zero emissions and impact, including solar-powered infrastructure, water-saving irrigation measures (or measures employing one of Portland's most abundant resources--rain), organic non-pesticide pest control means and heirloom varieties over GMOs, etc.
Pesticides, herbicides, soil contamination.
any restrictions on this.
none
The "backyard garden" phenomenon is absolutely wonderful and I don't want to see any additional regulation of it.
congestion
I'm as concerned as anyone else about noise and air pollution, and the access to healthy food. However, gardens and food coops do not create traffic, generally.
Slower traffic around area, but the more allowed the less people will travel to purchase. Neighborhood stands encourage walking to stand.
With unlimited public access to a permanent (seasonal) stand there could easily be crowding in parking areas.
I'm concerned by the impact of regulation not helpful to food security.
Blocking traffic and pesticides, fertilizer, other chemicals.
Not being able to have organic food supplies available locally. If we find an interruption in our main food supply because of a natural disaster or high fuel prices. Also I see there is positive impact on the greater community seeing we can become in control of our own health right down to growing the food locally.
possibility of pesticide and herbicide spraying getting out of control and covering the neighborhood. Noise and dust from tractors and tilling, potential stealing of fruit and veggies harming the bottom line of the grower
I worked in family assistance with families in crisis for nine years. Isolation concerns me the most. It can be devastating.
the limits on food buying groups and CSAs in residential areas. let's keep Portland a great place to live and grow and have plenty of choices when it comes to spending our food dollars locally!
Anything that would limit where food can be grown/bought/sold locally!
Over regulation by the city.
will limit the markets available by limiting the space where it is allowed
the quality of the food based on the environment and growing practices. Also I would be concerned over GMO and hybrid seeds breeding with open pollinated organic seeds. It takes away from the benefits and control over the food quality when we have less control over growing environment.
I am a little concerned about subsidies to encourage urban farming, possibly creating an unfair advantage over farmers going it on their own
Traffic could be a concern.
Unwitting would-be farmers growing on lead- or other pollutant-filled soil or in areas in which precipitants would make the health value of the food actually diminish.
Local water & air contamination/quality affecting the quality of the food.
The impact of _restricting_ the growth of food production in the city and county.
increased auto traffic
The impact of idiot planners thinking they have the right to tell me what I can do with my property.
Novice gardeners not doing the right thing. Waste, pesticides, etc., vandalism, theft, crop failure, uneconomic, business failure, appearance, lack of food quality, danger of poisonous food, bugs, disease, shade, lack of sunlight, bad weather, cost of doing business, lack of profitable enterprise, public criticism, lack of proper care, etc.
I am more concerned with overly restrictive legislation limiting market farms.
None.
None
Food security.
Having my lively hood taken away after I have worked so hard to make my farm work . I grow a acre here in Portland and Portland is addressing this plus water cost of . Try working for your self .
Pesticide/ herbicide use. May want to consider banning this in residential areas, so neighbors aren't subjected to having to breathe poisons.
Unsure of negative impacts at this time

I believe anyone intending to garden a space has good intentions, regardless if their skill or methods are honed. Over time anyone can become a good gardener and safe food grower.
Getting fresh food to people. Having food grown very locally. Showing kids where food comes from.
The erosion and "thinning" of our city by personal automobile use. Zoning regulations absurdly and intentionally put distance between the places we live and the places we shop, work and dine. The reason for this is because those economic activities create a lot of traffic and noise. But zoning is precisely the reason for this traffic and noise. Since the real problem here is traffic, that is what we should be addressing. The fact is that the design of our city forces people to drive. So any increase in economic activity always means an increase in the use of personal automobiles and thus an increase in traffic. The use of zoning regulation to divert economic activity away from residential areas (and thus divert car traffic) is the treatment of a problem created by zoning regulation in the first place. Prohibiting economic activity to occur near residential areas forces more reliance on personal autos, as it puts distance in between the places we sleep and the places we work, go to school, shop, dine, drink and live. This in turn creates a community wide demand for more and wider streets, more parking.
Maintenance and misrepresentation of safe food growing practices.
Limiting food access to areas that need it the most.
Traffic, design standards.
I'm concerned when city zoning regulations threaten force market gardens to move out of residential areas, thereby decreasing the amount of arable land that can be utilized and increasing the amount of energy needed to transport, store, and sell produce.
large operations with large noisy vehicles trucking things out or in excessively. this is another animal and i don't think it should be allowed
If the farm sprays chemicals and how that would be monitored.
That restrictions and red tape will keep fresh food (meat, eggs, vegetables, honey) out of the hands of those who need it most.
the availability of local food should preserved and encouraged unless it becomes a cost center. This doesn't cost the city a cent.
The cultivation of community, food security, reduction of fossil fuel use, reduced food costs and the consumption of healthier foods. The horror!
Not allowing for small time growers to sell there crops would be most concerning!
The impacts of urban gardening that concern me most are the unregulated use of dangerous genetically modified plants and seeds, the unrestricted spraying of Roundup, which is now known to cause serious disease and genetic damage, and the wasteful and inappropriate use of residential area land and water on pesticide and herbicide soaked lawns that pollute our rivers with chemical runoff and both pollute our air and disturb our peace with lawnmowers. I am also extremely concerned about government's increasingly violent attacks on The People's access to fresh, unadulterated, locally grown food. ANY limitation on people growing and selling food for themselves and their neighbors in the City of Portland is what concerns me.
Car exhaust on the food.
City government limiting residential food crop size.
If I had a zillion people driving into my neighborhood to go to a year round farm stand, I might be concerned. But if it is a seasonal thing, and small in scale, it's fine.
Potential traffic issues....but i don;t see that being any more of an issue than people parking on side streets off of Hawthorne. Parking is rough....we live in a urban environment. I think more people will bike/walk to a local farmstand anyway.
new forms of traffic in residential areas associated with the growing of food.
Noise, increased traffic, introduction of pesticides and other chemicals into area.
People who complain that the status quo will be upset might capture the attention of powers-that-be and thereby prevent logical yet profound progress from saving our asses.

I hope we have great impacts such as eating more vegies, gaining more health, meeting our neighbors, and emergency food resilience. Can we write in requirements around pesticide and fertilizer use? This could increase impact to water quality which we do not want. Besides, the local economy wants "pesticide free." Increase access to permaculture courses so new farmers learn to care for the soil and plants with mulching, guilds, and awesome gardens that support human food, insects, birds, nutrition, wildlife, bees, and community. Without knowledge of earth-friendly techniques, we could find ourselves with unintended consequences of soil erosion, too much water use, and degraded water quality due to run-off of chemicals.
The impact of agri-business on our nation's health and culture.
I am mainly concerned that people with money will have more say than the majority of us who have little.
rules and laws for land use on activities that need little city, state, or federal guidance , restrictions, or oversight.
Just making sure the food is organic and grown organically.
regulation prohibiting fresh foods
Regulatory impacts. More rules, less understanding, more of your time wasted on things that don't need regulating when there is plenty in this city that needs your urgent attention. The farmer's market scene is alive and well and thriving in Portland, as is the community garden scene, as is the private garden scene. If there is bare ground, and there is a hard-working person or persons who wants to put their sweat and effort into growing delicious healthy food in that ground, then they should be able to without permits, breaking any "laws", or otherwise dealing with some government agency. We, the gardeners of Portland. DO NOT want to be regulated! Thank you!
Over-regulation
My neighbors grow food for their business, and I appreciate their industry, and drive, and dedication to the neighborhood. Their organic garden provides food and income - lawns provide offgassing at every mowing!
Some precautions would need to be taken for night break-ins, and parking would need to be planned for/considered.
Making sure that these food producers have support to successfully bring their product to the marketplace, as well as support to grow their businesses.. Through MercyCorps, FoodHub, Ecotrust, etc.
Parking is always an issue. Besides that, not much else
I'm wondering how a market garden, just like any other agricultural production area, can be protected from contaminants that would make the food less healthy. For example, lead contamination, or pesticide contamination from run-off from those ubiquitous lawn services in Laurelhurst. I don't know if I'd eat a tomato grown down slope from Laurelhurst.
Would actually increase positive neighbor interactions, foot traffic and bring life to the street.
Positive impacts: + The possibility of my neighbors having the opportunity to support themselves through farming. + The chance to buy fresh fruit and veggies from my neighborhood. + The positive impact on low-income economies (similar to food carts, urban ag on home lots is a low-capital, easy market-entry option where people can use skills, knowledge and property they already have without huge risks of financial failure). Negative impacts: - Potentially uneven implementation that privileges and benefits mainly white or wealthier people. - 'Unintended consequence' of increasing patterns of gentrification and its negative health impacts. - Unequal perception/protection if immigrant families, people of color, or "poor" people start an urban farm.
Don't change the ability for residences to serve as CSA pick up locations
The lack of food being grown in the city as well as the beauracracy and rules that ate being established are major flaws.
Mini-crimes, as in theft of produce & safety of cash holders.
Chemical application to land - environmental hazards in soil - would need salt testing opportunities.
Industreal and commercial sites taking over lands that could be used to plant sustainable food sources without a seperate site being designated for such production.
That this has the effect of bringing neighbors together to share in costs and burdens (as vendors) and does not mean every single gardener has their own refrigeration unit, their own canopy, etc. but instead they work together
Traffic that would be generated, use of chemicals.
Any regulations need to be clear to gardeners and neighbors. Noise and traffic will be the most likely causes of tension between neighbors.
That farmers grow as naturally as possible with low use of pesticides.

I am more concerned with limiting people's use of their space than I am of traffic concerns or other impacts to the areas.
See comments above - nutshell, use of pesticides.
Really, I've never had nor heard any complaint about any neighbor doing any of the above activities. People pretty much keep it on the down low.
Obviously, if nuisance conditions exist, they need to be dealt with. Some locations would not be suitable due to narrow streets or other access problems.
1. Traffic, emissions, parking. 2. Lead/heavy metals contamination of food. 3. Vandalization: Making sure that the final rules are available to EVERYONE not just people interested in urban farming--people who are challenged by the idea of urban farming sometimes vandalize such gardens. I think they justify this vandalism on the assumption that such gardens are extralegal. They too need to know exactly what is permitted and what is not. 4. Foraging: Also, we need a city wide agreement on "foraging." Often the sunniest spot in the yard is in parking strips where people often garden for personal use. There is currently a disagreement/debate in the permaculture movement regarding "gleaning/foraging" with some people glorifying an "easy, zero cost" way to eat--from the parking strips of other people's gardens. This is very demoralizing when it happens. This is a minority viewpoint, but it exists, and we need to have official recognition that a homeowner/renter who toils in his/her own parking strip is entitled to the produce of that space.
dust and traffic
the city getting involved and slowing the positive grass root changes happening in the city
The main concern is government intervention that makes it difficult to produce food on a local scale.
i am worried that these new regulations will limit farming and decrease freedoms we currently have.
I'm concerned with the impact of increasing food prices as the global economy shuts down due to declining fossil fuel reserves. Local food production is an absolute must that we all must become more familiar with. I support any and all movement in this direction for the specific purpose of making Portland more food-resilient.
Impacts from growing and selling organic food in the city? None, compared to the impacts of industrial agri-business!
It would be important to have a good method for "cleaning up" any debris that accumulated due to the nature of a business. And if in a residential area, respect for business hours so that neighbors aren't bothered by loud noise late into the night, or at the crack of dawn.
I can only see positive impacts for this on the city.
None.
I hope that this can help increase the availability of affordable fresh fruits and vegetables and other whole food products, particularly in "food deserts" where heavily processed food is cheaper than fresh healthy food.
The impact which concern me the most is to be able to show people how this fresh food grown locally can protect us from illness...Also this process can locally encourage people to produce more and to gain from what they do. There more advantage than disadvantages. We need to encourage this process !
I have no concerns about this
Minimal standards about how food for sale is grown (i.e. pesticide use, in contaminated soil, water sources) and handled. Also, does clarifying and changing standards for market gardens impact land sharing agreements and people renting or utilizing land that they do not own?
can't think of any.
None.
Food Safety affordable food for everyone accessible
None.
None
That the city will regulate this kind of activity and thereby disrupt the informal relationships that we concerned citizens have with our local food growers and farmers. This is what makes Portland such a great place to live. You are reducing the quality of life and forcing us to re-consider whether we want to live in Portland by insisting on regulating harmless activity that leads to healthier families and more robust economic climate for local farmers.
Probably fear of vandalism of the gardens. I am a community gardener who lives in an apartment, and I worry about my plot all the time, that someone could jump the secure fence and steal or trample my produce.
Food access, and affordability.

Riff raff taking advantage of low security settings. vandalism.
I wouldn't want a permanent farm stand in a neighborhood- but some sort of time limit would be just fine- like June-October.
Mostly concerned about self sufficiency, building community, providing local food, modeling, encouraging better eating habits and health.
The only concern I have would be how to ensure folks are taking precautions and getting potentially contaminated soils tested before growing food.
that we don't do this quick enough.
if concerns me greatly that these kinds of restrictions and regulations might be applied to local market growers in our community. It is difficult enough being a farmer or market grower. The hours are long, the work literally back breaking and the rewards few. We do this because we believe it is extremely important and because we care greatly about the health of our neighbors, children and community members. We expect nothing less of the same type of commitment from our City.
Disease transferred to restaurants. Selling to commercial restaurants or big food chains should be regulated more tightly than neighbors helping neighbors.
quality
I see no negative impacts with market gardens and neighbor farm stands.
I'm not concerned at all about impacts caused by gardens/farms/markets. I am much more concerned about the impact of not enough of these. "Traffic" is not a valid concern because that is caused by anything, and gardens, farms, markets does not increase it. If anything it reduces it, since it would get people to drive slower to look, and/or walk or bike more. Come on, other places in this country are complaining about food deserts, and we're talking about *limiting* the growth of locally produced food???. Can this be happening? Are we that spoiled?
Limiting people from growing thier own food, and providing home-grown food to others. Why? What could be worse than grocery-store produce that has been shipped to the area from far away?
only if these gardens are full of poisons....
Parking, access, overuse of the land.
The only impact that I can think of is corporate interests bullying such efforts and suing to destroy them.
The strong regulatory hand on small gardens being misled and therefore restricting. The push from corporate grocery stores to restrict communities growing their own produce because of fear of lost revenue.
Too much traffic. If each neighborhood had a number of these mini farms it wouldn't be much of an issue since most people could walk or bike to it.
just wouldn't want produce grown on heavy car/truck roads.
I'm not sure I have an concerns in this matter. Our city needs this and running into obstacles is going to happen, but the positive impacts this will have will grossly outweigh the negative.
Can't think of any. If parking becomes a problem, people won't come. Same with traffic. Or they will think of alternatives to make it work better. Let people find the solutions for their own areas. A blanket decree can't cover all micro-markets as individually unique as they are.
I do not see market gardens as a cause for concern at all.
Mostly the regulation of 'safe' food, I suppose. But food safety and farm integrity seems to be pretty subjective, even in large scale regulated schemes. I tend to have a lot of trust in the people in my community, but not every person 'gets' legitimate safety regulations, I think. The market aspect of an otherwise residential area wouldn't bother me in the slightest.
None, I have no concerns about this.
More laws. More restrictions. More government intervention. More government regulatory persons. More costs to support more government. Enough. Quit invading our lives and our freedoms
Green laws (chemicals and water) concern me! Wasted earth concerns me! Food deserts concern me - especially outer southeast, and anywhere people are pushed into horrid apartment complexes.
Over-reactions on the part of a resident whose favorite parking space got encroached on once. Complaint-driven zoning decisions are problematic and we all need to learn to be flexible/adapt to change.
The use of heavy use toxic pesticides and fertilizers is of great concern to me, especially in residential areas and open spaces (parks).
Pesticide run off.

I support fewer restrictions if the scale of the stand is meant to mostly attract neighborhood customers, more if the stand also seeks to attract customers from a larger area.
Safety when people pull over to buy and upon reentering the flow of traffic and unsightly stands.
None.
Pollutants, either from nearby uses, or applied as pesticide or herbicides. Would want to limit use and work with nearby uses to limit applications.
The impact of private automobile use on the health and livability of a city.
see above.
I want to see more food growing with the community. I want my food local and organic. I want small farms everywhere!
Overall, i don't have concerns about the impacts. However, it seems that the average citizen would be most concerned about 1) any increased vehicle traffic and potentially 2) aesthetics. To me, vehicle traffic is a valid concern that can be mitigated...many market gardeners of this scale are likely to advocate and be selling to folks who bike & use public transit anyway in addition to folks who use vehicles more. On aesthetics, it's true we all have a different sense of what's ok here. I would encourage neighbors to engage and for the market gardener to try to mitigate impacts that other neighbors are concerned about. But, again, we should all begin to challenge ourselves... in hard times, which is more important, growing food we can eat, or worrying about how beautiful the neighborhood is? Currently, we can afford to think about both aspects and work with our neighbors to fix those issues. Right now (as in july 2011), in some cities, citizens are complaining to the city about individuals who try to grow any food gardens in their front lawns on the grounds of aesthetics. That seems to be going a bit too far
Use of pesticides/sprays/fertilizers, or other chemical run-offs from the garden. Reasonable limitations on chemical use should be easy enough to implement.
Equipment sounds. I see no other downsides. Health of the food in areas of possible contamination/pollution and folks not knowing about that.
None, this will only be a benefit.
I have no concerns about market gardens unless they were owned by a larger corporation with no ties to the neighborhood.
Limiting food resources unnecessarily.
I hope that fresh produce will go down in price. Because it is popular, it has become very "boutique - y" and pricey. I grow food for myself and know that the price of organic food is way out of line with what it takes to produce it.
Possibly an increase in traffic.
Agriculture has a number of impacts.
Any efforts by the City to LIMIT using free space to grow/distribute food!
Any restrictions scares me.
Arbitrary limitations on livestock. Maintaining community cohesion, communication and understanding.
Being forced to buy produce from a supermarket because there is no affordable local access. I also don't want to see one of the few more equitable means of buying and selling derailed.
Big Ag commercial interests pretending to be local and in community service.
can't think of any
chemical application in a populated area; pesticides and herbicides. Contamination of land, water and air of nearby properties.
Chemical fertilizers and pesticides.
Chemical usage in "intensively cultivated" gardens
chemical use
chemicals in the soil.
City taxing small businesses which kills small businesses. That tax money is then given to free things that people don't work hard for or given to croaked city officials, that's my concern.
CSA's and food buying clubs not being allowed to drop off in residential areas.
Dog and cat (and raccoon, etc) feces on garden plots in residential areas. Possible parking problems in residential areas.
empty land that is doing nothing is a concern.

Ensuring food quality and safety similar to what is required by all food producers.
Ensuring that soils are adequately tested for heavy metals.
farm stands that aren't kept up/maintained. poor quality structures, safety issues, produce handling
food safety - good agricultural practices
garbage, parking
Growing produce to be sold in soil that has not be tested for lead and other heavy metals
How the market gardens will maintain/verify that good gardening is used?
I am concerned that the City of Portland will limit our access to good, nutritious produce and meat. For many of us, food buying clubs are the only way we can access no spray veggies. I live on a block that has limited sidewalks, my route to downtown PDX is often interrupted by construction projects which doubled my commute to downtown, but the the City wants to limit my access to good food for my family. Not Happy. Sad face.
I am very concerned about any limitations with both types of distributions. We families in the city need easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for affordable prices. This improves livability, strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors TOGETHER as partners who share common values in the quality of their food and where it comes from. In other words, sustainability.
I don't have any concerns about impacts.
I have no concerns. The more gardening that occurs in Portland, the better. It will increase our food security.
I think the more areas that can grow produce the better. We need to rely on ourselves and not necessarily larger agriculture for food, especially as we reach an end to cheap energy.....
I want market garden businesses to be accessible to low-income people and people of color in Portland. These businesses should not have the impact of displacing small businesses owned by people of color. All zoning in Portland should consider these impacts (regardless of good intent) before making decisions.
I want to have as many options for feeding my family healthy foods as I can get.
I worry about too many restrictions making it impractical or unprofitable for the producers to sell in this way, and the result being fewer choices for consumers, and being limited to the commercial, impersonal, non-local, channels.
I worry that too much regulation will hurt people's ability to grow and sell food.
I would like no size limitation on a market garden. Especially people utilizing oversized lots, raw land, and industrial areas
If there is some breakdown in our ability to bring in food from the outside, and we don't have local resilience, that is what my main concern is.
I'm concerned that new zoning codes would prohibit CSA pick ups in residential areas. Local CSA pick ups are important part of food access and community livability.
I'm excited by the opportunity to have my neighborhood more connected to food production and sale.
In favor of anything that allows Portland families access to clean, safe, local food.
Increasing wise use of our greenspaces and creating healthy communities.
Infringement on my rights
Intrusive advertising
It would be important for any regulation or policy to require a market garden farmer to be responsive to neighbor complaints (ie rodents, chemical sprays...)
It would be very unfortunate if this regulation hindered, rather than helped, gardeners that are already growing for market. I am concerned that making the maximum size too small will mean that most market gardeners will not be in compliance. Let's make sure this part of the code revision helps and doesn't hinder these 'urban farmers' - as they are bringing great value to our community by providing healthful food, and increasing urban food security.
it's hard for me to imagine negative impacts that would be of concern.
Limiting access to food grown locally.
Limiting food access and ability to grow food in quantity.
Limiting local food production.
Limiting people's access to alternative resources for food.
Limiting the size & market-activities of urban market gardens is a negative impact. Currently there are NO impacts to these activities!!
Limiting the way people produce or distribute their foods.
neighborhood traffic

noise
noise, large crowds, parking impact... but if these stands are allowed in many/all neighborhoods the impact would be less as travel would be minimal for most.
None
None
none
None
none
None really - we have had a very positive result with the flower grower in our neighborhood - he has improved the property and it brings the neighbors together in an unexpected way
Not enough available land for people to grow food.
Not having as many food choices as I would like.
Over-reaching regulation by BDS limiting a burgeoning micro ag economy in the City.
Over-regulation of free enterprise.
Over-regulation.
OverWater usage. Overuse of fertilizer in the drinking water and local rivers.
People being able to earn a living is a plus for the city.
People making personal profits like running a business without paying taxes.
Pesticidal & herbicidal runoff & GMO drift are bad everywhere, doubly so in urban areas. Urban farmers need to respond to their neighbors' concerns. Also, this potentially converts some residential areas to commercial areas, which isn't the end of the world but there can noise, parking & traffic issues.
pesticide use
pesticide use
Pesticide use, ensuring that food is not grown in toxic soil.
Pesticides - if these gardens are next to lots where people are living, they should be pesticide free. Soil should also undergo testing to be sure it is safe for food.
pesticides, traffic, smell of manure/ compost piles
Pesticides.
Pesticides.
Please don't limit food buying opportunities for food buying co-op participants especially when families on limited incomes are trying to maintain healthy foods in their homes.
poor soil in urban areas
questionable non-organic growing methods being used and the effects from that.
Reducing local food production and consumption is my biggest concern.
regulating food quality and farming impacts.
safe food
Safety of soil; Safety w/car traffic & parking.
taking away our right to have a relationship with the very farmers who grow our food and provide safety with regard to that food to our family and children
Thanks for mentioning the health impacts of soil contamination and pesticides in the report. I have some concerns about growing food in areas with poor soil quality and the impact this will have on the elderly and children (often at greater risk for food safety hazards).
The ability to have locally-produced food available to all is a positive thing.
The city making broad rules that don't help anyone.
The idea that urban gardening and farming could be limited by the government at this important stage of development.
To allow Portlanders to grow and sell produce on site improves neighborhoods and communities.
Too much government regulation
Too much regulation - not enough access to local foods and local farmers
traffic
Traffic
traffic

Traffic
Traffic could be a problem.
Traffic in residential areas from customers buying produce.
Traffic to access the sites when purchasing produce. Quality of produce that's grown so close to traffic/industry.
traffic, proper disposal of various kinds of waste.
Traffic. Appearance.
traffic-if more people sold produce where people lived cars would not have to be used as much to go to the market.
Understanding why there would be a need to limit the use of Market Gardens.
unknown
use of non-organic fertilizers.
Use of pesticides --- I'd like an organic clause of some kind.
Use of pesticides should not be allowed in urban gardens.
Vandalism
vandalism, blocking traffic (foot, vehicle & bike) nuisances (too many animals in an area)
Vehicle traffic in residential areas.
Vehicular traffic
What concerns me most is that people should have the right to buy & sell food without interference if they want to.
You need to allow home distribution with CSAs and food clubs.
Responsible farming practices, especially composting, and security without tall fences / fortresses.
Raising the cost for small farms by making them pay for a commercial delivery site. I want my organic farm to continue(Dancing Roots Farm).
The impacts that concern me the most are that we come up with all sorts of rules about something so basic and vital as the ability to grow wholesome, healthy food and share it.
increased: traffic - vehicles and people; noise; litter (you would hope not, but may happen)
Pesticides, herbicides, chemical fertilizers.
Farm stand traffic, poor design or weedy fallow lots.
conjection around spots that sell on busy streets.....
Pesticides, dust, some noise, Rules could be made and enforced to mitigate these concerns. Even pesticides allowed under organic standards kill the insects we love like butterflies and ladybugs
Rats, mice, traffic, noise, etc.
(None)
none - I want everyone growing!
Positively: fresh produce; a bit of income for the gardener (payment for labor and materials).
I am much more concerned with the mainstream agricultural system that with anything related to this.
Unkempt or poorly managed sites.
As a recent homeowner looking into urban agricultural as a way to supplement my income I worry that current zoning laws will allow our neighbors to restrict our activities on our land despite the lack of immediately adjacent households.
GMO's and chemical pesticides/herbicides. Requiring organic production would serve to restrict participation to those committed enough to follow through.
Poorly tended (i.e. smelly) compost, which would be gross and which could attract rats. A proper composting set up would be necessary. I also don't want to see too much increased traffic in residential areas.
I am very concerned about any limitations with either type of distributions. Families need easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors together.
Use of pesticides and herbicides in mixed use areas.
traffic, signage, the appearance of the stand itself
I love garden and farm smells (compost and other fertalizers but not everyone does.
Noise and dust from mechanized operations.
farming in industrial or residential areas where there could be toxic soil concerns me

badly maintained compost piles and rodent infestation. Too much car traffic in neighborhoods
We need more biodiversity not less. Regulations that hamper this growth will be a problem.
Use of chemicals and increased traffic/parking.
pesticides, genetically modified seeds
As far as the growing of food in these areas, I would only be concerned about pesticides that could be harmful to kids and pets. As far as selling the produce I would be concerned about more traffic. unknown people. safety of children in the area, playing in the street/on the side walk. Too many strangers, etc. Mostly from a parent stand point and as a home owner (the safety of my home and property).
I am worried there may need to be regulations about chemicals applied to market gardens in residential areas, to avoid pesticides traveling to residences. But am even more concerned about pesticides applied to lawns in residential areas, which are likely to be worse but are perhaps out of the scope of this code update.
past chemicals in the soil and new chemical pollution from near-by industry/cars
Pesticide & fertilizer use in non-organic gardens presenting a health risk to neighbors, activity in early morning hours disturbing neighbors (loading trucks, etc).
Please let people retain CSA and buying clubs. They would be negatively impacted by point number four especially. The Azure truck and the vegetable trucks stop in residential neighborhoods to drop off our food. As I stated above my family now eats healthier food for less money since we joined the co-op over a year ago.
Traffic and noise. It's a disruptive activity.
Too much vehicle traffic
I am most concerned with contamination via pollution getting on the food I eat.
Supporting our local farmers is important as well as supporting the farmers markets that provide a venue for buying and selling. I am concerned that our farmers and local stores may suffer with such competition.
the type that harm mother nature and her people!
noise and pollution from bringing in large equipment such as tillers and harvesting machinery.
I don't see the need for limits on people's private property, placing limits on how much food they grow. Unless they are using heavy pesticides, polluting the environment.
Other kinds of sellers setting up
Some health/safety regs. I know people who compost human waste. For them, fine. For sale, no
Pollution on the one hand, and making sure that the soil is safe so the food is safe (lots of lead in Portland soil!).
Limiting the availability of fresh local food.
Noise, traffic, visitor impacy
not sure
on street parking management of compost pedestrian and bike access to gardens
Pesticide use
The food cart lots are a eye sore, and I don't want residential areas plighted like our commercial corridors.
Traffic
traffic
traffic
Traffic, Congestion in neighborhoods from both people and neighborhoods, chemicals for gardens that could carry to other lots, visual impacts if gardens are not properly maintained
Unsightliness at the curb (signs, cobbled structures, etc., where presumably such stands would be located
unsightlynss
Traffic, materials, noise, hours.
Quality of food. I.E.- WHat you're buying is what it actually is. How can it be organic if it is in the city near buses, cars, pollutants,runoff etc.....
There is a potential for too much traffic.
Shutting down local growers concerns me the most and CSA's.
Making good use of space
I think noise and safety issues are relevant to siting urban agriculture and sales.
The thought of not being able to buy directly from a sustainable farm is disheartening. We love the experience as a family from "seed to sauce".
Pesticide use.

Traffic/parking/invading privacy of residents
Traffic, related noise.
None I can think of. I'm all for this.
I am concerned about food policy limiting the ability to grow food. The scale of our food systems has to change. I don't want to feed my children corporate food. I want our local food policy to actively support and encourage local food production.
The impact on health and well-being if these food buying clubs can't continue.
wild animals (rats, racoons, etc.) also, commercial areas should stay commercial. even when vacant land, like along MLK, it's not good for the other businesses to have someone farming next to traditional businesses. not as big a deal in a light industrial setting.

TOPIC 2: COMMUNITY GARDENS	
Question 6: Direction: Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"	Question 7: What types of impacts concern you the most?
A community garden is beneficial to the neighborhood as much as a park. further, community gardens in areas where residences have little or no plot for personal use (apts) is <u>sorely needed by residents.</u>	
A cooperative stand perhaps but not individual stands.	A cooperative stand perhaps but not individual stands.
A garden is always right.	being told what I can or cannot grow. If I want carrots and beets in my front flower beds it is my choice.
a homeowner's garden will not be quite the same as a community garden.	
Absolutely continue to allow this!!!! It's imperative!!!!	I have no concerns about using land to grow food....or have livestock for that matter.
Again more gardens, more food security. Plus, people love to see gardens/ food growing. Any potential problems can be addressed on the front end with a PR effort to educate people about sustainability, low carbon footprint and a new way of thinking about our urban environment.	Probably noise from machinery would be the biggest problem for most people but probably the time of day regulations which are already in place are enough to address the noise potential. Huge, noisy farm machinery would not be an issue on small plots, however, reasonable noise levels <u>should be addressed. I think.</u>
Again the land needs to be worked people need to be fed and these above institutions hold vast pieces of land that they have cleared. We need more pollinator habitat and the soil can be <u>remediated.</u>	The use of conventional seed and herbicides and fertilizers
again, food comes first. we need to get more towards a re-villaging of our neighborhoods	my only concern is really unkempt garden operations. this may be hard to regulate. i would not want an ugly garden across the street from me; i would prefer it to be beautiful or hidden.
Again, people should be allowed to grown their food. There are probably LOTS of places that are vacant or under utilized that could be used to grow food.	
All the reasons stated in your report... plus it bring beauty to the area.	Upkeep - there are enough weed lots in the area - don't need more.
Allow community gardens everywhere. Don't put too many regulations on them.	Maybe we shouldn't allow marijuana gardens.
Allow for 20-minute neighborhoods. Soil tests for heavy metals. People build community through gardening.	Public access to joining gardens, information (contacts) transparent - must be organic.
Although, I quibble with "well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood" language. What does that mean? That people who don't want to see food growing can object?	People keeping community gardens from existing for no good reason.
Any way to provide discounts on water meter installation?	
Anything that promotes community gardens is a good thing.	

As a community garden user myself, I understand that opportunities to garden are all too rare, and that more people should be given access to them.	none.
As a community gardener, I am able to grow nearly all of my vegetables for summer and fall. Allowing access to community garden plots in a variety of settings will help connect those who don't have access to land with a place to grow some of their food. I think a variety of locations is necessary since one type of community garden is not sufficient to meet the needs of all gardeners. Gardens are a great way for neighbors to meet and gardens to teach each other. They are a place of beauty and neighborhood pride. I cannot see any negative impact of locating various types of community gardens throughout Portland.	Difficult access to garden plots / not enough garden plots to meet the needs of the people.
As I have said, anywhere we can encourage growing, this is positive for the well being of our citizens.	I would again hope for the low use of pesticides.
As long as it benefits the community and the space is used for teaching purposes.	
As long as regulations are clarified, NOT modified to further limit community gardening.	Governmental over-regulation.
as long as the zoning code allows for more community gardens--i.e. makes it easy to start and maintain one.	
As long as the zoning isn't too restrictive.	I want to be sure that anyone who wants to grow and sell food be allowed, as long as they are following safe practice guidelines.
As long as this promotes the development of MORE community gardens as opposed to less.	See above
Because community gardens should be allowed everywhere.	Limiting the ability of growers to sell excess produce to supplement their income and off set the cost of the plot.
Benefits outweigh drawbacks - City should create a guide for creating a new community garden.	Weeds and spoilage from unmaintained plots. Need standards for maintenance, surplus donation, gleaning from abandoned plots.
Best fit to each inique neighborhood makes sense.	None. Perhaps make sure water use is well managed and pesticides kept to none or minimal
Building community and growing food is beneficial.	
Builds community	
But how would the Zoning Code clarification happen and how would the decision of "beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood" be made?	The definition of "beneficial"
But only if the Zoning Code is not so restrictive as to negate the whole process.	
But with a qualifier. Who is going to define "well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood"? Shouldn't that be left up to the neighborhood councils?	People who don't understand the importance of these gardens.
But, how would a community garden not be well-integrated?	
Clarification is always a good thing!	none
clarifying code makes sense - restricting code does not.	
Clarifying regulations is a good idea! Many conflicts arise out of confusion and misinformation.	Indiscriminate use of pesticides.

clearly state in regulations that gardens are acceptable so no one's labor is wasted	vandalism of garden spaces
Collective gardens have considerable potential for cultivating community and nurturing relationships with each other and the natural world. Concerted effort should be invested in creating and allowing as many of these spaces as possible. It would be fantastic if the someday more of these community gardens would be gardened holistically, instead of simply dividing the garden into multiple plots with people working alongside each other. Then again, there is certainly a place for this as well.	Not having enough community gardens impact our health and food security needs.
Comm. Gardens allow people without cars or land access to gardening	None
Community garden are always beneficial.	
community garden rock! yes they need to not negatively impact their area. The ones I have seen have all been an asset!	
community garden should benefit the immediate surrounding neighborhood.	over-regulation could discourage people from taking part.
Community gardens are a benefit to the community and to our food security. We wish to see fewer limitations.	chemical herbicide/pesticide application.
Community gardens are a good thing	
community gardens are a good way for individuals to grow some of their own food.	
Community gardens are a great way for people to work together, grow food and learn how to garden organically. It is also good for families to get together and do a wholesome activity.	Vandalism
Community gardens are ALWAYS beneficial. Local produce should be easier for residents to get. Allowing neighborhoods to have a local source of food is extremely important	I have none
Community gardens are an important feature in a city that is emphasizing increased density as a major source of growth.	I am concerned that the "Clarified regulstions in the Zoning Code to . . . ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood." will pose undue barriers to the creation, expansion, or maintenance of community gardens.
Community gardens are an important source of produce for the gardeners and for donations to food banks.	I don't think there is any significant impact.
Community gardens are crucial to urban food security initiatives, public health, and providing a link to nature/less-built environments.	I am especially interested in establishing community gardens on lots of buildings that are not residential or commercial use, (churches, schools, etc.).
Community gardens are excellent, allow them everywhere possible as they take the resources of land, people's labor to create and trend them and bring people together with food, beauty and community.	I am not sure what the clarifications would be and worry they describe some type of restriction? This direction statement it unclear. In what ways are they not beneficial currently or somehow not well integrated?
Community Gardens are full of good intentions, but sometimes create "little red hen" scenarios as some people are more attentive, and territorial to their spaces. Zoning & regulations clarify rules that prevent conflicts, or at least give documentation	good intentions require intervention, but then again input is usually a positive guide

Community Gardens are great for healthy neighborhoods. They are a healthy source of affordable local food. They help people in a neighborhood meet, know, and trust each other.	I would love it if we had more community gardens with a paid (even part time) staff to help organize the gardeners.
Community gardens are great, therefore, let us have more community gardens.	They need to be available in all sorts of neighborhoods, including economically depressed areas.
Community gardens are worth it!	Parking, security.
Community gardens deserve to be part of an overall plan to foster sustainable housing for all Portland residents. Food production at a local level needs to be part of that plan.	If I were leading an effort like this in Portland, I'd be more concerned about the indiscriminate use of artificial fertilizers and pesticides in a residential setting -- than concerned about sizes and types of crops.
Community gardens help involve the community in gardening for those who do not have their own space to do so	(None)
Community gardens improve the fabric of our communities and encourage dialog around sustainable regional food systems. They also help people understand seasonality.	The lack of funding the Parks has received in which to implement the targeted additional plots.
Community gardens provide a valuable service to the community.	Traffic, noise, and odor would be the primary concerns. I believe most of these would not be significant in the community garden setting. Some code language regarding proximity of composting facilities to neighboring properties might be helpful.
Community gardens provide great benefits to communities across the city, so it is important to continue allowing them everywhere. Creating clear standards and definitions for different types of community gardens (without additional barriers) should help more individuals and groups be able to develop and access community gardens.	Will these definitions view all community gardens the same (i.e. private vs. public) or establish different standards for different types of gardens? Will the definitions make distinctions between community gardens split up into plots versus community gardens that are one big plot shared by members?
Community gardens should be allowed everywhere in my opinion. I would be cautious about wording that would exclude a type of garden because perhaps a few neighbors didn't like flowers or vegetables for instance.	
community gardens should not be restricted when there is a desire by people to organize the gardens and grow food. they provide food security for many families who may otherwise not have access to fresh produce.	none
Community-building activity coupled with locally grown food	
Continue to allow community gardens everywhere but back off on the regulations. This sounds like regulations for the sake of regulations, rather than for benefit. Building and setback ordinances probably already cover anything that would need to be covered.	Too much regulation for the sake of regulation.
Continue to allow community gardens everywhere!	too many regulations that might inhibit gardens if they are too "messy" or something of that nature. Growing food is not like growing a manicured lawn and flowers, the zoning code should not have holes that allow for HOA's to ban gardens for the unkept look. They should however be required to use minimal chemicals and have code aligned with keeping human health as a priority.

Continue to allow gardens, but do not restrict them unless absolutely critical.	None. I am more concerned with limiting or restricting use of usable space and private property.
Continue to encourage community gardens where they are welcomed and needed.	
encourage, not just allow, more community gardens	limiting community gardens
Except very little regulation of the gardens. They are gardens, not Ponzi schemes.	Lawn loving neighbors/neighborhoods trying to keep gardens that provide jobs and keep our produce local out. It takes less water to grow food than grass. While it is difficult to maintain a beautiful lawn with out chemicals harmful to the soil and water, it is not difficult to grow food without chemicals.
Food security is critical to a healthy Oregon and a healthy Portland.	Ensuring on-site security, if needed.
From my perspective, community gardens are one of the best uses of land (other than pesticide use) and any regulations limiting them (rather than how they are used) should be reconsidered and most likely changed.	The impact of zoning codes on the creation of gardens. Impact of pesticides on the neighborhood.
Gardens Everywhere! but not too tight regulations...	none except the one above.
Gardens everywhere.	No concerns
Generally, guidelines encourage better behavior for the small percentage that might abuse an opportunity.	I have no concerns since I don't live close to a community garden. I will defer to those who are more knowledgeable.
get oversight of gardens so food isnt wasted	
Good for community development	None
Greater distribution means more options for more people and less transportation to get to/from garden sites.	Imposing zoning/planning review fees
How can growing healthy food, and planting beautiful gardens every cause any problems...?	
However, I don't know how growing flowers and vegetables could ever be not beneficial to a community.	
I am not 100% sure how a community garden is not beneficial to anyone.	People who can grow their own, can feed thier own. Again, healthy and affordable food access.
I am not sure what prompts the concern that gardens might be poorly integrated or not beneficial to the neighborhood, but I agree that community gardens should be allowed everywhere and encouraged. I think there is room for a great many MORE community gardens, especially in areas where people are low income and could greatly benefit from the experience of growing a garden as well as supplimenting their diets.	Theft from gardens is sad, so maybe a locked gate with a combination or code available to gardeners. Other than that, not enough plots in areas where people need to grow food. Maybe tax breaks or other benefit to encourage owners of vacant lots to allow the spaces to be used for gardens?
I believe that continuing to allow community gardens every where is important! Without knowing what regulations would be 'clarified' and what those clarifications would be, however I'm not 100% sure I agree.	I'd want to be sure that poorer folks and renters in the neighborhood have as much access as homeowners.
I can't truly answer this since I don't understand what needs to be clarified, or how you define benefit to the surrounding neighborhood. But in general, I support community gardens and think there should be more of them. We feel the ones near our house bring a lot of beauty and value to our neighborhood, and we're always curious to see what's being grown and how.	None.

I do find it hard to believe that a community garden would *not* be beneficial in a given location.	
I don't know anything about this issue or if there have been problems with community garden zoning.	Anything that discourage community gardening.
I don't know what clarifications you're seeking, but I don't want to limit community gardens in any way.	
I don't really know - this question is vague and it's unclear what effect it would have.	Any kind of limiting.
I don't think it needs to be regulated	I don't see any potential impacts. I'm in favor of every bit of spare land being used to grow food!
I guess, allowing community gardens good, not sure what well-integrated and beneficial means	none, I'm most concerned that people will try to limit local food production for trivial reasons compared to the future of the planet, like people worrying about smells in the city <u>composting project</u>
I have gardened in three different PP&R community gardens. It is a valuable source of food, flowers, and herbs as well as a social activity. My current plot is on a visible corner and many passersby stop to ask questions	I think the visual impact of the older community gardens is not so good, with ugly chain-link fencing and plots that are sometimes pretty weedy and unkempt.
i have no idea what the above statement means. it seems pretty open to interpretation.	
I think community gardens are generally good and easy to integrate into a neighborhood	The down side to community gardens is that they are often not very productive. They tend to be used mainly in the high season, and because they change hands so often, long term planning or the use of sensible perennials is often left at the wayside. I think that market gardens and larger scale community projects should take precedence over community gardens of the type that you describe, but I don't think there is anything wrong with community gardens and I think they are a good way for people with limited resources/land to do some gardening.
I think growing on your own property is fine. In these times we need to be more resourceful.	Too many regulations and FEES
I think it is always a good idea to see if codes that are currently in effect are benefiting the neighborhood. If something can be improved upon without creating further limitations, that I feel okay with this.	That people who use and enjoy the gardens will feel like they can no longer be a part of this due to further restrictions.
I think it's important to maintain Portland's robust and highly beneficial community garden community.	I'm not sure that I understand what precipitated the need for Zoning Code clarification, but I would hope that it will not in any way make the establishment or continuation of any of Portland's community gardens more difficult.
I think there is a lot of demand for community garden plots, and it's unfortunate when they are not well utilized. Maybe more regulations could help.... though this is a little vague, so I don't know.	Really just making sure the soil is clean to start with, and making sure that people aren't using harmful sprays and chemical fertilizers.
I wonder what we mean by 'types of community garden'. I'm only familiar with the growing food type. But making sure that the neighborhood is given input into the gardens makes neighbors more willing to accept gardens into their community, so on the whole it is a good thing.	

I would favor the lowest possible barriers to entry for creating community gardens.	
I would have to understand the distinction between types of gardens.	My main concern would be protecting the food safety of the produce harvested by the gardeners. Traffic might also be an issue, depending on the size of the garden and the type of neighborhood.
I would like to see gardens everywhere. I'm not really sure how a garden could not be beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood.	I'm not too concerned about any impacts from more gardening.
If you mean clarify zoning so it allows more gardens, then yes this is the right direction.	Let us grow!!!!
I'm concerned that "clarification of regulations" and development that is "well-integrated" could mean more restrictions to where community gardens are allowed. I think the general rule should be to allow all community gardens in all places. If a garden causes concerns or extraordinary impacts that garden should be evaluated specifically.	Pollution from traffic contaminating food.
I'm not aware of any negative impacts of community gardens. I know waiting lists are long, it would be great to have more opportunities for people without land to garden.	
I'm not sure about this - clarifying regulations is good in general, but I don't want the gardens to be curtailed. How could they possibly be non-beneficial to a neighborhood?	
I'm not sure what needs to be regulated here?	Limitations on gardens. We need to promote this kind of activity!
I'm not sure where the 'concerns' are coming from. Integrated zoning is more efficient and requires less transportation to get what you need.	None
Improves relationships w/in community, which impacts safety: people out and about, getting to know each other, exchange of ideas in gardening, fresh produce	Vandalism and stealing, though don't know if that is a problem in community gardens here. Support organic; against using pesticides and various poisons, except slugbait! (if they're a real problem).
Increase urban food production and access to healthy food for urban dwellers.	I am concerned about what types of regulations the city is considering "clarifying" and what types of limits the city would set.
It depends on how the zoning code defines 'beneficial,' but generally I think more community gardens will be better for us than fewer community gardens.	No real concerns on this one.
It depends on how you clarify the zoning code - to protect and encourage community gardens or to stifle them in confusing rules and restrictions?	
it gives more people a chance to garden, we need more of them, I understand the waiting lists can be quite long.	I have visited a few of the gardens and my only concern was that some of the plots were not being used within the garden and if people didn't use them they should be opened to some one else--quickly.
It is find to clarify regulations, but regulations should be as limited as possible. We should not restrict community gardens without good reason.	I am concerned with overly legislated limitations on community gardens.

<p>It sounds fine, but I'd like more details on what "well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood"</p>	<p>I don't know if this qualifies as an "impact", but I am concerned about chronic underfunding of the community garden program, and poor garden management that doesn't create a successful environment for people when they first take over a new plot. I've encountered serious problems with mice, invasive weeds, and hard-to-remove cane berries that were not being addressed when plots are abandoned by the previous gardening. This means that some plots become chronically neglected, and hard to turn back into productive growing space.</p>
<p>It will take broad local feedback to get this careful integration into use areas; it would be well worth the effort.</p>	<p>see 6.</p>
<p>It's community oriented, it should help support the community</p>	<p>Accessibility may be an issue</p>
<p>It's especially important to have community garden access around multi-dwellings where individual residents do not have 'yards.' I'd like to see more of the community garden space used for native plants & pollinator habitat.</p>	
<p>It's just healthy for people to get together and dig in the dirt.</p>	
<p>It's probably a good idea to make sure everybody's clear on the rules.</p>	<p>If the restrictions discourage the formation of community gardens. That would be bad.</p>
<p>It's unclear from this description what keeping them "well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood" means, concretely. Perhaps adding additional clarification of what concrete steps the City will be taking to accomplish those goals. So long as it doesn't impede these gardens, and keeps them regulated and well taken care of, I don't see a <u>problem with it.</u></p>	
<p>I've heard that there is a long waiting list for community gardening spaces. There should be ample space for <u>everyone/anyone who wants to grow!</u></p>	<p>None. I'd love to live next to community gardens!!</p>
<p>I've only heard good things about Community Gardens. Of course, you need a community to garden in a community garden. I imagine there is a process that people go through to <u>designate and plan a site.</u></p>	
<p>I've participated in this program and have experienced first hand how it has brought me closer to my neighbors and community institutions, i.e. local school. Portland needs more of this not less.</p>	<p>Organization of the Community Gardens program is a disaster, esp. the waitlist and plot assignment process, and connections to local food banks. I don't have confidence that a larger scale project can be competently managed by the <u>present organization.</u></p>
<p>Keeps organization to the design of neighborhoods. A community garden is pleasing to see and provides a positive <u>community gathering opportunity</u></p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Language to define what they are and that they exist is helpful. Keeping regulations to a minimum/ on a basic level would be important to me.</p>	<p>run-off if a community garden uses chemicals. Other things like pests, odor, even noise I can live with and would like to 'risk' it in favor of a less regulated community garden code.</p>

love ours and the community it inspires.	just that it is well tended and simple community rules such as clean an area out if it is started but not continued with care.
Low impact use; no retail activity.	
Make it easier to develop new gardens. Provide discount on water.	Most of the impacts of community gardens are positive ones. No major concerns about possible negative impacts.
many people do not have the land to grow their own garden. I know people specifically who use community gardens due to this and would not be able to otherwise...it is a also a great tool for the children	if a community garden is not wanted in an area it would more than likely be left uncared for, thus being unaesthetically beneficial to the neighborhood
Many residents do not have the right space or any space for a garden. Community gardens provide residents with a fun and healthy outdoor activity.	None, community gardens are low impact. You rarely see more than a few gardeners in the largest lots.
More clarification will help support their existence. Keep community gardens in mind for any public land, as they are in great need for space.	
More community gardens and an easier process is need. Please allow sales from community gardens	Overregulation of zoning laws
More gardens with more community collaboration = a very good thing for Portland's future.	Respecting the input of a variety of residents in the neighborhood.
More people need to have access to spaces to grow their own food. Healthy eating and cheaper food as well as getting people out into the community helping each other cannot be a bad thing, and from what I have heard there are waiting lists at all community gardens.	none.
More people will know how to grow their own food,and eat at least once aweek fresh food grown locally.	Geting more space of gardening open to public(many people) to make their own food.
na	na
neighborhood involvement, ability to personalize a neighborhood and continue the city's individual reputation as a exclusive, not inclusive place to live.	
not everyone has somewhere to garden. Also, the community aspect helps make it a team effort.	I doubt pesticide use or water run off with fertilizers is significant, but that is the only thing that might need to be monitored.
not sure what beneficial to the neighborhood entails so this would have to be made more clear... I think if there is a house, institution, etc. that wants to have a garden they should be able to period!	
Not sure what limitations or various types you are talking about. I think you should be open-minded so we can provide food security and access as much as possible. Think outside the box, but promote more gardens, rather than limit.	Supporting growing food organically is paramount.
Not sure what the problem is with existing community gardens -- they seem great to me. Is there a need to change anything here?	
Only limit things that are real safety or health issues.	The lack of urban farming concerns me the most. Portland can be a leader in promoting more sustainable activities that reduce CO-2 production, and urban farming is a very important element to develop: wisely and creatively.

Opinions of the neighborhood locals is important. but anywhere there is space i'd rather see someone's garden than and messy or empty field.	Parking should be considered. enough for the amount of gardeners.
Provided that clarifications in regulation are more helpful than harmful to the cause of increasing accessible community gardens to Portland, this seems the right direction.	Bureaucratic red tape that would limit the ability of communities to rally around local food production.
Provides an opportunity for local families to grow their own food and experience the joy of gardening.	none. Community gardens are wonderful!
Providing community garden space is a great asset allowing those living in apartments or no yard dwelling to cultivate their own food for themselves or their establishment.	
Same as above -- creating a more sustainable system means growing more local food.	
Same as before	Same as before
Seems great.	Once again, mono-crop. We need a wide diversity in our neighborhoods. People get highly focused on food, and we lose then some very wonderful plants, along with their animal companions. Assuring that it is beneficial to the neighborhood seems like a nice starting point for resisting the development of more sustainable efforts.
Show clear support and encourage community gardens so that institution/multi-family/school has a clear path to establishing community gardens.	Leaving grass or weeds on a site when the site owner would be supportive of gardens if the zoning were established.
Similar to market gardens any productive use of land is great. The allowance of community gardens on institutional land is also a no-brainer, medical centers are in the business of keeping people healthy and having a tangible location where healthy food options are on display is wise, schools can help children develop an attachment of the land and a fondness for growing things that will stick with them through their lives.	Potential visual nuisance if 4 season gardening is not encouraged, neighborhood parking concerns since community gardens would likely have more participants than market gardens, and prohibiting selling produce. If a garden decides to sell produce they should be allowed similar to a market garden.
So long as these regulations are building and protecting these gardens, not limiting them.	That too many codes and regulations will make it difficult or expensive for these gardens to thrive.
So the privilege doesn't get taken away.	
Social benefits of community gardens are as important as the nutritional. Parks should NOT be the only community gardens.	Varies with location and problems should be addressed in response to complaints or at the neighborhood level.
Some people have no where to have a garden, like apartment dwellers, so community gardens are awesome for that. I was sad for the people who had used the community garden on my street when it was built on (about 20 years ago),	
Sounds fine.	Again, the more ready access to gardens will be a negative impact on the small farms and farmers just outside Portland.
Sounds good.	
Sounds good. Make sure they benefit the community they are in.	Non-tended gardens

Successful community gardens seem to be the ones well-integrated/benef to their communities.	None.
The "yes" is to the first part of the question. The latter part offers no details as to what the clarifications might be, so it's impossible to judge.	none
The latter language is questionable "to ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial". I see no reason why community gardens would not be so.	None.
The more access to gardening, the better. Especially for lower-income families.	None.
The more people involved with cultivating locally, the more environmental stewards we'll have.	I think a general concern is parking. Having composting and soil building on-site, or shared tool libraries can help reduce the need for people to bring their cars with outside implements.
There are perhaps 3 community gardens 'close' to where I live, and they all have at least a 3 year waiting list. I live in an apartment with no real access to a place to grow my own food (no balcony, no outside porch). The city should perhaps make creating more community gardens a priority over infill building for a time, to help create opportunities for people who live here already to have better access to food.	Traffic, again, but the more gardens there are, the less distance that people will have to travel to find one.
There are very few negative impacts from gardening, and we only have more mouths to feed and people to educate.	That educating people to appreciate and eat vegetables has some stiff competition from corporate food product makers with large advertising budgets.
There needs to be more access to places to garden for those who want to. There are long waiting lists for community gardens. In addition to providing food, builds community.	none.
There should be more community gardens. For example, the site of Fernhill Park has an enormous unused open space. This could be a great site for a Cully garden.	
They build community and enable neighbors to get to know each other.	Traffic, use of chemicals
They should be allowed everywhere.	I'm curious to know what the concerns are. I think community gardens are great and have always enjoyed living near them. The main problem I've seen is vandalism, but the answer to that is having more activity at the gardens, not less. I'd like to see more efforts to engage at-risk youth in these community gardening opportunities.
This allows for the expansion of community gardens.	The ability of individuals and groups to grow some of their own food is a positive thing.
This makes it fair for everyone and accessible for all to have a garden and grow food.	The gardens are open to all who want to grow food.
this makes sense, my caution would be in the use public land for these gardens- it seems a challenge to keep the public benefit truly public. If the plots are distributed to individuals, some will lose out.	

<p>This seems like a reasonable approach. As the statement is quite vague, I'd like to see more details on how different types of comm. gardens might integrate and add benefits to the neighborhood...and/or see your suggestions of what type of garden wouldn't fit in a certain neighborhood, so i could further weigh in.</p>	<p>not enough information in the direction statement for me to say what would most concern me. See my answer to #6, the direction statement, too.</p>
<p>This should probably be a "maybe". Unclear what you mean about the "types" of community gardens and how that will impact their classification.</p>	<p>Gardens being abandoned after construction since there was not a well thought out maintenance plan put in place from inception. It may be good to advise project planners to work with Friends of Portland Community Gardens or Grow Portland or Growing Gardens (some established entity who can consult during planning stages)</p>
<p>Time to be clear about downsides of a "cool idea".</p>	<p>vectors</p>
<p>transforming unused space into gardens is a benefit for people, environment, and neighborhoods.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>W/ reservations, regulations in zoning code often hurt the individual right to choose. be cautious that some personal agenda on garden style/appearance isn't favored.</p>	<p>worried regulations will cost small community gardens beyond their value.</p>
<p>We need as many community gardens as possible.</p>	
<p>we need more community gardens to meet the demand</p>	<p>see previous answeres</p>
<p>We need more gardens.</p>	<p>Again, they should follow organic practices.</p>
<p>We need to increase access to high quality food availability.</p>	
<p>We should be leading the nation in community cooperation during these times and moving forward sustainably under any conditions.</p>	<p>Vandalism and thievery, but those are issues for the property owners and policing. More important are feeding people and developing responsibility and community self-reliance</p>
<p>We should encourage community gardens as widely as possible but proceed in a way that zoning code and other regulations ensure equitable and appropriate use.</p>	<p>Adequate environmental protection - ensuring hazardous pesticides aren't introduced, runoff and other problems.</p>
<p>well-integrated and beneficial, make sure the codes fit the neighborhoods and people have latitude for filling their needs.</p>	<p>Avoid the application of chemical pesticides and herbicides near the homes of children and sensitive adults and pets. Strongly encourage and/or ensure that strong pesticide applications to do not bother the people who live near these gardens by limiting their use or stipulating only organic gardens in dense urban areas.</p>
<p>what does "well integrated" and "beneficial" mean?</p>	
<p>What does it mean to "clarify regulations to address various types of community gardens"? In my opinion, any community garden plot is an asset to ANY neighborhood!</p>	<p>Anything that the city of Portland does to limit or restrict access to locally grown and produced food. We should be allowing more gardens, food stands, community gardens, CSA's, etc., without limits. In the current economy and in the current state of health in our country, local food provides more food security and better nutrition. DO NOT CHANGE ZONING TO LIMIT ACCESS TO LOCAL FOOD FOR PEOPLE WHO WANT IT! Let Portland be a leader in the local, sustainable food movement!</p>

When people can be close to their food source, it benefits everyone.	I would not want to see heavy farming equipment or toxic fertilizers in community gardens or residential neighborhoods.
why make codes at all, or make broad safety codes.	Some have different ideas of "beneficial" Be careful not to favor some personal agendas
Why must it be "beneficial" to the surrounding neighborhood? If it is beneficial to the landowner and does not harm the neighborhood, then it should be permitted.	The concept that what one does must be beneficial to what his or her neighbors do. Are we "all socialists now"? The right of the individual should be superior to the right of the group as long as it does not harm the group.
Yes, allow community gardens everywhere. Do not restrict them. The language of the above question is unnerving.	Again, I'm concerned regulations will be passed that reduces local food production and consumption.
Yes, except I do not see why it matters what type of garden it is....or how to make it more integrated in the neighborhood. It is greenspace maintained by others....like a free park for the city.	
Yes, I think if the community wants it then it should be provided for, but if everyone has no need then it is better put to a different use.	Putting the gardens in areas where they will be abused. When people work hard in their gardens and then they get trashed or vandalized that is not good.
Yes, in theory. However, the above description of the direction is an incredibly broad and vague statement.	What are the "various types of community gardens"? And how is "well-integrated and beneficial" defined?
Yes, You can even look at vertical gardens in areas where there is no soil.. They are very effective at schools, In Los Angeles some of the schools have hanging or vertical gardens, the students can take home fresh salad greens and feel <u>empowered helping to grow their own food.</u>	The changing of our attitude on the way we look at food in our community. We have an opportunity to contributing to reduce stress for some people through community gardens in business and work areas.
Yes--community gardens should be supported. They should be allowed in a variety of situations.	Do not limit these. Community gardens are such a benefit to the community. The more we grow our own food, the healthier our community can be. This supports our health and supports building community together. Plus, community gardens are beautiful green spaces in the city. We need more. Maybe certain large buildings could have rooftop community gardens. Community gardens are our future. We need to further this.
Zoning can sometimes be unintentionally harmful to food production in urban areas and this ensures that both the rights of food growers are protected along with the character (and livability of a neighborhood).	None. I think this a wonderful idea.
	Access (bike/ped/auto), minimizing pesticide/herbicide use (onsite or nearby)
	access to these gardens in all neighborhoods
	Adding too many restrictions to community gardens. As long as there's permission from the land owner, there should be maximum flexibility for the use by the volunteers.
	affordable housing
	Again - "too much" regulation -- I think gardens by their nature are "well integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood."

	Again, careful control of chemical use, especially pesticides.
	again, I can't think of any negative impacts resulting from a large garden.
	Again, I think the more community gardens the better, so I would just want to be sure that whatever regulatory changes are made aren't unnecessarily burdensome to the creation of additional gardens.
	Again, limiting unwanted exposures to pesticides and herbicides.
	again, same concerns with the market garden: pollution from the pesticide/herbicide actions of others upslope from the edibles. Lead and other soil contaminants that migrate.
	Allow some sales, limited in time and duration.
	As long as the zoning code doesn't hinder small groups setting up community gardens with a bunch of paperwork loopholes or fees.
	Availability/accessibility. Making the plots available by need (income-based? folks in apartments before folks in houses with land?) & location (ability for residents to access their plot)
	Can't think of any!
	chemical use
	chemical use impacting nearby properties
	Community gardens don't concern me at all--the more the merrier!
	Community gardens need to be close enough to people's homes to be convenient. A plot that is cared for in an ongoing way is good, while a neglected plot allows weeds to go to seed and creates a nuisance, so it's great to have programs (mentoring, etc) that really help ensure people's success the first year.
	community gardens need to cost less to create.
	Depends on traffic, noise and other considerations.
	Descriptions being flexible enough that many different institutions may create a community garden if they want one.
	Ditto section one. Nothing about the idea of more gardens concerns me in the least.
	Do not want to limit access.
	Ensure that the zoning code works to promote community gardening rather than restricting the growth and increase of community gardening space.
	Ensuring they are well kept and maintained.
	Equity and access to gardens - making sure that all communities have an opportunity to create and cultivate a community garden where one is wanted, or near a site that they've proposed.
	Health of the food in areas of possible contamination/pollution and folks not knowing about that.

	how are "types of community gardens" defined? why do they need to be defined? who decides if they are well-integrated and beneficial?
	I
	I am concerned about exactly what limitations are put on community garden creation. I have heard that the aesthetics of having gardens are a concern for people and I just don't think that is fair- as a gardener and landscaper, almost every home in portland is landscaped and not necessarily landscaped 'well' or kept up well. It is true that vegetable gardens aren't meant to be ornamental, and that some plants go through a drying out phase in order to have their seed saved, and may not always look perfect and green- or perhaps the gardeners dont clean out their lots right away with brown or dying leaves (as a landscaper would treat an ornamental landscape). However, that isn't the point of a vegetable garden. End rant:)
	I am most concerned that city government works to ensure that EVERYONE has access to community gardens--to participating in one, or creating new ones--These gardens are crucial to the health of our population as well as to our future food security!
	I can't imagine any negative impacts with community gardens.
	I do not want an excess amount of city beaurocracy to limit our ability to grow, trade and sell food.
	I have no problem with residential gardens. I do have concerns with livestock and proper handling of wastes, but I find goats much less objectionable than leaf blowers if the owners of the goats keep them from roaming.
	I hope that we can make more space available for community gardens, as it strengthens communities.
	I support expanding where/ how community gardens can be established. But will the regulation clarifications potentially limit the number of gardens?
	I think that more gardens can only improve the livability of the city, regardless of location.
	I think the city needs to have some sort of outreach program to insure that community gardens have the correct resources like a tool shed and water hoses. I'm sure a bit of assistance from the city will help insure the continued operations of the community gardens.
	I worry that if the neighborhood doesn't buy in enough there could be vandalism.
	I would be concerned of movement in the direction of inhibiting the expansion or location of new community gardens in perfectly-good cultivatable space.
	I would love to see more community gardens.
	I wouldn't want to see any community gardens shut down.

	If there was noise from farm machinery.
	I'm most concerned that "clarifying regulations in the Zoning Code" will mean government getting their fingers in areas where they are not needed.
	impacts to nearby neighborhoods. account for parking (we're still very much a car culture!)
	Increasing the availability for citizens to have a community garden plot
	Inexperienced gardeners planting invasive plants that spread to surrounding areas
	Landlords removing the right to garden if they choose to do so, even if the land is not going to be developed. How might we establish renters rights to avoid the at will removal of community gardens just for the sake preference- and not due to land use laws or real and confirmed development plans.
	Liability issues on privately held land. Accessibility and opportunities in all neighborhoods.
	Longevity. Keeping the site available and coordinated in the future.
	Love community gardens; want more
	make sure that these types of spaces aren't restricted and have the ability to thrive
	Making it too difficult for community gardens to exist, due to bureaucracy, costs, etc
	Making sure these are "good neighbors" to those living in the area. I'm not aware that there have been problems, so if things are working well, don't add unnecessary regulations.
	making these gardens accessible to people of color and low-income families.
	mess! things left unmaintained.
	more gardens the better
	more gardens the better
	My biggest concern would be the heavy use of pesticides.
	Need to develop policy for pesticide use, possibly following Portlands IPM and utilizing expertise from the EM SWCD to educate and address any problems.
	Needless bureaucracy imposed upon the community.
	no concerns
	No concerns. Think gardens should be placed everywhere there is land being unused, especially vacant lots that might otherwise be unsightly and overgrown.
	Noise, oversight, and security; most of the CG in Portland are delightful and appreciated; sensitivity to specific neighborhood concerns is a great guideline.
	None
	None
	None
	none

	none
	None
	none
	none
	none
	None
	none
	None. I have a hard time imagining a problem with a community garden and, quite frankly, the demand in PDX for them is very high.
	None. I just hope there would be more households and people interested in participating.
	Non-Organic practices
	not worried.
	Once again, application of hazardous chemicals and potentially runoff of chemical fertilizers if such impacts are not carefully regulated.
	overall appearance and maintenance of grounds
	Overly-restrictive zoning concerns me the most. I understand wanting to keep a cadmium factory out of the middle of a neighborhood, but what harm is posed by a garden. Why is the wasteful practice of lawn-raising preferable?
	people monopolizing space
	Permit fees set way too high for redevelopment of sites into community gardens. I work with Depave and I have seen this problem first hand. Please email me if you want specifics: ted@depave.org Should BDS even be levying permit fees for redevelopment of under-utilized areas into community gardens?
	pesticides and herbicides used in and around community gardens.
	Poor design - trashy fences and overgrown plots.
	Potential chemical use by gardeners who may not understand proper application rates, safety precautions, etc. Some sort of regulations on chemical inputs?
	Privately controlled community gardens discriminating against some households in assigning garden plots.
	Regulation of farming practices and land use impact.
	Related noise.
	same as previous.
	See answer in question #5
	Single owner gardens that grow bizarre products for non-local use.
	Some concern about who is going to determine whether or not community gardens are "well integrated and beneficial to surrounding neighborhood" and what criteria is used.
	Telling people they cannot have community groups who work together and unify over a common cause that is beneficial to all, such as a garden.

	That community gardens are not used for commercial activities. Community garden sites benefit from regulation of soil testing, and other safe growing practices.
	That it is not exclusive and an open process for neighbors to apply for the plot
	That restrictions on public gardens will limit the community involvement in said gardens.
	that the areas are not fenced to prohibit dogs when there is organic gardening happening.
	That the regulations will be overly controlling and limit gardening activity.
	That those who may be without their own land, those in apartments, and those who are low income would have easy access to such gardens.
	That Zoning Code will change and Community Gardens will go away.
	The biggest concern here is to be sure the land is tended and doesn't become an eye sore for the residents in the area. To be organized about it so that the food is used and does not go to waste and to inform all the local residents to allow for maximum benefit to those who live close by.
	the lack of them! I love seeing neighbors interact and again seeing an empty, unused & usually neglected space turn into something lovely.
	There are so many waiting lists for the gardens. More would be best.
	To participate in a community garden the cost should be less for an individual plot.
	too many rules...growing food should be a free activity allowed anywhere someone wants to garden
	too much regulation is unnerving
	too tight of zoning
	Unkempt and poorly managed sites.
	unkempt community gardens that detract from the neighborhood.
	unknown
	unsightliness
	untended gardens with food going to waste
	use of pesticides
	Vandalism by outsiders of garden plants/tools sometimes.
	Vandalism to the gardens.
	Vandalism! Need better options for neighborhood security. Vandals love to trash gardens of all kinds.
	vandalism, dust, food safety
	we need to continue to incent community gardening and not hinder it.
	WE should create as many garden spaces as possible to give people the opportunity to grow their own food and create small ecosystems for bees and birds...

	What concerns me the most isn't the impact, it's the potential for petty bureaucracy, for people to say, "That's not "beneficial" enough for this area" or "That's not attractive right there."
	what restrictions will you place on it - as far as size - people should be able to use their own property as they want
	Why do you have to zone a community garden? I don't think it should matter where it is.
	Would like to see more folks grow more of their own food

TOPIC 2: COMMUNITY GARDENS	
Question 6: Direction: Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "NO"	Question 7: What types of impacts concern you the most?
"clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood." this makes me nervous. sounds like a carte blanch to regulate, perhaps heavily. kind of undermines the strength of the initial statement - allowing c.gardens everywhere.	fussy neighbors ruining it for the urban farming pioneers. people need to be educated that food security is a real issue and we are far far from real sanitation issues. people know what a farm smell is for a reason, farms sometimes smell unlike roses.... sorry if this sounds crass or simplistic. i am in a big hurry!!!
"Clarify regulations" is too vague. What changes are you proposing?	Cars. The more gardens and food source centers there are, the less driving.
"clarifying regulations" often results in over-regulation.	Same as above.
"well-integrated" seems vague, as is "beneficial." By whose standard?	I am concerned that neighbors could shut down community gardens out of fear of reduced property values.
Actually I'm not sure because the "clarifications" are not detailed here. But I believe restrictions on community gardens are the wrong way to go. There are already huge wait lists for many of the gardens around town. We should be encouraging gardening in the city as much as possible - it benefits all of us.	
Additional restrictions that are "global" over Portland or MultCo are inevitably wrong in most places in over-restriction. Local people can develop plans and programs that minimize impact and make/deliver the most food at the lowest cost (not just money-price).	Encouraging populations of Opossum, Raccoon, foraging dogs, non-native Birds, Rats, Mice, disease-causing insects, by providing food/standing water/breeding habitat. Current rules and legislation provide sufficient tools for enforcement against these hazards.
again,the more the merrier.how could a garden not be beneficial to the neighborhood?	regulations.
allow community gardens of all types as long as they are organic	excluding a community garden type for no valid reason
Because regulating different types of gardens will work against flexibility in types of gardens.	Putting too many hurdles in place for a community to come together and create a garden.
Because the government doesn't need to be involved. Period.	
Community gardens are always beneficial to their surrounding neighborhoods.	
Community gardens are beneficial in all areas.	I cannot even imagine how any kind of community garden could be anything other than beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood. I am concerned that there are commercial or industrial interests who may be pushing against community gardens for reasons which are not in a neighborhood's actual interest. I would also like to see the City of Portland allow community gardeners with plots in city parks to sell their produce if they want, as this would increase the food access in their communities.

Community gardens should be allowed where ever individuals want to join together to manage them.	
Continue to allow community gardens - they don't need to be controlled.	
Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, yes. Do not limit their integration. We need more community gardens, more access, fewer waiting lists, and simply more access to local food before we work on native integration or similar.	Not having access to local food concerns me the most. When you limit access you are doing a disservice to our diverse community. Not having access hinders our food security which simply hinders our security as a people. Encourage gardens, do not discourage.
Do not restrict community gardens. Only expand.	More family's producing food and being self reliant.
food growth should be allowed without out issues from government.. we have TOO MUCH governing of our lives, don't ya think?	same as before, those that harm mother nature and her people.
garden = good....government = bad(usually it creates fanatics and authority freaks and abusers)	monsanto and factory farms
Gardens should develop dynamically to insure that what is best for the surrounding area.	Over-regulation
I am actually not sure because these clarifications are not specified.	I would be concerned about any new regulations that would make it more difficult to establish community gardens. We definitely need more of them!
I am apprehensive that zoning regulations will out zone people ability to garden.	
I am concerned about NIMBY attitudes.	None. I think they should be allowed everywhere.
I am not familiar with the zoning codes.	The directions seem to indicate further regulation on community gardens not expansion. The gardens have a long wait list and we need more of them.
I am wary of placing regulations on community gardens as I feel it will discourage people from pursuing this. More restrictions lead to frustrations. Allowing community gardens with minimal restrictions will heighten use.	
I can't see how a garden would not be beneficial to any neighborhood.	
I don't believe they need to be regulated, except to ensure equal distribution of public land. I don't see how they could be harmful unless residents are abusing the system with toxins or invasive species.	above mentioned
i dont have enough information to answer this question propoerly, the above 'direction' is stated very vaguely.	that the zoning code would end up being restrictive and limiting access to community gardens.
I don't know what you mean by this statement - it's vague and so it means nothing really.	Don't raise the price on community gardens that the city runs. If corporate non-profits get involved, don't let them charge too high a price for renting the land at their gardens.
I don't see how regulation helps, or why it's the city's business.	
I don't think there should be much regulation of community gardens. If someone wants to put the time and work into finding a place and organising a garden they should be able to. I think there are mor important things to be regulated than gardens.	
I don't think there's a need change zoning codes. Community gardens should be allowed everywhere. Any inconvenience the garden may cause is outweighed by the benefits.	
I don't think we need any regulation.	None

<p>I don't think we should hinder any development of a community action place like a garden. Complaints regarding aesthetic concerns should not be allowed. Aesthetics are subjective and just as easily reversed. A neighbor doesn't like the look of a fallow garden box during the off season (please note there is no off-season here in portland and we can always grow winter cover crops in our boxes or salad greens or any myriad of things), but another neighbor could be concerned about high levels chemical fertilizer and pesticide & herbicide use by their next door neighbor and have no say in the matter despite the food crops dying near the property line due to poison.</p>	<p>I am also supportive of the use of unimproved right-of-ways being used for community gardening projects. It beautifies the neighborhood, improves wildlife habitat, and reduces water runoff.</p>
<p>I guess I don't see any reason to regulate community gardens in this way.</p>	
<p>I haven't seen any issues which would lead me to believe their are issues with regulations in the Zoning Code, does it need to be clarified? I think that community gardens should be continued to be allowed everywhere.</p>	
<p>I like the way the Community Gardens are set up now. Why mess with them if they're working? As for "well-integrated and beneficial", every garden is beneficial!</p>	<p>That the Community Gardens will be too regulated.</p>
<p>I oppose restrictions on growing plants. I see the word invasive, in reference to plants, as a marketing word for chemical companies.</p>	<p>Again I say that isolation concerns me the most. Anyone attending to the news should attend to what was going on with disturbed people.</p>
<p>I see community gardens as 100% beneficial. Why the need to regulate? Geez.</p>	<p>What are the problems that need to be addressed? Are folks complaining? Why get the city government involved?</p>
<p>I think that the gardens can work with their neighbors to govern themselves. I not in favor of the nanny state.</p>	<p>Overuse of pesticides.</p>
<p>I think they should definitely be allowed everywhere and I'm unclear on what specific regulations you mean.</p>	<p>parking</p>
<p>I think you should lay off creating more rules and regulations and leave it to individual complaints to bring issues to attention. Who cares what "type" of community garden you have? How do you define "well integrated and beneficial?" It is totally subjective and impractical.</p>	<p>More rules, fines, codes, registrations, documentation, red tape and hassles.</p>
<p>i would be careful about how much you regulate gardens on private land. I could see safety or environmental concerns. I guess it would be nice to have "depends" option</p>	
<p>I'm not sure about this. It depends on what "well-integrated" means and what the regulations on zoning what permit. This isn't enough information for me to decide whether this is the right direction.</p>	<p>Again, I think it is important to make local food available in residential neighborhoods, so that people can walk or bike to it. It will eliminate driving and help improving air quality. I associate local food with a healthy life style which includes less driving and more walking/biking. I want my local food (including community gardens) close to my home.</p>
<p>I'm not sure. "ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood." this is very subjective. We need more concrete guidelines or plans.</p>	<p>I'm concerned that people will be limited on what they can grow where based on a set of subjective limitations.</p>
<p>In privately owned areas, there shouldn't be any zoning codes.</p>	

I've heard no complaints regarding community gardens or their integration into surrounding neighborhoods. The regulations should be left alone.	None.
Just leave as is. If the community or some members place a garden somewhere and it isn't bothering anyone just let it be.	none.
Just leave them alone. Why mess with all the zoning. It is just more red tape, costing needless money and time! Why fix something that is NOT broken???	That the government wants to control EVERYTHING! Soon you will be telling me which flowers to grow at my own house and that I can't have a garden at all unless you approve of it.
keep the regulations vague; let people do what they will. we'll work it out.	the city bothering the kinds of people who work in community gardens.
Leave it up to the household residents that actually live in the neighborhood.	
Let the individual neighborhoods decide for themselves. Encourage neighborhood meetings to address any complaints. We have a community garden in our neighborhood and it's a wonderful cooperative effort. Leave it alone please.	Again, increased traffic which is diffused by allowing the community gardens spread out over the area. The gardens are beautiful, feed us and encourage community and set good examples for our children.
let them be	
limit regulations	restrictions
Limiting it from a zoning perspective creates more work for the city and doesn't always allow for nuances that benefit community gardens where they are located. Neighborhood associations are free to make some of these decisions as they are the primary stakeholders.	Hurting existing efforts (i.e. our church garden focused on reaching out to low income apartment dwellers) that are benefiting the community already.
make it very very simple. make various types of agreements that both sides can move on now.	that this doesn't move quickly enough.
No more laws or zoning, leave it be.	More laws
No need to change the zoneing - any household can grow produce, flowers, and trees and they wouldn't be subject to the zoning	Folks against community gardens tend to grow urban lawns and use toxic chemicals and a lot of water... this is not helpful to a community like plots to grow food are
no zoning code regulations!!	that your regulations will make our access to good, local food very difficult.
No. Please continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but reduce Zoning Codes that may make it difficult of confusing to create a community garden. Fewer regulations, not more.	None.
Not every community needs or wants the exact same type of community garden. Each area is unique and so are the people who use that garden.	
Not sure what this means. What would change? Aren't all community gardens beneficial?	Restricting of garden development.
Not sure why this is needed and nervous about how subjective "well-integrated and beneficial" are - would like more details before thinking this is the right direction.	additional work and regulations for the folks using the community garden; subjective definitions for "well-integrated and beneficial"
Once again, allow the neighborhoods to decide.	Too much regulation.
Organizations should be given freedom in how their community garden operates.	

<p>People should be allowed to create food and beauty in their own ways. Negotiations should be between individuals or communities and landowners. Regulation of such simple neighborly behavior creates costs and excludes people from what ought to be the most inclusive and level of playing fields.</p>	<p>Get real. The only time I ever heard of any complaint about what a neighbor grew or where, she had a patch of nettle well back from the street, and partly screened by a hedge, that she kept for making soups and home remedies. A 'helpful' neighbor came into her yard, cleared her nettle patch, and left her a rude note about the upkeep of her yard. If you want to regulate something, regulate interfering busybodies first.</p>
<p>People should be allowed to grow food on their own property and so long as the site is maintained nobody has the right to say otherwise.</p>	
<p>perhaps specific problems arising from this question could be addressed with already existing laws. Dont make more rules, make the rules we have work.</p>	
<p>Quit inserting the city into every citizen endeavor. There are far more pressing issues for the city to spend time and resources on. Prioritize. It is so ham-fisted for the city to propose regulating community gardens when the city can't even enforce water quality discharge standards on industry.</p>	<p>The expansion of city responsibility when it cannot reasonably enforce current regulations or maintain basic infrastructure well (roads, sewer and water lines, lack of sidewalks).</p>
<p>restrictions and laws cost more money to enforce. back off.</p>	<p>Land use directives</p>
<p>See above.</p>	
<p>Shouldn't be involved with the private gardens</p>	
<p>So far, I don't see what restrictions need to be placed if not organic ones.</p>	<p>eyesores</p>
<p>So it's OK to let weeds grow, but if someone wants to do something productive with the land, then there are restrictions and you have to "ensure it is well integrated and beneficial"? What is the problem you are trying to solve with any restrictions in the zoning code?</p>	<p>Too many restrictions, too many hoops to jump through.</p>
<p>sounds like bureaucratic B.S.</p>	
<p>The city has bigger issues to worry about than regulating carrots and tomatoes.</p>	<p>Over regulation = bureaucracy, more money spent on trying to control people. Take care of crime, keep roads repaired.</p>
<p>The information here is incomplete. It leaves out waay too much info re what discussions and power struggles that have gone before. What do you mean? Are you referring to disallowing chemical (non-organic) gardens? Or dictating what may and may not be grown??</p>	<p>Better yet, what concerns do YOU have?? What are you really angling for?? Chemical use - whether as fertilizer or poisons. And, in light of this question, dictatorship by folks who seem to think they know better than us commoners.</p>
<p>The question of whether or not a given activity is "well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood" is surely one that should be designed by the "surrounding neighborhood." Why create a city wide regulation when a neighborhood association could make this decision? Why must those who control the planning and zoning department make this decision for everyone in Portland? Let us decide at the street level.</p>	<p>None. I welcome community gardens in my neighborhood. I welcome a diversity of use. I welcome economic activity. I welcome the Do-It-Yourself ethos of community gardeners. I welcome food security. I welcome running into people from my neighborhood on the street, as they are on their way too and from the store, work, dining out, going to a show, and, yes, the community garden. Again, anyone who wishes to limit such activities likely has an issue with increased traffic, which is tied to *any* activity in the city as a result of city planning.</p>

there are too few community garden plots as it is, and some are even being sold by the city for development. This is not the right direction. There is not one community garden I have seen that is ugly, or a mess, or otherwise negatively impacts its surrounding community. In fact, I'd argue that quite the opposite it true.	Loss of community gardening space.
There is no indication in the document of what these clarifications would entail or what the operating framework is for determining "well integrated and beneficial" development would entail.	
There should be no restrictions, and no discrimination against whatever it is the community gardeners choose to grow. Gardens are beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood, regardless of what "type" it is.	Restrictions on community gardens concern me.
This Direction statement is unspecific so I cannot determine if it is the right direction or not. "Community garden development must be well-integrated and beneficial to provide for the production of food products in a way that does not limit anyone from growing food."	Given the scale of the economic crisis that is already upon us, there should be a focus on building a simple platform for accelerating a local food economy. Limiting the development of community gardens is inconsistent with the reality of our current situation and almost certain future.
This does not need to be regulated. All it takes is one person to complain that a garden is "not beneficial" to a surrounding neighborhood and then you feel that you need to regulate an otherwise harmless activity. Please do not regulate this healthy lifestyle.	The power of corporate interests and large non-local farms influence on your desire to regulate informal food grower to food consumer relationships.
This is so vague, which makes it difficult to respond to. I'd need to see more specific recommendations on zoning changes to assess if this is the right direction. Who decides what "beneficial" and "well-integrated" mean? Beneficial to whom? Well-integrated according to who's standards?	Impact of a few powerful residents over the fate of a community garden.
This language troubles me, because I reads to me as addressing aesthetic concerns in more affluent, groomed neighborhoods. There can be some negative associations of farming as something "poor" people do, and I feel those sort of concerns create conformity instead of community. I realize that may not at all be what is meant here, but it's what immediately came to mind.	see above
This question is unclear. What exactly needs to be clarified with the regulations in the zoning code?	
This sounds like regulating just to be regulating. Community gardens have been in Portland for a long time. Do we need to gild the lily?	I'm not sure I have any problems with community gardens.
This statement is misleading. Although I agree with allowing community gardens everywhere, I do not agree that the city should decide if it's well-integrated and beneficial. The neighborhood should decide that. Portland is too big for some disconnected city official to make that decision. Leave neighborhood problems in the neighborhood.	The use of chemicals. I can't imagine that most community gardeners would use chemicals, but some must. I would like to see this limited strictly to minimal use and a restricted list such as no round-up.
Too many regulations result in a community garden not being able to meet the needs of its community.	
Too much government involvement. Is there money for that?	Monetary and governmental control.

Too much governmental regulation could encumber the whold process so that people give up! No! I want local food!	
Too much zoning makes community gardens inaccessible.	See above.
Too restrictive.	
Too tightly controlled. They should be allowed very freely.	I don't see much to worry about here.
Unsure if code will dis-empower community gardens in certain areas.	Unsure if code will dis-empower community gardens in certain areas.
We as tax paying citizens do NOT need to be zoned and regulated in regards to this topic. So what if my neighbor has his yard full of any agriculture product. There is no need for the states opinion of "well-integrated".	Your involvement. Your looking at this as a way to generate additional revenue in fees and taxes. I cannot see one reason why the state should be involved in any way...regardless of the properties "Zone" or current useage, ie industrial, religious, school, or Parks & rec. Let people use their property in these ways if they want, stay out of it.
We do not need more zoning laws.	Already stated. We do not need more agencies, laws and enforcement.
We need to stop the not in my backyard implications of these rules. do not limit any planting whatsoever so long as it does not interfere with the public right of way. neighbors need to work these issues out and prepare for a future unlike the abundance of our past.	Situations where you are fined or worse for growing food in your front yard.
We really don't need that kind of regulation	City invasion on our access to local food
What is the meaning of 'well-integrated' and 'beneficial'? Sounds like it could be interpreted rather loosely to me.	
What kind of community garden is NOT beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood??? It seems a waste of time to "clarify regulations" on the "various types" of gardens... like city employees have too much time on their hands. All community gardens are good for their neighborhoods, so why bother them?	With community gardens, the only impact that concerns me is not having enough of them.
What specifically do you want to regulate?	
What types of gardens need special regulations in the code? Again, why are you treating gardens as potentially harmful and therefore feel the city needs to ensure their beneficial use? What are you afraid of?	City meddling on behalf of monied interests to curb or restrict life-supporting activities
Who decides what is well-integrated and who are the "surrounding area" beneficiary's? Safeway? Who has a voice in a particular area, and who does not? If the neighbors themselves want to make changes, personal involvement may work very well.	A community garden builds community, creates beauty, and healthy food choices. They improve the standard of living in most areas, but especially in those where access to open space and land is limited (for example in poor areas). The impact of failure, of derailing one more option toward change is the most frightening for me.
Who will decide what is a "good" type of garden and what defines "well integrated?" Which ethnic or cultural group's traditional practices will be deemed inappropriate? Community Gardens should be allowed everywhere. There should be more of them. The members of the community should be able to grow what they want to grow in the community garden.	The impacts that concern me most are limitations and restrictions on community gardens.
Why do we need any government regulating gardens, for goodness sake!	
Why does the city need to get involved?	regulatory burdens on property owners

Why does there need to be any changes to what is in existence now?	That there will be so many fees or regulations that it will destroy the community and neighborhood feel that these gardens offer.
Why in the world you feel the need to regulate community gardens I do NOT know. Do not regulate community gardens. Allow them in all zones.	
Why the limits?	Limits.
Why try to micro-regulate what can and cannot be grown by people whose life-mission and expertise is gardening and horticulture?	
Why would the city get involved in a decision that could be made by the neighbors. That is a waste of citizen resources and taxpayer money.	The regulations should have more to do with the maintenance of the site and what is stored on site, etc. Preferences could be given to gardens that incorporate gathering spaces for neighbors.
Why would we need to restrict them?	
Why wouldn't a community garden be beneficial to any "surrounding area"	
Yes community gardens should be allowed. However I do not agree with limiting it by zoning laws	My main concern is over regulation by government that makes it hard to start and run a community garden.
Yes, continue to allow community gardens everywhere. No, zoning codes do not need to become involved in determining what is "well-integrated" and "beneficial". Communities will flourish without regulations as has been the history of gardens.	No one should limit or regulate the food that any community or individual can grow. If the plants grow then let them be.
Yes, continue to allow community gardens everywhere. What does the latter part mean? Every human eats, so food is by definition well-integrated and beneficial. Are LAWNS beneficial? Very subjective.	
yes, continue to allow community gardens, but why should there be regulations on zoning to address types of community gardens? If a community needs the food, then they should be allowed to grow it & the county should have no say in what they grow as long as it does not become a public health risk.	No more prohibition.
Yes, continue to allow everywhere! Not necessarily on the regulation. Why?	Regulation = increased expense on both sides & limits creativity!
Yes, continue to allow them everywhere, but why does each little one need to be clarified and coded? Shouldn't the neighborhood decide if it's beneficial to the neighborhood? And wouldn't that kind of be how the "community" garden got started in the first place?!	Again, my concern is over-regulation. Instead of having all these "rules and codes" up front, why not instead have some kind of committee or mediation group that works with people to solve any conflicts that may arise? It needn't be anything huge and major, just a way for people to share concerns perhaps before, during, and after implementation of a new garden. Like a community notification group or mediation group that allows people in a neighborhood to work together to solve issues, and not make it bigger than it really is or a waste of time for city officials/police/whoever may be otherwise called.

yes, continue to allow them. No, what is the need to see that they are "well integrated and beneficial"? As long as people aren't growing pot, and the space is safe from traffic hazards (no growing tomatoes in a median for example), I don't understand what the problem is that needs to be solved.	I don't know the concerns - suggest a few for me.
You are simply complicating by adding regulation. Beneficial? define that?	
zoning code may limit people from creating community gardens	the prohibition of community gardens because not able to meet zoning code.
	As my previous comment, I'm concerned the most about how this impacts local food clubs and csa's
	placement close to light industry or commercial site can cause airborne contamination same with heavy traffic zones
	that the government is overstepping their bounds and controlling too much of our lives
	There needs to be less government regulations it shuts down small businesses like the flower kiosks
	to much un - planned vehicle traffic
	too many rules without an easy exception process can be a problem
	Who defines the right direction?

TOPIC 2: COMMUNITY GARDENS	
Question 6: Direction: Continue to allow community gardens everywhere, but clarify regulations in the Zoning Code to address the various types of community gardens and ensure their development is well-integrated and beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood. Is this the right direction? DIDN'T ANSWER "YES" or "NO"	Question 7: What types of impacts concern you the most?
As long as those clarifications are fair and don't disproportionately burden low-income people, people of color, immigrants, or institutions without a lot of political cachet or financing, I'm in favor. I am in favor of inclusive, equitable, and non-racist, non-classist definitions of "well integrated" and "beneficial". I can foresee a need to have in place very clear and fair criteria, positive inclusive marketing efforts (including language translation; partnering with people of color, immigrant/refugee, and low-income advocacy orgs; and moving messaging through trusted, credible messengers for marginalized communities, as well as soliciting and institutionalizing suggestions and feedback for making these efforts equitable), and potentially mediation or fair methods of resolving any conflict that might arise.	Portland decision makers have a lengthy history of accidentally or intentionally "clarifying" disadvantaged people right out of the picture. It's important to look at equity and unintended consequences of these decisions.
Depends - question is vague and does not specify anything other than a vague "change". This is not enough information to form a response.	
Depends on how their impacts are addressed.	
I don't know.	
I don't know. Are we having problems now that these proposed regulations would fix? By over-regulating are we cutting off the possibility of new models or experiments, like <u>Ariadne Garden</u> ?	
I don't understand the question fully	
I love the community gardens	I don't want to see the gardens go away--they give Portland personality!
Is this currently a problem? I would only add clarifying regulation to deal with chronic problems that are not already addressed.	Over regulation will make community gardens less accessible and less user-friendly.
not sure	need to know more
Not sure...as long as the clarification does not restrict community gardens it sounds good to me.	
too much regulation. food plants are not ugly to look at. and.... people need to eat.	
Unsure - I support allowing community gardens everywhere.	The more community gardens the better. I think they are almost always a positive influence on the communities they serve
Unsure. How could a community garden ever not be beneficial?	
Would depend on what "clarifying regulations" and being "well-integrated and beneficial" mean.	Allowing people to grow what they want on their property
	All community gardens are beneficial to the neighborhood just by being there.
	undue restrictions on where they can be located

TOPIC AREA 3: FARMERS MARKETS	
Question 8: Direction: Develop regulations to ensure ample opportunities for farmers markets to occur at appropriate locations throughout the city. Determining appropriate locations includes consideration of traffic, noise, characteristics of the market (i.e. size, duration, customer base). Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"	Question 9: What types of impacts concern you the most?
? well honestly, i don't see how this is different from the way things are currently run... for our market (hollywood) we fill out an annual street closure permit that includes questions on size, duration, etc. although i suppose if we were located solely on private property we wouldn't have to apply through the city. hmm, yes, i think this is the right direction.	
Absolutely. I frequent Portland Farmer's Market at PSU. I know the money I spend is directly helping the producer of the food I eat. Ironically, the best farmers markets are easily access by residential and mixed use neighborhoods...it would be a hoot to have them next to Costco, WinCo, WalMart and the other big box, packaged food behemoths.	Parking to a very minor extent. I've supported the PSU, South Waterfront, Wilson High, Hollywood, and Lloyd District markets because they're wonderful, lively, and bring neighbors together.
Accessibility to the freshest foods and supporting local farming and agriculture through farmers markets makes our economy stronger and it's citizens healthier.	That the price of fresh fruit and veg at farmers markets, especially those that are organic or trying to transition to organic practices is too high for the poorest and most needy in some communities to afford. The farmers market turns out to be a party they are not invited to attend. Ex. The St John's Farmers Market have very few vendors that specialize in the standard fair for Mexican cooking, yet it is located in a community that has a very large Hispanic population.
Again, maybe. Farmers Markets should be as close to residential neighborhoods as possible to ensure access for low income people and seniors. There should be at least 1 Farmers Market in every neighborhood (Portland Plan/20 minute access)	Ensuring the markets are well run and cleaned up after every market day.
Again, regulation might not "solve" anything	
Again, regulations that increase Farmer's Markets is positive. Any regulations that restrict new or existing farmer's markets would not be positive.	
Again, the more markets, the more farmers, the more access to local healthy food.	no concerns
Again, yes, this sounds good in theory, but the current multiple locations are more than adequate, so I'd hope this would only refer to any future locations. Moving current locations would create quite an uproar among residents.	Cost of these determinations, and how much time it would take to conduct them. Would the city be hiring more staff for all these endeavors mentioned in the questionnaire?
All of the markets that I visit (Hollywood, Montavilla, Buckman, Hillsdale) seem to be well sited for the neighborhood. I can imagine that having a market on your residential street (e.g., SE Salmon) would bring a fair amount of traffic and potential bad parking behavior.	Parking and traffic. Noise during setup/breakdown.
Allow small farm tables / markets at churches, neighborhoods etc.	

Alot of the Portland populace are afoot or on bike. Closer markets to neighborhoods allows each family to have access to the food they need.	
Already doing a great job, but aim to get other neighborhoods involved like deep SE- more diverse neighborhoods	None
Ample opportunities are good.	
ample opportunities sounds good. supporting our local farmers, especially small scale sustainable farming practices, is important if we want to have a self sustaining, local food economy.	who will define what "ample opportunities" are?
An alternative to impersonal chain-store supply of food is important. Local food is sustainable and feeds the local economy better than a conglomerate alone.	Over regulation. The city regulates the food carts too tightly about issues that do not directly affect food safety...a gravel surface is unacceptable, for example. I am concerned that in a move to support local Farmers Markets we will over-regulate them driving up costs of regulation, uneven complaint-driven enforcement will prevail and the Farmers Markets free enterprise mode will be regulated to the point of driving up prices too far
Anything that makes it easier for farmer's markets to serve communities and farmers is a good idea. They add a ton of value to communities and help with food deserts.	Traffic can get hairy.
Appropriate regulation is a good thing.	No particular concerns.
are the existing markets throughout Portland popular and profitable? do a little marketing research?	same as before
As long as it ensures that farmers markets remain viable and that more of them are encouraged to develop within the city.	
As long as the regulations increase rather than restrict the ability for farmer's markets to occur I'm okay with them.	
As our area becomes more and more congested and over-populated, we need to consider the ramifications of everything we do.	Traffic congestion.
Assuming it won't have many concrete effects on new or existing markets.	
because right now we don't even have a definition for farmers markets in the code. Location is a huge issue for FM organizations right now and the Land Use Review process is prohibitively complicated and expensive.	impacts on FM organizations since they provide jobs, boost the local economy & support food security. If there are no locations for FMs, without having to do a LUR, the community suffers.
Building a strong relationship between neighborhoods and nearby farms and ranches again improves the quality of food available and reduces energy use (transportation, refrigeration, etc.).	That the markets do not erode neighborhood livability, that communities be informed about market products that may contain harmful chemicals, that who may be a vendor be clearly defined and that consideration be given to customer base - i.e. too many markets means none of them succeed (as well as the farmers selling at them).
but keep the rules very general ie to protect safety of customers. Remember this is still a busines and with more laws less chance for business	
but please don't over regulate everything.	I like the way framers markets run now, they have set times so you know if you need to avoid a street or not.

Clearly the potential to mitigate food deserts in a low-cost way.	Reduced barriers causing "clustering" of food markets in high-income areas.
Currently get a special use permit to run a Farmers Market. Makes sense to have permit regulations specific to Farmers Markets.	Over saturation in one area and not enough in East County.
customer base needs to be adequate for the farmers' efforts to bring produce and set up and take down.	high traffic roads
do what you can to support local food while looking out for neighborhoods and farmers alike.	Not supporting farmers markets would cause more air pollution, driving, etc.
Don't over regulate.	
Don't want to saturate the market	
Due to higher traffic requirements, I agree that areas and times should be explicitly set aside by local government so as to best serve the community.	I am concerned by the term "ample opportunity". While this is suitable vague, it can be wielded inappropriately to excessively limit entrance into the market in terms of numbers of booths allowed and numbers of markets. Perhaps an appeals process can be incorporated to allow for appeal of determinations.
Each community and each market are unique. It is important to create a market that the community will support and where the farmers, ranchers, etc. will succeed.	
Encouragement of more markets would be great! The nature and size of a farmer's market itself would dictate the kind of space used or needed (obviously one with 10 vendors is not going to set up in a residential front yard), and most of those typically are already areas where large groups of people gather regularly or on occasion. However, be careful not to limit the ability of people to have a small scale farmer's market type set-up (say 3 people with a table each) in a variety of areas that obviously would not be used by larger-scale operations naturally.	Too many limits:)
Encouraging farmer's markets are able to occur is important, and managing their impact on the area is a practical way to ensure their longevity.	Traffic accessibility of farmer's markets - is there enough parking? Does parking spill over and crowd out the residents? Is it easy to get there by bus/max/walking, or are customers forced to drive?
Ensure ample opportunities but do not hinder the formation of markets with silly parking and noise concerns.	The lack of availability of markets to some areas concerns me the most.
Ensuring adequate access to farmers markets stimulates the local economy by putting money into the hands of our food growers and allows citizens to experience seasonal food in its prime - showcasing the value of eating WHEN you can instead of nurturing the demand for year-round produce available that must be shipped in from overseas.	Farmers markets must be distinguished as a separate form of business than a typical food retailer. The cost-prohibitive nature of taxation on small farmers can often take away from the quality level or even presence of a farmer at a market. Most farmers markets are run by a non-profit even though the farmers are profiting. They also are known to stimulate the local economy, increase food awareness and stimulate local health, the benefits that these markets provide should be weighed heavily when deciding taxation policies. It is especially important to encourage businesses to allow them to utilize parking lots and open space by creating tax incentives or benefits for places that allow them to exist on their property.

Establishing and nurturing connections with our local farmers will become increasingly important to 'growing' a vibrant localized food economy and ensuring our food security as transport becomes more expensive.	none.
Everyone should have access to a farmers market. But it also needs to be big enough to make sense to go there.	
Expand farmers markets to make healthy, fresh food available to all.	
farmer markets are a good way to help small local farms get products to market, and having a market walking distance from most people will reduce driving	traffic
Farmer markets are great additions to our community; we need more.	Traffic and safety
Farmers Markets add to community, sustainability and health.	If we have more farmers markets, we will have less concerns for traffic. If someone can walk to their local market, they won't need to drive to one further away.
Farmers markets are a good source of local and healthful foods. Making them more accessible to people is preferable	Easy accessibility to the farmers market. Ample bike racks at the site.
Farmers markets are a good way to expose the public to agriculture and food security issues. the city should support that educational process.	
Farmers markets are a precious resource. I stopped going as much when dog restrictions kept me from visiting while dog walking as I would often stop in on my way home & pick up dinner. Also, I loved seeing other dogs.	Pedestrians who cross mid-block & dart mindlessly & often daringly into oncoming traffic. Portlanders pride themselves as being intelligent, but then behave as if they're entitled & expect the waters to part when they decide to make shortcuts.
Farmers markets are a wonderful way to meet farmers and bring their food directly to the consumer. They bring the community together and offer good, fresh food.	None
Farmers Markets are appealing as a means to getting healthy food into new areas of the city, however, I am concerned with the pricing of products at them, and think public resources should be dedicated to other methods of healthy food access via grocery stores.	Cultural sensitivity. For instance, do low-income groups benefit from Farmers Markets- considering time/location of markets, time and labor costs to cooking, culturally appropriate food items, etc.
Farmers Markets are awesome!!	I hope the community is supporting Farmers Markets enough so that it is economically beneficial for the farmer. I love that SNAP and WIC are ok with food purchased at Farmers Markets.
Farmers markets are good for both the purchasers of food and farmers and should be vigorously supported.	
Farmer's Markets are great and should be encouraged outside the urban core.	Traffic and parking are the most likely concerns, but it is only once a week.
farmers markets are great!	
Farmers Markets are great.	False Farmers Markets, where the produce does not come from local farmers.
Farmers Markets are increasing in popularity for various reasons - all positive: they enhance neighborhood livability, facilitate community building and just bring more life to older neighborhoods that lack other amenities. It's time to provide a set of regs to assist with their siting as opposed to a case-by-case LUR. Too burdensome.	Noise and traffic congestion.

Farmers markets are justifiably popular with Portlanders. Proximity to a farmers markets helps minimize travel for food purchases.	None.
Farmers Markets are key in providing local farmers an outlet to sell their goods, as well as in providing access to Portlanders to buy fresh & local foods. Proper market research and planning can help ensure the success of these markets.	
Farmer's markets are larger, generally, than farm stands or food coops. Definately keep track of the flow of traffice and characteristics of the market.	
Farmers markets attract a lot of people so the flow of traffic and noise levels are appropriate to consider.	
Farmers markets bridge the gap between urban and rural. To maximize the benefits of the UGB we need to promote these interactions.	There are issues of competition that can arise from markets that are too close or on the same date. Efforts should be made to reduce conflicts between markets. PFM should be extremely aware of this and not undercut the smaller, less established markets.
farmers markets bring food to people and make the act of buying produce fun and social. I think the key is sizing the markets to the neighborhoods and locating them on or very near a major arterial street to reduce impacts of the box trucks, early set up, etc.	The impact of poor nutrition and cultural tendency toward bad eating habits that develop in neighborhoods or areas that do not have access to good fresh produce.
Farmers Markets build community and support farmers	Food only! Parking, disability access, covered area for year-round use needed.
Farmers Markets need to be established in thoughtful ways, taking into consideration those who live & work in proximity to markets, however we need to be very careful NOT to create barriers to opening new markets.	I am concerned about zoning regulations limiting the location of farmers markets. EVERYONE in the city needs to have access to local & fresh food. Farmers market are key in providing such access. It is crucial that farmers markets are allowed in residential neighborhoods where people live to ensure accessibility. If you limit farmers markets to industrial or commercial areas you will be cutting off access to these markets
Farmers markets need to be in good locations	
Farmers' Markets provide an outlet for local farmers and small producers of unique goods; local farms and factories provide jobs and a lively, diverse community!	
Farmer's markets should be able to be held in more locations that are currently allowed. When starting the Cully Community Market (formerly Cully Collective Market) last year the very ample space at a church on Killingsworth could not be used to its full potential because of zoning regulations restricting the number of times and frequency with which the market could meet. Zoning variance fees were prohibitive.	Parking and early morning noise are the main concerns. However, the more markets there are, the fewer people will need to drive to them and park.
Farmers markets should be in many locations many days of the week.	None.
Fit within 20-minute neighborhood model so that a farmers market is more accessible to everyone by many modes of transit	traffic

Food should be accessible. Its distribution and sale should not be restricted to large commercial enterprises. It is one of the most basic of needs and its accessibility should be supported.	Would not like to see large commercial enterprises in residential neighborhoods. Flow of traffic throughout the neighborhood should not be impeded.
Getting to know the people who grow the food we eat is incredibly important, and farmer's markets are an excellent way to do this. When we develop even small relationships with humans who work hard to produce the delicious fruits and vegetables we eat, we better understand its rich history and our food has new flavor.	Efforts should be coordinated so that markets are complimenting instead of competing with each other, when possible.
Good to align definition with Oregon Farmers Market Association's definition.	Make sure zoning favors easiest access, minimal fees.
Having more markets more often means that traffic is reduced. City policy should promote as many markets as possible everyday of the week. You will not need to worry about traffic if the markets are appropriately sized and frequent and evenly dispersed.	Restrictions imposed by NIMBYists and, tomorrow's erroneously high traffic predictions based on yesterday's data
Healthy local food! Nothing better!	none.
HOWEVER, I didn't see any specific reference to schools. Consideration of locations should also include the level of public benefit. Allowing schools to be a preferred location for a Farmers Market allows for a built in connection to the local community and helps further build the relationship between our schools and the community.	Definition of appropriate locations limiting access to fresh affordable produce and products.
However, I feel that this may already be happening so is this redundant?	I worry that the applications for farmers markets will become political. I would hope that no one on the board in making these decisions is not already on a farmers market board.
I adore my local market (Hollywood), and think that everyone in the city should live within easy walking distance of one.	The weather - I'd love to see some year-round markets in areas well-served by public transit.
I agree that it's important that the features of the market complement the site and the neighborhood.	Having small markets in more neighborhoods so people can walk or bike. Having ample bike parking at all markets.
I agree with this statement only if sufficient neighborhood input is involved in the decision. Who is to determine "appropriate locations"? This decision should be left up to the neighborhoods affected by any change in traffic or noise.	Trash generated. Take away containers and other disposable items should be strictly limited.
I am concerned with people "developing regulations" as a society we seem to have lots of rule makers and no one to undo any rules. it starts to get a bit overwhelming. But, having said that, I also like that someone look at traffic impacts etc.	
I do think some of the Farmers Markets are too big for their own good, making them feel more like a packed grocery store the day before Thanksgiving. When they get too big they are enjoyable for the consumer and difficult to operate for the farmer.	I am mostly concerned about the types of vendors at the markets. Many of the vendors are vary large farms from over 250 miles away, they make the competition tough and alter consumer expectations as well as create a false sense what is in season locally. I think there should be restrictions on the distance you can drive to be a vendor at the market, and I think we should make it a strict rule that you can only sell the produce or products you grew/made at the Farmers Markets.

I don't think that more regulations is the way to progress, but if it helps to understand where large or small markets are a better fit, then it should be investigated. It is beneficial to the farmers as well to be selling in a positive, easily accessible environment.	That too much regulation will discourage the farmers from participating in the markets. We want the farmers to focus on growing our healthy food, not wading through all the regulations of getting it to us.
I feel that this has the opportunity to create better access for various districts to local food farmers markets.	I am concerned about what the regulations will comprise of. Again, more regulations usually means more restrictions and frustrations, leading people away from what could be a helpful opportunity.
I guess, not sure about the considerations	none
I LOVE farmers markets, let's have opportunities for more of them!	IF you have more of them, the parking problems will be dissipated.
I love these markets, though they do create a lot of traffic for a few hours	Traffic
I support Farmers markets.	Truth in advertising and making sure the food is safe and organic.
I think clarification is important.	I hope that there will be more opportunities for people in need, and not more fees for those who cannot afford to pay them, thereby limiting their opportunity to participate.
I think Portland has many good farmer's markets already in place. I would just apply the same considerations to other locations.	Over regulation would inhibit growth in the number of market locations.
I think so, but only if the development of regulations and determination of appropriate locations are directed by those in the community with an understanding of the needs of the area.	
I want more access to farmers markets.	I want the regulations to be easily followed and not create too many hoops but actually provide an easier way for markets to happen.
I would like to see greater availability of farmer's market sites because I think it's important that people all over the city have access to a farmer's market in their community and that local farmers have the ability to sell their wares. The farmers markets that Portland currently has are well attended - some are downright crowded - and so I think the desire for them in the city is far from fully saturated.	
I would like to see opportunities for community farmers to sell at farmer's markets so that the urban farming and markets contribute to each other's success.	Traffic and parking. The Sellwood-Moreland market, for example, doesn't have much parking and gets quite congested as well as creates dangerous pedestrian crossings. Milwaukie FM is a terrific setting in a wooded block with adequate parking. The selection of vendors is also nicely balanced and of very high quality.
I would not want to see them become any more limited.	
I would suggest that the characteristics of the market might include food and crafts made from (at least some percentage) locally grown or fabricated products.	Traffic, litter, and noise would be the biggest concerns. These could largely be addressed through enforcement of existing code. A permit process to determine traffic impacts might be valuable.
I'd hate to see the current locations disallowed. More markets during evening and weekend hours would be desirable.	

If the regulations are simple, user friendly and documents online! Also, easy to contact government point persons need to be in place to make it an accessible process for the community of gardeners/farmers. Remove obstacles but keep it safe and organized and reliable.	Upper Hawthorne needs a full fledged farmers market and streamlining the process might encourage it.
If this regulation would actually create further opportunities for farmer's markets to exist in the city, then I support it.	
If this will help bring more farmers markets, great. I do worry that "regulations" will create barriers to other markets, and would like to avoid that.	
I'm all for ample opportunities for Farmers Markets.	Impact on the neighborhood. Courtesy is needed in this and all interactions. I don't know if courtesy can be mandated.
important to make sure that a market is located near transit, with ample parking, is accessible, etc.	
Increase access to healthy food, increase awareness of how food is grown.	
Increasing access to local food is important. Direct sales are great for everyone.	I hope "appropriate" is broadly defined.
Insures safety and fairness.	
It bodes well to consider the needs of residents when large numbers of people gather in one area.	None.
It is important to clarify the regulations, as long as it does not unduly hinder these important events.	I am concerned that the developed regulations will pose undue barriers to the creation or expansion of farmers markets.
It is important to have plenty of farmers markets- but when they are too close to each other- one ends up losing out. Prime example the Kenton market just had to close because they just couldn't make it financially. I don't see why the city should be in charge of deciding where they go- however.	I don't like the idea of the city controlling farmers markets- or any garden for that matter.
It is important to provide access to healthy, locally grown foods, particularly in inner-city type neighborhoods. It also helps local farmers and producers.	
it is important to take all of those factors into consideration for the success of the market and safety of all	too much money is spent on developing those regulations
It seems to strike a fair balance between the consumer, producer and other citizens.	
It sounds like you're taking everyone's needs into consideration... I love farmers markets!	none
It's definitely important to setup legislation that allows farmers markets on a "permanent" basis...vs. the current regulation situation. It also seems reasonable to figure out how to mitigate negative impacts to the neighborhood. My hope would be that this doesn't unnecessarily limit farmer's markets from spreading here in Portland. they need to be highly encouraged.	
It's hard to say without more information about "appropriate locations," but it doesn't sound like the intention is to reduce the number of markets, so that seems fine.	Anything that would limit access to fresh food. Some areas have limited access; we need to support more markets!
Just don't get carried away with regulations. Let this happen!	

Just hope we don't 'over-regulate'. The goal, I hope, is to make food more accessible and affordable. Too many fees or complications will defeat that goal.	Traffic
just make sure that the opportunities are AMPLE. This means considering areas zoned residential perhaps if they already have a conditional use that is public or semi-public such as a church or school.	
Keeping an eye on these "open markets" is important in order to avoid "year-long" squatters Markets.	People abusing these events to open up a non-stop business on someone elses property or publicly owned property.
Let's keep our money in the community. Let's support our farmers by putting more money directly into their pockets!	Offer more encouragement to local businesses to fund fresh exchange type programs that match EBT benefits.
Like to be able to buy directly from the Farmers and cut out the middle man	
Local farmers markets are part of a healthy neighborhood, providing fresh food to residents, a vibrant local economy and keeping food sourcing local. Please do provide AMPLE opportunities.	Local food sourcing is safer (ie national megafarm E Coli scares), and fresh food availability in neighborhoods increases health in the population. It has recently been documented that food deserts increase obesity locally, among poor residents. Local markets are part of the answer to food deserts.
Local produce helps the local economy, reduces carbon footprint and brings us closer to our food.	Markets should be protected from potential traffic incidents.
Lower the cost to consumers for higher quality produce.	
Markets are an excellent way for farmer's to access a market, and for the community to come together. Ensuring that these spaces are safe and welcoming would enhance the flow of local capital.	NA
Maximize access, community identity.	Traffic - but it goes both ways, congestion reduces speed etc.
Maybe. Is this (more regulations) going to cause more problems? Are there problems with Farmer's Markets that are operating now? (or not operating?) Of course, traffic, congestion, parking, hours, etc are important considerations. Just don't make the regulations burdensome to the point of impossible to deal with.	More regulations and fees and paperwork and hassle will discourage markets from happening
More access to good food for more people. The more the merrier. More outlets for growers. Win win.	Would love to see more markets in so called food "deserts" throughout Portland. Also, wish they were more affordable for the poor. (I can't afford eggs for \$7/dozen myself, but I'll spend \$5.)
More affluent neighborhoods often drain resources from and eclipse and disregard developing areas with similar, existing projects.	More affluent neighborhoods often drain resources from and eclipse and disregard developing areas with similar, existing projects.
More farmers markets aallows more opporuntiy for us city folk to buy food from a farmer. Plus all the other local goods, arts, music, etc we can access.	
more farmers markets in more places = good news for our city.	restrictive codes that dont take into consideration the needs of farmers selling at farmers markets.
More farmer's markets is better.	Would these "regulations" make it harder for Farmer's Markets to start up or continue?
More is better!	

More local markets, more often, are desirable for local food sales and consumption to decrease the carbon foot print of our city and eventually our country.	Things that you have already mentioned....traffic, noise, etc.
More markets mean more fresh, local food for more people.	
More markets means greater access for all	Markets that don't sell "farmer" products, either "manufactured" goods or products being resold from wholesale produce distributors, kind of like the people you see selling oranges and apples out of boxes by the side of busy streets, but also including stands selling cooked items and/or "packaged" goods (except those that have to be packaged, like honey, cheese, eggs, etc.)
More opportunities for people to buy local food can only be a good thing.	I am concerned that many farmer market vendors are not actually farmers, but are selling value-added products like jam, chutney, etc. These vendors sometimes seem to take over markets, where I would like to see more fresh produce. In some of the city's markets, these types of vendors seem to predominate. I think priority should be given to farmers.
More outlets for farmers the better, more access to local food the better.	parking. Fortunately, I'm able to walk or take trimet to the markets I frequent the most. Keep costs low for farmers so food isn't as expensive.
more potential access to fresh, locally grown food	approving locations that will result in reliable, profitable customer bases
Near public transit best for urban setting ie Portland Farmers Market at PSU.	Dogs.
Need to be accessible and not overwhelm areas with lots of congestion.	Be more flexible with farm stands by a single farmer. Are you considering these farmers markets? Don't assume one size fits a ll in regulations.
Need to ensure that markets are easy to establish, including micro-markets (i.e. a handful of vendors) in any zone. Perhaps should consider restrictions (%-based for larger markets; absolute for micro-markets) on sales of produce and value-added goods not produced by the vendor.	
no limits	any regulation that would limit.
Not everyone can or will grow their own fresh food. Farmers markets promote the local economy, fresh foods, and an active lifestyle.	
Only if it allows for more farmer's markets.	
Oregonians love Farmers Markets. This is the way to becoming healthy and involved in our community and what we put in our bodies. These markets bring together all kinds of people and promote a healthy lifestyle for everyone. I love Farmers Markets and there should be opportunities for them.	Oversaturation of Farmers Markets. They have grown like wildfire in the past ten years, but I think if you have too many alot of them will turn in to fair/festival like events, not marketplace type shopping like in Europe. This is a way to know your food directly.
Other types of markets should be considered as well, an it would be great to have more markets near big grocery stores so shoppers can get everything they need easily.	
parking and sharing of urban spaces	
People need easy access to farmers markets.	

People will be safe and protected.	Avoiding accidents, and other danger.
perhaps more parks could be utilized for the markets.	traffic and parking are 2 big problems, but you can't have crowds without the other---I have no ideas on that problem
Please continue to support these.	
Provided that the regulations are more helpful than harmful to the effort of increasing access to local food and farmers, yes.	Restrictive regulations; in particular, limits or mandates on parking, access, utility services, etc., which would require more than reasonable amounts of financial burden to be carried by markets and vendors.
Regular, well populated events must be considerate to all involved.	Not having access to local food. Encourage farm markets and make the process easy, transparent, and inclusive.
Regulations keep things from getting out of control.	Traffic, mayhem, noise, dogs and their poop.
relocalizing should be our primary goal these days.	what you mentioned; disruptions due to traffic and setting up the market.
Right if you actually intend to increase opportunities for farm vendors and number of markets.	"Developing regulations" and "...determining appropriate ...considerations,," etc, etc. sounds like it could get very complex and inhibiting.
Right now to have a farmers market on a regular basis a land adjustment often has to take place and this is costly to the non-profit farmers markets.	
See previous comments - these efforts will best serve our communities when they open access to people and neighborhoods who most need to see the health and economic benefits that farmers markets can provide (e.g low income, immigrant/refugee, and people of color families, homes, and neighborhoods).	I am concerned that "livability" concerns and perceptions will be used to limit sites and participation of markets. We don't have actual 'food deserts' in Portland but neighborhoods with less access to fresh fruits and veggies should be prioritized or fast-tracked to host a market.
seems fair	
Small farms should be allowed to have residential pickup sites.	
So long as the community has a hand in the decisions, not a say but an actual vote.	
Some areas are better suited than others	Traffic, on all fronts. Sellwood is a perfect example of what doesn't work.
Stability is key many times without codified laws these things are moved which causes a disruption and uncertainty pushing consumers to just goto the grocery store.	the elimination of current venues in use and the possibility that others will be unable to sprout due to the necessities of locating with a populace able to easily walk to said market.
Standardizing the process for finding land for farmers markets and identifying suitable places for them will hopefully reduce barriers for markets to be distributed more equitably throughout the city.	In selecting locations for farmers markets throughout the city, it is important to prioritize things like access to transit and perhaps proximity to other community services to ensure that future markets are accessible and integrated into the community. Increased need for parking and increased car traffic near markets could be a negative impact.
Supporting local food and farmers is sustainable and rewarding for the community.	
sure but also think of ways to improve streets from crime vs. traffic.	

The city should work with market boards to establish permanent, secure, appropriate sites for markets. Support of existing markets should take priority as there are probably too many markets in Portland already, we do not need more of them.	Lots of new little unplanned unsustainable markets coming and going.
the closer consumers are to the source of food the better.	traffic.
The direction is too vague. It would be good to definite "appropriate locations" for example.	Neighborhood nuisances.
The Farmers' Markets in Portland are one of the best events that bring people together to celebrate our region.	More farmers' markets in general are a very positive thing for Portland
The issues identified in the direction description are the major ones. Markets are limited hour activities. There are a number of possible sites such as church parking lots or school parking lots which could serve as good sites. Allowing a one day a week activity like a farmers market would be a good use of these spaces. However, these spaces are often zoned residential with conditional use for the school or church. Amending or obtaining a conditional use permit for a market is cost prohibitive. Eliminating this cost will be a big help to market organizers.	Heavier than normal traffic could have a negative impact on a residential street. Limited hours and number of days can easily address this problem.
The more contact between farmers and urban communities, the better.	There needs to be enough parking, without impacting neighborhoods in the area. Perhaps using the parking lot of a school or a business that is closed on the weekends, as is now done.
The more farmers markets, the better! Convenience has a lot to do with people's food choices, and making the better option more convenient will help a lot.	Making sure the local farmers markets aren't _just_ in the more affluent neighborhoods.
The more local markets, the better!	Concern that food carts and other vendors would have unreasonable limits.
The more, the better. City folk like us need to be as closely connected to our food supply as possible. We need that link to nature!	None.
There is a thriving market scene. A diverse array of sizes, styles of market and locations is wonderful and it's exciting that there are the vendors and customers to keep the number of markets growing.	
These are a good opportunity to get fresh food, support farmers and gardeners, see and/or make friends. They also help a neighborhood build identity as do parks, schools, business districts.	I use the Eastbank Market most often and shop by bike. However, many folks come by car and it does create some congestion, and more hazardous biking along bike route. These take more careful siting - on more major streets, ideally with some off-street parking available.
These are closer to large commercial operations and have larger impacts that need to be mitigated	traffic, parking, affordability
These are great economic and social attractions that build community and healthy citizens.	See previous answers. High cost of quality produce. I remember int the 1970s when sweet corn was a dozen ears for a buck!
They add to our culture starved community	None
They are usually in an easy to get to location.	
They might be around some kind of superfund site or some toxic or unsafe space	Trash

They should be encouraged (land leased/set aside at no cost by city) near public transit hubs.	Traffic
This will work if we look at the markets realistically and fairly.	Traffic, noise, parking, customer access to market.
thoughtful planning as to where the need/market is greatest, traffic impact absorbable, etc.	traffic can be a problem so that needs careful planning.
Traffic and parking for residents near the markets is a consideration, but the more Farmer's Markets the better.	
we also need to be concerned with over-supply of farmers markets--the vendors can't make it if there are too many. see NYTimes 8/23/11	
We have to support the local farmers. But we need to have cheaper food.	Fairness for everyone who sells food, these are their livelihoods.
We need many more so people can walk to them.	
We need more farmers markets in general I believe. And the existing ones ought to be encouraged and enabled to remain open all year. As far as adding additional markets, doing so drastically reduces food deserts without the infrastructure and investment of a big-box brick-and-mortar grocer, encourages small business entrepreneurship and healthy competition/diversification/cooperation in a field Portland is justifiably well-known for (food), and helps keep food fresh, cheap, local and community-driven.	
We need more markets, in more parts of the city, well-supported by a range of vendors. The best food shouldn't appear at just one or two markets serving higher-income customers.	I'd like to ensure parking (bike and car) are well-supported at all sites, since buying produce for the week takes up more space that I'm comfortable handling on the bus. Now, if you ran enough markets in each area that I only needed to get a few days food at a time, parking would be less of a problem.
We need opportunity	none
We need to encourage more farmers markets and improvements for those markets	food sales only and from the farm that is represented, not from sub farmers
We need to establish guidelines to keep wealthy neighborhoods from poaching business and killing farmer's markets that happen in the neighborhoods that really need the food access. Please add considerations of food access and equity to the list.	Allowing too many markets.
We should encourage farmers markets to allow people to have markets in their neighborhood. They should only be restricted when doing so is absolutely critical.	None. I am more concerned with undue restrictions on farmers markets.
What the city has done to encourage this has only helped build up local opportunities for employment and good food choices for the consumer.	
Wider distribution of small markets benefits growers and local consumers.	Re-selling of imported produce and "stretching producers too thinly" across too many markets.
With the lack of fresh produce available in many parts of the city any way we can make it easy for individuals to purchase good quality food is a win for us all.	None as these are one day a week events for 2-5 hours depending on the day and time.
wouldn't it be ideal if people all over Portland could walk to a farmers market in their neighborhood?	traffic

YES Farmers markets are wonderful and a necessity. We know where our food is coming from and we can support smaller farmers....	No concerns.
Yes, as long as their are ample numbers and distribution of markets to ensure that patrons don't have to drive to far or can take mass transit. Promote local vendor availability to stay green.	
Yes, but only if left to the specific neighborhoods to determine their own direction.	The only impact that concerns me is making certain people are educated about the overwhelming benefits of such local markets. People are afraid of what they don't understand
yes, love the farmers markets, dislike the traffic and congestion!	same as above
	Access to fresh produce should be the goal!
	Accessibility by transit would reduce car impact.
	Can the city start policing the everyday or every weekend "garage sales" AKA business some people run out of their homes instead of trying to regulate people trying to grow edible crops?
	Cost. If the cost of participating affects farmers and drives up the cost of produce then it isn't efficient to create more regulations.
	Disruption of surrounding residential peace and enjoyment.
	Do not limit farmer's markets
	Do not overweight the parking impacts -- people should be welcomed to the markets as pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Individual drivers should be the lowest priority.
	Don't over-regulate or add expense for the vendors.
	dON'T REGULATE THEM TOO MUCH, WHICH MIGHT INHIBIT THEIR CREATION OR LONGEVITY. MORE CARE NEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO ENSURE THAT THE FM VENDORS ARE ACTUALLY GROWING/MAKING THEIR WARES, I KNOW OF SEVERAL CASES WHERE THIS IS NOT BEING DONE ADEQUATELY. IT ISN'T FAIR TO THE VENDORS WHO ARE FOLLOWING THE RULES
	Don't want "determining appropriate locations" to be extremely limiting.
	Ensuring ample opportunities for markets and determining appropriate locations are important, however this direction should not be viewed too conservatively: The regulation should not be used to limit opportunities or locations if there is sufficient community demand and farmer supply.
	Equal access for all neighborhoods.
	Existing unregulated/unlicensed sellers that keep popping up on street corners in residential areas.

	farmers markets are great. the more we have the better
	Good access by bike and public transportation
	Having enough vendors to make going there worth it. Having prices competitive to grocery stores.
	high traffic in residential areas that lack adequate arterial roads
	I like to shop at the Beaverton Farmers market and go to the Beaverton Library. People who do not use the library use the library parking. Enforcement of the library's request that the library parking lot be for library patrons would be helpful.
	I love farmer's markets, but they tend to be a very expensive food source. My family can't rely on them as our produce source because of the cost, though we still make purchases here and there. We are a two-earner, home-owning household.
	I want a Saturday NOT Sunday shopping day
	I worry about the inability for local markets to develop outside of the Portland Farmer's Market organization.
	I worry that too many markets too close together will compromise vendor's abilities to make a decent profit. Not EVERY neighborhood needs a farmers market.
	I would be sad to see areas in high need for food options denied farmers market based on some arbitrary factors. Everything within reason.
	I would hope that research would go into locating a site for a permanent, indoor market as well.
	I would like to see market development done in a way that lessens the likelihood of the farmer's market contributing to gentrification (targeting food, products, and farmers that the local community is interested in buying, for example).
	If the amount of farmer's markets continue to increase, we should encourage more organically grown/pasture-raised products to be available.
	I'm that wealthier neighborhoods will be given gardens and farmers markets (Sellwood, Laurelhurst, SW Hills). We need to support and promote healthy food in working class/ working poor neighborhoods.
	It seems like these questions all require regulations, do we need to keep being so regulatory! Seems things are going well in this area already
	Just making sure they are compatible with other neighborhood activities.
	lack of children's activities

	Lack of secure space for farmers markets; lack of infrastructure: covered space, electricity, bathrooms, parking, bike parking, etc.
	Limiting the cost and regulatory burden of farmers market sites.
	Location of farmers markets should always take transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access into account.
	Make sure poor people benefit from these regulations. Regulations should be accompanied by tools to increase capacity for low income people and people of color to benefit from the new code.
	making healthy food and local produce available to low income families and neighborhoods.
	No concern.
	No concerns
	None
	none
	none
	none
	None
	none
	None
	None.
	None. the more the better if they can be financially supported. I'd like to see more food available at farmers market that can be sold with limited or NO packaging! And local, and pesticide free.
	None--farmers markets are great.
	Non-food sales should not be allowed.
	Our neighborhood farmers market sucks. Its a poor neighborhood, out of the city-ish, so cheese and meat sellers, as well as organic growers don't come here. Its people with backyard gardens which I love, but they mostly don't speak english so I don't know if they used harmful growth enhancers, can't even ask them, they probably aren't even concerned about it. There's a little bit of a disparity there.
	Over-regulation causing food prices at the markets to be jacked up.
	Overregulation of farmer market locations
	Overregulation or standards that ends up limiting the opportunity for new, small markets to establish themselves. Would like there to be support to help navigate restrictions.
	Over-zealous regulation by BDS that might limit the size, location, types of things to be sold, etc. around sites that are part of the burgeoning small-scale craft economy of Portland.

	Parking seems to be a major issue. I would not like to live next to a farmers market. I would like to live within a few blocks of a farmer's market, though!
	Parking. Also it would be nice to make sure that markets didn't overlap.
	pesticide us
	Please don't limit our growing farmer's markets from reaching different neighborhoods.
	Popup, "tent-booth" markets are fine, but I'd really like to see the city establish *buildings* with electricity, water, toilets, etc., and offer booths/stalls to for producers to rent or lease at affordable rates.
	produce at the markets and less pre-made food and craft vendors, overhead cost for vendors at these markets.
	Propagation of smugly self satisfied "localvores" congratulating themselves for working out an "ethical food system" Blech.....build me a separate entrance.
	regs too stringent
	Saturation.
	That larger, commercial operations that may not adhere to organic/non-GMO practices would choke out neighborhood participation.
	That too many regulations will hinder the development of farmers markets not help.
	The more small local ones the better. That way there isn't such an influx of people into a neighborhood. I'd like to see all of them as an opportunity for locals to sell whatever they make, not just food.
	the type of regulations that you may develop.
	there should be shelter (shade, rain) and adequate parking. Why not use combined recess/gym shelters at schools for farmers markets at times schools are not in session (night, weekends)?
	Too many allowed so not economic for farmers
	too many markets in the city having a negative impact on vendors.
	Too much traffic and parking limitations cause congestion in surrounding areas of the market neighborhood.
	Too narrow of regulations will limit access to fresh local, sustainable food.
	Traffic
	traffic - and that the markets stay farmer's markets. Not just re-selling other's produce.
	traffic and noise in the early morning hours, but the ability to purchase farm fresh food and flowers trumps that.

	Traffic and parking issues in residential areas could be a concern. Look for areas where there are compatible uses - church parking lots on NON-sundays or afternoon markets where there is not alot of afternoon biz activity.
	Traffic can be a problem in immediate neighborhood; encourage carpooling and public transportation. Take action only in neighbors where there are considerable complaints from residents.
	Traffic flow.
	Traffic, particularly parking for cars and bicycles.
	Traffic, related noise, trash.
	Traffic.
	Traffic.
	Traffic.
	Traffic. An increase number of market locations might reduce the localized impact of traffic.
	Ugh, why do we have to develop regulations to ensure ample opportunities? If people want a farmer's market, they'll make it happen.
	unknown
	urban farming is discouraged in favor of bringing food in rather than focusing on increasing back(and front)yard food production.
	We love our farmers markets but traffic and safety of pedestrians is a concern.
	We love the Peoples farmers market. We are also thrilled that Woodstock now has a farmers market.
	We need more farmers markets, not less, please do not limit markets that have been started.
	We should try to have as many as possible but there needs to be enough parking space.
	What is the definition of "appropriate" in this direction? For example, if appropriate means "financially feasible," a farmers' market in NW every day of the week would be great and probably would be supported. But if appropriate means "provide low-cost and healthy food to the residents than need it most," the location and type of market could be very different. They can co-exist, but goals of the farmers' market should be outlined.
	What one can consider "appropriate" worries me.
	Would like to see more markets
	Zoning should empower and enable easy access to healthy food.

TOPIC AREA 3: FARMERS MARKETS	
Question 8: Direction: Develop regulations to ensure ample opportunities for farmers markets to occur at appropriate locations throughout the city. Determining appropriate locations includes consideration of traffic, noise, characteristics of the market (i.e. size, duration, customer base). Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "NO"	Question 9: What types of impacts concern you the most?
Additional regulations will not ensure more farmers markets, but rather, restrict farmers markets. The ideal scenario would be to have farmers markets accessible to all Portland neighborhoods.	I am concerned with over-legislation causing undue limits on farmers markets.
Again - a solution in search of a problem!	
Again- farmer's markets typically take all of that into consideration before they even open. They are only a benefit to their community. As a member of a local farmers market board of directors, I see this as inhibiting the distribution of healthy food to as many community members as possible.	More regulations make it more difficult for markets to be allowed to operate.
Again, determining appropriate locations should be based on the community need and willingness to accommodate the market.	More regulations means more money spent on senseless rules that simply raise the cost of food and limit access.
Again, I don't understand why we need to restrict a good thing? More access to local food with a smaller carbon footprint... Easier access within the neighborhood for folks who can't afford or don't have a car.	
Again, the regulations are not detailed, so I can't check "yes." I am skeptical of this because I would like to see more farmer's markets in our city, not fewer, and I am concerned that these regulations would have the opposite effect.	I am concerned about the impact that not having fresh, local foods available would have on the health of individuals and communities in their neighborhoods.
Again, why fix something that is not broken. If there is a problem with a certain market, fix those problems. But leave everyone alone. We don't need MORE regulations!!!	
All communities should have the opportunity to have a farmers market where it fits best within the community--and the local community should decide what works best for them.	That the City regulations would be so restrictive that communities would not have the flexibility needed to build the market that best suits their needs.
allow farmers markets to continue. They are not a problem.	parking
Allow neighborhoods to decide whether they want farmer's makets. Allow more neighborhood commerce.	
Allow neighbors and neighborhood associations to resolve these issues. There is no need for the city to assert authority to settle simple civic disputes.	There is no abuse of farmers markets currently. This is an attempt to solve a problem that does not exist.
At the time of setting up the markets, the standards for traffic, noise, etc. must be quantified. Periodically thereafter, compliance should be rechecked so that the levels are not exceeded causing the surrounding neighborhood to be overwhelmed by the market's impact.	Sites should be well served by roads and parking so that market does not cause nearby residential areas to be used for parking. Market hours need to be sensitive to existing use of roads by commuter traffic. Special needs parking and access needs much more attention. Dogs don't mix well with crowds and food. Markets are not a dog park. Either create dog parking areas outside the market or don't allow them in. CSA pick-ups may be great for adding shoppers to the market, but they can overwhelm the available parking

Because farmers markets represent competition to corporations who may influence your regulation to make it more difficult to access local food.	Any restrictions to gathering around the effort to feed ourselves with local food concerns me.
Communities can determine through their support or lack of support for persons selling products in farmers markets. Why should the state or city government be involved. We have enough laws to inforce any problems that would develop.	More agencies. More government. More regulations. More restrictions. More laws.
Community organizing to get something going is already hard enough as it is. If the process of having a market is made any more difficult then we may not have them.	farmer's markets and other community-oriented organizing being regulated in a way that they metamorphasize into something non-organic or disappear altogether.
Deregulating farmers markets seems like the best option. Let them develop and fail or succeed on their own.	none
Do not make the farmers wick around a city designed for cars, make the city work for those feeding us.	
Does this mean increase or decrease regulation? Who determines "appropriate". It is reasonable to revise or clarify code to prevent harm, so to the extent the codes do that it is okay, but the limitations should be minimal.	Over-regulation.
Don't make regulations a difficulty for grass roots communities to sponsor farmers markets.	
Don't understand the need for increased regulation,	
Excessive city oversight.	
Existing farmers market system is nationally renowned.	The impact of unnecessary regulation.
Farmers and their customers with supply and demand, and the understanding of buyer beware is fine.	City doesn't need to be involved in deciding what is appropriate. Let businesses work it out with farmers if they want to allow a market at their location.
Farmers markets are an excellent community building opportunity and should be encouraged in every neighborhood. If every neighborhood had one, traffic, congestion and noise from the market would be limited to those in the neighborhood and less likely to raise concern.	I'm concerned that more regulations on Markets will increase cost and hassle to the vendors and farmers and make it less likely for them to participate.
Farmers Markets are one of portland's biggest blessings. That they are impromptu and randomly located it most delightful. I don't believe regulation is the answer at this point, contextual redirection or organization may be.	losing the vibrant, self-inspired nature of farmers markets. if people want more regulations, they can go to the gd supermarket.
Farmers markets can be located anywhere there is interest and space	
Farmer's markets have organizations that run them already. The people who are in these organizations aren't stupid, generally. They're not going to put a market in a residential area with no traffic or parking. "No special regulations" has been working well. Why screw it up?	If you start regulating them and forcing them to get permits, the smaller ones in poorer areas (where they are needed the most) will go bust.
Farmers markets seem to be doing well without whatever regulations are being considered. Why mess with that?	There could eventually be too many markets, but the market participants themselves should be the ones to decide that.
Good grief, have people been complaining about markets, CSA, co-ops? As I stated before Portland has always been progressive. Please let people in this city have some individuality.	

How many FM do we need - there are over 2 dozen in Portland, and some of the newer ones struggle for attendance, visibility and consistency. I think that NEED (as opposed to convenience and the "wouldn't it be cool" factor) should be the driving force. More useful to have CG space than another FM.	Necessity?!!
I am concerned about any limits against people who grow food, because I have never heard of any instance where marketeers are misbehaving.	I don't want to make it even more difficult for any growers of high quality food/ caretakers of the soil we depend on for our lives, to make a living- they are doing the rest of us a huge service!
I can't believe how much taxpayer money you are spending spinning your wheels invading private enterprise. Get out!	
I don't see a current issue with farmer's markets.	I'm concerned that the regulations will inhibit the growth and development of the markets.
I feel the community already handles and addresses this by supporting (or not) the market. More regulations will just muddle that process and honestly if it isn't broke why fix it?	
I like it when communities have more authority to create markets for themselves, addressing their own needs as they see it.	The impact of a future zoning board that might be less friendly to community food or markets.
I oppose regulations that might restrict farmers' markets.	When one looks to involve stakeholders in things, setting up tables for people to show what they are doing is a way to get involvement and buy-in. Restricting this seems nuts to me--I can't think of another way to say this in the short time I have to reply here.
I think the farmers markets are great where they are and should be left alone.	
I think this can be decided at the community/neighborhood level - Offer some guidance or a way to take up issues or complaints to the local market.... but don't think that every market should be exactly the same.	you would tie the hands of the volunteers and vendors who spend countless hours trying to bring local food to a small neighborhood.
I think we need less regulation of farmer's markets.	If anything we need to ban certain activities from farmers markets like dogs and religious pamphleteers.
I worry that regulations will do nothing to "ensure ample opportunities for farmers markets"	Making it harder for farmers markets to establish and succeed!
I'm concerned that limiting locations may shut down buying coops and be totally unnecessary.	I have not had any impacts nor do I forsee any. I rarely even meet anyone from our food buying coop.
I'm concerned that these regulations would negatively impact potential for locating farmers markets in the neediest areas of our city.	
I'm concerned that these restrictions would be too strong and could be manipulated to favor larger vendors.	
Is there a problem?	Why more regulations?
Is there any problem?? I think a "bad" market would simply go out of business or re-form itself - from the bottom-up, rather than top-down.	Over regulating, insistance upon insurance, making it more difficult for the independent markets to come into being or even exist.
It is difficult to determine characteristics of a market that is not yet formed and in place. Better to have neighborhood association or other group work with city on case by case.	
It's going to be hard to write the right code, regulate, implement, enforce.	the usual -- traffic

Just because there's a small market with a small neighborhood customer base doesn't provide me with good justification for shutting it down. I don't see any need for more regulations.	I don't want any farmer's markets shut down.
just keep us connected please! have meetings if there are issues.. set goals that are people centered and you won't go wrong.	same as before
Large stores are more of an issue that is often overlooked. "Ample" is too vague along with "appropriate". Adding too much also adds costs for regulation without real benefit.	None.
Let the (economic) "market" determine it.	Turning farmers markets into the same as existing supermarkets due to restrictions on them.
Let the markets flourish	Losing the markets
let them develop organically and keep City oversight to a minimum.	
Let them happen organically and where they pop up...if it creates a problem why can't the neighborhood (and vendors/home & business owners) work out a plan? Why must we create a "one size fits all" limitation? It supports local farmers, increases traffic to local businesses and helps create community...there is nothing bad in that...regulations will not assist people in creating them it will prevent them from doing so.	
Limiting farmers markets is limiting food security, food choice, local resiliency, community, and economic vitality. Limiting farmers markets is forcing consumers further into the hands of agribusiness. Limiting farmers markets is destroying local markets for the benefit of outsiders. With regards to noise, cities are economic hubs. Economic activity, diversity of activity, and living near other humans are all essential building blocks of civilization and the entire point for the existence of cities in the first place. Humans, in these activities, create noise. While we should all be kind to our neighbors, our neighbors must also accept that Portland is not the country. It is a vibrant city. If you wish to make it an unvibrant, economically dead wasteland, then by all means "plan" away until our city is a sleepy back country road. Or, better yet, let neighborhoods make the decision of the hours, operations and customer base of markets for themselves. Again, anyone who wishes to limit such activities likely has an issue with increased traffic, which is tied to *any* activity in the city as a result of city planning.	None. I welcome community gardens in my neighborhood. I welcome a diversity of use. I welcome economic activity. I welcome the Do-It-Yourself ethos of Farmers Markets. I welcome food security. I welcome running into people from my neighborhood on the street, as they are on their way too and from the store, work, dining out, going to a show, and, yes, at my local farmers market. Again, anyone who wishes to limit such activities likely has an issue with increased traffic, which is tied to *any* activity in the city as a result of city planning.
Locations should be able to be chosen at will.	
Markets shouldn't be limited to certain areas, they should have open access to spaces	limiting the ability for these markets to take place and be conveniently located and create a sense of community
may unintentionally block lower income households from farmer market access	access for all income levels
More farmers markets. They do not need the city to impose restrictive regulations. The neighborhood can decide what it wants.	Regulations imposed from above upon the availability of fresh locally grown food and the neighborhood's expression and use of its farmers market. The farmers markets are a delightful asset to the neighborhoods. Encourage them, let them grow, and let the people use them the way they think is appropriate.
More regulations may mean less farmers markets	too many areas excluding farmers market usage

Most Farmer's Markets are already long established. Why are regulations needed? If there are local complaints about issues such as traffic congestion or noise, work with the specific Farmer's Market to help find solutions. Think solutions, not more government regulation.	There are always going to be complainers and critics - people who don't like anyone doing anything. Creating more regulations doesn't change that. More regulations means more people to enforce them, when all that is needed is to bring people together to work out solutions.
Neighborhoods and organizations should control this without city regulations.	Saturation
Neighborhoods, not the city, should determine where in the neighborhood a farmers' market is held.	Too many markets might interfere with each other's ability to attract customers--then none would thrive.
No regulations need be developed. Neighborhood groups are perfectly competent to decide how they want their market to operate.	1. Governmental over-regulation. 2. Attempts by traditional grocery stores to keep farmers markets out of their territory. 3. Proliferation of markets that are not <u>producer-only markets-i.e. "produce stands"</u>
no, keep the regulation out. let the farmers markets happen naturally as they have been for years.	too much regulation, permitting decreasing producers costs, too much "red tape" decreasing desire to come to certain areas to sell
Not aware of any need for regulation.	None
Not sure we need regulations - have there been problems?	I do not want too much regulation on these and am worried that bigger business will get a hand in determining regulations.
Not sure we really need a bunch of regulations.	
Not sure what appropriate locations means. This statement is too vague.	I think it is important to make local food available in residential neighborhoods, so that people can walk or bike to it. It will eliminate driving and help improving air quality. I associate local food with a healthy life style which includes less driving and more walking/biking. I want my local food (including Farmers Markets) close to <u>my home</u> .
Not sure why we need regulation here? What is the concern?	
Please allow farmer's markets to occur anywhere there is space. We are in serious need of them.	Same as previous two comments...Healthy and affordable food access/
Portland area Farmer's Markets seem to be doing great without the regulation. Leave well enough alone!	Regulation would impose limits on a free market system that is working & increase costs.
Regulations should remain at a minimum, remove the red tape and cost of government and allow the markets to flourish (or not) based on market conditions.	Creating a lot of unneeded beauracracy which the city can ill afford or is ill equipped to handle.
Same as above.	Same as above.
Seems like existing regulations are doing just fine.	
should be under the control of the local neighborhood. If people don't like something about that market, then they go to the meeting and get it changed. It is not necessary to interfere.	more rules, regulations, applications, registrations, fines and inhibiting local capitolism
Sounds like it will be restricting	
STOP REGULATING! this survey is starting to get on my nerves.	Regulating leads to monitoring, beauracracy, and standing in line. not to mention control over land use. We live out west to have freedom to use the land as we wish.
Stop trying to "regulate"er interfere with a system that already functioning to the benefit of everyone.	
The creation of markets is community led. The won't last if the community does not support them. They are self-regulating.	

The government and regulating board cannot determine the specific needs of a community based upon a set of demographic reports. Regulations will only serve to stifle the ability of the market to attend to its consumers.	
The markets are a lot larger but once again neighborhoods can make these decisions.	
The more farmers markets around, the better. People often walk to these events, and the more there are, the more people will walk to them. They are not rowdy loud affairs and by and large people pick up after themselves.	Regulation of events that don't need regulating and that aren't causing a problem currently.
the more farmer's markets, the better for the local economy.	I am concerned that your restrictions will limit our access to farmer's markets. We need MORE farmer's markets operating in neighborhoods, not less. We need to have easy access (walking or biking) to these markets.
The more regulations and restrictions the county makes, the harder and more costly it becomes to the individual subsistence farmer who only goes to market to help cut costs of gardening and sell his/her overage produce.	No more PROHIBITION.
The more regulations you add to markets, the fewer of them there will be and that will mean more people do not have access to them in their area. And who gets to determine an "appropriate location"? Not the government, who in most cases does not realize just how important these markets in our area, both to the farmers and to the people who buy their products.	Regulation that would limit number and access of farmers markets. We are naturally limited in the NW by the growing season, don't limit them by outside regulation.
the more the better	the restrictions
the more,the better.	the regulations.
The second sentence is the problem. First sentence is great,yes, good direction. See Q9 for my concerns.	Very worried about some new rule "determining" that an existing farmers markte has a negative impact. (Sadly, I can see someone deciding, for example, that the Hollywood Market has a negative impact re: parking/customer base, therefore can't meet anymore). Am very, very concerned that theregulations would hamstring new farmers markets and would simply benefit the Portland Farmers market organization, which must have more clout with you and your committee than the smaller ones. :(
Their has been no problem yet with farmers market . This would cost us more money to have city government access farmers market .	
there is always a "bad apple" in every neighborhood that screws it all up	tooooo many regulations
There is little/no risk of oversized markets in residential areas. Let this be managed by the local neighborhoods and businesses.	
There isn't currently a problem, why intefere?	
there should not be an unnecessary restriction of locales for farmers markets, rather it should be essentially market-based on the model of food-cart pods, some of which flourish and some of which do not, but at this level of small-producer and walkable-retail, an open market-based approach really is best.	

These markets help the community. More regulations will only hurt the farmers and the consumers and may result in few markets causing prices to go up	Regulations = restrictions for farmers and consumers, which may lead to higher prices and lack of available local produce (and supporting local farmers).
These markets should develop where the community decides is best, not the city	My biggest concern is that the city will put rules and regulations into place that will put a stranglehold on this growing movement/trend. The markets need support, not red tape. Communities need these markets and can self regulate for the most part with occasional mediation if necessary.
This could be the right direction, assuming it moves in the direction of allowing more flexibility in farmers market locations. Farmers markets often change in size, duration, and sometimes customer base, so I would not like to see regulations that cause markets problems when this happens.	I think the City of Portland should consider regulations about what can be sold at farmers markets in Portland, specifically, allowing only LOCAL produce to be sold at a farmers market. If farmers markets need any regulation at all it should be to disallow reselling of non-local produce, which is currently legal. Most of the farmers markets in town already have rules against this but a few do not.
This kinda sounds more like creating regulations to restrict farmers markets.	I'm all for farmers markets. Would probably not be thrilled with one that had a ton of loud music or whatever by my house. Hrs of farmers markets never seem that conducive to my shopping availabilities
This should remain unregulated. The farmers markets don't seem to need any help from the city in finding "ample opportunities" at "appropriate locations throughout the city." They've done a pretty good job at finding those on their own. More regulation in this area would just slow them down and make it more difficult on them. Less regulation is better for them, so keep it that way.	Again, the only impact that concerns me is not having enough of them. Regulation on existing / future markets will only hamper them, unless your "regulation" includes actually providing locations for them.
This sounds like more regulation, which ain't cool in this case.	
too many regulations	
Too much regulation - too many hoops to jump through. Local food should be easily available locally	
Traffic congestion in Portland is self-limiting. If there is not sufficient access or parking, people will make other arrangements. Planning by the City destroys opportunity before any activity is allowed to begin, leading to greater unemployment and social unrest.	Loss of current "ample opportunities" using privately-owned assets, increasing cost of increasing numbers of City Inspectors.
We like it as it is. Of anything. Give more freedom	More regulations no matter what they are
We need more farmers markets, not more regulations about farmers markets. Anybody or business that has some extra space to allow farmers to come in and sell, should be able to. If you're looking for something to regulate, determine appropriate locations including traffic considerations, noise, characteristics of each fast food restaurant (i.e. size, duration, customer base)	Will the city make the permit process for running a farmers market appropriately simple and the fees appropriately low for these micro business'?
What we have is already working so leave it alone.	None. Traffic discussed in earlier question.
Who decides where these appropriate areas are? Does appropriate mean 'commercial'? Is the 'neighbor' who is inconvenienced the same kind of neighbor that is all for clean energy except when a wind turbine might mar their own picturesque landscape?	

Who is determining where an appropriate location is? Why are there more regulations needed? Farmer Markets are already successful.	Too much city regulation
Why have regulations for markets - size, durations, etc...? markets should be able to set up as long as there is safe access.	The community should determine the appropriate location, not regulation.
Why impose more rules on farmers' markets	
Why regulate something that is already working?	Regulatory issues that complicate and choke a system that is already working well
Why should a farmer be required to rent space away from the farm to sell his beef? All that does is create an extra expense for the farmer, which in turn gets passed on to the consumer. You're not talking about grocery store type traffic, so it's not an issue to <u>anyone except those who seek to regulate it.</u>	
You will invariably do harm and put a chill on farmers markets the minute you impose additional regulations on them.	Again, regulation is the problem here. Not the farmers markets. These are working fine and are a GOOD thing for the community. We the people LIKE farmers markets. If a few local residents complain about traffic, then they should be reminded of the positive values of having local farmers providing food to local residents, rather than food being shipped long distances after it has been exposed to questionable substances, pesticides, hormones, etc. Do not strangle this local relationship by adding layers of regulations that are totally unnecessary and harmful.
Zoning for farmers markets should parallel zoning regs for other business zoning. allow business to sort out where and how frequently to set up stores (markets)	over-regulation. Since 2008 farmers markets have been treated as "for-profit" by the IRS and Oregon Department of Revenue. They should not be discouraged by regulation but they should receive no more regulation than any other <u>type of business</u>
	do regulations help ensure opportunities?
	I love the 1 on 1 connection I have with my farmer and the small group of people that I have a strong community with. A farmers market will turn the experience into a circus.
	I think we need more local access to locally grown sustainable food. With restriction, you could cut short access.
	Like I said before, I'm concerned about the impact on local coops/food clubs.
	This might limit the growth/proliferation of farmers markets w/in city limits
	too much regulation by the government
	wh determines the right direction

TOPIC AREA 3: FARMERS MARKETS	
Question 8: Direction: Develop regulations to ensure ample opportunities for farmers markets to occur at appropriate locations throughout the city. Determining appropriate locations includes consideration of traffic, noise, characteristics of the market (i.e. size, duration, customer base). Is this the right direction? DIDN'T ANSWER "YES" or "NO"	
Again, are we having problems now that these regulations would "fix"?	Question 9: What types of impacts concern you the most?
I am not sure what is meant by "appropriate locations". Does this mean the City will limit opportunities?	Would regulations hinder the development of new farmers markets?
I'm not sure. I don't think that traffic congestion is actually a bad thing, and I really don't much care about parking, either. And I don't want to see farmers markets suppressed. But then again, it's always a good idea to clarify the rules.	That only some neighborhoods will have access to fresh produce.
It depends on what those regulations are. There are no specifics here.	
It depends on who benefits from the regulations. I support more opportunities for local farmers to sell their produce, but am concerned that the proliferation of farmers markets may attract large scale agricultural production, drive down prices, and hurt small local farmers.	
It is not clear to me if this is the right direction because it is so vague.	
Not sure what this changes. I want as many farmers markets available for people to shop at as possible so if this in any way hinders ones that are already set up then No, but if it helps build new markets in areas that are not yet served then yes it's great!	
	I'm concerned about farmers markets becoming tourist sites - I want them to be mostly about food (not prepared food.)

<p>TOPIC AREA 4: FOOD MEMBERSHIP DISTRIBUTION SITES</p>	
<p>Question 10: Direction: Allow food membership distribution sites in commercial zones and areas where light industry is allowed. Consider allowing small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"</p>	<p>Question 11: What types of impacts concern you the most?</p>
<p>"allow" it anywhere.</p>	
<p>about time that you let the FBC and CSA do what they do and feed their kids naturally</p>	<p>the USDA raiding farms with DEA agents for really stupid reasons but yet we still promote "roundupReady " food</p>
<p>Absolutely right to allow people more opportunity to have greater number of options instead of just the grocery store. Find ways to allow low income families to use food subsidies with those two options as well, instead of restricting those subsidies to grocery stores.</p>	<p>None. They are fantastic.</p>
<p>Absolutely. If I want to participate I should not be restricted by fees, law, regulation or agency. No government should be allowed to restrict trade, or community clubs, sharing costs to help one another.</p>	<p>None. This type of activity has no reason not to be done as desired by the members.</p>
<p>Access to affordable, healthful food is paramount. Bulk buying and farm shares are an easy and cost-efficient way to do this</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Access to wholesome foodsp again, it could increase access.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Again, it puts the vacant land to good use and creates a positive community activity in the spot. It attracts positive interest by neighbors and provides evidence that the community is invested in land use as well as small business.</p>	<p>Abandoned farms or gardens, vandals, water supplies and runoff.</p>
<p>Again, this is another tool for directly linking regional food production with urban markets. I could see food membership in residential areas as well, even at a medium to large scale (for example 47th Ave farm).</p>	<p>Hard to apply a one-size-fits all approach to zoning for CSA drop-offs. May want to regulate for the smaller side, and then allow operations to happen until neighborhood complaints occur. Also, CSA stands for Community "Supported" Agriculture.</p>
<p>all of these help support small local agriculture operations, and give people access to fresh, high quality produce</p>	<p>I don't feel that c/a and buying clubs generate enough traffic to be problematic</p>
<p>allow all sites for distributionbut rather than limit what can be done require instead a signed statement from all neighbors within so many residential spaces to sign of on said site much like an easement.</p>	<p>neighborly strife</p>
<p>Allow Food Buying Clubs to exist and to thrive, PERIOD. Why wouldn't you? The buyers wouldn't accept spoiled or rotting food. This is the whole purpose and reason for the existence of these clubs. Non-regulation is the best solution.</p>	

Allow food memberships wherever they are wanted! Do not limit them! Why on earth would you? Promote the ability of people to buy locally and lower prices to keep the costs of feeding their families as low as possible.	Any further restriction of food buying clubs or sharing food. Really? Do you not see what is happening with the economy and how people need more access and not less?
Allow in these areas but don't overly restrict it.	NIMBYers or bored planners will zone these right out of practicality.
Allow it everywhere though. Food clubs are better for the health of the individuals, the local famers, company and economy, the environment and many others.	Please DO NOT limit food clubs or CSAs from existing anywhere. See above comments. Having belonged to CSAs previously and not a food-buying club for the last 6 months or so, I am a firm believer in how much they improve the health of the community as a whole. It allows access to local small companies, direct purchasing where you know what you're really getting and the ability to negotiate things like, no packaging/reusing containers, etc. I don't see any downsides to them.
Allow this type of initiative to flourish.	
Allowing multiple avenues to acquire food via farm share or distribution sites gives people the choice and convenience to support local foods at a fair price.	
Anecdotally, this is already happening.	
Another source of food.	
as long as the "direction" keeps the distribution sites in residential areas.	how you will determine what constitutes "fewer members."
As long as the hours for pick-up do not extend too long into the evening, these activities are relatively low impact.	Traffic.
As our world changes for the worse, we need to encourage people to group together to survive.	I don't have any concerns about food buying clubs and CSAs. Let them be!
availability of what I want to eat w/out having to drive all over town	nothing comes to mind
be sure to get residential "buy in" before imposing on a neighborhood. could be the most convenient and desirable option if most in the residential area participate!	same as before
Because CSA's use less public resources within the City limits (in particular, they don't waste urban land for farming) these seem to have a potential to benefit low-income groups more so than Farmers Markets as costs could be lower. As such, I almost think they should be given more priority in the Zoning Code update as CSAs offer more benefit at less cost.	certainly the driving- perhaps innovations such as piggy-backing on other freight movements or even on MAX lines?

<p>Both CSAs and Food Buying Clubs are so entwined in this city and regions positive food and community mentality. These drop sites bring neighbors together. There should be very little restriction. It seems very clear that they should be allowed in all non residential zoning and that realistically not many people are going to converge on one house or open space for these food sites, at the exact same time and somehow create an issue. Let people get food together and as directly as possible. Allowing these at people's homes also helps bring humans to each others homes in an important way at a time when our society is more and more technology focused and full of big box stores, some more friendly, some more anonymous, but further from neighbor connection and the source of the food. The only wording might be that members are courteous of neighbors when picking up their goods and obey all parking and traffic laws or something basic if needed, otherwise it's not clear how allowing this in residential, along with all other zoning, is not an excellent idea? People connect with our local farmers, their neig</p>	
<p>Brings access to organic and fresh produce into the city at a lower cost. Will encourage large commercial entities to bring down their costs.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Brings more people into possibility of eating better food.</p>	<p>Use of petrol, traffic, congestion.</p>
<p>Building community through these endeavors is a win for all of us. Know your neighbors, know your farmers.</p>	<p>be careful not to over-control.</p>
<p>But PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE only use this process to restrict excessively large or conspicuous operations that operate more like a store than a club from residential areas. The limits should be such that most clubs CAN continue to operate in residential areas.</p>	<p>I am concerned about the vague definition of "fewer". Even if a club has many members, each member may order only occasionally, and everyone picks up orders at different times so traffic & disruption to neighbors is minimal. Perhaps a compromise could be setting a number of days each month that pick ups can occur at any one location?</p>
<p>buying clubs are great and if operated correctly greatly increase the ability to buy healthy food affordably.</p>	<p>operations that are too large for the location.</p>
<p>Can't this happen already? What zoning prohibits this?</p>	<p>If you distribute food, you need refrigeration.</p>
<p>Certain residential zone/open space area activities have adequate space to handle the temporary influx of people and traffic to accommodate these activities. Some areas in the city identified as food deserts have large church or public park parking areas that could easily house a CSA drop.</p>	<p>Some food buying clubs receive deliveries via tractor-trailer. I can see how this would be a problem for a narrow residential street. We probably need a limitation on that issue. Otherwise, there should be no issue for a food buying club. As for CSAs, there shouldn't be too much of an issue with traffic. The number of people picking up could be limited to some number, say 50 or less, and most issues should be resolved. The potential benefits for city residents, particularly those who don't live near groceries, is greater than any minimal discomfort of a temporary activity like a food drop.</p>
<p>Citizens should have choices.</p>	
<p>Consider small number of sites for home distribution.</p>	<p>Time and duration of distribution.</p>
<p>Creating more access for CSA share pick-ups would benefit farmers and their CSA holders.</p>	

CSA distribution sites have very little impact, as they are active only for a few hours a week. There may need to be a size limit - like no more than 100 customers within a 2 hour period for commercial/industrial spaces and 30 or fewer for residential spaces,. Neighbors' permission should be a requirement for residential area pick-up sites. The best sites might be churches, senior centers, etc.	Traffic/parking.
CSA pickup locations don't typically cause traffic or public safety issues. If traffic is a concern in residential settings, set an upper limit of 30 shares per location to prevent large scale operations from distributing from a single residence. distribution should be unlimited in commercial and industrial zones	limiting CSA distribution makes it harder for small farmers to reach their customers
CSAs & Food Buying Clubs are essential to the health of our local economy and people. They are also the main way my family buys food. I honestly don't know what we'd do without these opportunities.	Many, probably hundreds if not thousands of CSA drops & food buying clubs already exist & operate all over Portland, mainly in residential neighborhoods. These drops & clubs are how my family buys the bulk of our food, and I can say the same for most of our friends. It is essential that these drops & clubs ARE NOT LIMITED to commercial/industrial zones. I am concerned about new regulations on the #'s of members involved causing the food sources of thousands of Portlanders being cut off and/or being forced to move parts of the city that are distant from where we live & currently pick up our food orders. Such a move would only cause great inconvenience for all parties involved, would increase traffic congestion and air pollution.
CSA's and FBC's are very beneficial to both the sellers and the buyers.	
CSAs and food buying clubs are essential in building community. Making it easier to access and distribute goods in commercial zones would be great!	
CSAs are a great way of getting good healthy food to people. They should be encouraged.	
CSAs are great. Even better when they are close to your house.	Trucks or super long lines
CSAs bring folks together, which is good, so reduce limitations on them and provide some incentives to these farms	Food safety is a concern for some crops, so develop programs to help small farms test their products, address problems early.
CSA's have difficulty finding proper distribution points that don't interfere w/ the livability of the neighborhood.	increased auto traffic
definitely allow in residential areas!	While we don't want our little neighborhood streets crowded with trucks, an occasional drop-off is awesome. You get much healthier food and lower costs.

Definitely keep allowing CSA's and food buying clubs to be picked up in residential areas. I don't want to have to shlep to the industrial zone to pick up my organic flour, etc. Now, I just walk a couple of blocks - no car, no environmental impact, easy. Picking up on a neighbor's porch is convenient and doesn't create traffic jams - there aren't a lot of us picking up orders on any given month, and we just trickle by over the course of a day. If people really want to have pickups in the industrial zone, sure, let them. But don't ban them in neighborhoods!	
Definitely small sites with few members should get to be in residential & open spaces!	Global impacts. Food buying clubs should be helping the global food & environmental crisis by reducing shipping/packaging/miles traveled for our food. Bringing huge trucks into neighborhoods just so you can get your organic mango juice cheaper is not the answer.
distribution sites do not have much of an impact except traffic and parking - most people drive to pick these up mid-week	traffic, but these types of facilities have less overall impact than a farmers market!
ease of access	
Ease of access and freedom of choice. As they are now, the distributions happen quickly. It's done and people move on. No traffic issues that I know of. Now if we could only regulate the drug deals which cause worse problems!	
Empower people to feed themselves!	
Encouraging people to work together is always good.	
Fantastic use of appropriate zoning.	None.
Find a way to allow in residential areas.	
Food access is important, and this makes it easier.	
Food buying clubs and CSAs are important avenues for people to access healthy and affordable food, so these activities shouldn't be subject to too many barriers. Food membership distribution sites that fall under a threshold of minimal community impacts should be allowed in residential areas.	There are many different types of food distribution sites that don't necessarily fall into this definition of "food membership distribution", so it will be important to be clear about what types of activities this definition and subsequent standards do and do not govern. Also, will these new standards and definitions allow the use of institutional spaces for food membership distribution? Is that already allowed?
Food buying clubs are essential to families who want to buy healthy food on a budget. Moving them into commercial or industrial zones could put many of them out of business.	I believe that people should be allowed to get together to buy things, as long as its legal. Group buying is a strong form of community building, helps bring healthy food at affordable rates, and cuts down on resource expenditure for everyone.
Food buying clubs are good for the community and for overall health.	From my experience, these clubs are pretty self-limiting. They do not pose a problem for the neighborhoods.
Food buying clubs do not need outside regulation or interference. We run our club just fine on our own.	
for car people only	internal combustion engines and asphixiation
GREAT!!! Love this option!!!	No concerns!!! We know where the food is coming from and how it's grown!!! Organic is preferable!
Greater access to all	I have no concerns.

Has there been a lot of problems with this? I would not want to discourage this type of thing from happening.	
Having residential drop sites is extremely bonding for neighborhoods and builds community around FOOD!	
Homebound and low income would benefit.	
How many members could a small club have?	Traffic. Appearance.
However, I think small distribution sites should be automatically allowed. Many people need access to proper and sustainable foods near their homes, and within walking distance. Commerical stores and their marked-up prices do not allow all local people to participate in opportunities for less expensive, yet organic or sustainable foods.	
I am very interested in allowing drop points in residential areas. If people can pick up food in their neighborhood they are more able to utilize bikes, wagons, and other ways of transporting goods that don't involve fossil fuel usage. Anything that makes it more possible for families and neighbors to share resources and not have to leave their neighborhood to acquire food is a positive thing. I think this is actually the more important part of the item. I for example, don't have a car and it is difficult for me to have to bike out with a trailer to an area far from where I live to get food for myself, especially if I want to buy local produce or food in bulk to save money.	
I belong and buy this way because I cannot afford what the local stores charge for Items I want, and because Item I want are not carried locally, and because I want nutritional quality too.	
I belong to a CSA which has always used residential pickup sites with good success. This should definitely be allowed.	
I belong to a food buying group. We find our own place to distribute food that does not infringe on traffic or residents. People usually come and go within 15 minutes. The person delivering comes and is done within 45 minutes at the most. This does not have an impact on the area he/she is delivering to.	
I belong to CSA; love our small pick up points; have been in residential, very mellow, slow stream of pick up; have also been in school parking lot after hours.No problems whatsoever.	Just want it to be easy for farmer.
I belong to one about 1 1/2 miles from my house. Since orders are usually heavy for me, I drive. I am at the residential location for only the few minutes it takes to load my order.	No negative impacts. Many positive impacts: easy online buying, quality products, quick loading so neighbor parking and quiet street traffic aren't compromised.
I can't think of a reason it's not a good direction. It seems to me that the more such resources proliferate and the more people become involved, the prohibitive cost to buy the locally grown food may come down so that ordinary people can afford it. This is the way the original food co-ops used to operate.	Doesn't concern me at all. I would strongly encourage putting food back into the people's hands on all levels. What concerns me right now is the upscale character of places like The People's Co-op, which I find to be an ironic name, since only upscale people can afford to shop there.

I currently belong to a group purchasing food directly and wouldn't want this taken away.	The government steps in too frequently and takes away what should be my right...the opportunity to purchase a well researched, higher quality of food, in bulk, at a lower price.
I didn't know that there was any regulation of CSA drop points. I always pick up my CSA share in residential neighborhoods.	
I see no problem with distribution sites in residential and open space areas. Indeed it's happening already, isn't it?	traffic, but the more this becomes popular, the more people could walk to these areas within their own neighborhoods. Again, a call for education to familiarize people with new, more sustainable, ideas.
I think that this direction will increase the number of Food Buying Clubs and I think that's a good thing.	
I think they should be allowed in residential and open spaces	
I think where ever it is most convient for most people to get to and not disturb the flow of heavy traffic should be the best decision. Times for pick up should be during the least busiest hours of traffic whether it's residential or commercial.	
I think you are on the right track, although part of this is unclear. What does "fewer members" mean in this case? If a CSA or food club operated in a residential area without concern from the neighbors, there should be absolutely no problem with the operation, weither they have 50 members, 100, or 300. What matters is how they conduct themselves. How often pick ups are being made and how open they are to working with the neighbors on any concerns or issues. This decision might be different location to location, and should be left to the people effected by the distribution. Would it be possible to have a probationary period? Is there a number that neighbors can call with concerns?	It is important that the food for these club & CSA members be picked up locally. One of the main reasons that people participate in these clubs (for lack of better word) is to ensure less travel, cutting back on the carbon footprint, etc. It is also important to keep in mind that local pick up enables people of all classes/economic situations to join in the benefits by not having to travel far distances to pick up. Many people walk or ride bikes to do these local pick ups. This also shows that the traffic would not necessarily be increased by a large amount simply because there is distribution allowed.
I want the sites to be available close to home. I want them to be both in industry and residential areas. I think for my personal access residential areas make more sense because I will more likely g to them then if I have to drive to one in an industrial area.	Limiting the areas to commercial zones would make it harder for people to access and might cause the CSA's and Clubs to be impossible.
I wouldn't personally participate in a food share that came out of an industrial area, because the idea of fresh food is healthy, not industrial, but the idea of these operating in residential and open space areas is a good one.	
If a person desires to increase their self-sufficiency by having a food buying club out of their home, then it should be somewhat easy to do so, assuming they meet health codes, etc, to ensure fresh foods are safe for consumption after distribution.	My only concern is the frequency that deliveries are made (Ifor example, large loud trucks!, as well as the numbers of volunteers arriving per day to help. I have been a part of a food buying club in a neighborhood, but admit that I felt really sympathized with neighbors who had no idea who I was when i walked into the club owner's back yard. With proper communication and limitations on the numbers of people coming in and out, I think this could work really well
If it's prohibited in residential areas, this will not flourish.	

If they are a big distribute , they should be in commercial sites but if their small and providing enough money to support them selves they should be able to work from home	
If they follow standard renters or owners laws in regards to land or buildings, they should be able to run their business in the same fasion as anyone else.	
I'm a little surprised to see the language "consider allowing" small distribution sites. This seems like a pretty basic thing for people to do, work together to save on food, and I can't imaging it being more disruptive to a neighborhood than, for example, sunday morning church traffic.	Limitations on people and groups acting in the interests of making healthy, affordable food accessible to more families.
I'm a member of the Montavilla Food Buying Club and have been able to get local, organic food at lower rates than the gorcery store. I haven't seen any problems with traffic or anything else. Environmentists say one of the most important things we can do is the buy local and buy organic. We should make this as easy for people as possible. Being a member of this group has had a great positive impact on my life.	not concerned about impacts, am concerned about people's 'inconveniences' interfering with an important community resource
I'm all for CSA's and FBC's. it bring food security health and vibrancy to people and areas. Everyone should be able to organize these when ever they feel the need or opportunity. It <u>builds friendliness in cities.</u>	Regulation. Let us control our own food and buy as we please. we are smart and we need to be free.
Important to allow small buying clubs in residential areas to ensure access to affordable high-quality food for all families. Small clubs can not afford to maintain commercial space. It makes the prospect unaffordable, putting safe, farm-raised foods <u>out of reach if many.</u>	Making it easy for buying clubs to operate. They are an important resource for our community.
Important to family's economics but shouldn't be a negative <u>impact to neighbors</u>	Too many visitors and their cars in a short period of time <u>in residential area.</u>
Include residential and open space.	That a significant minority can hinder my ability to join <u>buying forces with my friends and neighbors.</u>
Isn't this already allowed? There is no reason to limit this nor to define distribution sites used by residential volunteers. Volunteers usually regulate themselves by their own capacity to participate whether location is accessible by truck or storage until buyer can pickup.	My main concern is that government regulation would make it difficult for these types of transactions to occur. There should NOT be any need for permits or licenses to do so. Since this is volunteer based, these arrangements are very sensitive to any cost incurred due to regulation.
It brings healthy activity to a street, healthy foot traffic to a commercial area, and adds value to a neighborhood. I would love to have something like this in my neighborhood.	
it centralizes efforts.	My only concern is around folks who do not have easy transport options. What provisions will be made for people <u>who are differently abled?</u>
It encourages local food production and helps get people out of the clutches of big box retailers.	None that I can think of.

It has been difficult sometimes to get food out to people. Time constraints with people not being able to participate because they can't get to the distribution center at the specified time being one.	Food storage, delivery, parking, access to distribution centers, neighborhood concerns.
it is very important to me that i be able to access buying club drop sites in neighborhoods, as long as parking and traffic issues aren't a major concern. many "drops" take only 10 minutes to complete and shouldn't be unduly restricted. just limiting drops to commercial and light industry will be a burden to many trying to provide affordable, healthy food for their families.	limits on neighborhood drops for food buying clubs
It is wonderful to be able to have access to locally grown food at a reasonable price.	
It minimizes the distance people have to travel to get food.	None.
It works fine, leave it alone!	
It's great to be able to give people more access to quality food.	Please don't limit in residential areas. Think about having deliveries staggered so it isn't too busy all at once.
It's the right thing to do. If the farm has a certain amount of share holders. I would think that is what we should look at.	traffic.
I've supported CSA's for several years. This year I'm growing my own veggies on a vacant lot in South Waterfront. But other's may not have the space, inclination, or ability....so CSA's are a great deal. They wouldn't be a nuisance in residential areas.	Very minor, short term parking.
Like farmer's markets, food buying clubs keep us closer to our food. By keeping local distribution sites in residential areas it reduces the need for people to drive too far, increases participation and often allows for alternative commutes via bike, bus or walking.	None
like smaller distribution sites in residential/open spaces better access for certain constituents	
Limits impacts on residential areas.	Impacts on open space--parks are probably OK, but not natural areas.
lowers transportation needs and encourages connection with local farm industry	
Makes it more accessible to more people.	
Makes it very accessible for everyone.	local markets.
Makes us more creative in the kitchen when we are given something & have to apply ourselves to use it.	The "shares" need to be sliding scale & appropriately portioned to the size household you are feeding. If you create the same box for everybody there will be a lot of waste.
Making food more accessible to people is a good thing.	
Maximize distribution points to reduce driving to distant pickup points.	Make distribution as close to users as possible.
maybe but people get anxious and immediate grow too much or commercial folks get crowded	
Maybe.	
More access to healthier foods means healthier citizens.	
More convenient distribution sites cut down on costs for the farms, while making it easier for members!	

More diversified food distribution = a safer food supply.	
More food would be available to more people.	
More sites means less transportation to get to/from each site.	On the one hand, the potential for "large" distribution in residential zones. On the other, a new Planning/Zoning "process" that requires "approval or permit fees" or that tries to police this policy.
Need to definitely allow distribution sites with fewer buys (regardless of members) and longer pick-up hours to operate in residential and open spaces. This makes more sense than commercial zones where folks will be encouraged to drive. Residential areas means that members can walk with their wagons or bike trailers.	You don't seem to get that the whole idea is to discourage auto use and help us become more self-reliant! That means food sources closer to home!
Need to support local food buying in all ways.	Food safety. Make sure food is left at appropriate temperatures.
Neighborhood nuisances (traffic, noise, pollution, litter.)	
Not every buying club or CSA can find a commercial drop off site	Traffic and noise
Not everyone wants to or can have a garden. Buying clubs and CSAs help people to eat healthy, locally grown foods.	Again, pesticides.
Note: Add institutional lots to be allowed.	Traffic.
OK in existing commercial areas - but not if it spreads to residential areas	negative impacts on quality of life in residential areas
Okay, sure, allow distribution sites in commercial and light industrial zones, but ABSOLUTELY ALSO ALLOW distribution sites in residential areas, houses, vacant lots, etc.	Allow distribution anywhere, and impacts can and will also be distributed.
People should be allowed to decide what they will eat, where they will buy it and involving it in a community effort not only saves us money in this failing economy, it provides good nutrition for our families.	
People should be allowed to purchase food how and from whom they wish. If that entails creating a food club to distribute bulk items to it's members, I feel that should be a protected right. It can only benefit our local farmers and citizens, lessening our need for large corporate giants and unsustainable food.	I am concerned about the recent government raids on food clubs such as this. However, if more and more cities participate in this, it will gain favor by the people of america and hopefully government will have less power to intimidate and shut down small food clubs.
Please allow small distribution sites to operate in residential areas and open spaces.	
Please do not discourage buying clubs. They are empowering. They encourage community. They enable substantial savings that: allows access to high-quality organic food that can be too expensive otherwise; can be redirected toward other living expenses; that can be spent on higher priced items produced by local farmers, instead of mass-produced corporate food.	I am concerned that more value will be placed on out-dated ideas of neighborhoods based on image and appearance. There is a new narrative taking hold regarding local food, local economy and resilient home owners. Any policy that we make should understand and support this change. Neighborhoods are for living complete lives, not just manicured lawns.
Push it further. Allow food membership distribution in residential zones. It's already happening. Why not?	Overly restrictive zoning making these sorts of things impossible or impractical.
Rather than just "consider", instead definitely allow distribution sites to operate in residential and open space areas. It already happens informally with people picking up CSA shares at a neighbors house.	As long as people are respectful with basics such as not parking in front of driveways, there are not any concerns.

Residential - senior housing good idea because of limited mobility.	
Residential area should be allowed.	
same idea as taking shopping list of shut in or elderly neighbor when you make that trip to costco. people need to look out for one another and help as we are able	
seem to be reasonable options to consider, allowing for ease of the programs to operate and be more effective	Traffic again would be a potential concern
Sigh. I really hate that word "allow" in the context of real people getting together to help each other.	The main impact I see with this entire study/commission at the moment is that of controlling, fencing in, suppressing creativity. Dang! Who the heck are you folks?
Small distribution Sites are the life blood of farms not located in the city proper. These should not be prohibited in residential areas. I would think that 25 people would be an appropriate cap for any 1 drop location	Parking in residential areas, no concern elsewhere.
Small groups may have difficulty with the cost of a location in commercial zones	Traffic
Smaller distribution sites should definitely be allowed in residential areas. The further people have to travel to these, the less accessible they are to the families that need them most.	
Solves most complaints from neighbors about traffic and noise for the larger buying clubs.	None
sounds like a good idea BUT ---how do you even hear of these plans, I think some education that these are even available is definately needed .	
support for small farms, support for individuals who would like more control in their food source which will usually lead to less pollution because less food needs to be trucked in and less trips to the grocery store.	that too many regulations will remove the power from the consumer and business owner to operate and buy items they deem safe/appropriate for themselves.
Supporting local farms and being able to feed my family what I believe to be the healthiest food!!!	Not being able to participate in a buying club!
Supports direct-to-table agriculture	traffic/parking
The distribution of CSA shares and Buyer's Club portions is critical to the existence of these entities, and should not be restricted unless as long as increased traffic is of limited duration and not grossly out of character with the neighborhood. Generous guidelines should exist for traffic in residential neighborhoods, and organizers should work hard to keep their traffic well under these benchmarks.	Food buyers clubs are the wave of the future here in outer southeast Portland. Making it easier for people to engage with their neighbors to reduce the cost of food only makes sense.
The easier to access local food the better! Plus, allowing distribution sites in residential areas would enhance a sense of community.	That people picking up deliveries would potentially leave garbage or compost that came out of the share. (i.e. leaving carrot tops).
The farmers market at Kaiser Interstate is an example of how bringing the produce to people, and connecting suppliers directly to consumers, can open up so many healthy possibilities. Making sure that CSAs can operate where people are naturally congregating makes a lot of sense, especially in neighborhoods with few options for affordable fresh produce.	It's great to promote biking, walking, carpooling and public transportation to CSA sites to cut down on traffic, and to encourage CSA distribution points at sites where active transportation is easiest. I'd also like to see the city and county subsidize or facilitate economic access - publicizing and ensuring WIC or SNAP benefits for CSA food, and making sure shares are affordable for low-income people and families.

The impact is so minimal. Allow it!	none
The more accessible (available, affordable) food can be, the better it is for everyone.	Possible disruption of traffic in residential neighborhoods. Intermittent drop-off of goods should not be a problem.
The more accessible the location, the more likely people will be to join a CSA or food buying club. It makes sense to keep the big warehouses in areas that are conducive to such, but smaller distribution centers should be present in neighborhoods, especially lower income ones.	I think it's important to keep the neighborhood distribution centers near main arterials so they don't interrupt the character or residential quietness so much that they become destructive to, or problematic within a neighborhood.
There should be NO reason why people cant have CSA or buying club drop points at their own house. It would be absurd to try to regulate such a thing. We each have the right to have fresh food delivered in our neighborhoods and at our homes. Look at the all the stuff people buy and have delivered from on line stores, that isnt being "regulated".	
These clubs are not intrusive and do not compete directly with other produce vendors.	
These seem like good options for local growers to improve their margins and make their operations more viable.	
These uses should absolutely be allowed in residential areas, to provide easy access to residents.	
This empowers consumers and reduces artificial constraints placed on market demands for local, organic food - constraints that benefit large producers, not the consumer.	Assuring that there is adequate oversight to protect consumers and that the distribution in residential areas have clearly defined conditions to protect neighborhood livability.
This is absolutely the right direction, and at little cost overall to the city.	
This is one of the only ways families can gain access to fresh food and socially responsibly raised meat without buying an entire animal or large part of one, it's very important. Changing the codes will make it legal to do what is already being done, and would open up this kind of market to many new and/or struggling farmers/ranchers.	
This is somewhat the right direction, however, small and mid-size food clubs should not be forced to use commercial or industrial spaces for their activities, since the cost of using and maintaining these spaces is highly prohibitive. These clubs often operate by the sweat of their volunteers alone, and do not have resources for renting or buying commercial space.	
This would help people get more access to local food. As a member of a co-op myself, we sometimes have difficulty with drop-off points.	none.
Though, allowing distribution sites with fewer members should not be restricted as to prevent their creation. As long as the group doing it is mindful of the neighbors and has pick-up hours that don't interfere with the neighborhood, it shouldn't be a problem.	
traffic and neighborhood disruption	
Using the CSA model helps increase access to healthy food for low-income families.	

<p>We belong to both a csa and a food buying club. Our buying club is organized to minimize member trips to the central pickup point as much as possible. Both organizations are key to the way our family eats, giving us access to lots and lots of veggies and high-nutrition foods that we can afford. The food buying club especially has also been a community-maker for us, and a way to learn skills related to gardening, canning, etc.</p>	<p>I know there were issues with a specific person's club. I think this is the exception not the rule, and that there may have been communication issues with this individual. I'd really hope that this one instance doesn't drive policy, because I think it's the exception not the rule.</p>
<p>We had a distribution site on my neighbor's porch 2 years ago and that worked great--its actually less traffic. One truck arrived with 10 CSA shares and 9/10 were picked up by folks walking locally. This is better than all 10 of us driving out to a large parking lot somewhere. It could be part of the regulation that neighborhood drop sites must have at least 50 or 75 or 90% of members within walking distance (bikers may not choose to bike in rain)</p>	<p>traffic</p>
<p>We need multiple options to pick up the local/buying club food that we purchase. I pick up my farm share on the porch of a church; if I didn't have this option I'd be trying to take it home on the bus. The outcome of this limited choice is that I wouldn't get the share, and it is very valuable.</p>	<p>Loss of availability for the small farmer to produce and the small consumer to be able to partner with them.</p>
<p>We need these pickup locations to be accessible to the neighborhood. - There should be no restrictions unless the neighborhood complains.</p>	<p>No restrictions are necessary</p>
<p>We participate in a csa that distributes out of a members home. It works well as far as I am concerned.</p>	
<p>We rely heavily on CSA and FBC groups for our local food. I can't imagine getting along without them. They should certainly be allowed to continue to thrive and grow.</p>	<p>Again, the fear is any codes developed would try to place universal rules on small groups that should be able to make unique decisions based on a very localized need.</p>
<p>We should create more opportunities for people living in the city to have access to healthy food, and provide small family farms and CSA's more access to the public.</p>	<p>Don't regulate it too much! This will make it harder for the farmers to have access to the buying public.</p>
<p>We should have the LEAST regulation possible in the way of the flow of food to the people of the city. Food safety in commercial settings is appropriate. Otherwise we should encourage the sharing of the most basic requirements of life.</p>	<p>I think we need to get this done FAST. If there is any interruption in the corporate food-provision system, we need alternatives, which can be ramped up, to already be in place.</p>
<p>What's the big deal? CSA's make people happy!</p>	
<p>Why do we need restrictions on this?</p>	<p>Traffic should not impede business.</p>
<p>why not?</p>	
<p>why shouldn't they be allowed? are they currently not allowed? there is business involved, but it seems like it should be like any other club or civic organization</p>	<p>I would be concerned if having distribution / CSA pick-up sites were not allowed in any one of those areas! It should be allowed anywhere!</p>
<p>Without access to 2 food buying clubs and a CSA, my family--BELOW the poverty level--could NOT afford fresh produce or healthy meat for our children. LITERALLY. My CSAs/food clubs are SMALL, I NEVER see other members when I pick up the food, and my family's well-being/health is improved immeasurably.</p>	<p>The grapevine tells me the issue here was complaints about Rebecca Andersson's enterprise, which was/is the largest thing of its kind, and yes, had an AWFUL impact on her n'hood. Ours, however, are TEENSY in comparison. PLEASE PLEASE do not prohibit us from helping our families, based on the problems with hers.</p>

<p>Yes and no depending. I have been a CSA member in Oregon as well as CA and needed the residential distribution site in order to get my produce. Had the distribution site not been allowed, I would have not been able to participate in buying local produce. It depends on the amount of members you are talking about as well. It would be best to talk to the local CSA and their residential distribution sites to see how many members pick-up food there and if there have ever been any complaints.</p>	<p>residential distribution sites will be discontinued and many people will be left with no means of easily buying local produce or they will have to drive farther to get their shares and that will have an even greater negative affect on pollution, traffic, etc.</p>
<p>Yes, and we NEED to allow distributions to happen in residential and open spaces, too. Anything that can be done to ease the amount of burden on the tiny market gardener/CSA grower is an important effort. It's not easy or very lucrative to being tiny-scale urban farmer, but it's important to be doing. The act of growing food on a small scale growing ultra locally to feed people very close by should be supported. Let's find ways to mitigate any impacts while still allowing this to occur. We also need this kind of activity in our residential neighborhoods. Humans interacting, and participating in community... it's too bad some people feel this is a "burden" in a neighborhood environment. In harder times, even folks who feel that way will be happy they can pick up locally grown food in their own neighborhood.</p>	
<p>Yes, churches, medical centers, apartment complexes, private homes, should all be included.</p>	
<p>Yes, IF CSA's are still allowed to deliver to individual homes and IF small distribution sites are that will continue to operate in residential neighborhoods are not made to be unreasonably small</p>	<p>Will the big corporations that run most business where people can buy food and other staples be catered to instead of the benefit to the community that CSA's and FBC's offer?</p>
<p>you dont want to get into setting a definition for the "small" site. so let the customers regulate that. more customers will demand bigger spaces and thus force business to move to keep growing or loose business.</p>	<p>Please do not limit the distribution of fresh produce/fruit within residential areas (drop sites). First reason, this allows people to participate who might not have the time or want to spend gas driving to a farm, so many people are being green and riding bikes and walking to drop sites. Also this opens up the opportunity for people to buy healthy food, support local growers, and meet the neighbors. These drop sites are usually weekly and thus the added traffic is minimal at best since drop sites operate at a certain time and for only for a few hours. These sites also allow people the chance to 'chat" with local residents about various civic activities affecting their way of life. This would be a great spot for local government officials to meet people who are affected by possible legislation. :) This is only for farm food and does not consider processes long life/canned foods only distribution. Since the farm food is perishable and long life food can be picked up at later dates.</p>
	<p>access and availability to these services</p>
	<p>Again, I am most concerned about introduction of GMO's and toxic pesticides/herbicides.</p>

	Again, traffic etc. in residential neighborhoods.
	Csas and clubs need to be bike accessible - crossing or riding Columbia or 82nd on a bike is too dangerous
	Distributing the goods in a timely manner
	I am concerned that allowing food membership distribution sites in commercial zones will require all small distribution sites to be only in commercial locations. Revising the code to include allowance of both residential and commercial locations would be of greater good to the communities they serve.
	I am more concerned that it not be allowed.
	I am very concerned about any limitations with either type of distributions. Families need easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors together.
	I believe food membership distribution should be allowed in all types of areas and neighborhoods as long as it doesn't cause harm to anyone.
	I support allowing distribution sites in residential and open space areas- lots of potential for senior centers and senior residential facilities.
	I think it is a very good idea to allow small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas, and I wonder what the number of members might be. I would encourage folks at the Bureau of Planning to survey existing food distribution sites to assess what an appropriate number would be. I think setting this number too low could negatively impact csas and buying clubs providing a valuable service to the community by increasing food access. It can be difficult and cost-prohibitive for csas or buying clubs to find distribution sites in commercial or industrial zones, and easier to find distribution sites in residential zones, particularly at churches, and member's homes.
	i worry about CSA's in particular being over-regulated. why would a drop off site where 10 families meet up to pickup food be a zoning issue? too nit-picky
	I'm concerned CSA farms will struggle to find appropriate distribution locations if residential options are taken away.
	It getting out of hand and too many
	Large amounts of cheap, shelf stable food could reduce the amount of fresh and healthy foods people should be eating.
	Large trucks doing drop-offs at coops in small residential streets
	Maintain residential pick up locations.

	my only concern is that CSA distribution in residential areas would be limited. it seems like most CSA drop-off points already have limited memberships. restricting these types of activities could limit the ability of members to get their shares. i think residential areas are exactly the right place for many CSA dropoffs. also, on a different note, i can see how some people might see this restriction as government interfering with the rights of people to assemble. wow, i can't believe i just said that. i mean really. anyway, it's not a big deal, and i don't think it's really an issue, but i can certainly imagine people framing it as one. okay, maybe i should just delete this. hmmm.
	None
	none
	None
	none
	None
	none
	none
	None
	None, based on the experiences I have had personally.
	only high traffic in residential areas that aren't designed for it
	Perhaps BDS should not regulate small distribution sites where 10-15 CSA members pick up their weekly food shares. Please explain what thinks you can regulate this?
	There should be fewer restrictions on clubs comprised of local residents (walking distance.)
	This is a great cooperative economic model for our city.
	This needs to be somewhat regulated to protect against abuse and ensure public safety.
	toxic soil concerns me. I love that people are growing food and raising animals in our neighborhoods- I wouldn't want food raised in bad soil
	traffic
	Traffic. But I'd like to see these types of operations allowed as much freedom as possible.
	unknown
	want to have fresh produce options that support local farms at reasonable prices in my neighborhood that are not supermarkets. Picking up fresh produce at CSA brings neighbors together.
	why it is not allowed to have small distribution sites in residential areas
	Would love to see more focus on fresh foods/veggies. I wish every 7-11 was a veggy stand, instead of the junk food emporiums they are.

<p>TOPIC AREA 4: FOOD MEMBERSHIP DISTRIBUTION SITES</p>	
<p>Question 10: Direction: Allow food membership distribution sites in commercial zones and areas where light industry is allowed. Consider allowing small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "NO"</p>	<p>Question 11: What types of impacts concern you the most?</p>
<p>"residential and open space" can be too loosely used.</p>	<p>same as above.</p>
<p>Again too much regulation. I want to be able to get a group together to buy locally - when and where I need to</p>	
<p>Again, I don't think this needs to be regulated!</p>	<p>None!</p>
<p>Again, not allowing a land owner the right to produce food on their own land is ridiculous, I am fine with allowing use of light industrial sites so long as soil and water samples are taken to insure no contamination that could be harmful is present.</p>	
<p>Again, the question's language feels tricky. Would this "direction" be restricting some places and allowing others? What is allowed now? Portland should let people pick up CSAs and food anywhere they want, ie everywhere.</p>	
<p>Again, this is an issue of *traffic,* specifically car traffic. If you would like to address that issue, then the planning and zoning department should address traffic. An increase in automobile traffic results in any human activity, because you have planned our city in such a way that we must drive cars to get anywhere.</p>	<p>None. I welcome CSA's and food buying club distribution points in my neighborhood. I welcome a diversity of use. I welcome economic activity. I welcome the Do-It-Yourself ethos of CSA's and food buying clubs. I welcome food security. I welcome running into people from my neighborhood on the street, as they are on their way too and from the store, work, dining out, going to a show, and, yes, going to their food pick up distribution point.</p>
<p>Again, why restrict the location. This adds costs and depersonalizes the process. If a neighbor were to be inconvenienced maybe a solution can be found for that neighbor that doesn't involve limiting choices for the CSA members.</p>	
<p>again....more,more,more</p>	<p>restrictions</p>
<p>All sorts of products are delivered to residential areas via truck (and other vehicles) every day. Why should CSAs or food buying clubs be treated differently? Why should I be able to receive a FedEx or UPS package by truck but not a CSA delivery? This would be discriminatory.</p>	<p>I am concerned about the impact further restriction would have on small food buying clubs that help stimulate our local economy, absolutely vital during the depressed economic climate of our nation right now.</p>
<p>Allow all food memberships to operate out of residential.</p>	
<p>allow at residential...i know of 10 csas that distribute from homes</p>	
<p>Allow distribution sites in residential zones based on traffic impacts (e.g. # of automobiles per hour) rather than absolute membership size.</p>	<p>Excessive automobile use, rather than total number of members or number of pickups.</p>

Allow food buying clubs in all residential spaces and open spaces.	People need to be able to get wholesome food through these buying clubs. Limiting their access will keep a lot of people from participating. Our food system here, in Portland, has been moving in a wonderful direction, with all the buying clubs supporting local farmers. Please don't stifle this progress by shutting down the buying clubs
Allow food distribution in all areas of Portland so long as it isn't a detriment to the neighborhood in which it operates.	Limiting access to food is not a good thing.
allow freely	the regulations.
ALLOW PEOPLE TO HAVE ACCESS TO FOOD PERIOD.. why is this an issue?	same same same :)
Allow these food sources to function unhindered in residential areas. Many of us do not want to be forced to shop in corporate environments.	
Allowing CSA and buying club delivery sites in all zones would promote healthy eating, and allow convenient pick-up locations for Portland residents. Delivery using semi-trucks in residential neighborhoods could be discouraged through code.	Traffic would be the primary concern. Enforcement of existing code would adequately address most of these concerns.
Allowing it in residential zones it should not be regulated.	
Although, Most food buying clubs have many members who sign up, but only small groupings purchase. Also, most coops start with buying clubs. I honestly would like to see many more efforts of buying clubs in each neighborhood area.	Same as previous
Any limitation to distribution sites would make it less convenient for people to get fresh local produce. I am proud to live in a city that supports CSAs and Clubs.	Sustainability is a big part of our local culture. Limits to distribution sites would hurt farms, farm members, and neighborhood livability.
As a CSA operation, delivering to 12 different different pick up site locations throughout the Portland Area, most of them in residential neighborhoods, this is one of the most important aspects of CSA- the ability for our members to pick up in their neighborhood, most often within walking distance from their home or work. Most of our members have said the number one reason for joining a CSA is the option of having their food delivered and picked up close to their homes, in their neighborhoods. This is what the community members want. It would always be easier on the farmer to have their members pick up on the farm or garden site, but that's not what the customer wants. They want their locally grown food delivered to their neighbors house.	If this restriction was put in place, CSA membership would decrease significantly, and it would hurt the farmers, the local economy, and the health of our community members.

<p>As a member of a food buying club, I think It is VERY important to expressly allow appropriately-sized CSAs and food buying clubs to have drop-off/pick-up locations in residential and open space areas. Smaller clubs and CSAs, or those that split their activities between several locations have minimal negative impacts on neighborhoods, but do provide a number of benefits. Benefits include increasing social connectivity and community involvement within neighborhoods, supporting the local economy by establishing direct ties between specific urban communities and regional farms and producers, and giving people access to high-quality and local foods at affordable prices in their own neighborhoods. I am also a "market gardener" with two small CSA programs, and believe that it is important for urban farms to have flexible distribution options. I have worked on a number of urban farm sites in the city that have access restrictions and would not be appropriate pick-up sites. This is true of the land that we are farming now, so we both deliver some of our CSA shares individually and also have a small (15</p>	
<p>because many CSAs currently distribute from members homes in residential neighborhoods and to force these CSAs to find other distribution points would perhaps limit their distribution abilities</p>	
<p>Because most food buying clubs would die IMMEDIATELY if you forced them to rent a space in an industrial or commercial zone! They don't run at a profit, they run at NOTHING GAINED. They are not a business. The non-business structure is size-self-regulating, because once a club gets too large the drop-offs and pick-ups become too much for one person to handle at one home. The club is forced to break into smaller parts or divide drops between several people's homes.</p>	
<p>Because the restriction works easy convenient access to local food closer to the point of home/food preparation.</p>	<p>Any restrictions that serve to put distance between the consumer and the local farmer.</p>
<p>Both of these activities are commercial in nature. Pick-ups are made by purchasers. Pick-ups in residential areas are bound to cause traffic and parking impacts on local streets, which goes against the peaceful enjoyment of one's residence. Private residences are not set up to provide refrigeration for produce, bathroom facilities for customers, or meet accessibility standards. There are plenty of public and private venues suitable for pick-ups. Why put them in residential neighborhoods, when the # of pick-ups is so variable. There is no way to predict what "small" is?</p>	<p>Does the city of Portland need to create local area public markets? This is where farmer's market, CSA's, and buying clubs belong. Historically, this is what cities had. Lots of empty real estate now, why not get developers engaged with creating mini-markets. Pick a major city--Boston, Baltimore, Charleston, Washington DC--all have produce markets.</p>

<p>Buy clubs are mostly low-income, volunteer organizations and lack the ability to operate commercial areas. A few people have tried to create "fake clubs" that were really businesses, and these should be relocated. Many buy clubs are ten or fewer households and cannot afford rent.</p>	<p>Impact seems based on NUMBER OF PICKUPS and FREQUENCY. A blanket policy that treats a monthly drop for five families the same as twice-weekly drops for fifty is illogical. Perhaps allow weekly pick-ups for up to X families for no more than Y hours at a time, if limits must be established. This would NOT hurt smaller clubs and CSA's while protecting against abuses and semi-businesses (that belong in commercial or light-industrial areas).</p>
<p>Buying clubs and CSAs provide people with *direct* access to producers of food. This concept should be ENCOURAGED through flexible or no rules. Grassroots solutions should be implemented *if* a site has a problem solved at the neighborhood level. The city should *not* be involved when it comes to neighbors buying food together.</p>	<p>Not having access to local food. Not being able to build, foster, and develop relationships with the people who produce the food I eat. Not building a solid food secure region. Limiting access will *limit access*. This is NOT the stated direction of any plans that would encourage WALKABLE access to food and distributors.</p>
<p>Buying clubs and distribution points in residential areas is the best possible case of allowing a local food movement to take place. Neighborhoods get to know their farmer and know and trust the food. Building these relationships by moving the drop sites to a light industrial would be hampered by expensive property rents and impossible pickup and delivery routines.</p>	
<p>Buying clubs in residential areas are very important for providing access to local, healthy food. Buying clubs in residential neighborhoods should *definitely* continue to be a part of our urban landscape.</p>	
<p>Buying clubs play a critical role in ensuring healthy, cost-effective food gets distributed to local families. They also provide the convenience of local drops, since not everyone has access to quality grocery stores or other sources. The impact is negligible since the activity is infrequent and volume is low--they are not grocery stores. These CSAs and clubs should be allowed anywhere, as long as they are collaborative or volunteer efforts, and not commercial. For-profit, commercial efforts would be different. These CSA and food buying club efforts are good for families and for local farmers.</p>	<p>When you say "allow small distribution", what do you mean? See comments above on why all non-commercial groups should be allowed.</p>
<p>Buying clubs should be allowed in residential areas as long as it doesn't disrupt neighbors</p>	
<p>Buying clubs usually happen out of peoples garages - it is volunteering and not possible for people to sit in some commercial warehouse waiting for drops and pickups. Also the NUMBER of MEMBERS does not signify the potential parking disruption - you can have alot of members but only a few households taking part in any particular event. Making this zoning change based on ONE problem on the books seems overkill. Leave things as they are.</p>	<p>i can see no problems with these</p>

<p>Buying clubs, csa's, etc need to be in neighborhoods where neighbors get together to share the bounty of local farmers and the ability to save money by buying in quantity. In today's economy this is even more necessary. If it has to be in a light industrial zone, the cost of a site will make the savings disappear and is not feasible for pick-up for some families. Having neighbors who work together creates strong neighborhoods and a healthy state and city. We keep talking about how we as a society want to have better choices for food and this is one of the easiest ways for families to achieve this in an economical manner. We need options that work for all kinds of families (single parent, young, old, multi-generational, and everyone in-between). Oregon touts itself as wanting us to be green and local and this is a marvelous way to have this happen. There also needs to be allowance of trucks for delivery. All the trucks that I have seen delivering are quieter than the furniture, UPS, and other vehicles used in residential neighborhoods. Most of these companies use bio-fu</p>	<p>Ways to mitigate the concerns of some with pick-up is to have sites use only parking allocated to their home (in front, side yard and driveway), neighbors who give permission for parking (same as above), stagger pick-up times so that only 3-4 come at a time (just like if you have family and friends visiting), consolidating pick-up of multiple orders to 1 day a week with the exception of perishable items, allow for pick up until 8 pm for families with conflicting work schedules, and not make it so difficult that when life happens that there are no exceptions whatsoever(ie, need to pick up next day because of sick child or being out of town on pick up day for work, vacation).</p>
<p>Consider allowing in all areas, subject ot evaluation of imp0act (see below)</p>	<p>Traffic (particularly parking), noise, hours.</p>
<p>CSA distribution sites should be allowed in residential and open space areas. Many of these operate today with no problems with traffic, parking, or other conflicts. Holding CSA distribution sites in neighborhoods improves urban quality of life by giving Portland residents access to farm-fresh food within walking or biking distance from their homes. Moving all CSAs to commercial and industrial zones would significantly limit access for many people. If parking and traffic in residential areas are a concern, the city should develop a process for dealing with these issues as they arise.</p>	
<p>CSA drop off points should be permitted in residential neighborhoods, the communities that they serve. Ours is directly across from our house (2909 SE Main) and I've never had the sense that it's presence there was doing any actual harm to anyone.</p>	<p>Having another node in my connection to the food that I eat removed.</p>
<p>CSA drop off sites in residential areas provide an important community building function allowing neighbors to get to know one another and learn more about CSAs. these should not be relegated to commercial areas. In addition, fresh local food should be easily accessible, via walking, biking and mass transit. Alternatives to mass production of food in supermarkets should be made more obtainable, not pushed out of residential areas.</p>	<p>Loss of community, access to fresh and local food, diminished opportunities for others to learn about CSAs and food buying clubs</p>
<p>CSA drops should be allowed in all areas, as is currently the case. CSA drops do not disrupt residential neighborhoods, and benefit residents of that community by lowering the need for vehicle trips to other parts of town.</p>	<p>Governmental over-regulation impeding access to the food supply.</p>

CSA pick up sites have very little impact on the surrounding community and don't need to be limited by zone & should be allowed in all zones	
CSA pickups are a place for community members with a common interest in fresh local healthy food to gather. People should be allowed to freely assemble per the First Amendment. What's next, the regulation of needlepoint clubs?	Needless bureaucracy where it isn't needed.
CSA shares and food buying clubs should be located in areas that the members live. If members had to travel out of their neighborhood they would be less willing to participate. Making healthy, affordable food available in every neighborhood should be encouraged whenever possible. Housing a CSA pick up in a garage, yard, or business is a great way to encourage community and health, while ensuring that small farms are able to stay in business.	Limiting the areas available to CSA shares and food buying programs also limits the people who would otherwise participate in them. Allowing pick up locations in residential areas is essential for the continuation of CSAs. If my CSA wasn't in my neighborhood, I wouldn't be a member!
CSA's and buying clubs should be allowed to operate in residential areas	closer to the people that eat the food, less travel for food and farmers. Better access for seniors, alter-abled and folks without a car.
CSA's and Food Buying Clubs are critical to many families and will be even more so as people learn to use them as a resource. MUCH of their appeal lies in the neighborhood factor-close by, shared community, group buying/planning.	Limiting these very grassroots paths to food access will leave more people eating what they do not necessarily want to eat, but what is available. This is often not a good thing, especially in areas with limited market access.
CSAs and Food Buying Clubs don't have high enough memberships to have a significant impact on location traffic. Also, picking CSA and Food Buying Club food at residential locations allows more people to access the food. Often times food can be picked up from a home in my neighborhood, without traveling to a commercial or light industrial zone.	One person complaining about something that is not a problem to the rest of the city and having policy developed to benefit that one person and discourage others.
CSAs and food buying clubs should not be prohibited anywhere. Both rely heavily on residential distribution - particularly in the early days of a CSA or club. Both of these build strong communities and belong in residential neighborhoods and offer an alternative healthy food source.	If you must regulate the distribution sites, please make sure that you write it in such a way that isn't based upon total membership. Many of these clubs have lots of members but only a handful (literally) drop by on any one afternoon for a pickup.
CSAs and Food Clubs are frequented by people in neighborhoods. Many pick-ups are done on foot or on bicycles. Requiring them to locate in light industrial areas will increase traffic, and reduce safety. I live in Laurelhurst and the CSA pick-up in our area does not negatively affect the neighborhood.	Bicycle and pedestrian safety and miles driven.
CSAs are COMMUNITY agriculture meaning that people in the community should be able to volunteer their homes as pickup sites. I have belonged to a CSA for nearly 20 years and being able to collect my share in a neighbor's garage in my neighborhood is key. I can bike or walk there and it is true community.	That CSA pickup would be limited to commercial zones. This is wrong. It takes away the community and personal relationship aspect that members desire and forces me to navigate into heavier traffic, perhaps then rely on my car instead of bike due to safety concerns regarding bikes in heavily trafficked areas. Also, commercial spaces will not want to give up profit-making space to an outsider group for CSA distribution.

CSA's may have a lots of memebers but that doesn't mean all the members are buying each opportunity. We have a CSA in our neighborhood and it is quiet and never have I seen more than 2 members at a pick up at once. Limiting CSA's will hurt local farmers and our ability to secure safe and sustainable foods for our community.	I am concerned that CSA's will be moved from individual's homes and thus raising prices and could shut these communities down. It takes a lot to organize a share at a home much less have a commercial site. That hurts our local farmers and community memebers.
CSA's need to be able to pick convenient, low or no cost distribution sites to encourage membership.	I'll have to drive further to the distribution site, burning more fuel, and pay more to cover commercial or industrial zone space rental.
CSAs should go wherever they want. FBCs too.	Please don't limit these opportunities.
DEFINITELY allow broad residential and open space sites. Thinking about limitations is the wrong direction.	We need easy access to CSA's and buying clubs so that good food is affordable. The farmers need us, and we need the bulk pricing. And the community vibe is priceless.
Depends on your definition of "small" distribution sites. Need to be big enough for the business to be successful without negatively impacting purely residential areas.	I am concerned that too many limitations will put some CSA's out of business or make it more difficult for them to be successful. We all need them to be successful!!
Distribution should be allowed ANYWHERE including on private residential property. This proposed direction in absurd. Is this Arizona or Oregon?	Business owners' concerns over liability insurance will make finding commercially zoned pick-up spots near to impossible to find. There is a movement to move back to simpler times where communities work together and have a tangible connection to our food sources. Why on earth is the city trying to hamstring such progress. What a disappointment to find out the city is wasting resources on developing such backward thinking regulations.
Distribution sites have very, very limited impact on the surrounding community. Allow distribution sites in all zoned areas, including residential and open space areas.	none.
Distribution sites should be allowed everywhere. They lessen the overall impact of driving and allow people to have their needs met within their own neighborhoods. Members often carpool, stagger pickup times, ride bikes, etc. and do not have to drive out of their neighborhood to get what they need.	I am concerned that distribution sites will be restricted and citizens will need to spend more time in their cars, driving out of their immediate neighborhoods to purchase food.
Distribution sites should be allowed to operate in residential and open space areas. The "size" of a CSA/Buying Club is variable - all members do not participate in every purchase, and not all members arrive at the same time to pick up their orders, so there is usually little impact on the neighborhood. Restricting pick-up sites to commercial areas will greatly diminish members' ability to support our local farms and businesses as well as the ability to access high quality food at an affordable price.	I am concerned that the ability of CSA and Food Buying Club members to continue connecting neighbors, supporting local businesses & farms, and securing quality food at affordable prices will be threatened by this change to our Urban Food Zoning Code.
Do not limit CSAs to commercial & industrial only, they should be allowed everywhere.	
Do not limit in residential areas.	Do not limit residential areas - many churches, etc. distribute food there!

Do not restrict food clubs or CSAs in any way. Allow them to continue operating out of residential spaces. Restricting them to commercial and industrial zoning will defeat the purpose of CSAs and food clubs.	None. I am more concerned with undue restrictions on these community building activities.
Don't like commercial involvement such as wholesalers	Loss of people to people sales
Don't limit this to commercial and light industrial sites. Residential sites are critical for these programs to be accessible by all. the number of members in a group is not necessarily correlated to how busy/how much traffic the site gets.	Too much regulation. Also, regulating this would be a poor use of resources. It's just people buying food!
Don't make assumptions about distribution systems, only components. See locallygrown.net and note its rapid, wide adoption. Also see localfoodcoop.org .	
Don't restrict residential area	
Don't restrict small distribution sites. People have been doing buying clubs forever, is it really a big issue, or are you trying to legislate where there is no problem?? Leave them alone. Let them distribute what they've purchased. And kill the restriction on the "semi-truck" deliveries. If a semi-can make it down the street safely, and can find an adequate place to park and unload, it should be allowed. That should be up to the semi-truck driver to decide if the neighborhood is appropriate for his truck.	The loss of the ability to form buyers clubs in residential areas. That kind of defeats much of the purpose.
Don't think this is something that needs to be regulated by the City. Too minor an issue to need to be restricted.	Restrictions on small distributions sites that ends up disallowing their use and making it harder for buying clubs to operate.
fewer members? I thought we wanted to encourage the growth of CSA's	
Food buying clubs & CSAs should be allowed to have residential and open space drops, as well as drops in commercial zones & light industry areas.	
Food buying clubs allow families access to quality foods at very affordable prices. Access to these clubs should not be limited! Most of these clubs are strictly volunteer efforts. Restricting their activities to commercial or light industrial areas would cost a lot of money. It would defeat the whole purpose of the clubs which is to buy farmer direct at affordable prices. This move would spell disaster for my family, other families, and several local farmers. Restrictions on food buying clubs and CSAs is a step backwards, away from food security for individual families and the community at large. There are dozens of food buying clubs in Portland and only one has generated neighbor complaints. That situation has been remedied and other clubs have learned from it. Most clubs work very hard to ensure efficient distribution that minimizes club impact on neighbors. Clubs are behaving responsibly and should not be penalized for quietly providing services to their fellow members.	My only concern is the possible disruption of these vital supply lines of healthy affordable food by this proposed regulation.

<p>Food buying clubs and csa deliveries should be allowed in residential areas and sites like church parking lots. This kind of grassroots cooperation makes neighborhoods more cohesive, secure, and safe.</p>	
<p>Food buying clubs and CSA's are successful in large part because they operate out of residential areas. Restricting them to commercial zones will cause undue costs to the clubs and CSA's. I say this is not the right direction because the direction only states to "consider" allowing "small" distribution sites, but without any definition of small.</p>	<p>I am concerned that undue regulations will interfere with the operation of CSA's and food buying clubs.</p>
<p>Food buying clubs are an asset to any neighborhood and no efforts should be made to restrict them. As a member of one myself for the past two years I can say that it's rare that I ever meet another club member at a pickup and I have never noticed any impact whatsoever on neighborhood traffic or parking. What possible need could there be for the city to get involved? Worry about drug dealers and prostitutes on our streets, not neighbors buying produce together.</p>	<p>I can't even believe the city has time for things like worrying about buying clubs. The city does not seem to be concerned that thousands of Portland citizens live in food deserts, without convenient access to affordable healthy food. Friends and neighbors have come together to fill a need that has been ignored by both city government and private business--these groups should be recognized and lauded as models of neighborhood problem solving rather than made subject to pointless regulation. Quite simply, there is no problem here.</p>
<p>Food Buying Clubs are appropriate for residential areas as they are then accessible without long drives. The trend to larger regional shopping markets tends to require transportation. Of course these stores would want to limit residential access to FBCs.</p>	<p>The size of a club is not an indication of its ability to manage traffic during delivery. Enough regulations now exist to control traffic without new restrictions on FBCs.</p>
<p>food buying clubs are like loosely formed volunteer groups, circles of neighbors and friends. regulating these clubs will impact access of community members to affordable fresh foods that might only be accessible financially through this format</p>	<p>over regulation will result in reducing access by people who most need the access</p>
<p>Food buying clubs are vital to the change in food direction in this country. Portland is a leader in this area. Take away citizen's choice to host a food drop in her home infringes upon her and her friends' rights to accessing local, healthy, untreated food, no matter how large the group gets. Restrict pick-up hours, but not distribution sites. Encourage bike pick-ups, shared pick-ups. Limiting sites to non-residential is the wrong direction.</p>	<p>The impact that concerns me most is access to good food were this zoning regulation to be enacted. I pick up my food from a distribution site. Our group works hard to minimize impact. Help us to do that, don't stop us from getting our food. None of these neighborhood FBC's can afford to move to a commercial location. This regulation would essentially shut down FBC's and move us all back to the giant grocery store. Definite wrong direction. Lead the way, Portland. Don't stop a good thing.</p>
<p>Food Buying Clubs do not increase traffic much at all. Most are small, with members who are conscientious of neighbors and traffic. Limiting them limit's people's ability to access food that is healthy.</p>	
<p>Food Buying Clubs don't need to be regulated by having an "appropriate" number of members determined for them because they are already self-regulating naturally.</p>	<p>regulations that would destroy the food buying clubs because a certain number of members has to be adhered to.</p>

<p>Food Buying clubs should be allowed anywhere, and to operate in residential neighborhoods as long as there are no complaints about traffic. You shouldn't take away people's ability to choose the food that they want, and their ability to pick up said food.</p>	<p>People not being able to access food/food buying clubs not being able to afford the rent in commercial zones, and having to shut down.</p>
<p>food buying clubs should be allowed in residential areas and not be limited to commercial zones, since this will severely restrict their potential to serve families in need.</p>	<p>forcing clubs to abide by "Home Occupation" rules, as was done to Know Thy Food, is unworkable. the club was forced to become a commercial venture by renting space in a commercial building and paying rent. part of the savings that could have been passed on to member families now goes to enrich a landlord instead. the City ought not to be able to dictate how friends choose to pool their resources and buy food for their families. this should be a free unrestricted activity</p>
<p>Food buying clubs should be allowed in residential areas. They don't create a lot of traffic as they have various pick up windows and people don't park long. Neighbors won't be bothered.</p>	<p>limiting these clubs or options for these clubs to be able to operate</p>
<p>Food buying clubs should be allowed to distribute from residential areas, unless there are complaints or problems with traffic. Most food buying clubs that have large numbers of members only have small numbers picking up food at any given time. It is very different than a commercial enterprise.</p>	
<p>Food Buying Clubs with larger memberships work well in residential areas too as not all members participate in each buy.</p>	<p>Let's not restrict Food Buying clubs. They help build stronger communities and offer real options for lower income families struggling to provide nutrient dense wholesome foods to their families.</p>
<p>Food buying clubs, in particular, are a good resource of "affordable" food when compared to farmers' markets. And they're good community-building activities. I can see limiting pick up of food to certain hours, or perhaps # of households actually ordering, but strongly disagree with restrictions based on # of household members. You can have 300 members and only 10 that order regularly - why limit those clubs to commercial areas? Doesn't make sense. And again, we want to encourage short walks to food supplies, not centralized drive-only options</p>	
<p>Food Buying Groups use different neighborhoods for drop off/ pick up sites. We aren't burdening the same neighborhood for each vendor.</p>	<p>I use my food buying club to stay out of commercial areas. I want to know my community members and nearby communities. There is nothing about our Food Buying Club that has to do with "Light" Industry. We should not be forced to move to those areas.</p>
<p>Food club should be able to operate were ever to allow people access to food quality with less cost. Regulate the big guy not the little one trying to feed their families the BEST they can afford</p>	<p>Limiting access</p>

<p>food clubs and csa's originated as a way for concerned consumers to access high quality local food (that means it isn't shipped in from Mexico, turkey or god knows where) and pay prices that actually makes them able to afford it. It is also another way that some mindful people choose to more closely connect with their food sources and help out the farmers themselves by making a direct and more rewarding contribution. I don't see how Anyone should be punished for that. Especially those who couldn't afford it or manifest it without these opportunities. Like those who would not have access if these things were not delivered or close by.</p>	<p>I don't think these clubs and CSAs are at a point where they need to be regulated to that extent yet. Again, if we wanted that, we'd go to the grocery market and buy lower quality food for higher or equivalent prices. Not Cool.</p>
<p>food clubs need to be in residential neighborhoods; there is very little traffic from our food club as pick ups and drop offs are spread out over 1-3 days. I'm able to provide much better food for my family because of our food club and we are all very involved in our community as a result.</p>	
<p>Food distribution sites should be allowed regardless of the amount of members. Consideration should be given to how many people are coming at one time-perhaps by having a wide window of pick up opportunity available rather than just a short window that would cause many people all at the same time arriving. But most importantly, it is critical that individuals and families are afforded every opportunity to obtain the food of their choice at a cost that they deem reasonable. CSAs and Food Buying Clubs do just that. It is extremely convenient for individuals to car pool and share their homes and spaces with each other in order to have healthy food of their choosing available as they choose.</p>	<p>I am concerned with overly regulating the ability of an individual or several individuals to seek out and obtain their choice of food and to pay for it and transport it as they desire. This is food we're talking about, not illegal substances. Every person should have the right to obtain, transport and store food.</p>
<p>Food membership distribution needs to continue to be allowed in residential and open space areas, as it is an important way that Portland citizens afford healthy foods and support local agricultural industry. These groups embody the very meaning of community and neighborhood, and need to be allowed to continue to operate in those places. Food membership distribution sites are hubs of community and fellowship, often organized according to geographic proximity--that is, neighborhoods. Food membership distribution should continue to be allowed to take place in residential and open space areas as these locations are most accessible to neighborhood dwellers, allowing participants to walk rather than drive to gather their groceries, while cultivating community, which leads to improved neighborhoods on so many levels. Furthermore, requiring these activities to take place in commercial zones may be too costly for many of these groups to continue; the forced closure of any CSA or Food Buying Club as a result of this Zoning Code Update would be criminal.</p>	<p>Cost of requiring commercial location for these activities; loss of community/neighborhood aspect of these activities; loss of access to these resources. When defining "small distribution sites with fewer members" consider the minimum number of members to make the buying club a club of value (there is a critical mass). What are the real concerns of allowing these activities to continue in residential and open space areas? Traffic? Loss of business to the grocery stores in the area?? Consider placing limitations on hours of distribution and amount of vehicular traffic rather than number of members.</p>

<p>Food membership distribution should be allowed in all sites. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	
<p>Food membership distribution should not be limited to commercial and light industrial zones. A big part of the draw for CSAs and food buying clubs is the opportunity to keep it local. If members have to leave their neighborhoods, participation in these groups, and the sense of community that they foster, will suffer.</p>	<p>I understand the concern about parking in residential areas related to food buying clubs, but the proposed direction does not consider the many other ways that food buying clubs can manage food distribution traffic. I am a member of a food buying club, and we use a system whereby only a select number of members actually go to the distribution point to pick up and distribute food to others who have ordered. We do this out of respect for our neighbors and to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. I also want to note that the number of members in our club is not indicative of how many households order at any one time. We work with numerous vendors and only some of the households order from any one vendor at one time. Therefore, the number of members in the club is not in and of itself an appropriate metric for regulations related to how a food buying club can operate.</p>
<p>Food membership distribution sites should absolutely be allowed in _all_ areas. Any club or farm share pickup which does not exceed 60 buyers or a 6 hour window for pickup will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic. Creating regulations to prevent neighbors from buying food together is certainly not the right direction to improve food access in the City of Portland.</p>	<p>I am very concerned that families of low-income NEED to have access to buying clubs and CSA drop points in their neighborhoods. Many families have limited or no transportation to access grocery stores far away from their homes. People living in food deserts in East Portland, where grocery stores (especially grocery stores selling healthy or fresh food) have refused to operate, need to continue to access healthy food at prices they can afford. Buying clubs are beneficial to neighborhoods, allowing neighbors to get to know each other, which makes our neighborhoods more livable and can help prevent crime as well. Also, I think it would be fairly ridiculous not to allow CSA pickup sites on land zoned as open space as this would prevent farms located within the city limits from having CSA pickups of their own produce on their own farm. (Such as the CSA pickup for the Zenger Farm CSA, which provides produce to low-income residents of Outer Southeast Portland who could not otherwise afford it.) I am extremely concerned that past complaints which were specifically about one truck driver del</p>

<p>Food membership distribution sites should be allowed at school, church, or community center sites including residential areas. Restricting food membership distribution sites would limit or eliminate some food buying clubs, which would be unable to relocate. In this economy, people need the cost saving power of community food buying clubs or groups.</p>	<p>I currently belong to St Johns SwapnPlay, a community sharing community. Our Mission: We exist to establish and maintain a network of families whose mission is threefold: (1) provide material resources and promote sustainability of the Portland metropolitan area through community sharing efforts (2) provide educational resources to children, parents and families, and (3) collaborate in partnerships with other organizations to create and implement large scale community outreach projects that provide educational and material resources for North Portland communities. Several food buying/food sharing groups exist within the SwapnPlay community. I am very concerned that restricting food membership distribution would negatively impact our food sharing/food buying groups that are such a valuable resource to us in the St Johns neighborhood. Please don't take this away from us. Restricting the location of food membership distribution sites would also mean increased time, expense, & wasted fuel as people would have to drive to these sites rather than obtain healthy affordable food right in their neighborhood.</p>
<p>Food membership distribution sites should not be limited.</p>	
<p>Food membership works better in residential areas as it promotes community interaction and keeps the club small. Clubs that get too big will have complaints that can be dealt with on case by case.</p>	
<p>From my personal experience, the ability to walk a few blocks and pick up a CSA share is a positive community building experience that should be encouraged; limiting such distribution in residential areas would make this impossible for many folks. My experiences is that such distribution sites have a limited effect on neighbors and all involved try to keep that effect limited. Other methods of resolving conflicts that come up should be used before considering restrictions.</p>	<p>Accessibility of more direct access to food purchasing. Freedom from unnecessary and misguided regulation.</p>
<p>Government should not be able to regulate when I want to buy groceries with several neighbors and pick up at a local community spot. This is ridiculous.</p>	<p>I support CSA's and I am a member of several food buying clubs.</p>
<p>Have been csa member for 6 years now, pick up sites at or in residential areas works. We should just leave it. Restricting residential drops</p>	<p>that there is going to be restrictions put on residential drops</p>
<p>I agree with this except for the "consider allowing." Small distribution groups (less than 75) should be allowed to use residential spaces and anyone should be able to use open spaces. There could be a rule that the pick-up times need to be at least four or five hours so the number of people arriving at one time is limited.</p>	<p>This will make it harder to participate in CSA or buying clubs or even force some to close. This is a big benefit to our area. Portland should be seen as a healthy, in touch with where our food comes from, place</p>

<p>I am a member of a CSA and also of a food-buying club. These are a really important way for me to get (somewhat) affordable, healthy food for my household, without having to travel far (we are car-free). Being able to get our food IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD, is really important in terms of transportation safety, convenience, affordability, and community-building. That seems worth keeping to me. Moving this kind of activity to commercial/industrial zones seems to be taking a way a lot of what makes this kind of activity valuable in the first place. It would also increase the cost of this kind of activity, making it harder to do and harder for people like me to afford.</p>	<p>I bike to my pickup sites with my kids, and I really don't want to have to travel further and make more dangerous crossings in order to get to a commercial or industrial zone to get my food. I would probably stop getting a CSA share, which would mean we'd eat less produce. That seems like a pretty bad impact to me.</p>
<p>I am a member of two buying groups and one CSA. These distribution channels allow me access to more affordable, healthy, organic, sustainable practice food that I would not be able to afford otherwise, plus I've made great friends in the process. I am very concerned about any limitations with both types of distributions. Many families can't afford this quality of food otherwise.</p>	<p>As a member of 2 buying groups and 1 CSA, I have not witnessed the problems noted in the plan. I heard of one buying group with lots of traffic, but they have since moved to a commercial facility. I have witnessed a neighborhood developing a stronger sense of community. Instead of restricting buying groups and CSAs, restrict junk (junked cars, boats, etc.) people put in their yards which hurts our property values!</p>
<p>I am concerned about any limitations with either type of distributions. Families need easier food access that allows for purchases from local farmers & in bulk for reasonable prices.</p>	
<p>I am concerned that the proposed limitations would restrict people's availability to local food.</p>	<p>I don't want to see regulations that would make it harder on local farmers and consumers.</p>
<p>I am concerned that this regulation would limit the distribution of CSA produce in residential areas, which is a crux of that model. The beautiful and elegant thing about CSAs is that they are community based, community driven and community centered. To alienate the distribution sites from the community is completely at odds with their mission and function.</p>	
<p>I am personally a drop site and have never seen or heard of a problem with this. It is not necessary to regulate it.</p>	<p>Only that the city is trying to regulate everything.</p>
<p>I believe that many residential sites are appropriate for CSA distribution and I would not like to see CSAs overregulated. However, they could be required to apply for a variance, to ensure neighborhood notification.</p>	<p>Traffic.</p>
<p>I believe that the regulation of how many people can be a member of a food buying club that is hosted at a private home is wrong. The people that organize and open their homes for good of many members so that all can benefit should not be penalized. It sure stinks of a natural foods lobby trying to exclude food buying clubs to individuals forcing them to buy at retail. Tsk tsk.</p>	<p>I want the local government to recognize people's rights to gather in private for what ever purpose they wish. If I hosted a knitting circle at my home and 20 ladies came once a week for an hour or two, would this be in question? It's the commerce aspect here that invites the intrusion.</p>

<p>I belong to a CSA and pick up at a member's house. This arrangement works very well and allows my family access to healthy produce in bulk at a reasonable price while at the same time building community. I would be strongly opposed to limiting the areas where CSAs or buying clubs could operate/distribute.</p>	
<p>I belong to a CSA and they distribute at a members home. This cuts down on the cost and the carbon of a whole bunch of people driving to a far distribution site. It is overkill to have them go to a light industrial where they would have to pay.</p>	<p>The impact to the members and the farmer.</p>
<p>I belong to a neighborhood food buying club and the idea of it is to connect with other like minded people in my area to procure quality food at a reasonable price. Travelling to a commercial area to get my food is exactly what we are trying to avoid!</p>	<p>The concept of small distributions sites with fewer members makes the price go up and discourages food buying clubs from growing!</p>
<p>I do not believe that we presently have a problem with CSAs or food buying clubs having pick ups in neighborhoods. We should make it easy as possible for Oregonians to purchase and pick up food that is healthy.</p>	<p>This would impose undue regulation on a system that does not need to be regulated.</p>
<p>I do not see a point in limiting residential drop off points. CSA farmers work hard to develop relationships with the community that supports them. Drop offs in residential areas are vital to the relationship. Residential drops offs are convenient for members which encourages folks to participate in a CSA and allows them to mingle with their neighbors and farmer when they are at pick up. Additionally residential drop offs are a way for members to give back to the farmer by volunteering their space.</p>	<p>Limiting the size of and/or not allowing residential drop offs will make CSA set ups less convenient for residents thus discouraging folks to participate. The loss of the home feel of these drop offs and convenient location will not allow participants the same interaction with their neighbors and farmer. And most importantly this could result in requiring farmers to rent a space thus add another cost to their businesses that already have slim profit margins.</p>
<p>I do not see any problems with CSA's or buying clubs. They do not need to be regulated. I do not see how this is a problem. I think the City's time and money could be better spent somewhere else.</p>	
<p>I do not think this should be regulated at all. Why would one only consider allowing small distributing sites? That should be a given.</p>	<p>I am concerned about small farms/farmers being able to get the business they need. And consumers being able to choose what is best for themselves.</p>
<p>I don't know -- this explanation is unclear. How would this be different from the rules now in place?</p>	
<p>I don't like the idea of these groups being overly regulated. if there is a problem with neighbors being concerned over increased traffic, for example, I would expect that they could talk to the person who is in charge of the drop site and work out a solution. I have some experience with buying clubs, and usually the drop consists of a truck being parked on the street for at most 15 minutes and members picking up at their convenience. if this amount of traffic is of concern, we might as well start regulating the UPS trucks and the number of visitors people can receive at their homes.</p>	<p>I am not concerned by the impacts of CSA and buying club groups.</p>

<p>I don't like the shunting of the distribution sites to "light industry" areas. A lot of these farms are very small and have small scatterings of customers throughout the city. It is extremely important that distribution sites be allowed in residential neighborhoods. Certainly, issues like parking and crowds should be kept in mind, but as far as I know this is very rarely a problem. If it does become a problem in a certain location, it can be dealt with by moving the distribution site, but I think it will seriously impact small farmers if they cannot set up distribution sites at normal homes in residential areas. Furthermore, the impact of traffic and parking and crowding would be <u>increased</u> if all members had to travel outside a residential neighborhood to pick up their CSA shares or visit their food buying club. If the distribution sites are in neighborhoods, most people can walk or bicycle or use transit to get to the site. If it's in a light industrial area, there may be concerns about pedestrian or bicycle safety due to large</p>	<p>the impact upon small farmers if they are required to find "light industrial" areas in which to distribute their produce.</p>
<p>I don't see how regulation helps, or why it's the city's business. Should be allowed in residential areas, no matter what.</p>	
<p>I don't think food-buying clubs or CSAs should be limited. I was part of a food-buying club that was forced out of the neighborhood b/c of the city's rules about only 8 people per day coming to a home. I think this is b.s. I think that it is important to be respectful of neighbors, of course, but both CSAs and food-buying clubs are important ways that families provide good, real food at a cost we can afford.</p>	
<p>I don't think there is any reason for any changes in what people can and can't buy and from where. The food buying clubs allow people to purchase from them directly, and I don't think new zoning is needed to deal with that. Let it be!</p>	<p>More regulations are not what is needed. People who are interested in healthy cooking and living have found a way in a bad economy for good whole foods to be affordable. If that changes and you make it harder for them, it is for absolutely no reason!</p>
<p>I don't think there should be any limitations with both types of distributions. Families NEED easier food access beyond supermarkets, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors TOGETHER as partners who share common values in the quality of their food and where it comes from - sustainability in other words</p>	
<p>I don't think there should be zoning restrictions on this type of community.</p>	
<p>I don't think they should be required to be in commercial zones. I think they should be allowed in residential as well.</p>	

<p>I don't think they should be restricted to commercial zones only because someone who would like to run a small food buying club drop from their residence would not be able to. Just because there is a food buying club drop doesn't automatically mean that there will be dozens of people clogging the street. It should be based on the size of the drop.</p>	<p>People are increasingly turning to food buying clubs to have more access to affordable, healthy food. I do not favor restricting it.</p>
<p>I don't understand why you're trying to regulate this practice. This is not a role for government. Stay out and put LESS regulation. There is not a need to regulate this!</p>	
<p>I have been a member of 2 food buying clubs and 3 CSAs during my 10 years in Portland. One of the food buying clubs was around 10 families and we rotated houses for drop points. Eventually we were able to locate the drop point at a neighborhood church, which had its own complications, but worked a bit better. I think allowing small clubs in residential areas would not be a bad thing. As for CSAs, I have done pickups at a farmers market, which works pretty well. But not all CSA farmers have market stands. Currently, I pick up my CSA in inner SE, and it's a fairly large drop (maybe 30 bins). Pick up time is 3-8pm. I stop by between 4:30-6:30 and sometimes there will be one other person picking up during the 5 minutes I'm there. It feels like pretty light impact on the block to me.</p>	<p>Using big trucks to deliver to narrow urban streets, or multi-lane busy commercial streets. Doing this a regular basis always makes for lots of complications. If I had a neighbor getting weekly drops from a big tractor trailer, that would irritate me. Foot, bike, and light car traffic from buying clubs and CSA drops concerns me very little.</p>
<p>I have belonged to "large" CSAs and Buying clubs, and all of them distributed in residential neighborhoods, in homes or churches.</p>	<p>I understand concerns about traffic in neighborhoods, etc. But tightening regulation too much will all but destroy the ability of these organizations to operate. Much of the appeal is being able to get things close to home, perhaps on foot, within your own community. They are attempts to remove the retail element from people's relationship with their food. This would require sponsorship (in the form of a space) by or rental of a commercial or industrial space, which would be a big impediment.</p>
<p>I have had the good fortune to join together with some other families, to buy some lovely grains directly from the farmer. I am currently waiting to pick up a gallon of honey. If the direction was challenged, then I wouldn't be able to <u>participate in the group buying.</u></p>	
<p>I live two houses from the Whole Foods on Fremont and 15th in N.E. There are often semi trucks spewing diesel smoke while making deliveries to this overpriced, out of state owned establishment which sells poor quality food to the more affluent demographic that can afford the extravagant prices. I would much rather see a stream of neighbors on foot and bike patronizing local growers and producers. Allowing Whole Foods to operate adjacent to my residential neighborhood while limiting CSA and Food Buying Clubs would be an unfair, illogical, and unsustainable double standard.</p>	

<p>I manage a drop point at a church in a residential area. Churches are built for gatherings and should be considered exempt from any restrictions put on residential gatherings.</p>	<p>In addition I will add that these drop sites are a huge resource to busy families. Sadly the grocery store experience has become one of being constantly marketed to while in the store. The stores can be overly stimulating for your children with special needs such as my daughter. I avoid the grocery store at all costs and at time buying from the farmers market can even be overwhelming for her. We find being part of a food group we can better set parameters. Limiting how many people can come and benefit from a group buy at a time is placing the government in our living rooms. What if the purpose of the gathering is to pray or to share a meal or to have a play date. Why should food groups have restrictions put on them when all other groups do not. I dont think the government should be involved in who I invite to my home.</p>
<p>I think CSAs and food buying clubs should be able to operate ANYWHERE.</p>	<p>I am concerned about the city LIMITING food accessibility. For many speciliazed foods for people on restricted or special diets, the food buying club offers the most affordable option. I would prefer not to see any restrictions on this type of operation, but the smaller ones CERTAINLY SHOULD BE ALLOWED in residential areas.</p>
<p>I think drop locations should be allowed wherever the members determine is appropriate and convenient. If there is a neighborhood issue or complaint, that should be looked at on a case-by-case basis. When there is a real issue, voiced by more than one neighbor, I think it's appropriate to look at splitting a distribution site in two. Only allowing these in commercial or light industrial areas most likely means more cars on the road and traffic for everyone to deal with.</p>	<p>Local access and not having to use a car to pick up my food is critically important to me!</p>
<p>I think even larger distribution sites can operate in residential and open space areas without difficulty.</p>	
<p>I think it's really important that these drop sites/distribution sites are allowable in residential areas. From my experience, the point of having such a drop is to serve the people in a residential area which cuts down on car use, builds community, etc.</p>	
<p>I think more than "considering" smaller distribution sites is necessary and should be a key concern. Supporting small distribution in neighborhoods should be a key objective, again limited by a revenues-based threshold.</p>	

<p>I understand the inclination to limit impact in residential areas. However, this rule will squash many successful food clubs in Portland and limit access to local, healthy food. Our food club in North Portland operates by sharing the workload and locations among our members. It sounds like the current system works, given there has been just one complaint that has been reported (at least publicly) and that issue was resolved. ***Also, this is a poorly worded question and implies that this change would allow for an expansion of food clubs and CSAs, when in fact it is prohibitive and installs new limitations. I think many people will check "yes" thinking they are voting in favor of expanding food access, when this is the opposite.**</p>	<p>The decrease of access to local, healthy and **affordable** food in the Portland area. We can't all afford New Seasons or Whole Foods; food clubs allow people with fewer financial resources to eat healthfully and sustainably.</p>
<p>I wasn't sure which particular cities solution was favorable to the city council, or whomever is making this particular decision. I think the solutions implemented by San Francisco and Seattle are reasonable while that implemented in Philadelphia is not. Disallowing tractor trailer drop offs would hinder Food Buying Clubs significantly as it would increase overhead, thereby reducing the amount saved by each member household and the efficacy of the club.</p>	<p>We belong to a medium sized and thriving food buying club that helps support our families nutritional needs on our limited income. Because of the cooperation of its members our club is able to buy food at a larger discounted rate without having to pay the overhead typically associated with food cooperatives. This helps our and other families survive on less and buy sustainable wholesome foods that we otherwise could not afford.</p>
<p>I would strongly support allowing small distribution sites in residential areas. The ability to walk over to a nearby home to pick up your box is part of the "community" in community sponsored agriculture.</p>	<p>Large volume distribution sites in residential areas.</p>
<p>If folks have concerns about traffic, develop regulations around that, which could then be enforced in situations where a <u>Food Buying Club</u> is causing problems.</p>	<p>Losing opportunities to create community by interacting around food.</p>
<p>If the buying club is at a congregation or non-profit in a residential area, there is no reason to restrict its size if similar sized crowds typically come to the facility on a regular basis. Prescribing limits for number of members doesn't make sense because not all members order every week.</p>	
<p>If this is not currently legal, this survey needs to say so. If it is currently legal, no additional restrictions need apply without notifying the public the essential reasons why.</p>	<p>Same as above.</p>
<p>I'm not sure I see a need to change the current system that allows smaller CSA pickups at residential sites. I am unaware of problems related to that practice currently and I think it would severely impact CSA membership if members had to travel long distances for their pickups. It would also seem to add to the costs for small CSA farmers if they had to arrange for other, more commercial sites since presumably those are not free to the farmer, as residential pickup sites generally are.</p>	

<p>I'm unsure why the concern for having these sites in residential areas. As someone who is a CSA host site and has been active with food buying clubs, parking is minimally affected (pick up lasts less than 5 minutes) and traffic is affected only during delivery times (which can be predictable). Additionally, this type of arrangement is in keeping with the city's goals for 20-minute neighborhoods, particularly in residential areas that don't have immediate access to commercial and industrial zones. Many of the people who pick their shares up from our house live nearby and walk or bike to get their shares.</p>	
<p>In addition to knowing the farmer from whom you buy your food, CSAs and food buying clubs offer cost savings to their members. Requiring distribution sites to locate where you propose increases the farmer's cost and ultimately, the consumer. Additionally, the further people have to travel to pick up their shares or their food increases traffic and air pollution.</p>	None.
<p>Is there a problem? Why regulate where there is no problem?</p>	Over-regulation that will limit CSAs and Food Buying Clubs.
<p>Is there really a problem with food buying club pickup locations? I belong to a large food buying club and I've never encountered another person when making a pickup. Forcing clubs to only use commercial areas for pickups reduces local access to the healthy and affordable food these clubs provide. If there are zoning requirements, they should be based not on a club's total membership, but on the number of people who participate in each "buy" and how long the window of time is for pickup. Only a fraction of a club's membership buys food at any time.</p>	Impacts on the ability of food buying clubs to provide affordable and accessible healthy food to residents. These regulations would benefit companies at the expense of grassroots solutions to the food access/affordability challenges we face.
<p>It does not make sense to limit an activity that is not distinguishable from allowed activities. If you would limit people from distributing their CSA shares, would you also prevent them from carpooling, or from making a shared run to Costco? I have difficulty envisioning such regulation being sensible or enforceable.</p>	I do not see food membership distribution as being a cause for any concern whatsoever. The identified potential issues in the study are ridiculous.
<p>It is hard to stay in business as a small (or medium) sized farm. It is important that a farmer should be able to utilize their house, a friend, or members house to distribute produce as long as they are considerate of their neighbors needs (traffic, etc).</p>	I am concerned that pushing distribution sites away from neighborhoods will make costs rise for the small farmer and food less accessible to people without vehicles (specifically low income folks).

<p>It is not appropriate to evaluate a club's ability to have residential drop sites based on their membership size. Rather, they should look at how many people participate in a club's average/largest buys, how often those large buys happen, and how long the pick up windows typically are--since a club can have 200 members but only 40 are buying and picking up for any one buy and it is usually spread out over a number of hours. This type of buys have virtually no effect on neighborhood parking or traffic. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose largest buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>Allowing buying clubs to distribute food from residential sites and urban farms is important, and to limit distribution to commercial/light industry zones would severely limit their ability to build community as well as educate members about where their food is coming from.</p>
<p>It is too difficult to define size of membership. A club with many members might be functioning fine in a neighborhood with little impact while another club may have few members but may be disruptive due to parking issues, debris, noise, traffic, etc. Some neighborhoods are very open to food buying clubs, while others would be less tolerant regardless of the membership size.</p>	<p>that over regulation would result in the abolishment of neighborhood food buying clubs. A distribution site in a commercial area, IS NOT a neighborhood or a friend based food-buying club.</p>
<p>It is very concerning that your first sentence limits neighborhood food distribution outright while your second sentence suggests considering smaller sites. When would this considering occur? How would a smaller site be defined? By number of members? By \$\$ volume? By the weight of total goods? By the number of hours allowed for pickup? Please do not limit the availability of people to pick up food in their neighborhoods. Your report mentions complaints of "a" site. That site has since moved to a commercial location in order to address the concerns posed by neighbors. An idea grew until it caused problems and then those problems were addressed over time. Great. Let's not respond to what is no longer a problem. For the most part, these types of arrangements are working just great all over the city without interference from the city. Are you even aware of how many sites there are that are not generating complaint? Right now I get my bulk goods from 3 blocks away and my veggies from 9 blocks away. I do this by bike or foot. A commercial requirement will move pickups out of my walking zone. I used to get my eggs 15 bloc</p>	<p>Finding commercial sites for these mostly informal arrangements is likely to be huge burden on volunteer organizers. Such a requirement is likely to add costs which will eliminate any savings benefit in buying in bulk and force drop sites out of neighborhoods. The Philadelphia regulations seem particularly restrictive and counter to local neighborhood food distribution.</p>
<p>It is very important that you continue to allow small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas.</p>	

<p>It's not clear to me how much this would limit distribution from a CSA. This is different than allowing sales to occur from a house such as could occur through a fruitstand. Since distribution is typically only once a week, and only an established group of people participate, this is much less impactful and should be allowed.</p>	<p>I'm concerned that CSAs would not be allowed to distribute in neighborhoods, which would be detrimental to that business model, which is very low impact and should be encouraged.</p>
<p>I've had a small buying group before. It had no more impact than the yoga studio around the corner. There is no reason to restrict it too commercial zones. No one in my neighborhood ever complained to me. The dropoff of food was short in duration and the pickup wasn't anything abnormal. More gas will be used if restricted to comm'l zones.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Leave distribution site choices up to the buying club. Recommend that they keep in mind concerns of traffic, etc.</p>	<p>I am concerned about restrictions being placed on where delivery points may be. I feel that residential neighborhoods can typically handle food buying clubs, because I have seen this to be the case.</p>
<p>Let individual area residents decide what they want by letting a location sink or swim within the framework of free enterprise.</p>	
<p>Let the people have access to their fresh, locally grown food in their own neighborhood. Let the people help each-other share. Maybe we should regulate Girl Scout meetings, kids riding bicycles in groups, Bible study home evenings and every other kind of thing that involves people coming and going in a neighborhood. Sheesh.</p>	<p>Unnecessary restrictions and nitpicky zoning regulations for normal neighborhood activities, like picking up a food box. My goodness. Seriously? Doesn't the City have anything better to do?</p>
<p>Let them be. Stop trying to regulate everything. Especially, don't restrict these for people's own "safety". If I want to drink raw milk and risk getting sick, that's my business.</p>	<p>Too many regulations and restrictions.</p>
<p>Let them drop off wherever is convenient for the consumers - again, allowing the CSAs to work with the community. Most people want to be good neighbors. Let them work it out,</p>	
<p>Let them operate freely in neighborhoods. The whole point is to get good food to everyone. Quit trying to complicate it and make it harder for small operations.</p>	<p>Lack of healthy food availability.</p>

<p>Limit the regulations regarding distribution sites. Allow for individual and community based arrangements.</p>	<p>As a multi-year participant in CSAs and multiple buying clubs (spanning in size from two to three households to hundreds), I am aware of parking and noise concerns, and I would seek to work on small, local scale efforts to reduce any neighborhood tensions and rely on human to human (versus city to group) communication and resolution. I am concerned that excessive regulation from the city level undermines the personal, grass-roots, and community-based nature of the local food efforts. I am concerned that the regulations may be more harmful than helpful to the effort of increasing access to local food by consumers. Increasing the costs associated with distribution and/or delivery to farmers or producers (by requiring arrangements to be made at commercially zoned properties or by necessitating the break-up of larger groups and the formation of additional drop points) may increase the financial and emotional burden on producers and consumers, both.</p>
<p>Limiting access to CSA drop off points and food buying clubs restricts local access to fresh and more affordable foods, particularly for residents that do not have cars and/or are not able to meet their needs at area grocery stores. We should be increasing access to these two throughout the city, especially during this recession.</p>	<p>Having to buy all of our groceries at stores is expensive and very difficult to do while shopping with young children. Protect food choice in Portland, preserve access to CSAs and food buying clubs.</p>
<p>Limiting CSA and food buying clubs to commercial/light industry areas will decrease the availability of locally produced, safe food for people to buy at a reasonable cost. Food buying clubs currently operating in residential areas present wonderful opportunities for neighbors and others to connect, as well as places for our local farmers to effectively move their goods. People participating in buying clubs are concerned with the welfare of people and their neighborhoods and many of these clubs have operated without complaint for quite some time.</p>	<p>Regulation will ultimately will harm people looking to positively impact their families and communities through providing access to sustainably grown and distributed food at a reasonable cost.</p>
<p>limiting residential largely defeats the purpose. grocery stores are in residential areas (tho' of course the stores themselves are zoned commercial)</p>	<p>limiting the ability of CSA and buying clubs to have drop points where their customers are!!!</p>
<p>Limits home distribution! "commercial areas" are not always free, available or convenient!!!</p>	<p>There is no good reason to cut out all the CSAs and food clubs that use homes.</p>
<p>limits the size of neighborhood food clubs. just because larger size does not mean access to funds to pay for rent/space in commercial and light industrial areas.</p>	<p>seems like type of food club 'prohibition'. Only larger coops and stores will have available funds for space in commercial and light industrial areas.</p>
<p>Local food has to be easy to access. Commercial zones are often too far away from neighborhoods. I want my local food in my neighborhood withing walking/biking reach.</p>	<p>I think it is important to make local food available in residential neighborhoods, so that people can walk or bike to it. It will eliminate driving and help improving air quality. I associate local food with a healthy life style which includes less driving and more walking/biking. I want my local food close to my home.</p>

Many times food buying clubs are operated out of someone's home as a necessity. Restricting the location of food buying clubs will result in many people not being able to participate thereby restricting their access to healthy food.	Inability to operate buying club because of restrictions.
Maybe. Depends on what you mean by "small distribution sites." Condominiums, apartments, and co-housing communities are perfect venues for large numbers of members to benefit from a food buying club, with minimal impact on the environment.	I'm concerned about the curtailing of food buying clubs in R1 residential areas, which would undermine the innate benefits of high density housing.
members of food buying clubs and CSAs should have access to the food that they buy in both commercial and residential sites.	I am concerned that you will limit our access to food buying clubs and CSAs.
More locations allows for people to be able to walk and bike and may open the market to more local farmers being able to deliver their produce	Less drop sites equal more people driving and less people be able to participate
More regulations hurts the community. I am a drop for a food buying club, in a residential neighborhood. I would have to drive further, driving my food costs up, if deliveries were not allowed at my home.	It seems that any complaints from citizens could be cleared up with neighborly conversations rather than getting authorities involved to make more regulations prohibiting me to get fresh, healthy, local food, directly from the farmers who grow it.
Most food buying club drop sites we use are at people's houses and rotate between them. I have never noticed problems with that, because pick-up windows are at least a few hours, the number of people going in on any one buy is rarely excessive, and some people walk to pick up their food. Additionally, many people pick up for each other and drop off for one or two friends. We are in a fairly large buying club, but for instance our last delivery of salt meant we put salt in bags on our porch and over the course of a week, fewer than 10 people came for pick up.	We need access to healthy, pure food from known sources due to health issues. We rarely buy food from the store because of these issues. We are also extremely low income right now. Our access to food relies on convenient drop-sites and our buying club and community of local farmers. Regulating the drop sites, which are extremely flexible at this point would reduce our access to healthy food. If one home is regularly hosting large drops with short pick up windows and everyone coming just to them (not further distributing it), I could see a problem for the neighbors. If there are to be limits on it, it should be based on frequency, pick up window, and number of people in the specific buy. I think this should either be taken on a case by case basis as complaints arise, or there should be an upper limit on the number of pick-ups allowed in a given time period in residential zones.
Most of the CSA and Food Buying groups I belong to are all volunteer organizations and it makes sense for them to be in residential areas, where the volunteers can make it happen. If they had to move to commercial zones, they would be unable to provide this service.	accessability
Most of these groups do not have access to commercial areas. I do not see the need for this regulation.	If Portland wants healthy, local food, then it needs to help, not hinder, small groups that come together to make this food affordable.
Most pickup spots are now in residential areas. These work well and help knit community.	commercialization of what has been a very small-scale, community system
Must allow drops in residential areas, community gardens	

<p>My family and I have participated in CSA drops & food buying clubs for the past 6 years here in Portland. All of his activity happens in our neighborhood and nearby neighborhoods. These drops are my family's lifeline--they make fresh/local/organic foods much more affordable and accessible to us. It makes no sense to limit such activity to commercial and light industrial areas. If such limits were set in place, my family's source of food would be cut off or moved, causing us to either drive farther, increasing pollution and congestion, or forcing us to compromise our health by no longer being able to access this food--which by the way would also have a hugely negative economic effect on the small farms & businesses that rely on these drop sites & food clubs to distribute their products!</p>	<p>I am most concerned by the potential limitations caused by zoning regulations. We all deserve the right to have access to the food we need & want & can afford. Individuals, families, small businesses & farmers have come together to create these small-scale networks of CSA drops & buying clubs that have been providing sustenance for so many of us--WHY would you want to destroy these networks by enforcing zoning regulations that benefit no one? The only folks who would benefit are the big box stores because many of us would be forced to go back to buying from them instead of from local farms & businesses! That would be a sad day, and it would make our city less livable.</p>
<p>My milk group picks up from my driveway, and my CSA picks up from another residential house. I don't want to have to drive to a commercial zone in order to get my food. The resident should be able to decide how many members is too many for their site.</p>	<p>I don't want to see any CSAs or food buying clubs shut down because they have too many members.</p>
<p>Need good access via bus/bike/ped. How to transport without a car? Would love to see better delivery options.</p>	
<p>Need to know what you mean by residential and fewer sights</p>	
<p>Neighborhood CSA and club drop sites make them more available to more families. Restricting them to light industrial areas is too strict. If you cannot allow them in neighborhoods (which I think should actually be left up to the individual neighborhood) then at least allow them in commercial zones of any kinds. Restriction to light industry will make pick up more car-dependent and make it impossible, in some cases, for families to use bike and bus to pick up their produce.</p>	<p>I participate in a neighborhood-sited CSA. This structure allows my family to buy safely and locally produced food at a good price, and "our" farm is local and adds to the local economy. If the site were moved to light industrial I'm sure the farm and families would suffer. If the neighborhood</p>
<p>Neighborhood delivery of both csa and Foodclub purchases is critical to their success and central mission of reducing food miles and getting people closer to their food. I can walk or bike to both my csa and Foodclub sites, and see or combine trips with friends and neighbors. This is what the movement is all about.</p>	
<p>No limitations on food buying clubs.</p>	<p>The more limitations you place the harder it can be for people with limited funds and time to participate in food buying clubs and csas. I haven't heard of any wide spread major problems due to current practices.</p>
<p>No need to regulate food buying clubs or CSAs in terms of where they pick up and how many people are involved.</p>	<p>regulations should support community-driven programs and resource sharing as a means to access healthy food.</p>
<p>No need to regulate food buying groups at this time. I belong to two different ones and there is no impact to the neighborhood in terms of traffic or noise or whatever. We just get a delivery and divide it up. It builds community. It makes for healthier families.</p>	<p>Concerned about regulating what is mostly a grass roots attempt to feed our families healthier food at a lower cost. Not bothering anyone, so no regs needed at this time.</p>

No regulation is necessary here. CSAs and food buying clubs increase access to high quality food.	This is a regulatory solution looking for a problem. I suspect the involvement of the food industry.
No restrictions!	Restrictions on distribution sites concern me the most!
NO!!!!!!!!!!!!!! These activities should be allowed in all zoned areas. Food buying clubs are small and usually operate in residential areas by actual people NOT businesses.	Overregulation putting small CSA and food buying clubs out of business. Please allow in all zoning areas
NO, they are not headed in the right direction. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pickups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.	you are making it very hard for people to get food. If there is not problem with the current practice why make it harder?
NO, they are not headed in the right direction. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pickups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic	Inhibiting my rights to purchase food as I wish. I don't know of anyone who has had an issue with either of my food buying clubs or my CSA. The "traffic" is sporadic and at the most would be the equivalent to the person having a weekly poker party or bbq.
Not all clubs can afford that since they are volunteer run ventures and the amount of people picking up from a location is never a big number. Clubs such as the North Portland Food Buying Club have made efforts to have multiple distribution points and pickup locations both to lessen the burden on our members (again volunteers) and to lessen traffic in our areas. We have had no complaints at all.	
Not aware of need for regulation.	None. I wouldn't mind people coming into my neighborhood to pick up food. It enlivens the neighborhood.
Not in residential - not in open spaces - but should be allowed at churches and community centers.	Regulate traffic and drop off hours and noise.
Not sure	
not sure i understand why there would be restrictions on distribution sites for things like csas.	
only in commercial and light industrial zones would more than likely have people driving farther to pick up their produce. conveniently located is better for all.	
Our NoPo food club would be negatively impacted. We are a not for profit and spread the pickups around so there is not traffic concerns	I am concerned you would take the ability of our food club to function as is. This food club has done an outstanding job of building community and getting more families to buy local.
People can use their homes as weekly or monthly distribution sites without causing an impact to their neighbors. You could put a limit on how many households each site can serve and frequency of deliveries if you want to make sure that it doesn't become a full-on business in a residential neighborhood.	People with special food concerns use buying clubs to access the highest grades of farm-direct meat and other products, so this should be supported within reason.

<p>People do not live in commercial zones and light industrial areas. They live in urban areas. They need to be able to separate out their shares and distribute to their friends and neighbors from their homes. Most buyer's club members do not make any sort of profit, so there is no "commercial" interest is being served--food bought communally is being divided up among friends and neighbors. There is no need to regulate neighbors and friends who buy food together. You cannot treat a food club as a commercial interest. It is more like a foodie hobby. It would be like requiring scrapbooking clubs who bought scrapbooking supplies together, to only separate their orders in a commercial zone. We're not "food membership distribution sites" --it's just a backyard or garage where someone who put together a buy is letting other people pick up. It's not like there's tons of traffic or people.</p>	<p>I am concerned about the impact of arbitrary regulations making it harder for me and my friends to provide healthy, inexpensive food for our families in a simple way.</p>
<p>people live in residential areas. let's get food to where the people are. (sorry i answered this on the first question. i misunderstood how the survey was going to work.)</p>	<p>the city does not need to limit people working together to get food for their families.</p>
<p>people who live in residential areas really benefit from healthy access to food. The club drop site is very low impact and low traffic within the neighborhood. These are not commercial enterprises, it's just neighbors helping neighbors have better access to healthy food.</p>	<p>A regulation that restricted access to buyer's clubs in residential areas would restrict my access to healthy foods. I do not want a regulation that will negatively impact my ability to get healthy foods easily for my family. Buyer's clubs bring the power to individuals who live in underserved areas, without grocery stores, and allows them to still buy healthy foods. Please do not put a regulation in place that would actually make it harder for me and other families to get market-fresh and less expensive foods to drop sites near our homes. We're not hurting anything, we are helping ourselves and our neighbors. Thankyou</p>
<p>People will have a hardship getting to these areas, actually finding one to distribute from, renting the ability to do so (which will raise costs which goes against one of the reasons of doing CSA's and food buying clubs).</p>	<p>Do NOT limit the distribution sites. It will be too much of a hardship to distribute in commercial zones and light industry zones. We want this IN the neighborhood! This is how we get to know each other and build community. It is much easier to access through bike, on foot, etc. Please, do not go backwards and limit these to areas that are not as accessible. It is VERY important to continue to allow these distributions to occur in neighborhoods and open space areas.</p>

<p>pick up sites should be at the convenience of the drivers and the people who support them- it should be decided between them what makes sense- they should be trusted- if a commercial site suits them, that's fine, if it does not, then a site that does must be available</p>	<p>Limiting where food can be dropped off could limit access to affordable and high quality foods that families absolutely rely on- remember healthy food is our insurance for a healthy future- I think people can be trusted to inform those picking up products on the proper etiquette for their site. Many people have home businesses that have deliveries made and sent much more often than a food drop off point has activity and this is acceptable. If pick up sites were not at residences, then security would be an issue, someone would have to mind/possibly refrigerate the products, and the ease and convenience would diminish- and costs may go up- this would not make sense! We are aiming to make local food more available, right? The more good food one eats, the more one demands good food- there are many reasons people cannot rely on large for profit stores for all their food needs.</p>
<p>pickups that don't involve large trucks should be allowed at people's houses anywhere if they are a short time period and once a week. If neighbors have concerns they should address them with the pickup site host. Pickups involving large trucks should occur on or near busier streets or at commercial areas with parking lots etc.</p>	<p>larger trucks on smaller streets</p>
<p>Please don't regulate our food buying clubs. Ours is in a small neighborhood in SW Portland. I can hit it on my way home from work and it has saved our family so much money because we aren't running to the store all the time and buying <u>a bunch of stuff we don't need.</u></p>	<p>I am worried about you restricting the small distributions sites in residential neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Prohibiting CSA share distribution in residential areas limits convenient access to fresh healthy food. This would hurt the community aspect of these systems, which usually have a narrow pickup window for a few hours once a week at <u>residential locations.</u></p>	
<p>Pushing these food clubs out of neighborhoods is the wrong direction. Giving people the option to have these clubs in commercial or light industrial zones IN ADDITION TO neighborhood locations would be okay, but limiting them to these areas undoes the very goal -- bringing neighbors together to share and work together. The more people involved in a neighborhood, the bigger and better the club. Then you would move it? That doesn't make sense.</p>	<p>limiting peoples' right to gather and share in a project or club together. Especially where food is concerned. Especially during these difficult economic times.</p>
<p>Putting caps on sizes of distribution sites will hamper them by adding more regulations to follow and capping the size will <u>limit their ability to exist.</u></p>	

<p>Regulation of food distribution sites based on membership size seems inappropriate, given the low impact of these distribution sites on surrounding neighborhood locations. Restricting distribution to industrial and commercial zones may sufficiently increase overhead such that membership costs are prohibitive, particularly to members who may gain the most from CSA or buying club membership (such as members from a lower socioeconomic background). This may serve as an additional barrier to equitable availability to fresh and locally produced foods in Portland.</p>	
<p>Removing CSA drop points to commercial light industry zones makes good food less inaccessible to people.</p>	<p>What qualifies as "small distribution sites with fewer members"? Who is going to regulate this?</p>
<p>Replace the word "Consider" in the residential section with 'Allow', plain and simple. Why should I get in my car and drive to the store, when I can just walk to a neighbor' house to pick up my CSA box? As with the other urban agricultural questions, more in this case is definitely better.</p>	
<p>Residential drop offs allow access to more people. I wouldn't want to drive far to get my CSA.</p>	
<p>Residential sites are ideal for food buying clubs and csa drops. This promotes community and sustainability. Driving to other locales is going to create more traffic and lessens that focus of small farm to table.</p>	
<p>Restricting access to light industry and commercial zones removes them from the customers who need them most. In the food buying clubs I belong to, traffic has never, ever been an issue. I have never even encountered another person picking up at a residential site. I cannot believe that this is an activity that needs restriction to industrial/commercial zones. Having easy access to affordable whole foods is THE MOST important thing we can cultivate for our communities. Restricting access once again removes availability from those who need it most: people with limited mobility/transit options.</p>	<p>Restricted access to affordable foods. I have no concerns about excessive traffic in residential areas. Traffic seems like the thing that could be addressed on an as-needed basis.</p>
<p>Restricting cooperation is just wrong. I oppose restrictions.</p>	<p>We need more Food Not Bombs and other ways neighbors and volunteers get together to share. I oppose restricting this kind of response to need.</p>
<p>Restricting distribution sites to commercial and light industry zoning will create a capital barrier to clubs who cannot afford a storefront. The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>I am most concerned about low-barrier access to healthy food for neighbors. Food buying clubs can create social cohesion and a sense of place -- please don't prevent this from occurring in residential areas.</p>

Should be allowed in residential and open space areas as a rule, with exceptions made in high impact areas.	This rule will end our small food club, that operates by using a number of member's homes as distribution sites. I can understand perhaps preventing clubs in residential areas that have complaints on a case by case basis, but to make it be a blanket rule is impractical and seems to go against the spirit of encouraging access to local, organic food.
Sites in commercial zones and industrial areas cost money, and may require additional travel time or expense for participants. If the point is to make getting high-quality food inexpensive and accessible, moving the food farther away from the people is NOT the way to do it. CSAs mainly do their drops at the markets where the farm has booths, anyway.	None.
Small distribution sites MUST be allowed to operate in residential and open space areas.	Small distribution sites MUST be allowed to operate in residential and open space areas.
Smaller distribution sites in residential areas are needed and must be a focus.	
Some of us that use this type of service have to rely on public transportation and there isn't usually good service to commercial/light industrial areas. More people would have access if it stays in residential areas.	Not be able to participate in a CSA or Food Buying Club.
that regulations about the size of "small" buying clubs will prohibit members from being "eligible" to distribute in residential areas	
that would require people to pay for commercial space, they may not be able to fund a commercial space delivery	Will lead to shutting down of food clubs as people will not be able to pay for commercial space
the buying clubs i'm involved with do not impact neighborhood traffic. I hardly ever run into more than a few other buyers. even with fresh produce/berries the pick up window is ample	being restricted by city regulations so it is harder to buy in bulk w/other like minded families.
The city does not need to regulate how we feed our families especially when there are so many other impacts to "quality of life" in our neighborhoods	regulating the HELL out of everything
The city should not limit the number of people participating in a food club or CSA. These are private activities.	The city choosing an arbitrary number to limit foodclubs or CSA and therefore limiting the freedom of individuals to eat what they want.

<p>The concerns related to traffic and noise in regards to Food Membership Distribution Sites is not worth considering. Should we start to limit the meeting of a Book-of-the-Week-Club because neighbors are upset at the upflow of traffic to a residence hosting a weekly meeting? Or should we consider banning residences from making more than one weekly purchases from an online shop or mail order catalogue in order to keep large trucks out of our neighborhoods? How tightly will we regulate our neighborhoods? CSA's and Food Distribution Clubs allow individuals and households not located near a "health food store" or co-op grocery to acquire healthy produce, whole grains, and support the local economy all in one symbiotic step. Many small successful co-op groceries actually have developed out of Food Buying Clubs. Let's not limit people's options to food by forcing them away from their neighborhood into commercial zones to pick up healthy foods.</p>	<p>I am most concerned about restricting access to quality food by hindering programs like Food Buying Clubs & CSA's</p>
<p>The easiest way to deliver reasonably priced local produce and goods from food buying goods is to allow dropsites in residential neighborhoods. Perhaps this could be coordinated at areas where gatherings already occur, ie. parks. Restricting drop sites to commercial and industrial areas would limit accessibility for individuals who do not have private transportation.</p>	<p>I am concerned about what kind of buying clubs could be regulated under such provisions.</p>
<p>The more accessible, the better. The locations should not be more restricted, but made more available.</p>	<p>The zoning would negatively affect who is able to access these services.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any buys/pick ups smaller than should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>I am very concerned about any limitations with both types of distributions. Families NEED easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors TOGETHER as partners who share common values in the quality of their food and where it comes from - sustainability in other words.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least per 6 hour for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic</p>	<p>Neighborhood churches and club meetings have much bigger impacts on congestion and safety from what I've observe over several years.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>high quality food is expensive, but crucial for families and we need simple and local access to it. we should have the liberty to buy together and save precious resources. i have a small buying club of 10 people. we are not growing, but this regulation would put a stop to our community endeavor!!!</p>

<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>I am very concerned about any limitation on food distributions. We need easier access other than supermarkets, and ought to allow for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for economic benefit. Not only do these models improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and creates a community spirit that shares common values around food and healthy eating as a lifestyle. This can set a precedent for further community collaboration on other important matters.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>I am very concerned about any limitations with both types of distributions. Families need easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors together as partners who share common values in the quality of their food and where it comes from - sustainability in other words.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>My main concern is not giving households access to alternative distribution methods for obtain non-supermarket foods.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>Our neighborhood buying club has revolutionized the way my family eats. By working together with our neighbors, we have been able to afford high quality food, and by buying in bulk we have greatly reduced the amount of packaging we throw away each week. I am concerned that if you increase restrictions on residential drop sites, that small food buying clubs like ours, that have little traffic/parking impact on the neighborhood, will not survive.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	

<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs and CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>I would be very concerned about negatively impacting the ability of Portland residents to be involved in food buying clubs and CSAs. These groups support our local economy and bring neighbors together to build community. We need to support these efforts and not regulate them away.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should allow drops in residential and open space areas for food buying clubs & CSAs whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic. It is important to understand that the membership size of a club is largely irrelevant and that a club may have 300 people on its Yahoo group list, but that at MOST only 40 people participate in any given buy and that most buys involve 20 people or less! Also, that in most cases there are long pick-up windows, sometimes up to several days for non-perishable products. Understanding the range of buying clubs, what they are and how they operate is essential before writing code about them. Please work with some of the folks from local buying clubs (like Lents, Montavilla, Eastside) in order to ensure you get this right and not just decide based on what happened with Know Thy Food. Also, many local farmers/p</p>	<p>As I have indicated before, complaint-driven zoning decisions are problematic, and it is essential to differentiate between a buying club that is a true "collective" of friends and neighbors who are coming together to ensure they can buy better by buying together, buying in bulk, and buying as directly from producers and distributors as possible, from a COMMERCIAL venture (like Know Thy Food) where the founder is making her living off this and should be lodged in a commercial zone. Also, since home-based businesses are allowed to have 8 clients at a time, buying clubs should have at least that much leeway. So if you figure allow for 10 minute per pickup (which is actually longer than it takes with most CSAs or small buys), that's 48 people an hour. And most buying don't force this into a one hour window (nor do the buys happen every day or even every week). So the impact on parking and traffic is really much less than your average, busy home-based business.</p>
<p>The new zoning codes should continue to allow CSA and buying club drops in residential and open space areas, rather than restrict these drops to commercial and light industry zones. One possible solution would be to allow at any residential site those buys/pickups which do not exceed 60 buyers, and to offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pickups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic</p>	<p>I'm very concerned that the new zoning could limit people's access to fresh and local food--this is critical to sustainability and an essential piece of Portland's food policy.</p>
<p>The whole idea of CSAs and food buying clubs is to bring food into neighborhoods and make it accessible to the residents there. Restricting it to commercial zones makes absolutely no sense and goes against the whole idea of neighborhood and community food that buying clubs and CSAs promote.</p>	<p>As a member of buying clubs and CSAs, I'm concerned that access will be restricted by the new regulation. Why make it more difficult than it already is? Make sure that the limits are reasonable if limits have to be placed on membership because of parking concerns, etc. (I have participated in two CSAs and a buying club that picks up all over town, and parking has NEVER been a problem - farmer's markets cause much more challenging parking than CSA/buying club pickups.)</p>
<p>There was no 'not sure' choice. I don't have enough information to make an observation one way or another. However, I think it unwise to assume that one size fits all and that it may be advantageous to be flexible with each site.</p>	

<p>These activities are spontaneous and are currently occurring. They don't require City Planning intervention or legislation. Further inspection and enforcement activities reduce the desirability of Portland as a place to live and operate a business, especially a low-profit-margin small business.</p>	<p>Excessive cost of Inspection and Enforcement on people attempting to feed themselves and their friends/neighbors leading to wasted time and increased cost of doing so.</p>
<p>These activities should not be blanket regulated. Problems should be handled between neighbors and traffic and noise should be handled on a case-by-case basis through noise ordinances etc. To restrict basic access to fresh and inexpensive food is wrong.</p>	<p>Undue restriction.</p>
<p>These are privately run and operated food distribution sites, and we need more of them. They are not asking for help from the government, so don't try to hinder them with regulation. They are doing fine on their own, with no complaints, except for one which wasn't even a true food buying club but instead was a commercial grocery store operation who someone was operating out of their home. That one has since moved to a commercial space which better fits their business. CSAs and buying clubs should be allowed to operate anywhere their private organizers choose. If there are complaints, those should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, not by a broad city-wide policy which could/would discourage new CSAs or buying clubs from even forming. Again, leave the regulation out of this area -- it's not appropriate or helpful in this area.</p>	<p>Again, the only concern I have is not having enough CSAs and buying clubs. Government should stay out of the way and let more of these form, unless your regulation would include startup funding or physical locations to help them start.</p>
<p>These clubs should be allowed in all areas including residential</p>	
<p>These distribution sites should be allowed in whatever location they choose. Stop infringing on the rights of citizens to gather. We gather to increase health and nutrition, reduce consumption, keep money as local as possible and to further values that should be encouraged by the city, not discouraged through the production of codes and regulations.</p>	<p>The desire of the city of Portland, which I love, to deter the distribution of produce and money to the local community which reduces emissions, increases food security, promotes money staying in the local economy, and brings food producers and consumers closer together.</p>
<p>These drop sites and club deliveries promote community in the neighborhood. The idea of small farm to table is reversed if you only allow drops to be in commercial zones; this would require people to drive to various locales, also impact the whole idea of sustainability.</p>	
<p>These operate best in residential areas. Some choose to move to a more commercial level, but this is economically prohibitive. Sets the stage for hostile behaviors.</p>	<p>Powerful entities controlling consumer options.</p>
<p>These should be contained to specific locations with a minimum distribution group size.</p>	<p>na</p>

<p>These types of food buying clubs have been around in residential areas all over Portland and have done so with no complaints from neighbors. Small clubs have no impact on traffic, etc. and should be allowed to continue as they have been doing. Larger clubs should also be able to operate in residential areas after fulfilling neighborhood notification requirements similar to those already in place for residents who keep backyard livestock. As long as clubs stick to the guidelines and pose no problems for traffic flow, etc., there is no valid reason to stop them from providing much-needed affordable quality food to individuals and families.</p>	<p>the impact on health and well-being of people if these resources are no longer available.</p>
<p>they should be allowed to distribute from residential areas</p>	<p>if food buying clubs and/or csas are forced to move to commercial zones many may end up closing down or losing members</p>
<p>This direction will limit access to food buying clubs for those who cannot organize around commercial zones.</p>	<p>Limiting access to clubs for those not able to organize around commercial zones. Also change of drop-off sites could be less convenient making people less likely to participate. Food is a residential commodity. We prepare and eat food in our homes, in our neighborhoods. Food buying clubs are residential business, we should have access to them in our neighborhoods.</p>
<p>This distribution does not need to be regulated, there is no impact currently.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>This is a restriction of food access. All distribution sites should be allowed to operate in residential and open space areas until a concern is raised by the neighbors. Most CSA's and buying clubs are low impact with either few members or few members picking up at one time. Those with more members picking up at one time and who are in spaces that cause concern among neighbors should be evaluated on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>Restriction of food access.</p>
<p>This is another example of unnecessary regulation. Food buying "clubs" are not commercial enterprises, nor are they home based businesses. Typically they are busy families trying to help each other live healthier lives. There is no significant impact on the local economy, and probably no significant impact on the local community. My neighbor hosts a "bunco" party every so often, which results in cars parked all up and down the street for several hours. That is probably more impact on the neighborhood than someone having people pick up food for a food buying club. Someone has lost perspective in this matter. The complainers will have an all night party with inebriated guests, then complain the next day that their neighbor had three or four people pick up something at their house. There is no need for regulation of food buying clubs.</p>	<p>Government bending to lack of tolerance and creating regulations for the sake of regulations.</p>

<p>This is fairly vague and limits access and opportunity, particularly for low-income groups that cannot afford commercial space. How about distribution sites at schools, or other public/community buildings with the infrastructure to support the traffic.</p>	<p>Unmeetable standards of operation.</p>
<p>This is senseless administration that will only cost the community money. The shares of food I purchase and where I organize to distribute is not of concern.</p>	<p>Share drops are an avenue to building community.</p>
<p>This is the WRONG direction. Food buying clubs are extremely low impact. Please do not regulate this because of a few grumpy neighborhood complaints.</p>	<p>That food buying clubs will be harder to access, thereby creating a barrier to affordable high quality and LOCAL food. Having small neighborhood pick up points also strengthens the community.</p>
<p>This might limit the # of buying club locations allowed in the city. As the economy continues to worsen, such clubs serve as important wholesome food resources to individuals with shrinking incomes. I belong to a buying club and am quite happy with the experience.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>This sounds like it's restricting where distribution sites will be allowed, which is the wrong direction.</p>	
<p>This sounds potentially restrictive to me. Maybe because "fewer members" is not defined. Food buying clubs are a way for people to get healthy food at lower prices, and it's not easy to organize a large enough group to meet the minimum for a delivery, let alone have to find a commercial space for distribution.</p>	<p>I really would like to encourage growth of both CSAs and food buying clubs, so more people can get healthy food.</p>
<p>This will basically destroy a valuable community resource. Allowing residential food buying clubs/CSAs based on membership numbers is faulty, since many members do not make regular large purchases.</p>	<p>It needs to be easier, NOT harder, to purchase affordable, sustainable and nutritious food for Portlanders. This change would be disastrous to this crucial service.</p>
<p>This will make it harder for food buying clubs and CSA's to exist. This is a network that should be cultivated. In case of economic or natural disasters they will become a lifeline for whole communities. They also allow people to buy locally and consciously.</p>	
<p>This would be a financial burden to the very people attempting to lower food costs. The city claims to support efforts that decrease food insecurity so this would be a step in the wrong direction.</p>	
<p>This would be very damaging to many, many small farms as well as the consumers who rely on these deliveries. These delivery points are very temporary, often just a couple hours per week, and cause very little to no neighborhood disruption. Often the opposite happens, and neighbors are brought together for a common cause.</p>	<p>The economic impacts for some small farms would be staggering, probably putting some of them out of business when the CSA members would be required to travel to a potentially undesirable commercial location to pick up their food. Portland has been at the forefront of the local food movement, and this is clearly a step in the wrong direction.</p>
<p>too restrictive. Most food buying clubs are grass roots small groups, requiring them to distribute only from light industrial areas is too restrictive because that is not where we live. This would have repercussions for racial equity of food distribution as it might negative impact people of color who already have less access to high quality inexpensive food compared to Whites.</p>	<p>Let all these process be led by a complaint process that facilitates neighbors working with the CSA or foodbuying group directly rather than trying to make rules that don't fit for everyone!</p>

<p>Using membership size to determine where pickups area allowed is not a good idea. The size of the order and number of members ordering is a better guideline. Clubs need to be convenient and not have a lot of overhead to be workable. These new regulations would be a huge burden to small <u>volunteer-run clubs.</u></p>	<p>Addin regulations to something that I'd already difficult to manage could shut it down completely.</p>
<p>We have been part of two buying groups. One, KNow Thy Food, was operated more on the model of a business and so generated more traffic. Moving it to a different location works fine but our local, very small Azure buying group is very different in scope and traffic generation. This works well in residential areas with limited group buying times, such as once or twice a month.</p>	
<p>We need access to food conveniently & taking them out of neighborhoods hinders this. Making it more difficult to access food from local farms while also building strong community is the beauty of a CSA & this direction works <u>against it.</u></p>	
<p>We need residential drop off sites for CSAs!!!</p>	
<p>We should allow food buying club drop sites in any area that does not exceed 60 buyers and at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic. I reiterate that if there is a problem with a club, then people will complain and then their complaints can be resolved on a per case basis. Do not judge all food <u>clubs the same.</u></p>	<p>There is a recession happening right now. Do you really want to RESTRICT people's access to food? How does this help anything? If anything, we need more buying clubs and we need to give them money and resources, not squeeze them all out and cut them off with restrictions. If we have a problem, we can solve it between ourselves. We don't need a nanny to solve our disputes, we need encouragement and <u>empowerment.</u></p>
<p>We should look at clubs and CSA drops not by # of members but by largest buy/pickup. For example we could allow drops in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>Making it more difficult for clubs and CSA drops to be in residential areas will make it more difficult for people to participate. See above statement.</p>
<p>We should outright allow small food buying clubs to distribute in neighborhoods. The overhead associated with finding space in a commercial area would kill small buying clubs and commercialize the ones that can afford to rent space - <u>which pretty much defeats the purpose.</u></p>	<p>Food buying clubs are a solution for areas of low food access. I am concerned that the behaviour of wealthier clubs who participate because it's fashionable might be negatively effecting the smaller clubs that exist because of need.</p>

<p>Well, sort of the right direction. Most food buying clubs that operate out of residences are by nature small. Currently, home based businesses are allowed to have up to eight clients per day. Similar rules should apply to buying clubs. CSAs, which generally only distribute weekly, could be allowed an exception. For example, zoning codes should allow distribution sites in residential and open space areas for clubs & CSA drops whose LARGEST buys/pickups at any residential site do not exceed 60 buyers and offer at least a 6 hour window for pickup. Any residential buys/pick ups smaller than that should have no restrictions since they will have virtually no impact on parking or traffic.</p>	<p>Food buying clubs provide working class families access to high quality food that they could not otherwise afford. Part of the savings comes from volunteers who offer their homes as distribution sites.</p>
<p>What about rotational delivery sites? Size maybe isn't as important as process of delivery...</p>	<p>obviously, this is geared at traffic, but it seems to limit accessibility in various areas.</p>
<p>What impact does a CSA drop site have in a neighborhood except to bring fresh vegetables and fruit to people? We have been operating a CSA for 20 years which delivers to many residential neighborhoods in both Seattle and Portland and there have been no negative impacts that we can see. That rule would have a huge negative impact on our CSA.</p>	
<p>Who will determine what the right "small site" size is? Arbitrary work being done to find a problem to attach to.</p>	
<p>Why does a food buying club need to be regulated so much?! On what basis would "size" be determined? Not all members are always active or always order every week or are able to go great distances to pick up orders (many are on foot, on bike, with children, etc), so requiring them to only operate in certain "zoned" areas is an undue burden. Again, if a situation arises, deal with it on an as-needed community basis. Uniform zoning across diverse neighborhoods is NOT always appropriate. Plus, causing groups to have to get/PAY for permits to order their own food with friends is ridiculous. Plus an undue burden of paperwork (I can imagine), constantly having to watch member numbers to keep the group "small" enough--just a lot of unnecessary regulations, just to get food! Again, space will limit size. Once/IF it becomes big, it will move! The club would WANT to! But all these things should be decided by the members, for whom the club operates, to ensure access for its members.</p>	<p>Making it more difficult for people to access good, healthy food from alternative sources (as in, not grocery stores). Reducing the ability of local farmers (obviously including surrounding cities) to sell their goods to people who want them but may otherwise not be able to access them. If you are talking about EXPANDING distribution sites to include commercial zones/light industry (though I can't imagine why they wouldn't already be allowed there?), great. But if you are trying to LIMIT group size to keep distribution zoned for different areas, that is the wrong direction.</p>
<p>Why does the city need to regulate this? CSA's and food buying clubs function fine without the city regulating them. If there is a problem it can be addressed at the neighborhood level.</p>	
<p>Why is this regulation needed?</p>	

<p>Why limit neighbors from coming together to get their food? This is actually creating less traffic on the roads and honestly most buying clubs have GREAT relationships with their neighbors (who are not in the buying club) and are respectful of their concerns and issues. If you make more regulations it will probably cause some clubs to close which would mean individuals will have less opportunity to support local businesses</p>	<p>That once the government starts to "regulate" these naturally occurring, evolving things (i.e. buying club, food stalls, etc) and by regulating it they are disrupting the community.</p>
<p>Why limit residential neighborhoods. a CSA has considerably less impact than the plethora of legal and illegal "child care" facilities allowed in res. areas</p>	<p>tyranny of small group of complainers ruining things for rest of us by complaining.</p>
<p>Why need the limit? Also, this question is confusing as well as the other ones. What is allowed now and what is changing? I support any access to any food people choose. Please do not put restrictions on where we get our food from! Keeping our food IN our neighborhoods, allows people to travel less to get what they need. Food buying clubs as well as CSA's are part of a sustainable approach to healthy communities and our planet!</p>	<p>Not having access to affordable healthy food. Also, giving up the freedom to choose how we get the food for our families. This is just crazy!</p>
<p>Why not allow for drop sites in residential areas? That's where people live. If we're going to survive peak oil, we have to begin re-integrating our residential activities with our 'commercial' activities. People shouldn't have to drive across town to pick up their CSA share! Distributing food from a buying club or CSA in a residential area is also an opportunity for neighbors to get to know each other.</p>	
<p>Why restrict residential?</p>	
<p>Why should it matter to the government where food is distributed? These should not be limited to commercial zones, nor should the number of people be limited in any one club. This is a private venture, it should be allowed to stay that way!</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Why the restrictions for buying clubs? I belong to one, only order about twice a year, and I have to pick up within 4 hours, so it's not especially hard on the neighborhood.</p>	
<p>You absolutely need to allow people to participate in small distribution sites in residential areas. These are an important alternative for families to access wholesome food at a more reasonable price than available commercial options can provide. This is a critical component to ensuring food security for struggling families in Portland. Don't take convenient access to food clubs away!</p>	<p>I have none. This is a great option for families and should be promoted.</p>
<p>You are limiting a local economy and integrating it into areas where cost and economies of scale have already created barriers to entry for small farmers. open it up</p>	<p>Limiting these groups to higher cost areas will hamper the growth of buying locally grown</p>
<p>you are limiting our access to CSA and FBC based on a single complaint. People need to pick up the food in a in good location not limited to commercial zones and light industry</p>	<p>Limiting access to CSAs and buying clubs</p>

<p>You need to allow this in residential and open space areas as well. Most food buying clubs do not have access to a space in commercial areas or light industrial areas. This would add quite a bit of cost to folks who are trying to keep their food costs low (and local).</p>	
<p>Zoning may regulate for a longer pick up window or cap the number of members so as to manage the number of vehicle trips near pick up site</p>	<p>Maintenance at site</p>
	<p>I am very concerned about any limitations with either type of distributions. Families need easier food access that doesn't involve a supermarket, and allows for purchases from local farmers and in bulk for reasonable prices. Not only does this improve livability, it strengthens neighborhoods and brings neighbors together.</p>
	<p>I have never heard of a food buying club or CSA pickup causing high traffic problems. Usually they are infrequent, small, and seasonal. I think they should be allowed in any neighborhood because that is the whole point. As long as they are not more than say 10 days per month there should be <u>no restrictions</u>.</p>
	<p>There shouldn't be limitations.</p>

TOPIC AREA 4: FOOD MEMBERSHIP DISTRIBUTION SITES	
Question 10: Direction: Allow food membership distribution sites in commercial zones and areas where light industry is allowed. Consider allowing small distribution sites with fewer members to operate in residential and open space areas. Is this the right direction? DIDN'T ANSWERED "YES" or "NO"	Question 11: What types of impacts concern you the most?
Allow food buying clubs to flourish in neighborhoods --they are wonderful and not disturbing the flow.	Losing the buying clubs. they seem very under control in our neighborhood. I know there is one right around our corner and I have never seen a traffic back up due to pick up.
Depends where the cut-off is placed between small and large markets.	
I have no experience or knowledge of this, so I'll pass.	
Is CSA delivery restricted now? Will this be restricting it further? I think there should be no restrictions on distribution.	
It should depend on parking available, average number of people picking up at a time.	Restricting buying clubs would decrease food access. Our buying club accepts USNAPOWLC.
Maybe. How many members is "fewer?"	Like all small farms, CSAs operate on a shoestring. Having to pay for commercial/light industrial space, rather than delivering to the home of a volunteer, could break the operation. Maybe define the characteristics a "deliverable" home would need in terms of space and access, and put it on a permitting system.
not sure how to answer this question, seems tricky, most of the CSA I know deliver to residential areas, which is great, seems like this proposed direction would regulate that and I'm not for that	
The intent should be to ensure that food distributors check with immediate neighbors to smooth out any potential problems and open avenues for communicating concerns. Rather than create new regulation, I would state the intent that distributors work with affected neighbors and deal with complaints under existing neighborhood dispute resolution processes.	Parking, foot, bike and car traffic, or delivery vehicles which create safety, access, property damage or trespassing problems for neighbors.
This is not clear to me what the answer is. I would probably say yes, but I could be mistaken.	???
What do you mean "consider allowing" small sites to operate in residential spaces? THEY ALREADY DO!	
	I am currently a shareholder of a csa and my family and I are very concerned about possible limitations on distribution of the farm we belong to. These limitations directly effect our access to this food! Bringing fresh farm food into neighborhoods for the residents (csa members) helps build healthy, vibrant communities and is part of what makes Portland such an amazing place to live.

TOPIC AREA 5: ANIMALS/BEEES	
<p>Question 12: Direction: Clarify and resolve minor problems with existing regulations; consider modifying the neighbor 'sign-off' requirement for beekeeping, and consider increasing the number of animals allowed from 3 to 4 for good husbandry practices. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"</p>	<p>Question 13: What types of impacts concern you the most?</p>
<p>100% sign-off for doing just about anything is a pretty rare event. Modifying that seems prudent.</p>	
<p>3 chicken or even 5 is not going to impact a neighbor. A family of 3-4 actually needs 5 chickens to supply their family with enough eggs.</p>	
<p>3 chickens is not enough for egg production for a family of four. Also, what if you want to raise chickens for meat? You will need more than 3, but they won't be around that long , mitigating their impact.</p>	
<p>3 to 4 won't make any practical difference. people all over violate the 3 animal limit and i think up to 10 farm animals is workable, but i wouldn't bat an eye at 6. perhaps for larger animals like goats 6 would be too many at one time, but poultry and rabbits would be fine.</p>	<p>Dave Thompson, who handles permitting, needs to be replaced by someone who has actual knowledge and experience with urban farming!!! The guidelines need to be re=vamped to make sense and actually consider the well being of the animals as well as the neighbors. i also think that the biggest gap in achieving food security is social. the anonymous complaint system inhibits community dialog and gives too much power to uptight or otherwise grumpy neighbors. citizens need to be educated to make the shift to seeing farmers as some of the most respected participants in the economy and community. in cuba farmers are among the MOST respected people in the community, like doctors and teachers!</p>
<p>4 animals makes sense, as even chickens do better in a flock than just a few isolated individuals. Bees are an important resource, and the neighbor sign-off requirement is a little silly. There is no way to keep all types of critter out of your yard, wild or domesticated, and not allowing your neighbors to keep bees is ridiculous.</p>	<p>It concerns me that children are growing up in antiseptic environments without access to dirt, bugs, and food. Trying to keep our lives germ-free is a bad thing. Allow people to keep food animals within reason, and we'll all have access to quality sources of nutrition, and better quality of life all around.</p>
<p>4 animals seems reasonable. neighbor sign-off on bees is trickier. i get why it's required, i get the argument that it should not be required. have heard it can be hard to get unanimous approval. the risks aren't high in general, but then what about the family with a young child who is highly allergic to bee stings? it's a hard one to get right; deserves another look though.</p>	
<p>4 still seems a little low.</p>	
<p>Absolutely. As a chicken owner, having 4 chickens is much better for the animals than 3. There are more problems getting 3 to get along than 4. I learned that from my chicken vet when my 3rd chicken almost died from abuse from 2 chickens. I got a 4th, and now the flock is much healthier and happier. For beekeeping, we need more bees. It would be great to make it easier.</p>	<p>There really are no impacts from increasing to 4 for chickens as long as current regulations for maintenance and upkeep are upheld. I have found 4 soo much easier to manage than 3 with no extra work (except more poop to clean up - but that's minor!). The chickens are happier and less disruptive. My neighbors love the chickens and come to visit often.</p>

Again, brings our food sources closer to home. Brings folks back to the land/earth. Totally for this where ever possible.	The bee sign off is hard. People should know that bee swarms are inherently docile (they're homeless, and full of honey), so are nothing to fear. Wish it was easier for beekeepers in Portland. Maybe just require a swarm catchign class for all beekeepers, vs sign off.
Again, many people don't have any money. If they can raise some animals, it only helps everyone. If we have bees, it helps pollination of those small market gardens you are promoting.	Too many animals will cause noise and air pollution. We need an effective complaint resolution system to solve any problems with neighbors. Also, no billy goats, roosters or pigs please!
Again, the closer we are to our food sources, the better. Also, the more responsibility individuals/families can have in agricultural practices, the more aware we'll be regarding sustainable & environmental practices. Plus, it will help ween us off of large Ag who is more interested in big money than healthy populations.	Animal abuse would be my biggest concern.
Again, the more food is produced within the city, the less must be imported. This not only improves the economy of the community but makes it more secure in the event of some disruption. Even the people who would never eat locally produced food will benefit if supplies to stores are temporarily cut off by a flood or earthquake.	Good manure management is important.
Again, the more the merrier, please create regulations and wording that encourages people to raise easily accommodated animals in residential areas.	None
Again, this is important for sustainability and community. Bees are important for the future of all people who eat food!	Neighbors should be respectful as far as noise and smell are concerned.
Again, we need to become a sustainable population. We cannot count on commercial practices to supply all of our food needs. The trust is gone between many buyers and stores.	
Again, with the caveat that I don't know what you mean when you say "modifying the neighbor 'sign-off' requirement". Adding one? Dropping it? Some more info would be helpful. A lot of my neighbors keep chickens and bees, and I think it's a really positive thing.	
Agree with animal husbandry practices...	Disclosure during house buying process to neighbors with animals.
Allow more animals and allow MORE bee keeping.	
Allowing people to keep animals allows people to control what they eat and keeps food from having to be shipped.	If this is in favor of backyard animals, I have no concerns.
Although I don't know what modifications you'll be making for the beekeeping sign-off requirment.	
Always good to keep the peace with neighbors!	
Animals kept as livestock need companions; a limit of three often leaves, with predation, a single or only two animals, which is too few for regular food production.	Educating people that bees are not harmful to have as neighbors, and encouraging people to not see animals in neighboring yards as a nuisance. Teaching people that to have food, there have to be animals involved at some point, whether birds for eggs, dairy for milk (goats are better in neighborhoods, obviously, than cows) and bees for any and all produce we eat: 1 in every 3 bites of food comes from pollination.

Animals like chickens, goats or ducks need to be in pairs whenever possible, so this would allow two pygmy goats and two chickens or two chickens and two ducks and seems very logical. The neighbor sign off for bees is not realistic and divides neighbors, whereas many of the other activities in this survey bring people together. There are honey bees all over the city, along with other stings insects beyond everyone's control. I think that it would be great to work with local beekeepers, Matt Reed, Glen Andresen, Laura Dalton and many others to make sure that siting options or restrictions are correct in terms of the activity bees have coming right in and out of the hive, but otherwise, let there be bees!!! :)	The growth of urban livestock is incredible and the animals involved all have useful, positive waste products for composting, garden and landscape use. They also can't seriously bite or kill anyone the way a domestic dog can. Yay Portland!!
Animals will play a vital role in ensuring food security for all Portlanders, so I support movement in any direction that breaks down barriers to adopting these practices and integrating animals into the land space we have available.	
Any increase in productivity is better than existing.	
Anything that provides more freedom and food security is positive.	Excessiveness for lot size but what is excessive for one is not for another so it's a personal issue.
Anything you can do to make this easier (and yet still safe) is great.	
As long as neighbors have some sort of veto power.	
As long as only 4 hens maximum are allowed (unless more with a permit). Having chickens, myself, I don't want to attract mice, raccoons, etc.	
As long as people are able to maintain their animals/bees in a sanitary manner they should be allowed to house more than 3 animals at a time. We should encourage anyone who is able to keep bees to do so for the sake of our plants and gardens.	Bees are essential for the survival of virtually all plants and therefore all animals and humans. I'm concerned that people with allergies will discourage the keeping of bees in urban areas. While allergies are serious for some, we need to encourage bee keeping for the good of us all.
As long as people take good care of their animals, it is a bonus to incorporate chickens, bees, and goats into neighborhoods.	Hopefully animal keepers are incorporating symbiotic practices such as using manure to fertilize gardens.
As long as the beekeeping modification is to get rid of the neighbor "sign-off". Too many people are mis-educated about bees and this requirement makes it nearly impossible to become compliant.	As long as the beekeeping modification is to get rid of the neighbor "sign-off". Too many people are mis-educated about bees and this requirement makes it nearly impossible to become compliant.
As long as the homeowner or renter can provide and maintain adequate shelter and noise restrictions with the animals on their property then it seems beneficial to have 4 animals that provide food and help with grazing to live within city limits.	Noise ordinance violations and unintentional animal cruelty by unknowledgeable animal keepers.
As long as the people are being responsible, 4 seems reasonable. There should be some level of control over residential husbandry.	
As long as the policy to have more chickens is not removed.	
as urban husbandry develops in Portland, the number of animals allowed should increase for responsible people.	what are the minor problems with existing regulations? what modifications are being considered in regards to the neighbor sign-off requirement?

Backyard bees are great and safe! Please don't over-regulate them.	Chickens can be kinda loud. Seems like that would be better suited for neighbor sign-off.
be careful with this one since animals move make waste and noise. Plants don't. Besides you can live a long life without meat.	
Because 3 is a minimum necessary for herd animals social well-being; with mortality a reality, it's simpler and easier to keep cushion - I know this first hand raising chickens. I learned to always have 4.	None - I am surrounded by poultry keepers (3 within the block).
Because people need to be able to raise their own food as much as possible.	As long as neighbors communicate any concerns regarding allergies, there should be no problem with urban beekeeping. As for chickens, goats, and the like the city should make it easier to keep these animals, perhaps with workshops and subsidized chicken coops--that's what I'd like to see my tax dollars buying!
Bee hives need to be encouraged! (Maybe limit them to less than 4 per single unit dwelling and require they be in a fully fenced backyard.) We cannot pollinate the food in gardens without bees so this is very important.	
Bee regs at present are built to fail the beekeeper	
Beekeeping has such beneficial impact and I have never been stung by bees from neighboring hives. I think increasing the possibility of 4 animals is fine as long as they are well taken care of.	just want to be sure that the animals are not neglected.
Bees and chickens should be allowed.	
Bees are becoming endangered and I strongly support Urban Bee Keeping. There are well recognized health benefits for using local honey. The other animals listed would have a negligible impact.	Would be concerned about husbandry practices in too close proximity causing sleep disturbances due to noise.
Bees are a beneficial insect that don't impact neighbors, therefore their consent should not be required.	
bees are extremely important and we need to do whatever possible to increase the amount of bees in our areas. four animals is not that many and might be a better number for health of the animals	now if there were four goats...that could get very disturbing for neighbors due to noise
Bees are generally beneficial to gardens everywhere and neighbors should not be required to sign off on the activities of urban beekeepers. The number of animals allowed should be increased beyond 4, in my opinion.	None.
Bees are needed!!	Having a neighbor with a bunch of smelly, loud animals. Obviously, not going to happen if we keep it to 3-4.
Bees are useful and as long as there is warning in the neighborhood and the neighbors agree, there should be little to no problems.	Possibly concerns for people who are allergic
Bees are wonderful! They help all plant life, for eating and for oxygen and for everything else -- and local honey is the best honey! I think it'd be great if people were encouraged to keep bees (responsibly).	none
Bees have a right to be.	

Bees should not require neighbor sign off. Additionally, 4 chickens is no more burdensome than 3. This would be great.	
Bees still need to be regulated.	
Bees, wasps, hornets are present in all neighborhoods, and bees are the most placid. Although my son was allergic to these insects as a youngster, I realized that having bees around was necessary for agriculture and the health of our gardens. And I love the sound of clucking chickens!	
Bring it on.	Colliding headlong into a ram.
But I don't have much knowledge to really say if this is a good direction or not.	
certainly letting people support themselves in more ways on their own land would be a great idea.	I would like to see many more people in the city becoming more "country", this would be great.
Chickens are good and ducks rule!	Animal neglect, smells
chickens breeds need to be bought in pairs of 2. When I get my chickens next spring, I intend to get the necessary permission to purchase 4 because I want two different breeds. I think just for the sake of happy numbers for animals, it would be a more peaceful dynamic....if that makes sense. groups of three never work out except on the wall. lol	I didn't know about the sign-off policy for neighbors so I can't speak to that. I do like it though! I think that is very conscientious. :)
clarification is fine, however, please limit increasing regulations where there are no wide-spread problems recorded.	
clarification is good.	
clarification is the biggest issue. If we don't like it, we can try to change it - but it helps of the law is clear	I want people to be able to keep more animals/bees - but I also want a venue for complaints if they are not good caretakers. I am concerned about animal health, odors and disease. I am not concerned with permitting so much as making sure the right info is available, esp to first time animal keepers - to know how to provide adequate care, housing and feed for their livestock.
Clarifying the existing regulations to fix problems is wonderful. Making the process clear to people and protecting the rights of people to raise farm animals and keep bees in their yards is one of the things that makes portland an amazing city.	
Clarity is good.	
Considering the problems with bee colony collapse disorder the more back yard bee hives the better. If enough people were raising bees and planting bee gardens it could really provide a population and gene reserve if commercial bee populations continue to fall.	
Definately the right direction!	
Designating neighborhoods as needed could work.	Noise of too many animals can be a challenge in neighborhoods with small plots.

Different sizes of lots and the lay out of the buildings can offer different opportunities. Ideally, neighbors will respect each others sensitivities ~ bee allergies being one and sanitary conditions with creatures such as chickens and rabbits are another. We have a neighbor here with 14 cats and kittens. They roam through our yards. I'm sure it will increase to 36 as soon as the kittens mature. It will have to be addressed. There will always be issues between neighbors. We solved a barking dog problem ourselves. We can do it with smelly chickens or goats as well.	The typical human condition.... irresponsibility and disregard on how one's actions affect others. That will exist whether there are regulations or not. I know there are concerns about vermin when food is available for chickens. People need to be viligent and there will be those who won't be. *sigh*
don't know, this survey doesn't give me enough imformation for respond correctly. What are the minor problems with existing regulations?	not concerned about people having animals in the city
Easing regulations would be a good thing.	Forcing production into outlying areas distances consumers from farmers. I'd like to be able to walk to a small, neighborhood dairy for my milk, as I have been able to do in Germany.
Encourages neighborly respect and cooperation, encourages a continuing support for urban farms which are so popular here and a great example, which is being noticed by the way, across the nation - in a positive way.	
encourages self-sufficiency	noise; disturbing neighbors
Encouraging good husbandry practices with less neighbor sign-off.	The home and land where I live should be available to my family to use as we see fit. The health of the animals should be protected.
Even 4 is not a whole huge lot.	
everyone has more than 3 chickens anyway	
Everyone wants 4 chickens. Most already have. Make honest citizens of them.	
Families have the right to grow their own food be it vegetable or animal.	None.
fewer restrictions is better	too many restrictions and regulations
Food density and diversity.	I live in a duplex and grow food for both occupants and the landlord. all three families have sat down and planned for some of the chickens to be raised. great plan until we found out that we are considered multifamily housing and can't have any livestock.
Four animals are highly unlikely to cause more problems than three. I think the neighbor "sign-off" requirement for bees is currently untenable, as it is difficult to get neighbors to "sign-off" on anything, however innocuous, due to (reasonable) paranoia about legal responsibility. There are of course already a vast number of wild bees in Portland (thank goodness, as we need them for pollination of course) and small numbers of beehives in residential areas would not even cause a noticeable increase. Anything which helps people in Portland raise more food is a step forward in sustainability for the city.	I am slightly concerned about the impact of pygmy goats on Trimet buses after more than one incident of unattended goats boarding unattended buses in my neighborhood. :) But I believe unattended goats are already covered in the current regulations, although unattended buses are not.

Four animals would have virtually no more impact than three and would be a positive change. Modifying the neighbor sign-off requirement for beekeeping would also be a positive change. Notifying neighbors would be a better requirement - that way, communication would still be taking place, and people could speak of their concerns, without being able to hold up the process unreasonably. This would encourage more beekeepers to register with the city.	
from 3 to 4 why bother.	
Gives city people access to fresh food.	Noise could be a concern
Gives people more opportunity to be self sufficient.	Animals can sometimes become a nuisance, i.e. roosters crowing, goats bleating or escaping. Owners should be responsible to their neighbors, and regulations do need to protect the community from these types of problems.
Good food closer to home!	
good stuff	none
Growing our own food is an important skill and helps with food security.	
having poultry and bees in the city is good for everyone	mistreatment of poultry by folks who know nothing about chicken. Perhaps a chicken certificate would be a good thing that city poultry raisers must have to raise chickens- that being just a basic facts of raising chickens class
Healthy food should be more accessible and easier to grow.	
Helps save bee populations; improves quality of urban life.	Good fencing for farm animals, warning signs around large bee concentrations.
Honeybees are so benign, it is silly to allow fearful neighbors to impact the siting of hives. 4 chickens are not excessive.	what is the meaning of 'for good husbandry practices'?
Honeybees need our help. Can we get beekeeping away from Vector?	It shouldn't fall on beekeepers to educate the entire neighborhood about beekeeping and address people's ingrained but sometimes inappropriate bee phobias.
How can a bee hive or 2 or 3 possibly cause any problems in a neighborhood. There are colonies all over in nature in our parks, everywhere around us, but people dont even realize it. There should be no reason at all not to be allowed to have hives in residential areas. I am a bee keeper myself and my neighbors dont even know I have hives! Healthy bee colonies are SO needed right no. Same thing with chickens, they make SO much less noise and cause less trouble than dogs, who bark, poop all over and sometimes even bite people. Chickens do nothing but lay yummy eggs. If anything there should be tougher regulations about dogs in the city.	

<p>I agree with both. I would just add that some general information about beekeeping be included with the sign off. A lot of people have a natural fear without a lot of knowledge. A beekeeper should be allowed to show his neighborhood what background and knowledge he/she brings to the project.</p>	
<p>I agree with the increase to 4 animals (for most this means chickens); the difference between 3-4 is negligible.</p>	
<p>I AM AN ANIMAL SCIENTIST AND URBAN AGRICULTURE EDUCATOR, AND I AGREE THAT BEES SHOULD BE ALLOWED WITHOUT NEIGHBOR SIGN OFF, AND 4 LIVESTOCK UNITS SHOULD BE ALLOWED FOR POULTRY (EXCEPT ROOSTERS) & RABBITS. IN MY EXPERIENCE, MOST CITY LOTS, AND MOST CITY PEOPLE, ARE NOT EQUIPPED TO HOUSE & CARE FOR URBAN GOATS, EVEN 1 - 3 GOATS. Simple specified animal permit might be a good idea for urban goats.</p>	<p>I AM AN ANIMAL SCIENTIST AND URBAN AGRICULTURE EDUCATOR, AND I AGREE THAT BEES SHOULD BE ALLOWED WITHOUT NEIGHBOR SIGN OFF, AND 4 LIVESTOCK UNITS SHOULD BE ALLOWED FOR POULTRY (EXCEPT ROOSTERS) & RABBITS. IN MY EXPERIENCE, MOST CITY LOTS, AND MOST CITY PEOPLE, ARE NOT EQUIPPED TO HOUSE & CARE FOR URBAN GOATS, EVEN 1 - 3 GOATS. Simple specified animal permit might be a good idea for urban goats.</p>
<p>I am both a beekeeper and a chicken keeper. We have complied with all existing requirements and had no trouble getting the approval of our neighbors. We pay them back with eggs and honey, but our relationships were already great. For others, I would say that the permission part could be hard, and as a beekeeper, I know that a simple setback requirement is all that is necessary to keep a hive or three from even being detected by a neighbor. Bees fly up and away, so you can stand practically in front of the hive and not impact the bees. There is no reason to get every nervous Nellie all wrapped up about a hive of bees in the neighborhood.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>I am in favor of reducing the beekeeping permit requirements as much as possible. wild honeybees live all over the place and are obviously not subject to permitting. we have at times had several hives going in our backyard (standard size city lot) and people who are actually in our yard do not always notice the hives or the bees. our neighbors have never reported any negative effect due to our bees and I think the neighbor sign-off should absolutely be done away with. either that or the wild bees should also have to check in with the neighborhood.</p>	<p>I can imagine that there would be concerns regarding noise and smell from some of these animals, but 4 is still such a small number that it would take some pretty poor hygiene for it to become a problem. actually, I don't see why roosters aren't allowed in the city, when barking dogs, motorcycles, lawnmowers and weedwackers are all allowed and are equally as noisy and, in my opinion, more obnoxious.</p>
<p>I am not familiar with neighborhood sign-off regs, but bee keeping should be promoted, not restricted. We need them to pollinate almost every bit of produce we eat.</p>	<p>none</p>
<p>I am very supportive of removing obstacles to people raising appropriate animals in residential areas.</p>	

<p>I currently keep goats and chickens and have a permit that allows me to have more than 3. The time it takes to invest in a coop and chicken run is significant and it makes sense to allow for more than 3 chickens (I would recommend 5). I am also sensitive to neighbors and have given a chicken away before who was exceptionally noisy. To our neighbors that one chicken was louder than our goats ever were.</p>	<p>I think there could definitely be more considerations about goats in the regulations... I don't think that every neighbor should have to sign a petition, although I would stress that those getting larger animals regularly collect their neighbors concerns. I know our goats are really loud when they are in heat, so we take them somewhere else out of town for those few days. Not all breeds are like that, but it's something to think about.</p>
<p>I do agree that this should be regulated, for the animals' sake as well as the people. I'd like to see it correlate to the amount of space available. A person with half an acre should be allowed to have more animals than someone with a small lot in the same area.</p>	<p>The well-being of the animals!</p>
<p>I don't have enough information as to what you mean by "minor problems." But allowing an extra chicken or rabbit sounds great!</p>	<p>Again, just be careful of potential unintended consequences of new rules.</p>
<p>I don't know anyone that follows the beekeeping regs - too onerous.</p>	<p>Simplify registration and regulations, but make violations more punitive and actually more risk based (I.e. Vector problems, sanitary complaints)</p>
<p>I don't know enough about the "neighbor 'sign-off' requirement" so I can't comment, but if you are considering modifying it to make it more restrictive on the beekeeper/animal raiser, then NO this is not the right direction. If you would modify it to lessen the input of neighbors and allow beekeeping / animal raising regardless of neighbor sign-off, then YES that's the right direction. When bee populations are collapsing everywhere on this continent, why would we make it any more difficult on them? The more bees the better, and the more in the city the better... especially for our many fruit and nut trees and berries which grow here in <u>Portland</u></p>	<p>The only impact that concerns me is not having enough bees, or heaven forbid they go extinct.</p>
<p>I don't think goats should be allowed, due to their smell.</p>	<p>Noise, smell, bee allergies</p>
<p>I don't think neighbor approval should be required at all. Just allow or don't. Increasing number of animals is a good thing. Should allow more chickens, too.</p>	<p>They don't. I'm very flexible for how each person wants to use their property.</p>
<p>I don't think neighbors should have input on beekeeping, as hives are low impact and occur naturally. If numbers of animals are increased, are there square-feet-per-animal and humane treatment requirements along with those increases?</p>	<p>There should be culturally competent communication about how to raise, pen, and harvest animals and their products in a humane fashion.</p>
<p>I don't think that gaining neighbor approval for beekeeping is necessary and having two pairs for animals is a better number than three.</p>	
<p>I have neighbors who have more dogs than the current chicken standard. Why limit the birds? I've lived in several cities in the Northeast where my neighbors had goats. There was no <u>problem</u>.</p>	<p>I don't have any issue. It's no different than all of us who own dogs, cats and rabbits.</p>
<p>I haven't witnessed problems with this practice and given the potential benefits to the owners who are willing to raise the animals well, I don't see a reason to hinder them.</p>	

<p>i know neighbors who do not adhere to the sign-off requirement and the impact on neighbors of maintaining a hive is minimal</p>	
<p>I like that Portland allows all these animals/insects. However, I've been increasingly concerned about people choosing to break the rules and keep roosters, many chickens, let them run around in the street, etc. Seems like everyone I know does it... where does it stop?? I advocate many privileges to those who follow the rules but tight controls and swift fines for anyone who does not respect the rules or their neighbors.</p>	<p>Lack of education leading to neglected chickens or bees, ignored rules about roosters/max number of critters, neighbor impact. Neighbor complaints should be taken seriously and addressed immediately. Complaints about bees... I think this is an issue of community education. Bees are not wasps. Yet, some folks are allergic or phobic. I would like to see regular, good communication between neighbors and respect toward others in the community as a major requirement for those who wish to keep critters. Appropriate (predator-proof) housing should be addressed as well. Biggest concern of all... who is regulating it? Animal Control? Vector? the police? Who does a person call when their neighbor is breaking all the rules and being a bully about it? How's it being funded? Make the rules tight so offenders can't get a grip and neighbors have a leg to stand on for swift action when things escalate out of control.</p>
<p>I love that we have a city open to urban homesteading.</p>	<p>More rats & other wildlife can & do come with bringing more farm practices into the city. Some people are not clean or careful.</p>
<p>I love the urban farm and hearing chickens from my neighbors yards.</p>	<p>With larger livestock the smell of feces.</p>
<p>I support bees and these animals in the city.</p>	
<p>I support increasing the number of animals allowed and facilitating increased beekeeping within the City.</p>	
<p>I support increasing the number of animals allowed without a permit, in fact I would increase it further. I would also remove the neighbor sign-off requirement for beekeeping. Bees benefit our urban environment. While there is some risk involved with bees, they do not stay in the 50 foot radius of one's property. If the hive is properly sited so that the bees' flight path is up and not directed at neighbors or high traffic areas, neighbors should only benefit from their presence.</p>	<p>Urban animal husbandry should be encouraged by the city. Incorporating animals in a victory garden is an important part of building soil fertility and providing much needed healthy protein sources for low income families. 4 chickens is not enough to keep a whole family in eggs, or to rotate through the cycle of "retiring" older hens and raising up chicks to replace them. More should be allowed.</p>
<p>I support the increase from 3 to 4 and generally would want to reduce hurdles. Neighbors who do encounter legitimate disturbances from animals should have a recourse, but should not be allowed to preemptively stop a neighbor from having these animals.</p>	
<p>I think 4 animals is good. Three is too few. 4 sounds more appropriate to me. I think more than 4 rabbits should be allowed; 4 chickens or ducks is reasonable (and maybe more depending on size of lot).</p>	
<p>I think 4 chickens is great! It would be nice if there was a limit on a block for chickens. Our block has way too many and their food has attracted raccoons as some owners don't keep their food locked up.</p>	

I think as long as the animals do not disturb near by neighbors with noise or smell there should be no limit other then space of course.	Noise and smell pollution. Having some sort of public hotline or specific place to call if neighbors should disagree and answers to these types of questions before matters get too complicated. Guidelines would be helpful.
I think increasing the number is great. The more self-sufficient we are, the better.	I don't know what the existing minor problems are.
I think it's fantastic that folks are keeping animals in the city. I think it's very healing for folks (including neighbors of animal keepers) to have relationships with the animals and plants who feed them and this practice needs our support. I think we could go even further and reach for new ways to support this-- perhaps some kind of incentive for folks to tear down fences and share yards for this purpose?	I wonder about animals like goats having enough pasture on a residential lot.
I think neighbors need to be aware of the bees as there are life threatening allergies. But gov't regulation?? hmmm - maybe people just need to be respectful of each other..	
I think that the number of animals could be even greater, 6-8. Also what about pigs in small numbers, 1-2?	
I think the amount of animals should be dependent on the situation, not a 'one size fits all' solution. But the ability to have more is better	
I think these type of animals are better than Viscious Dogs aren't they ?	can't think of any
I think this is fine.	
If good husbandry practices really say 4 goats is enough, then great. But really, 4 goals is the max? Seems like too few goats, but then again I'm not an expert.	Unhappy farm animals.
If small food-producing animals can be kept in residential neighborhoods, food is more accessible to everyone.	Cleanliness. Owners must be able to maintain good hygiene with their animals.
If we are serious about conserving resources and increasing health by encouraging families to grow their own food and sell it to their neighbors, we have to have regulations that support this. Fears about beekeeping and animal husbandry are outdated.	
I'm concerned about what is meant by neighbor "sign-off" requirement because this survey does not state the meaning. Therefore, I'm unable to say if I agree with the direction. I think beekeeping should be encouraged and made easier not harder.	food access restrictions, poor animal husbandry practices (animals not treated humanely or unable to have their needs met)
I'm for more animals. You don't say what the modification to the beekeeping piece would be. I know that some people are afraid of bees, and some have a good reason because of allergy, but people who aren't allergic really need to get over their fears and consider the importance of the bee! Yes, it hurts me to get stung, but it kills the bee, so who suffers more? We need more pollinators, not fewer.	No roosters, please. They just make too much noise.

In most cases, keeping small amounts of small livestock on a neighborhood lot has no negative impact and many positive impacts on the neighborhood. This kind of practice should be made simple, streamlined, and fun. Education would also be a good direction to go in: along with providing regulations, provide classes and workshops.	No concerns.
Increase access to local food.	One neighbor, without logical reasoning, hindering access to local food. There should be an appeal process that allow exceptions, as needed, to INCREASE access to local food.
Increase education about where healthy food comes from. Increase access to healthy food for low income and urban dwellers.	
Increase food security where possible.	
Increase the ease of producing food locally!	
Increase the number of animals allowed, certainly. One may need four or more chickens to produce enough eggs for a household. And then there's the other animals, too.....	Bee keeping - if a person wants to keep bees they should be able to override the neighbour "sign-off" requirement if their property is a certain size (large).
Increase the number of animals to more than 4, and do away with the beekeeping sign-off. This is silly.	
Increase the number of animals, and remove the neighbor sign-off requirement for beekeeping. Bees are in reality less of a nuisance than chickens. They are not aggressive, do not make loud noises, and do not make a mess of backyards. Beekeepers, chicken keepers, duck keepers, etc DO NOT need permits to do what they do, with good practices. Bird and mammal numbers should be tied to lot size. 4 is a good minimum. Residents with half-acre lots could easily keep 20 chickens. Whatever the number of farm animals allowed turns out to be, there should be a similar cap on dogs/cats, as they are more of a noise/poop nuisance when kept in city lots than chickens ducks or bees tend to be.	Governmental over-regulation.
Increasing allowance is appropriate. Solving minor problems is great.	Response to unleashed dogs interacting with livestock.
Increasing the bee pollination is good for many plants and provides nutritious raw honey.	Prohibiting bee hives by one or more neighbors, with the present regulation.
increasing the limit slightly is good. the no rooster policy that is currently in place is also good to keep.	killer African bees... just kidding!
Increasing the number of allowed animals is good. I am unsure what the changes to the sign-off for beekeeping are. Encouraging more people to use their land for food production instead of decorative lawn is good.	None. This does not seem to be adding undue regulation.
Increasing the number of animals allowed from 3 to 4 will make it possible for families to produce a larger portion of their own food without an adverse impact on neighbors.	
increasing the number of animals allowed is going in the right direction. I'd like to see it increase even more, maybe including checks/support to identify & stop any animal abuse that may occur.	Animal abuse. There should be an allowance for when your animals have babies & you have more than 3-4 for a short period of time.

<p>Increasing the number of animals allowed to 4 is a very reasonable and sound suggestion. I strongly agree with modifying the neighbor "sign-off" requirement fore beekeeping. As a beekeeper I can tell you how ridiculous it is to inform so many neighbors of an activity that will not concern them (my next door neighbor had no idea we had bees until I had mentioned it off-handedly assuming they knew about it. The point being that keeping bees doesn't impacts neighbors.). I think changing the requirement to letting your neighbors know you are keeping bees in order to address concerns. However, one neighbor a block away shouldn't be allowed to shut down your potential apiary because they are unreasonably fearful of bees (and in reality their fear probably stems mostly from hornets & wasps). Also, a neighbor could harbor other issues or resentments (including racism, sexism, ad infinity) towards a potential beekeeper and prevent them from increasing their food security, self-reliance, and potential income. Also, if you locate your hives in the middle of your</p>	<p>I think that concerns of health are inflated when relating to home livestock. However, I am coming from an educated background and find it ethically important to provide a healthy environment for my animals, so that line of action leads to a healthy animal. So I have had zero cause for concern with health issues due to my livestock animals in the city.</p>
<p>Increasing the sign-off area for beekeeping is NOT helpful. Fear of bees can ruin the chances for a farmer to keep them on their property. Increasing the amount of animals allowed onsite is practical.</p>	
<p>Increasing this sort of husbandry in the city is a good thing!</p>	<p>Education around what is "good" animal husbandry. Well cared for animals with good hygiene/ waste management is vital for being a good neighbor</p>
<p>It is a god given right to raise your own food if you do it in a responsible manner and care is given to provide for the needs of the animal in question. Raising your own food puts the responsibility of taking care of yourself back on the individual. If more people could provide for their own needs and were more self-reliant there would be less need for government entitlement programs.</p>	<p>I would be concerned with over regulating the rights of individuals to provide their own food.</p>
<p>it is a good start.</p>	
<p>it is becoming more and more essential for urban dwellers to have the ability to provide their own food.</p>	<p>noise, smell, bad neighbor practices of animal husbandry</p>
<p>It is important to make growing food, be it vegetables or animals, easier and more accessible within the urban landscape</p>	
<p>It is unreasonable to have to ask ones neighbors for permission to raise one's own food.</p>	<p>If the beekeeping rules stay the same neighbors will have the power to keep others from beekeeping based on personal grudges, sexism and racism. We need bees to survive, they pollinate our food.</p>
<p>It isn't realistic to expect 100% neighborhood support for keeping small-scale livestock, since many aren't familiar with what it truly entails. Barring severe bee allergies, or other medical concerns, I think this requirement should be lessened, if not removed.</p>	
<p>It will happen anyway.</p>	<p>Loud animals in the morning and poor husbandry.</p>
<p>It would depend on the what the modification is.</p>	<p>Will there be a provision for neighbors that are confrontational and just don't want to sign off because they have other issues.</p>

It's important for animals to be allowed in the city; but it's also important for neighborhood peace to be maintained. For examples, roosters would be bad. Too many goats would be bad. Billy goats are stinky. The most important thing is a solid system in place by which animal cruelty can be reported and curbed. I plan on getting chicken next spring, and I am happy to abide by the three-hen law.	Neighborhood "sign'off" runs the risk of a snarky neighbor just being snarky. Honeybees are not aggressive creatures and there are wild bees around in any case, for those who are super allergic. You shouldn't stop the world for doing it's thing because you have a problem with it.
Less restrictions are good. I do have chickens and my neighbors all enjoy them. I plan on having bees, and plan to talk with my neighbors about any concerns they may have.	
Lifting limits on economic activity and resiliency is a step in the right direction. Any conflicts that arise between neighbors should be decided in a mediation, with any limitations of use decided at the neighborhood level.	None. I welcome backyard chickens, honey bees, goats and other small livestock in my neighborhood. I welcome a diversity of use. I welcome economic activity. I welcome the Do-It-Yourself ethos of back yard farmers. I welcome food security. I welcome running into people from my neighborhood on the street, as they are on their way too and from the store, work, dining out, going to a show, and, yes, while they are tending their flock of chickens.
Like the increase to 4 animals.	
Limit by impact, not by fixed number.	Noise, Smell, Materials used, animal welfare.
Limit the number of animals kept only to that which can be maintained in a healthy environment and prevents harm to other's property (such as escaping goats). Increased beekeeping would increase food production of fruiting trees in the area.	There would likely be an increase in claims of animal abuse, just because some people take on more than they can handle. Education, training and support groups could help reduce those reports.
Local bees will help combat the great pollinator die-off happening. I am open to changing the number of animals from 3 to 4. Those who are not caring for their property or animals can be dealt with thru official channels.	
local food is important. not much more local than the backyard	noise from not only roosters but hens too.
LOCAL FOOD!!!	
local not factory food	flies
local small family-farming needs this	
major benefits to this approach outweigh any potential noise issues.	can't think of any.
Making it easy for people to keep animals and bees in empowering and takes power away from industrial meat and dairy production which is environmentally damaging and ethically questionable	
Maybe.	Over-regulation of careful natural beekeeping.
Modifying current regulations as needed is important as we evolve as a food supporting and producing community.	
More access to fresh local food in the neighborhood is a good thing.	
more animals should be allowed	

more animals! no roosters! I'd take whatever Seattle is doing and stamp it on Portland and move forward now. Also, haven't seen a discussion of community orchards yet. Hope that's coming, too. I suggest that someone get a copy (I can provide one) of the Mult Co. food policy council report on fruit and nut trees, and implement all of the recommendations ASAP. I have sent this document to the PDX City Council this week.	
more chickens = better food and compost.	
More food producing animals as well as bees are good in residential neighborhoods.	None.
More friends are raising animals throughout the city. In this recession it is wise to encourage people to raise their own food on a small scale.	
More goats would allow more food access.	I am only concerned with limits. It would be wonderful to see community farms in our local parks. Maybe, something modeled on Zenger Farm's community egg coop.
More urban beekeeping!!!	
Most animals are social beings, and allowing for four per site means we can better meet needs of more than one species.	A close neighbor who has documented severe anaphylactic reactions bees might be the only reason to not allow beekeeping on residential lots less than 5000 sq ft.
Most people keep more than 3 chickens with no problems whatsoever. It would be nice to have a tour de bees as many people are bee curious.	Chickens and compost piles attract rats. Training is needed so that folks know to secure feed and avoid wasteful feeding practices that spread it around as rat feed. Also, people need training to locate compost piles in FULL SUN in secure containers so that materials decompose quickly and do not feed rats.
Need increased opportunities for bees / pollination - increase the number of animals allowed, increase opportunity for protein foods grown.	Increasing to four animals is not much more of an impact.
Need to thoughtfully expand the ability of people to practice animal husbandry in the city.	Potential poor animal husbandry practices -- inhumane conditions, etc.
Neighbor sign-off can limit people to do what they want on their property.	Just making sure people keep things clean and free from too much noise, smell, and pests.
Neighbors having these animals are more preferred to those having cats and dogs which regularly poop and pee in my yard. Portland seems to support and condone the latter. My vote goes for the bees, hens, etc.	None. (I'm more concerned about the dog poop bags left hidden in bushes or left along sidewalks and the ignored poop and the cat piles.) I have lots of flowering plants and the bees don't bother me as I work among them; if someone wants to expand their beehives, I wouldn't mind having one put in my yard, with "payment" of some lavender honey!
Neighbors should not be able to protest bees. Bee keeping is safe and important for growers and people who want to encourage local agriculture.	There needs to be less restriction on animals and bees.
No requirements for bee keeping. Fears from bee hives are overblown. Possibly have flyer available to neighbors who object explaining benefits and safety of bee keeping	Too much oversight in keeping bees.
No sign-off should be required for bee keeping. 4-5 chickens should be allowed instead of 3	

Nobody likes bees, even though they are essential. No bees, no food. There is concern for neighbors who are allergic though, but in general I'm for more urban bee keeping.	Too many animals in urban setting. Smell, noise. All the above.
Not much downside that I can see	
Not sure what "consider modifying" means, But I think that increasing the number of animals is in a positive direction.	
Odors.	
Of all the items in the study, this is the most likely to cause individual contention, thus it is important to clarify the rules. The suggested changes also make progress towards improving the rules and removing unnecessary or unenforceable sections, and limitations.	The greatest concern I have is contention due to remaining lack of clarity and inconsistency. For example, a setback of 50 feet is required for animals which are vocal, yet vocal is not a technical term. Instead specific categories of animals should be defined, since there is no point on a standard lot that is more than 50 ft from an adjoining lot.
Of course clarity and fixing problems is good. How would the neighbor sign off for bees be modified? Maybe I'm not qualified to be taking this survey, but I was born and raised in Portland and local food is very important. Allow more local food production and consumption.	
Once again, this helps to sustain affordable housing. The difference between 3 and 4 animals is negligible.	
Only if roosters are still excluded. Neighbors should have the option of signing off on bee hives. Rabbit and Fowl are small enough to be kept in urban backyards; goats are another matter and should be restricted in number and location.	Noise (NO ROOSTERS please) and odor; livestock feed often attracts raccoons as well.
Our health and food security increase when our freedom to grow & raise our own food is increased! This is very important for the future food security of those of us in urban areas such as Portland. We deserve the responsibility and the right & We can handle it too!	I am thrilled that the city is interested in supporting those of us who wish to grow & raise our own food!
People are hurting right now and this may make it easier for families to become more sustainable.	I have bees and have no permit because I don't understand the "sign off" clause.
People need the ability to grow thier own food.	
People should be allowed to have small "farm" animals. A clucking chicken has much less noise impact than someone's constantly barking dog. At least you don't have to worry if the chicken is going to bite you.	As stated previously, my greatest concern is that of government creating unnecessary regualtions.
people who live in cities should still be allowed to support themselves by raising different sorts of animals as a food supply source	

<p>Personally, I am fine with 4 chickens/ducks/rabbits, but not as positive about larger animals such as goats or cattle. Some of the conditions that I see chickens living in are bad enough but to allow someone to crowd larger livestock into a city lot just because they don't know what an animal requires is a potential animal abuse situation. I think larger animals should be restricted to actual larger farms, but am OK with them being in the city limits. Re bees, I think the beekeeping should also be a somewhat isolated activity. Maybe community gardens would be fine, but I don't think I would like my neighbor to be raising bees in the back yard.</p>	<p>Animal abuse or neglect, bees that would make it uncomfortable to be in my yard.</p>
<p>Please expand and extend freedoms around raising animals at home in Portland.</p>	<p>Overzealous regulation by BDS planners</p>
<p>Please modify the neighborhood sign-off regarding bees so one neighbor who might have totally un-related issue can't hold the would-be beekeeper from a very beneficial and productive hobby. The reality is that there are bees everywhere, although not in the desirable quantities. Proper siting and setbacks should be adequate.</p>	<p>I think sound and perhaps scent can be problems with most livestock. Setbacks and good management should alleviate. Having noticed that worm bins are mentioned, I wonder whether something should be included about proper management of compost and/or animal waste.</p>
<p>Portland is a leader in allowing small animal agriculture in the city. Let's keep it that way.</p>	
<p>Predation of urban chickens is a big problem what with the raccoons and flying predators. Three hens is too small a flock size to sustain itself. At least six hens should be allowed. The Seattle approach works well and we should simply adopt it.</p>	<p>What works in Seattle should work here. So none, so long as we adopt the same policy.</p>
<p>Prejudices often motivate neighbor vetoes. Seldom are there legitimate concerns. When there such concerns, civil courts or other neighborhood agencies should be able to resolve them.</p>	
<p>Producing our own food is better for our bodies, the environment & brings a sense of pride. Ever moving away from it in the 1st place was a mistake. People own their property, they can do with it what they want.</p>	
<p>Promoting self sufficiency along with the added ecological benefits.</p>	<p>Not allowing for residential bee hives in urban areas.</p>
<p>Push it further. Five or six chicken or ducks is really no big deal. I can see how six goats might be a bit much, but chickens are no worse than cats or dogs, and in many ways are lower impact.</p>	

<p>Regarding Beekeeping: Thank you for looking at the issue of requiring 100% neighbor permission. This process has MANY inherent problems, as my personal experience demonstrated. After realizing the potentially devastating effects of the current honeybee Colony Collapse Disorder, I began my attempt to get permission from approximately 21 households (all 150 ft. from my double lot property line) this spring. The good news is that I met many nice, aware, and enthusiastic people, many of whom were excited at the prospect at helping the honeybees and their own flower and vegetable gardens in the process. Several expressed interest at having bees themselves. The not-so-good news: 1) The process was incredibly time consuming and difficult - I wanted to talk with each household personally to explain my rationale and answer questions. Nice idea but the reality is that people are very busy (necessitating 2 or 3 returns to a house before giving up and leaving an explanatory letter, copy of the petition for them to sign, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope) or, in some cases unwilling or unable to an</p>	<p>Inappropriate barriers (subjective prejudice or ignorance) to beekeeping / supporting our pollinators). I support bringing objective measures into the process (such as validation of allergy as a rationale to deny a permit, if that is judged appropriate.</p>
<p>Regulations already exist. Modify them.</p>	<p>proper waste handling.</p>
<p>Remove the neighbor 'sing off' for beekeeping. As bees tend to forage in a 2.4-5 mile area, even the bees neighbors see in their yard rarely belong to a nearby hive. Bees are naturally occurring occupants with or without local beekeepers - does Mother Nature have to clear this first with the world... NO! Pollination is a benefit to the WHOLE community.</p>	
<p>Respectful animal husbandry is a great practice that unites community members with the natural world. Urban beekeeping is a safeguard against colony collapse disorder and other ailments to invertebrates.</p>	<p>Mechanisms to deal with improper/irresponsible animal handling. It is very important that animals be raised in a humane manner that does not risk animal or human health via disease.</p>
<p>re-villaging again; local food; sustainability; resilience; diversity of the food stream.</p>	<p>i thing these ordinances will have to be fine tuned as Portland goes along. We have to learn a new way of co-existing with our food and peoples' acceptance of the tradeoffs will not happen overnight. a new paradigm will have to be accepted as the industrial food system changes due to energy and supply constraints.</p>
<p>right direction but does not go far enough. we should not "consider modifying" but "modify" requirements to increase residential husbandry practices.</p>	<p>I am most concerned with those who feel that aesthetics is more important than developing a smooth, efficient and maximal local food supply.</p>
<p>Seems manageable</p>	
<p>Self sustainability is a right each citizen should have. The more exposure communities have to husbandry practices the more it will likely be embraced and become more of the norm.</p>	
<p>Size of property? Yes to bees with neighbor agreement - worried about animal slaughtering in residential areas - noise and smell.</p>	

Small livestock are beneficial to city dwellers. The urban chicken phenomenon has been very educational for a lot of families. I think the closer people are to their food production, the better.	Noise. Some animals just aren't meant to live on 5000 square feet. No roosters is a good thing. Most chickens aren't that noisy, but if there were some right outside my bedroom window I wouldn't be pleased. I'm very happy to hear that the neighbor signoff requirement for hives may be lifted. I think the fear that a neighborhood colony will mean a big increase in stings (and allergic reactions) is way <u>way overblown</u> .
Some people are too afraid of bees and education is needed. Four animals are as easy as three.	None.
Sort of	Arbitrary limitation on livestock numbers.
sounds like you've done your research and that the changes are good!	
Speaking from direct experience, the current neighbor 'sign-off' requirement for beekeeping is unusable and unfair. We push for fewer regulations and less neighbor control over well-tended bees and animals. They are important for food-security, ecosystem health, and affordable, engaged living.	none
Sustainability is a key for many families and good for our neighborhoods. This creates along with all of the previous topics a great way for our state to grow and be green.	No roosters because of noise but otherwise none.
Thanks for working to make small-quantity food production viable within our neighborhoods. The changes that you are considering make sense to me.	
The 98% of Portland beekeepers who are 'outlaws' can finally show their bees to their neighbors! I think we'll see a lot more urban beehives this way.	None with this change.
The ability for neighbors to withhold approval or withdraw approval after the infrastructure investment has been made does not seem appropriate.	None
The beekeeping requirement should be changed so neighbors must document an actual problem before they can block a neighbor from keeping bees. Many people have irrational unfounded fears of bees and it is difficult to convince them that bees are safe. Many people are simply uneducated and don't care to learn about the subject.	The city needs to do more outreach on the subject. A program like the one on London called the Capital Bee would be a wonderful way to organize and support urban beekeepers and would provide a place for neighbors to learn from a trusted source, the city.
The current beekeeping regulations are strenuously prohibitive, there needs to be a balance to respect allergy sufferers but not be overly prohibitive - encouraging pollinators is super important to the survival of any other vegetable and fruit production, and can be such a good cottage industry - we need to <u>find a happy medium</u>	
The current regulations are unnecessarily burdensome with veto power down to one person.	Food safety, animals getting out of designated areas, people being stung by bees.
The fewer restrictions the better, in my opinion. The raising and growing of one's own food is a basic right.	
The folks I know who keep animals in the city are responsible about it and I like being able to show my 4 year old the neighborhood goats.	As a person who is allergic to bees, I would be a bit concerned about a huge hive next door, but I would probably sign off on it personally.

The increase from 3 to 4 is appropriate for the smaller animals, but not the goats, they simply require much more land than most city lots can accommodate.	
The increase in animals from 3 to 4 is positive as more and more people desire to raise animals themselves to ensure healthy food practices.	
The more food production in the city, then better food security we will have. I do think people need to better understand how much work is involved in animal husbandry, but I think that has more relevance to people starting out that expanding a flock, etc.	On-site management of waste/odor. Educating people about the space and care needs for animals. It concerns me to hear of animals that people thought would be a good idea, being neglected when city people are too busy to care for them properly.
The more food that individuals can produce on their own, the less burden on the environment. And the better prepared neighborhoods are in case of major disasters.	To ensure that animals have enough room to be animals... though that is rarely a problem with individuals invested in this.
The more open and loose the regulations the better	
The more the better!	
The more urban husbandry is promoted and encouraged, the better off we'll all be.	The only impact that concerns me is failure to educate the public about these issues. We all need to be on the same page regarding the need for affordable, healthy food.
The more we can allow people to be self sufficient the better Portland will be a position to handle the increasing number of people which will immigrate for climate reasons.	Creating more and/or unnecessary red tape and bureaucracy. Keep regulations streamlined.
The more we encourage the growing and harvesting of our own food at home the more we eat healthy and the more we anchor, improve and enhance our communities. We meet neighbors, share knowledge and food and we are able to teach others.	That people are well-trained on proper care and husbandry before they can have livestock (for the sake of the animals and the neighborhood). Could there be a prerequisite class before a permit is issued?
The neighbor sign-off for beekeeping is a nearly impossible thing to reach. There might be sexism, racism, or grudges at work, and people won't sign. Most friends I know with bees refuse to get a permit, knowing that it would be futile to try. The bees travel up to a mile from the hive to forage--there are bees everywhere in the city! I think neighbors should be informed, maybe the beekeepers needs to print off some basic info for immediate neighbors, but if you are more than 20 feet from a hive you probably won't notice any increase in bee activity.	
The neighborhood sign off requirement is rather extreme for bees.	One person getting to decide when many feel differently.
the problems in existing regulations are minor, give people opportunity to be more self reliant	people who would not follow a regulation fair or otherwise.

<p>The right direction, but again, depending on the location and the community, 4 animals may still be tight. In many neighborhoods, there is enough space that animals are not a problem. Are there any regulations that include land size per number of animals?</p>	<p>I would be concerned about the way people take care of their animals, the smell, The noise, and the danger of bees around small children. But on the flip side, many people take very good care of their animals are harvest their food well, without concern. Again, this is a situation that works from person to person and neighborhood to neighborhood. Is it possible to be reported? Are offenders given consequences? How are these things followed up on? Those are the considerations I would like to hear more about</p>
<p>The small animals as allowed by code can easily be increased from 3 to 4 without problems and many municipalities across the US have adopted four as the number.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>There are already laws in place that can prevent problems. Such as: animal neglect, stench, noise ordinances etc. I think it is good for kids to see animals and interact.</p>	
<p>There is not much difference between the noise/smell produced by 3 birds and 4 birds (even up to 6 birds). Also, poultry are flock animals. They may die if they are solitary. If a flock of 3 loses one or two members (predators/illness), new birds should be introduced immediately. It is good to have padding of a few extra birds to fill out a flock. Re:Honey Bees, they take very little interest in objects that don't produce nectar or pollen, e.g. humans. Even neighbors with allergies would face only minimally increased risk of being stung by a neighbor's bees. Only notice should be required.</p>	
<p>There needs to be more flexibility and the regulations should reflect best practices for small-scale home agriculture.</p>	<p>Need an inspection program to respond to neighbor complaints about odor and noise — with regulatory/permitting authority.</p>
<p>There should be exceptions for the number of animals allowed based on total lot size, ie. larger lots are automatically approved for more animals as long as set-back requirements are met.</p>	<p>Animal welfare should also be included in future regulations. Not all city dwellers are competent in keeping livestock.</p>
<p>Think this is supportive of the movement for more home-grown animal products.</p>	<p>I keep chickens and can understand how it would be a nuisance if not properly maintained. Important for neighbors to have readily available channels of support if husbandry practices are inadequate.</p>
<p>This activity will be self-limiting; people get excited and try it, then find out how much work it is. Dedicated urban farmers need all the help and support they can get.</p>	<p>The community as a whole needs to be educated about what to expect from their non-human neighbors.</p>
<p>This allows familys to be more self sufficient. There are not regulations on how many dogs and cats, ect a house is allowed. Neighbors are able to put in formal complaints on those who have animals who are out of control or too loud</p>	
<p>This appears to be the right direction, BUT the details matter greatly. Neighbor sign off, but what about when a new neighbor moves in? Those types of details.</p>	<p>My main concern is more of government over regulation in this area. It should not require permits or licenses to engages in this activity, but regulations should be in place where if it becomes a problem in the community enforcement can help fix the problem.</p>

<p>This area seems ready to expand, and has virtually no public cost as the activities take place on private land and don't require public expenditures.</p>	<p>the bees- enforcement could be needed to ensure safety.</p>
<p>This is absolutely the right direction. The neighbor sign-off for beekeeping is kind of silly, anyways - what are we to do if wild bees decide to set up camp on our block? Kick them out because they didn't ask the neighbors first? I also agree with increasing the number of allowed animals.</p>	<p>I'm concerned about the worldwide decline of the bee population, and think that beekeeping should be encouraged wherever possible. Having a limit on the number of animals that can be kept in an urban environment is practical and responsible, but raising it to 4 is reasonable.</p>
<p>This is more difficult. I had neighbors with chickens and we got more rats in our immediate area. I think the size of the yard matters, not just the size of the overall lot.</p>	<p>Rats, raccoons, noise, etc</p>
<p>This is one of the fabulous conventions Portland is known for, and improving our code for better husbandry and wider acceptance makes good practical sense.</p>	<p>Education for the non-farmer about residential livestock would be helpful - someone may have qualms about bees or chickens, for instance, that are based in a lack of understanding, and not all backyard farmers are the best educators/communicators - a brochure or website that they could give to neighbors might go a long way toward community acceptance.</p>
<p>This promotes inexpensive, sustainable eating practices.</p>	
<p>this seems like it's going in the direction of less restrictions...</p>	<p>the restrictions!</p>
<p>This sounds good. Let people have four chickens. Let children see where their food actually comes from.</p>	
<p>three chickens doesn't seem to be quite enough to keep my friends flush with eggs; I do appreciate the need to have neighbors weigh in when the number or type of animals starts to impact them.</p>	
<p>Three seems like an arbitrary number. I have neighbors with 3 chickens and I don't see there being a problem with additional birds. Bees are already in our urban environment and keeping won't impact the numbers but will allow people to have access to local honey and increase pollination yields for urban gardens.</p>	
<p>Urban bees need very little flight space - about ten feet in front of their homes. The 150 foot rule is not possible for many folks. Really you should be talking to the Oregon Bee Association folks for this - both the bee keepers themselves and to Ramesh Sangili at Oregon State University. Sorry, I have no URLs (google should work OK).</p>	<p>Formal chicken runs (different from fenced yards being the chicken's run) need to be constructed to be rat proof. It's an extra expense and extra labor, but addresses a real public health problem.</p>

<p>Very important to eliminate 100% neighbor approval requirement for bees. It doesn't make sense. This is a public education issue. Honey bees forage far beyond 150'. Bee stings are rarely by honey bees. If anything, Portland should become a bee-friendly city promoting bee habitat gardening and beekeeping. There is a critical interdependence between food growing and bee pollinators. Backyard beekeepers may be the only way bees can survive on the planet. No bees=no food.</p>	<p>Simply as an urban area, the city has eliminated natural habits for many species (including bees) with its roads, buildings, and infrastructure. As such, the city's footprint in the natural ecosystem is hugely negative. This reflection on zoning regs offers an opportunity to redress old wrongs. Being activist about addressing Oregon's hunger issues through encouraging local food self-reliance, must be wholistic. World food security is dependent on bee survival. Portland has an opportunity to be a leader in establishing itself as a city-wide bee sanctuary through its land-use practices. Every publicly owned land in the city should have a natural habit area that is friendly to native and migratory species. Specific to allowed animals, how are "good husbandry practices" defined? Who is supervising this? An unintended consequence of allowing farm animals to proliferate in urban areas may be the rise in rats, raccoons, and other opportunistic predators and the diseases they carry. Are there requirements for safe handling of animal wastes? Who is regulating impact of ani</p>
<p>Very minor impact.</p>	<p>None at that level.</p>
<p>We are not limited like this with dogs, cats, guinea pigs, birds, pet rats, snakes, etc. so why limit these other animals?</p>	<p>animal cruelty</p>
<p>We had chickens and rabbits in the SoCal suburban, tract housing sub-division in the 60's.</p>	<p>Keep the animals from running amuck in neighbor's yards. Fence or other screening can mollify neighbors who aren't keen on the idea. But bees? They help every other neighbor's gardens and plants.</p>
<p>We have bees and chickens and none of our neighbors noticed until we brought it up. What we do on our property (as long as the animals are healthy and happy) should not impact our neighbors or our rights.</p>	
<p>We must take responsibility for our food- the education that comes with relying on ourselves; including friends, neighbors, and family, will only make Portland a better and more resilient community</p>	<p>If animals are not part of our daily lives, we are at risk of forgetting that we are a small part of the picture here on earth.</p>
<p>We need a system that is less complaint-driven.</p>	
<p>We need bees! Not sure it makes a difference whether it is 3 or 4 so let's allow 4.</p>	
<p>We need more bees! I wish more of my neighbors kept bees. I also support allowing more animals to be kept.</p>	
<p>We need more bees!! Very few people are actually deathly allergic to bees, it is a common misunderstanding. Animals make people more humane and connected to the world. By raising your own honey, milk, eggs, you are in control of what goes in your mouth.</p>	
<p>We need the bees! Also, many people are eager to learn animal husbandry and live more in harmony with the natural world. Education again is the key.</p>	<p>Sanitation and humane treatment of the bees/animals. A course could be offered by knowledgeable volunteers (so the expense impact would be minimized). a kind of "pay it forward" principle. this course could be a prerequisite for becoming an urban "keeper"</p>

<p>We need to be able to feed ourselves. And we need good food. A city does not need to cut people off from either nature or its food sources. Lets get this started. We don't have a food supply problem now, but we could and its easier to ramp up from 2 to 4 goats than from 0 goats.... :-)</p>	<p>Sanitation, Smells and Sound Pollution. It also seems that monitoring this is going to be a nightmare. A complaint driven system does not create equal treatment under the law, and the amount of regulation required to tightly manage animals could be difficult to police. We can't get a police officer to come to the house for a car break in. How could we afford to police a goat eating the fence? In the end, light regulation and neighborliness should just have to do</p>
<p>We need to be able to raise food for ourselves and not be reliant on big box stores. We love having livestock options! And bees!!! This is the right direction!!! Yes!!!</p>	<p>No concerns!</p>
<p>We need to keep moving toward expansion in this area. Four is better than three, and five is better than four. And so on.</p>	<p>I am concerned that the egos of folks are controlling food supply. We need to get off our high horses and down to earth, with all of her critters.</p>
<p>We need to make sure that the animals are not harmed, or that people are not adversely impacted</p>	<p>No slaughtering of animals in a residential neighborhood</p>
<p>We should be able to harvest food as we please.</p>	<p>One concern would be if a family member had a bee allergy and a neighbor wanted a hive next door. Then that could have an adverse effect on the person with the allergies quality of life (ability to enjoy the outdoors). There should be room for considerations such as that.</p>
<p>We should be allowed to raise our own food if we so choose.</p>	
<p>We, in general, need more honeybees. Too many hives are disappearing for whatever reason(s). If they are allowed, with no neighbor sign-off, that would increase bee population and increase plant pollination which leads to more produce.</p>	<p>Noise from goats. We had a neighbor several houses away that had two goats at one time and they made more noise than a barking dog, We have lots of dogs in the neighborhood and rarely hear them, the goats were maawing all day. I like goats, they just don't belong in the city.</p>
<p>What are the current "minor problems"? How would they be "resolved"? How would the bee-keeping requirement be "modified"? I believe these items ought to be clarified so the general public has a better idea what you are referring to!</p>	<p>I am concerned about certain animals having the proper amount of space and adequate infrastructure to ensure that they thrive. Some plots/households are easily able to provide for 3+ animals, but others are not based on amount of open space and various use of said space.</p>
<p>What does "modifying the neighbor 'sign-off' requirement for beekeeping" entail? We all benefit from a healthy bee population. Four animals seems reasonable, but there can be issues...</p>	<p>How will Portland keep the rat population down? People who keep animals and compost might need more information about keeping rats away.</p>
<p>With good husbandry practices, bees and small livestock are a valuable addition to the neighborhood. Making it easier for people to keep bees and animals in the city encourages learning about food security.</p>	<p>Please keep the code as clear as possible.</p>

<p>With good husbandry, more animals can be accommodated easily. There are already nuisance ordinances in place to deal with smells, noise, vermin, or neglect. In the interest of simplifying laws, those should be how excess animals are dealt with.</p>	<p>The sign-off requirement for beekeeping is strange. Bees don't stick around a yard; they forage in a 3 mile circular area. While I completely agree that being on good terms with the neighbors if one has bees or animals is beneficial, having one neighbor saying "no" because they don't like me, or they don't like bees, or they think it's weird, or whatever, and that keeping someone from having bees...that's ridiculous. Hives need to be located with their entrances pointing away from traffic paths, but if a house is on the back side of a hive, they probably won't ever even know it's there.</p>
<p>With good husbandry, more than 3 animals can be kept at a site without nuisance. Also, if kept at a good distance from residences with good husbandry, bees are safe and absolutely necessary to our food system. perpetuating fear of bees is <u>uncalled for.</u></p>	
<p>without bees we die. Bees are good neighbors. I had 4 hives on a city sized lot for years with out a complaint. When they were discovered, by the city, they were outraged, but my neighbors went to bat for me as the bees helped their plants and they had not even known they were there. Good husbandry wins as long as things are kept clean so as to not create smelly yards and fly populations.</p>	<p>I want to be able to use my yard. If a neighbors activity makes it un-usable because of odors or massive pest populations then I should be able to seek assistance from the city.</p>
<p>Would like to see raising number of chickens</p>	
<p>Yea! More chickens. As for beekeeping, I think that making it easy to keep them and easy for neighbors to complain if there are problems is important.</p>	
<p>Yes - the difference between three and four small animals is negligible and should not affect anything negatively. The "sign-off" requirement for beekeeping should be eliminated - as it stands, any neighbor could prevent their neighbors from beekeeping (a very important practice) for any reason. Modifying it to notification only would promote communication among neighbors without making one beholden <u>to the opinions of the other.</u></p>	
<p>Yes to allowing more animals, not sure what it means that minor problems to existing regulations need to be resolved, or what is meant by "modifying neighbor sign off".</p>	<p>Above. If limits mean restricting people from having bees, I do not agree.</p>
<p>Yes! This is the right direction because it will increase our ability to raise our own food sources in responsible ways.</p>	
<p>YES! We have bees and chickens and honestly the dogs and dog attacks are MUCH more of an issue. Our neighbors didn't even realize we had bees but now one neighbor (who was one that had no idea) stated she "doesn't know" if she wants us to keep them..even though she has not been stung or even noticed them. That is not okay.</p>	<p>my rights as a property owner.</p>

Yes!! People like to feel good about where their food comes from.	Making sure that the animals are properly taken care of. Also, educating people about the benefits of these animals would help.
Yes, but it should go much further. Four is not enough.	Irresponsible animal owners. Maybe there could be a check and balance to ensure those of us who are responsible can have what we want/need.
Yes, in talking with many local beekeepers the restriction of the permit is currently to stringent. I think increasing the un-permitted animal limit to 4 makes good sense as well.	
Yes, the beekeeping regulations are overly burdensome, leading to the current situation where almost no one gets a bee permit before having bees. That seems counterproductive. Let's see zoning that supports beekeeping. With the recent die-off issues with bees, it's important that we support the proliferation of these amazing creatures that are needed to pollinate many, if not most of our vegetable and fruit crops. 4 animals seems good, for the reasons stated.	Bees are a tricky issue in that I want to be sensitive to a neighbor who might be highly allergic to bees and work with them. However, I also feel like given the right conditions for the bees (access to water on-site and perhaps with the right siting of the hive with respect to any allergic neighbors, etc.), the neighbor will likely not even be aware of an increase in bees in the area. Bees travel quite far in many directions for food.
you're not going to make everyone happy.	
	again - this type of practice is best regulated when there are problems - complaints.
	again, too much regulation! Leave it alone!
	allowing people to be able to create urban farms without road blocks
	Also need to examine the location requirements. 50' from neighboring house may be impossible in residential (50x100) lots. Animals may be pushed to the wrong space on a site just for this requirement. Should have the ability to move closer (even right against the house) if neighbor approves.
	Also need to examine the location requirements. 50' from neighboring house may be impossible in residential (50x100) lots. Animals may be pushed to the wrong space on a site just for this requirement. Should have the ability to move closer (even right against the house) if neighbor approves.
	animal waste, rooster
	Animal welfare -- there should be regular inspections & enforcement of husbandry standards.
	animals on the loose.
	any restrictions on animal or beekeeping
	Basing zoning decisions on neighbor complaints. Gives too much power to the grumpy.
	Bee keeping should be allowed unless there are complaints.
	Bees are a concern, due to the risk of anaphylactic shock, and other animals may bring noise issues, but I think it can all be worked out.
	bleating and noise; rats

	Chickens die, and with three it is easy to loose one or two and then it is hard for a single bird to make it in the cold winter
	Concern fo noise, odors, safety and health
	Don't allow one neighbor from a group to disqualify an applicant -- not everyone is logical.
	Don't change current permit process for animals > 3/4
	food safety
	Good coordination with other regulating agencies like Multnomah County - are they willing and able to regulate these activities (inspection and enforcement) at a higher level?
	how are bee requirements changing?
	how would the 'sign-off' requirement be modified?
	Humane treatment should be part of good husbandry practices. Allow exceptions for urban chicken enterprises on a case by case basis.
	I am concerned about arbitrary limits on animal numbers. Poultry requires less space and has different impact than animals like goats. And will number limits be rigid or will they be correlated to available square footage allowing more animals on double lot or larger urban properties?
	I don't care for the bees. I would like to see them stay out of the city.
	I think the increase from 3 to 4 is superfluous for animal husbandry. Most small livestock require only one breeding male per group of females, so having an even number doesn't make much difference. Furthermore, many types of breeding males (such as roosters and bucks) are not permitted in the city, which I think is an appropriate restriction in residential areas. The challenge that actually needs to be address in regard to animal husbandry is the fact that milking animals must be bred regularly to remain in production, and therefore the herd temporarily increases in size after kids are born. For example, a dairy goat keeper with only 2-3 does will typically breed the goats in the winter, then in the spring there will be 4-9 new babies, which need to stay with their mothers for 8 weeks. Therefore, any urban/home dairy will inevitably be out of compliance for 8 weeks out of each year. I think it's fine to leave the maximum number at 3, but it would make a lot of sense to exclude young animals up to 8 weeks old. Just a suggestion.
	i would not like to live near areas where animal are mistreated and/or slaughtered.
	I would prefer that a large number of bees not be brought close to my home since I have kids. I understand the value of honey bees, but I do not want my kids to be restricted from playing outside due to too many bees.

	If animal's habitat is not well cared for and creates problems for neighbors such as attracting pests & rodents.
	I'm deathly allergic to bee stings....it would bother me if my neighbor had a hive.
	I'm most concerned with the neighbor sign off requirement for beekeeping as I don't think it's necessary.
	Increased restrictions might deter more people from pursuing this avenue of home food production. The ability to produce food is highly valuable for lower income families.
	Mostly careful control of excrement, noise and animal containment so no incidents with dogs and kids. Also check that it is not a loophole for animal "hording" clinically.
	My only concern is noise from roosters.
	My only concern is the beekeeping since there are many people with life-threatening bee allergies.
	Need to factor in bee allergies and proximity to concentrated bee keeping. Perhaps modify to notification unless there is an adjacent neighbor with severe bee allergies, in which case a sign-off might be more appropriate.
	Need to make sure that the folks with more animals are set up for this to be a humane situation
	Neighbors should be able to sign off on bees and noisy animals.
	no concerns
	noise
	Noise & smell (primarily with goats!!!). I think keeping goats on a regular sized residential lot could be very disturbing to neighbors and should be highly regulated with enforced setbacks & acknowledgment of financial liability of the goat owner if they escape & damage vegetation on neighboring properties.
	Noise and smell issues for neighbors.
	None
	None
	None, I own 3 hens and would love to add another to the flock. I keep their pen clean and am a responsible owner.
	None.
	Not so sure about the changes to the sign-off, it would depend on what the changes are.
	Odor.
	Persons who do not have adequate good husbandry practices.
	Poor animal husbandry
	Poor husbandry of chickens concerns me. Chickens bring rats to the area. And rats are horrible!

	potential noise, smell and rodents. our neighbors got chickens and we got rats.
	Raising animals can be hard on the land and may limit some people's garden diversity. However, it think animal products are essential to good health and should be allowed on the land. Neighbors are often afraid of bees because of misinformation. This limits the keeping of bees, which are of special concern in recent years, and essential to our nourishment.
	Related noise.
	restrictions
	Roosters being set loose in neighborhoods.
	the definition and enforcement of 'good husbandry' practices
	the problems I see with the bees, of course, is the worry of people in the close ares of allergies and if people are not careful about the animals---what about smell???
	This is an unclear description. What would the "modifications" be?
	this one sounds more helpful....we need more bees!
	Unwanted smell and noise - there should be a complaint-resolution process.
	What would the modification be?
	Why the neighbor sign off for bees?

TOPIC AREA 5: ANIMALS/BEEES	
<p>Question 12: Direction: Clarify and resolve minor problems with existing regulations; consider modifying the neighbor 'sign-off' requirement for beekeeping, and consider increasing the number of animals allowed from 3 to 4 for good husbandry practices. Is this the right direction?</p> <p>ANSWERED "NO"</p>	<p>Question 13: What types of impacts concern you the most?</p>
Any business use should be tightly regulated to zoning requirements.	Disruption of the neighborhood peace and enjoyment.
any neighbor "sign-off" seems inherently unfair because two similarly-situated individuals would be treated differently simply based on who their neighbor is. I am, however, okay with keeping the number of animals to three.	
As someone concerned with animals and their fair treatment, I cannot with good conscience say that the City should encourage the keeping of any large domesticated animals in residential areas. Domesticated animals are frequent attractors of vectors and it is too difficult to ensure all animals currently licensed to households are well cared for. Additionally, given the average size of a Portland lot, certain limits exist as to how many animals are practical.	
Because it is unclear what the city's intent is based on the question. I am not in favor of the city increasing barriers to apiculture.	Increased restrictions and access to apiculture.
Change the allowed number of animals to 4 or 5 and additionally allow up to 20 or so immature animals to allow for onsite breeding. Honey bees are everywhere anyways. I don't believe all neighbors should have to sign to allow them.	noise, odor
Chicken dust is known to cause lung disease. Neighbors should not be exposed	
Current regulation is adequate.	
Flies are a problem w raising animals in high population areas.	
I agree with the bee part but I believe so long as the animals being kept are for food purposes the limit should be 6	
I don't know much about this.	
i have no idea what the answer is..i would say it mostly depends on space -- but honestly, just be realistic about this stuff. people need to feed their families and we want healthy food and what better way than to grow and raise it yourself! :)	same
I like the beekeeping modifications but the 3 seems to be a good number of chickens. What about rabbits?	Chickens attract rats and raccoons.

I think animal and human health should be protected by regulation--but nothing beyond that. If my neighbor can reasonably maintain more hens on his large lot, or my other neighbors can run a healthy 'chicken collective' by removing their back fences and sharing space, they should be allowed to do so. Beyond the minimum, whatever neighbors can agree on should be allowed.	Impacts that prevent people from having enough hens or whatever to serve the needs of their household.
I think people should be allowed to keeps bees and animals without restrictions. We need more beekeepers not more regulations. No bees no food people!	
I think this is mostly the right direction, but I think that the number of animals allowed should be higher for larger lots.	
I would suggest 3 fowl on lots up to 5,000 sq ft, with an additional fowl allowed for each 1,000 sq ft. I agree that beekeepers should not be required to have neighbor approval. I think neighbor notification as part of the Multnomah County permit for beekeeping should be adequate to inform proximal neighbors of beekeeping activities. Limits of 3 hives for a 5,000 sq ft lot with 1 additional for each 1,000 sq ft would be reasonable.	Noise, odor, and escaped bee swarms would be the primary concern. With a simple neighbor notification process, nearby neighbors would know which neighbors keep bees (and should be able to retrieve lost swarms). Noise from hens is not typically considered significant. Odor from the increased number of fowl allowed would not be significant.
If one neighbor has a problem, they can talk to their neighbor. City doesn't need to be involved with this. The only exception I can think of is if bees were right next door to someone who is allergic to them.	
I'm not convinced that all people know what is best for an animal. Often people think bigger than is their reality and when a living thing is involved, I'm concerned that it won't be safe for people and animals.	The safety/comfort of animals in residential areas.
increased "livestock" allotments will get out of control - noise, odors, waste handling, etc	negative impacts on quality of life
It depends on what 'modifying' means. I'm not sure if increasing the number of animals is a good idea. Some back yards are really small and there might not be enough room for 4 goats for example. We also should consider animal welfare.	Animal welfare. Small lots and too many animals. I
Keep limits at 3. Only have sign-off if bee colony exceeds 3 hives.	Animal abuse in livestock handling.
Most animals have more than 1-2 offspring at a time. Plus this doesn't help for keeping more than one breed.	If a neighbor has a valid complaint against keeping animals besides a prejudice based on aesthetics, perhaps the appearance of pests can help decide the matter. Is there a significant or bothersome increase in mosquito larve or rats? This in no way addresses my or my farming friends abilities to homestead in the city.
My neighbors have chickens -- they are noisy and irritating	I really don't want more chickens and goats in my quiet neighborhood

Need to factor in the lot size in relation to the number of animals.	How would the beekeeping sign-off requirements be modified? This is vague. Make it easier to raise bees - we need them desperately.
Neighbor sign-off is not an unreasonable requirement and helps make aspiring beekeepers think it through before starting.	Most animals spend most of their time in cages which I find objectionable. I'm also concerned about the skill level of many people who have started chicken and rabbit coops on their property - after initial interest, the animals are largely ignored.
no no non..... people get too anxious and then get more dogs and more dogs.	
no, 3 is plenty	4 turns to 5 five turns to 6. this is the city people!
not for bees they are important and do not make loud noise or bother you unless you bother them	
Not sure what the sign off is now	
Not sure. What about breeding dogs etc ?	Noise, related structures, sanitation
Not sure. You don't specify what modifications to the beekeeping sign-off, and I did not see that addressed in the report.	
Number of animals does not matter as much as animals per area in a given facility to ensure good husbandry practices. Four chickens may be similar to four rabbits or a hive of bees, but is very different than four goats, pigs or sheep. Perhaps divide animals by size based on poundage with an always-allowed minimum, subject to cleanliness or hygiene complaints and review.	Bad husbandry is quite possible and can be quite annoying for larger animals (10+ pounds each), particularly pigs and male goats.
Only if currently zoned for that usage.	Noise, smell, trash
People can be deathly allergic to bees. The County doesn't have resources to fight "farmer abuses" like too many chickens, garbage etc.	Garbage and rats, then bee stings.
People may not understand the importance of bee keeping for the community and have just one neighbor that will not sign off and limit that person's ability to self sustain.	
People need to be educated, not limited in beekeeping. Without bees, we would not thrive.	Too much government.
People should be allowed to harvest food such as honey, eggs, milk, and chickens on their own property. Increasing chickens from 3 to 4 is a good thing.	I do not think that neighbors should have to sign-off on anything in order for a person to be an urban farmer. In Milwaukee, residents can have 50 chickens, and there are no problems with this.
Perhaps the number of animals allowed should be tied to the amount of space available for them. Larger animals such as horses and cows should be addressed in the code. Perhaps modeling after Seattle's code with a minimum of 20,000 square feet, but reducing that to 15,000 square feet or less if surrounding properties are equal or close to the same size.	Smell and mismanagement (poor treatment of livestock).

Setting an arbitrary number for everyone is never a good idea. Situations are different. You will never be able to come up with a workable number that will suit everyone, so don't attempt to come up with any number.	
the chicken population in Portland is too large already. every other house on my block has two chickens each.	avian diseases, stench of chicken shit
The neighbors shouldn't have to sign off. More animals per lot is a good thing. Allow more chickens per lot. Why restrict bees so much?	
There appears to be a lack of regulation in this area to the detriment of neighborhoods. We should make sure these type of activities do not cause disharmony in residential neighborhoods. Posted notices, neighbor notifications, and adherence to proper guidelines are necessary.	chicken coops need to be at least 20 feet from neighboring houses. There should be some sort of notification process and resolution process for animal raising. It is very different from food crops. There are often noise and odor problems that seem to have no process for resolution.
There are no formal restrictions on the size or quantity of medium-sized animals called "pets". A person could easily keep 1000 pounds of dogs (which are being bred and grown as meat/food animals by my VietNameese neighbors) on a 5000 square foot lot, but 20 pounds of hens or 100 pounds of goats is restricted. Nine 120 pound dogs make a huge quantity of solid waste from off-site food while chickens/goats consume undesirable insects and weeds, in addition to vegetarian feed, while improving the fertility of the soil. Bees kept for honey or pollination are the most harmless variety, not even comparable to aggressive yellowjackets or wasps native to Portland.	Excessive regulation enforced by highly-compensated inspectors leading to increased City Bond-indebtedness, higher fees, wasted time filling out applications and complying with overly-complex and broad rules or legislation. Abuse of animals is already a crime, although "abuse" is subject to wide interpretation.
There is plenty of rural areas to live, if you want to own animals a few is plenty in the city limits otherwise it degrades residential areas with noise and mess	City becoming a barnyard
too much regulation	see above
Type of animal, lot size and or location should all be considerations in how many animals are allowed, the range should be more like 0-10.	Bees are good, bee keeping needs less regulation.
We have heard recently of chickens and other animals in residential areas attracting rodents and providing hiding, cover and breeding areas for these rodents, particularly rats.	See above (12)
We need to support anyone who is willing to beekeep. Our bees are in crisis.	The death of bees and the loss of beekeeping knowledge.
We should reduce the number of such animals not increase them.	

<p>what rule about combination of animals? So someone has a few ducks, a pig or 2, rabbits plus pets -- who insures compliance? Eventual problems with flies, improper living conditions, etc. Most people in cities don't know how to take care of farm animals. Urban restrictions on farm animals were introduced because of problems with disease, waste, etc. Wouldn't want to reintroduce those problems</p>	<p>I have bees in my back yard (belong to a neighbor). I made sure no adjacent neighbors had allergy to bees -- a serious issue. Distance and approval requirements seem appropriate as they are.</p>
<p>Yes in terms of beekeeping. In terms of other animals, I would like to see ways that residents can self-organize zones where animal confinement is not permitted (for ethical or other reasons).</p>	<p>Impact of confined animal on the animal's welfare and the physical and psychological impact on neighbors.</p>
	<p>Poor animal husbandry practices</p>
	<p>The keepers just don't feel they have an obligation to their neighbors. Countless times, I have had unwanted chickens in my yard that had escaped from a neighbors coup. The chickens destroy my plants and my neighbors laugh it off as "oh well." Leave farming for farms.</p>

TOPIC AREA 5: ANIMALS/BEEES	
Question 12: Direction: Clarify and resolve minor problems with existing regulations; consider modifying the neighbor 'sign-off' requirement for beekeeping, and consider increasing the number of animals allowed from 3 to 4 for good husbandry practices. Is this the right direction? ANSWERED "YES"	Question 13: What types of impacts concern you the most?
Context / density.	Poor husbandry and rats!
Current practices work fine	Increase in animals
I am not sure what the "sign off" requirement is. The number of animals should be consideration.	Laws and regulations now limit the number and types of animals. I am not adverse to a review as long as any discussions and regulations lean towards practical solutions.
i DON'T KNOW...What is the sign off beekeeping thing?	
Maybe	More chickens? chickens can be noisy and their food can attract rats, raccoons- I'm not sure this is appropriate in dense neighborhoods, where we already have rodent issues. Maybe that is why there is an increase in coyote population in the inner city?
Not sure	
The question does not clarify how the beekeeping neighbor sign of will be modified. I am in favor of increasing the number of animals.	
This is more problematic. There should be places where this can happen but it should not be a universal. There should be a high degree of neighborhood judgment.	public opinion and possible negative factors. Remember the controversies around dog parks!
Unsure. Don't raise animals.	Am very allergic to bees. Wouldn't want a hive right next to my fence, but understand the purpose and need for them.
What are the current problems? What are the planned modifications? It's impossible to answer this question without knowing more about the situation.	safety, access, property damage or trespassing problems for neighbors
	Animal noise. Not sure an increase in animals is appropriate considering most lot sizes. I don't know about "good husbandry practices" I would imagine this doesn't apply to most people with a few chickens for eggs.
	Give more freedom not less
	I am mixed. Personally, I think the bee 'sign off' is a bit of a hassle- interesting how many other cities do not require anything...However, I think it encourages beekeepers and potential beekeepers to reach out to neighbors- and this is important for children, frail and elderly neighbors, neighborhood cohesion etc-- especially if your bees swarm! I support modifications and would be interested in discussing this further

GENERAL COMMENTS (All Topic Areas)

Zoning for farmers markets should allow for a small structure on site to be used as storage. Support your Farmers Market organizers and volunteers,...otherwise the markets will dissolve...and farmers will not have a local venue to sell.

zoning codes should work to expand availability of local food by supporting farmers, especially small family farms, and consumers by making some sort of local food in as many neighborhoods as possible.

you folks are awesome! this is such a huge task to undertake. i'm really impressed with all your work doing research, outreach, information gathering, etc. you deserve a pat on the back. or a massage! yes.

You are definitely headed in the right direction. We need fewer encumbrances to growing, sharing, and selling scrumptious, organic, local food here in Portland, especially in poverty stricken outer southeast.

Yes, two things: (1) food security is a crucial area. Several groups (Multnomah County and Coalition for Livable Futures are among them) are working to increase the access for food security among low income and people of color, Some of the directions you are considering may have disproportionate negative impacts on people of color and low income peoples. (2) I do not consider the process for developing your report "robust" since I work in the area of equity and food security and I just heard about this! I also work in the area of community engagement--you need more meetings and they need to be widely advertised in neighborhood newspapers and community newspapers such as the Asian Report, the Scanner and the Portland Observer...not doing so puts you at risk of discriminating against the very people most at risk.

Yes, the questions in this survey lead people to answer "yes" to questions. A better worded survey would be more accurate, and its results more reliable. I am really disappointed in the availability of this survey and the written proposed changes to the public. The people who conducted this survey and the proposed changes are at an unfair advantage in the dissemination of the survey and its results. I had no idea any of this was taking place until yesterday and am very upset that the city has not sought more involvement outside of the internet posting located on this difficult to find website.

Yes! 1. I don't see anything in here about ag-related structures. Confusion about zoning for hoop houses, greenhouses, animal houses, etc (both temp and permanent) can be a significant barrier to urban ag practitioners. 2. This report should coordinate with current conversation about updating cart regulation. Several cities, notably Philadelphia, have used carts as a distribution point for healthy food, particularly in neighborhoods underserved by groceries. 3. In the Cultural Heritage benefit (p. 2), it is important to note that many (particularly elderly) residents who came to Portland from other parts of the country bring share cropping and other ag practices as part of their skills and cultural heritage - not just immigrants from other countries. 4. Soil Testion on p. 8: where the document reads, "it is recommended that soil be tested..." is that recommended by DEQ, or this report? 5. This is a tremendous accomplishment. Thanks for your work and for the opportunity to comment

With all of the issues going on in Portland, sidewalks, crime, schools, I am pretty angry that the City is exploring ways to stifle community building and increasing folks access to good food.

Will any of this revision take into account the use of median/parking strips as options for home owners to cultivate?

We wish we had been more informed of these "thoughts" and planning. Not enough time to form a cohesive and comprehensive thoughts and ideas.

we run an urban farm and buying club and have not known about these meetings. i think you have a missing link in your marketing!

We need to encourage more local agriculture and community building. I am most concerned with potential restrictions on CSA's and food buying clubs and am a member of both. These are incredible community building organizations and offer a great benefit to communities.

We need more community gardens and encouragement of backyard gardens...rules should foster same

We need local producers of food. That those producers be many and divergent adds stability to the areas where they are located. To place the access points outside these areas seems to me to defeat the purpose. That, and the fact that "over-regulating" small enterprise has too often been a means to derail, or impede small efforts by larger establishments who don't like to share.

Walk the talk, Portland.

Vegetables! Flowers! Bees! Small farm animals!

Urban Food Zoning seems to be on the right track. My only concern is to not have enough input demographically from a variety of different thinking groups to make a collective decision.

urban agriculture is a food security issue, and as we continue to loose agricultural land to development, it is increasingly important. The more access and exposure children and adults have to freshly grown or growing food, the healthier and more well-educated portland's culture will be.

Unfortunately, we have had negative first hand experience with rats, so we are a bit biased. Rats feed on the neighbor's garbage and then want to nest under our deck.

This is great! Thank you for putting this project together. Please - any way to support more land dedicated to growing more food and people learning how to grow food is crucial to our future of food security. Farmers markets are stretched to find farmers and more and more people want markets / farm stands nearby. But more people need to get in the business of growing food!

This is all the right direction. Well done! I would just add that we need to not be thinking of CSA's, market gardens, and backyard animal husbandry as hobbies or nice additions to our standard food sources. We need to be thinking of them as one of the primary ways (along with local area agriculture) we may soon be feeding ourselves if current trends continue. Let's do what we can to most fully promote urban food production!

This is a step in the right direction. Increasing our independence from big box stores and shipped in food will help the city, especially if 'The Big One' hits and our supply chains are interrupted, even temporarily. Local foods help increase quality of life in many ways, and the city should be doing everything possible to encourage residents to deepen our relationship with each other and the area.

This is a great step forward.

This effort is part of what is attractive to many people moving to portland, even in the new industries. Keep up the efforts. Add a school tour for younger folks that instructs and connects to similar school project that produces food etc for food bank or better an event of serving to folks connected to certain outlets and restaurant efforts like the pay as you go ones. Build skill, community and sense of common care.

These are all important issues and I think it's important to allow for locally grown food of all sorts!

These are all good ideas.

There should be minimal regulations regarding urban cultivation and husbandry. More superlocal food equals less destruction and engenders community.

There should be greater emphasis on growth of food production and less emphasis on regulating or limiting this production.

There is a new narrative taking hold regarding local food, local economy and resilient home owners. Any policy that we make should understand and support this change. Neighborhoods are for living complete lives, not just manicured lawns.

There are few things more lovely than turning a corner and discovering beautiful flowers being cultivated for personal use or resale. I would like to see more people grow flowers or veg in their parking strips.

The way of the future is to have more people growing more of their own food, bartering with neighbors, using open spaces for food growing instead of ornamentals or concrete. Portland is in the fore of that kind of thinking, and should lead the way!

The reason I took this was to respond to a call from my CSI. I have been picking up in the neighborhood for three years. It is so much more convenient than all of us driving out to Troutdale. I would hate to see it become more difficult.

The more small food and garden production the City can encourage, the better. People need to be encouraged to try to grow their own food, to show the challenges, expense, relative ease and enjoyability of the process. If people grow their own, it helps the neighborhood, it helps the community, it helps their health, and it educates everyone about our larger food systems.

The more I think about this, the more it seems like a bad idea. Why are we restricting access to healthier options within neighborhoods? We need to make healthy food easier to get. We need to encourage small business.

The last question had grammatical errors. None of the questions were very clear. The questions felt wishy washy and dangerous. I'm a supporter and participant in local food so I want to give the city my input and want to encourage the city to do more for local food. Taking this survey left me unsure whether my voice will be in support or subtraction of local food.

The federal government has been giving subsidies and advantages to terrible food practices. It is imperative that local people organize and cooperate to take care of their own needs safely.
The CSA direction concerns me & I would like to see adequate data to support it.
The city should be careful about how they go about this. Portland continues to develop into a beautiful city with diversity for all but it must be controlled or we can actually backslide and ruin all the opportunities we have created
The big picture is the need to raise food as a community in the best possible way for the environment.
Thanks for your desire to have input.
Thanks for working on this! Exciting! Let's keep this an open conversation/work so that all kinds of Portlanders feel welcome to participate, especially those of us who are poor and/or People of Color.
THanks for the survey. Love seeing us look at growing more food (meat and veggy) locally. Win win win.
Thanks for the survey!
Thanks for opening this up to the public for comments, I know there are many like myself who feel very strongly about these issues.
thanks for keeping the dialog open!
Thanks for giving me the opportunity to fill out this survey.
Thanks for getting our feedback.
Thanks for asking!!
Thanks for asking for public input.
Thanks for all your work. So glad to see you are thinking about health issues related to this topic!
Thanks for all of the work you've put into this report!
Thanks
Thank you...
Thank you!
Thank you for your work!
Thank you for working on these updates. In general, you are heading in the right direction, but there are a few things to reconsider.
Thank you for undertaking these issues. I try to feed my family from my garden, our buying club, and of course through the wonderful farms we find at the farmer's market. Access to the best food is my top priority and I believe it is a basic right for everyone. Our neighborhood and community are stronger for sharing these activities, please don't let a few disgruntled souls ruin what is a wonderful thing for most.
Thank you for thinking about all of this! We love our local food communities and the empowerment to produce what we can for ourselves!
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.
Thank you for tackling these issues. I feel like we have a good foundation here in PDX but could do so much more to increase the number of gardens and thus opportunities for folks to grow and eat real food, have a healthier life-style, raise children with this practice and awareness, . . .
Thank you for opening the door to more urban agriculture!
Thank you for extending the time for the survey.
Thank you for caring about these issues and being open to expanding the current rules and guidelines. This public survey is great! :))
Thank you for asking for public input on these questions, I appreciate the chance to share my thoughts and values.
Thank you for addressing these issues.
Tackle the real problem here: personal automobile traffic. Also, most of these issues are street, block and neighborhood level issues. There's no reason what so ever that they should be decided on a city wide basis. What works in close in SE Portland doesn't work in the West Hills. What's needed in outer East Portland is different than what's needed downtown. We all have different tastes, needs and different ideas of what our respective neighborhoods should look like. Allow a diversity of neighborhoods, districts, streets and blocks to bloom. Stop pretending like you should make these decisions for us.

Supporting urban food is very important and is really preparing our community for our present tough economy and the economic and oil scarcity hardships that will eventually come to us. By providing a supportive and strong infrastructure we make ourselves healthier, our communities stronger and safer.
Support local and organic food and practices!!
Small farms and market gardens rock! We should do everything we can to support them and make them more accessible to low income families and communities of color.
Safe, local, sustainable and healthy food - make it as simple as can be.
Right now the term "food security" is not abstract. It has a very personal meaning. My family has been terribly impacted by the bad economy, but thanks to our backyard garden, Montavilla farmers market, food buying clubs and the community of caring friends that has grown up around these ventures my family eats well and I have energy to help other neighbors in need.
Recommend non-rpofits such as churches in residential areas should be exempt from regulations up to the size of their membership base. Farms stands, especially those fewer than 5 vendors, should have no minimum number of days sellign of on property of organizations and selling during regular hours, such as during church service hours. The goal should be to increase access to fresh, healthy food. With the great need to access, those in low-income neighborhoods should get <u>special consideration</u> .
Protect CSA and farmers markets. Not interested in protecting every tom, dick or harry who wants to "farm" an empty lot.
Promote food diversitity and density, restrict pesticides, quantify and regulate toxins but let neighbors regulate their neighborhood gardens. if my neighbor has a problem with my chickens that can often be solved by supplying him with some eggs rather than removing the resource altogether.
Preserve food access, affordability and choice.
Portland is unique. It is the only place I have lived or visited with such green and sustainability consciousness and I think we are trend setters for the rest of the country. I want the trend pushed greener and more sustainable and supporting access to local food is one great way to do that!
Portland is known across the country as having excellent values when it comes to sustainability and community-building around food. We have the opportunity to be even more of a positive example for other cities. When updating the regulations, please keep this in mind.
Portland could be a model of food co-ops and growers stands of, by, and for every neighborhood- each to suit it's constituents- then neighbors would get closer and we would be better prepared for what ever the future holds.
Please, please don't over-regulate. Help us change things to match our coming needs as communities.
Please support and encourage the neighborhood and community gardens, share farms, pick your own farms, farmers markets, etc..
Please spend time thinking carefully about how this code creation and revision will benefit or harm low income people. While their is clearly interest in serving low-income folks because having greater access to high quality food at lower prices is good, there hasn't been much attention paid to HOW low income people and people of color (who are experiencing the greatest disparities in Portland right now) can take advantage of these changes and create health and wealth out of the code and code revisions. Please don't let this be an example of where a good initiative "should" have led to increased access to healthy food for low income people but didn't. In order to prevent this outcome, the code revisions need to be explicit and intentional on HOW low-income people and people of color will benefit from the revisions and what tools will be available to those groups to empower and create capacity to build local food systems, neighborhood stands etc
Please let people do what they want without trying to control, fine, mandate and bureaucratize everything!
Please give farmers a greater ability to provide local food, not less!
Please exercise reason and think about the big picture in terms of bringing people together to support small farms, bulk buying and what people want to do on their private land.
Please enact laws and policies that bring humans and nature closer together. We have plenty of opportunities to reside in artificial environments, and whereas they have value, we must not forget the values and joys of the natural world. Less processing of food, life and reality.....
Please don't wreck this wonderful direction our city/area is heading in. Local, sustaiable agriculture for health and a rising economy, it's nothing but good.

PLEASE don't restrict the ability of CSAs and food-buying clubs to have drop points in res neighborhoods.
Please don't over-regulate these activities. Clarification of existing rules is fine, but let some creativity happen and get people closer to their food.
Please dont make urban agriculture more difficult with these regulations than it already is. This is an opportunity to make our local food economy more resilient and vibrant and healthy. Don't regulate people out of actual real potential and important jobs.
Please don't limit CSA and food buying club pick up sites just because there were complaints about one club that have since been resolved!
Please don't do anything to make this harder for food producers and consumers. Educate reluctant neighbors on the benefits of bees and chickens, for example.
Please don't break something that isn't broken. If you want to improve the existing law, then please do, but overall, if the world "LIMIT" is part of that so-called improvement plan, you are probably not improving anything. Thanks! We hope you guys can understand this and not mess up a good system.
Please do not use the "greening of Portland" as an excuse to over-regulate food producing activities. People already have it hard enough, and we don't need to make it any more bureaucratic and difficult for people to raise food and make a small living from agriculture. We neighborhood farmers and gardeners are ultimately better equipped to make better decisions about management practices than City planners and politicians. I also believe that this survey is simplistic and somewhat insulting to people who are actually deeply involved in urban food production. Many of the explanations of what kind of regulation is proposed, as compared to what kind of regulation (if any) exists were too brief to be meaningful. The survey format tied together a proposal of increasing regulation with the sentiment of improving conditions in a single question. That is a totally leading and unacceptable way to ask a question with a yes/no format. I had to answer 'no' to everything accept the apiculture issue, even if the sentiment was good, the proposed method of improvement was through more regulation! Why don't you invite everyone who is ACTUALLY AN URBAN FARMER or GARDENER down to city hall!
Please do not overregulate. Open uses of land and agriculture is what make Portland what it is. Do not make us a city we are not.
Please do not impact our non-profit food club
please do everything possible to support the local food movement. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE
Please contact me if you want the dirty details on the challenges of establishing new community gardens, even when you have great partners like the Portland Community Gardens Program, Friends of Portland Community Gardens, W and E Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Portland BES Community Watershed Stewardship Program, neighborhood associations & residents, etc. BDS permitting staff have not been universally supportive of this effort! And the permit fees have been crippling! And there are an untold number of other road blocks that are often thrown up: e.g. resolving community sewer lines via a permit for a community garden, conditional use review for removal of a few parking spaces when an abundance of parking remains at a site, etc. - Ted Labbe, Depave
Please consider the impact on low-income and middle-income residents when making your decisions. It's not always either the 20-something, cruncy type; nor the affluent, canning-exotic-fruits type that uses these types of foodways. Some of us need and rely on them in order to help combat the questionable food found in supermarkets. (And, of course, the "soft" benefits (support local economy, teach children where food comes from, not jetting in fruit from Chile, etc.) are lovely, too)
Please be very thoughtful about limiting CSA's. They are a gift to our community and should have the right to procure healthy sustainable foods and share them at our own homes.
Please be aware of the economic aspect of using zoning to control food growth and distribution. As food growth and distribution becomes more local and better organized, food security and health will benefit over time.
Please allow more food access to more people. Regulations that form limits to larger sized lots are elitist, and make it harder for the poorest in the community to access healthy foods.
People will arrange for their own food sources and distribution systems, in addition to commercial suppliers. This is not the business of the City.
People need to be able to access and/or grow local foods if needed/wanted. It's healthier - it gives people something productive to do (think teenagers). If there are too many regulations people won't even try
Particular deference should be shown to food markets, community gardens, and membership distribution that specifically serves a pedestrian-based area or which impacts identified deserts for healthful food.

Overthinking things. Most regulations hurt freedom and limit choice, while creating unintended consequences. How does restricting food availability, freedom, and location help the "food desert" problem?
Overall, I think flexibility is the key if we are truly to be as sustainable as we hope.
not at this time
Nope.
Nope! But this was great. Thanks!
nope
nope
nope
noop
No. Thank you for making this survey. I appreciated having fields where I can leave comments, in addition to answering yes/no question. I'm happy to be contacted if you need clarification or more community involvement.
No, except I'm very happy that this huge undertaking is in the works. I'm not a farmer nor am I an organizer or have any experience in the finance, food, or retail industries, but I'm thinking I should get involved somehow if there's every an opportunity.
My main concern is preserving the ability for low-income people to access nutritious food at minimal cost. Personal and volunteer groups are very different than businesses, and non-commercial access for families and private individuals is important. Most of my nutrition comes from a monthly, ten-family buy club, our garden and home chickens. None of these should be subject to regulation as businesses.
My home is zoned commercial is much more affected by the mosque and gymnastics academy nearby. There are upwards of 50 cars in a short period of time that floods the neighborhood and prevents homeowners from parking. Food club activities have virtually NO impact on the local area in terms of traffic flow and parking - they are non-commercial entities and designed exclusively for the benefit and enrichment of neighborhood food access.
My beekeeping permit was revoked after neighbors (who had initially signed my permit) complained to Vector Control about a swarm. I hived the swarm within 3 hours of it happening, but still my permit was revoked. The reason given was "unmaintained hives." This is a huge problem for anyone who wants to cooperate with regulators. Swarms are natural and healthy, not a sign of poor maintenance. I'm very interested in helping to change these regulations. Why does Vector Control regulate beekeeping? Bees are not a threat to public health.
My 4 year old is delighted by the fact that we have our own personal farmer because we belong to a CSA. Everyone I meet at the pickups has been gracious and happy to be witnessing the interaction between farmers and their satisfied and well-fed clients. Do as much as you can to ensure that family farms get the support they need to thrive!!!
move slowly and thoughtfully, we want to get buy in from Portlanders, not turn off people by initiating dramatic changes for only a small constituency
more more more....gardens,csa's,bees etc!
more local food!
More access to fresh, healthy food is valuable for the economy, public health and neighborhood health. The city should be focusing on opening up more opportunities for people to feed their families in this way vs. traditional, industrial, retail food sources.
Maximizing locally-grown food availability in the URBAN CORE is my main intent.
Many recent earthquakes, tsunamis, and storms remind us that we are not secure relying on imported food for such a high percentage of our diet. A landslide, or earthquake that stopped truck traffic on Interstate 5 on Mt. Shasta would cause our stores to rapidly run out of food. Urban gardening is unlikely to be able to feed all or Portland. However, the more we encourage it, the more help it will be in the event of an emergency. With our high level of unemployment it is also very good for people to feel like there is something constructive they can do with their time and energy.

Many of the concerns that seem to be issues for people are issues we have with neighbors who are not raising animals or farming in their yards. We have neighbors who make noise at all hours of the day and night, and have vehicles coming by regularly (they sell pot). They also have a vicious dog who regularly escapes, barks at night, and has attacked me and my son as well as killed my cat. Oh, and it's a domestic violence situation. Despite involving animal control, noise control, the neighborhood crime prevention officer, and Resolutions NW, we have not yet been able to resolve our differences and live next to each other comfortably. In the past I have lived next door to similar people... a lien was put on my house for having grass 7 inches high, but I could get nothing done about knife fights, meth, and child abuse next door. These are the kinds of problems I'd like to see the city addressing... not the perfectly harmless and indeed beneficial acts of growing, selling, and distributing high quality, healthy food!

Making urban agriculture accessible, easy and profitable for people is a critical part of a sustainable city. I applaud any effort to do so, but worry about limiting rights to community resources like food buying clubs or farmers markets.

Growing food for yourself or your family should be a right not a privilege.

Loved being a part of this process. I hope you are getting a lot of feedback.

Love that Portland is so progressive in this! Great job!

Like with the existing community gardens, can you add that they must be organically maintained? They don't have to be certified, they just have to follow the same rules.

Let's stay ahead of the curve and keep Portland progressive and couched in future thinking.

Lets return to the old happy neighborhoods of our child hoods where diversity was cherished.

Let's make Portland a self-sufficient garden of Eden.

Let these great ideas come forward at a rate that is supported by each neighborhood. Some folks will hate certain aspects of each idea, especially if they feel they're not included in the discussion

Leave the rule the way they are, with the exception of allowing more animals in a backyard.

Keep up the great work putting Portland in the front row of the emerging culture.

Keep up the good work to bring local, quality healthy foods closer to the residents of Portland

Keep the government out of farming and out of food production.

Keep PDX DIY through the enactment of minimum and sufficient zoning practices. While I understand that zoning regs are necessary to maintain copacetic cohabitation in crowded urban environments, those zoning practices need to be balanced with sustaining the creative and vibrant DIY climate that brought me to move to Portland.

just that we need MORE of the gardens,csa's,etc.so please do not restrict them!

I've been in Portland almost 3 years and this is the best place I've ever lived, and I've lived in 4 states. I'm impressed with the buying clubs, farmers markets, bees, hens, etc., and hope you don't do something "politically incorrect" to curtail the Portlanders' healthy way of life. I don't want to stop bragging to family and friends who live in non-recycling, non-domestic animal, non-buying club/csa areas of KY, TX, and OK!

It's wonderful that Portland zoning supports urban farming.

It's important to consider the Peak Oil task force and climate action plan side-by-side while updating these zoning codes. The challenges that those two issues are addressing are real (but we're always wondering how fast we will see the impact of them show up) and I find that some city/county planning doesn't take those considerations as equally important as other planning, such as the Portland Plan. Overall, I want to thank all the folks in the City of Portland who are working diligently to update the codes with respect to urban food & animals. We are a city leading the charge in many respects when it comes to learning and following through with ways to live more in tune with nature and minimizing our ecological impacts. This revisit of zoning barriers is a big step forward. Thank you!

It seems you are very concerned with appeasing those who would complain that self-sufficiency and food production doesn't belong in a city. The city does not have the right to restrict our right to livelihood and survival based on aesthetic/traffic concerns from a few neighbors. It's unfortunate that the city would put these "needs" before actual human needs of food.

It seems to me that some of the negative impacts of urban agriculture assume that the existing condition of any site is "native." I would disagree with this assumption. I would suspect that if a comparison is done between a hands on (and likely organic) market garden and a weed and feed intensive lawn you would find that chemical inputs would be less on the land used for crop production over lawn. This would be especially so for the urban farmer who would be more in tune with their plants and not immediately reach for a chemical solution to a plant problem as is common for home gardeners. Additionally the idea that contaminated urban soil would cause contaminated crops has not conclusively been shown. I believe most studies show exposure through direct soil contamination on the edible portions of the plant not through absorption of contaminants by the plant. In either case building up healthy soil would be the first priority of any urban farmer. I think it would be great if the city did a study to validate if urban contaminants actually get into the food stream, I suspect the primary exposure pathway would be from handling affected soil not eating vegetables from contaminant affected soil. It is hard to try to live a lifestyle that values farming independently and supporting our local farmers and gardeners when we have so many road blocks. It is already hard enough for farmers to compete with major corporations and our farmers are able to keep us much healthier.

It is exceedingly important to ensure continued access to as much local food as demand warrants.

Is all this regulation really necessary?

Increase fresh, healthy, local food access to all Portland citizens regardless of they type of dwelling they live in or where they live within the city.

Increase food access! I honestly don't have time to read this whole 35 page report and suspect many community members with a stake in these issues don't have the time, either. To the extent that these changes increase food access, that's great.

increase and Keep access to CSA's , farmers markets and buying clubs open in the city. It increases food sustainability for all.

Increase accessibility to and ability to grow healthy food. Don't let NIMBY concerns about traffic, etc. shut it all down.

Increase access to local food. Have more meetings that happen at night and on the weekends so that I may attend. I cannot say it enough: INCREASE ACCESS TO LOCAL FOOD. Set up policies and priorities that are transparent, easy to follow, and simply allow people ACCESS to food whether it be buy organizing buys with a farmer, growing food in the right of way, having bees or chickens, or growing exotic food in a community garden. We all deserve safe, stable homes -- and controllable food is essential to that premise.

In these economically difficult times we are wasting money on these somewhat trivial issues

In the case of animals, it would make best sense to regulate what impacts animal owners may have on neighbors, rather than how many or where they may keep critters. Reasonable, *realistic* rules about animal welfare, noise, odor, stings, or keeping animals contained would make sense. Keepers ought to have any number of livestock that they can handle within those rules--this way people with more time/energy/space can keep more critters, while folks with small yards and 9-5 jobs would still keep their flocks small. But controlling numbers too strictly makes it awfully hard to cycle in younger animals as our creatures age, or to raise meat critters.

In general, most of these questions deal with enterprises that are very healthy for the community. Regulations should be written in a way that mostly allows these operations to go forward while minimizing (maybe not eliminating) disruption to neighbors in residential areas. Operations in commercial & light industrial areas should be largely unrestricted.

In general, I think there is good thinking going in to these code changes. I can understand that some people may feel that extra neighborhood traffic is a nuisance, and I am sympathetic to that feeling when it is on a large scale. However, when farm stands, CSAs, food clubs, neighborhood animals, etc. are kept on a small scale they are typically a benefit and a community enhancer. I have ordered through one of the biggest entities (Know Thy Food that has a warehouse on Milwaukie). Mostly I find it to be big enough to be disorganized, and the location isn't very convenient. I'll stick to co-ops, grocery stores, farmers markets, and my neighborhood CSA. Small scale and localized to meet the needs of each neighborhood feel like the most significant areas to focus on.

<p>I'm thrilled these changes are being considered. We have to take food deserts and their impact on communities, esp. lower-income neighborhoods, seriously. When low-income families have to drive long distances to buy food and cannot easily find fresh food, our environment and community health both suffer. Cities all around the country are finding that urban agriculture is a great way to revitalize neighborhoods and add vibrancy and economic health to our communities. Shelterforce magazine has had some very interesting articles recently on how entire communities, laid low by the recession and foreclosure crisis, have been turned around through urban agriculture. Thank you for your hard work on these issues.</p>
<p>I'm sure the city is examining these regulations with positive intentions. Remember that cities should work for people, not the other way around. If the city makes food access more difficult, more will be hurt than helped. Thank you!</p>
<p>i'm so glad Portland is attempting to be pro-active on this. It's always better to try to hit a target, even if you have to keep changing the target, rather than just let things happen scattershot. That you are getting input from the ground up is very important on that.</p>
<p>I'm glad Portland has progressive urban farming practices and would like this city to continue to be the leader in the country for greater access to healthy, local affordable food.</p>
<p>I'm at least glad you are asking! At the current time, because of the economy, I think restrictions on gardens and raising animals will need to be set aside for a while.</p>
<p>I'm happy to take this survey. I would add that we need to do everything we can to localize and decentralize our food production.</p>
<p>I'll get back to you</p>
<p>If you're going to share your garden, the property owner should get a tax incentive</p>
<p>I'd definitely be willing to make statements, etc. at hearings if I can make it into my schedule. I think the more we can localize food, the more prepared we are as a community/neighborhood/city for disasters, the less impact we have on the environment, the healthier we eat, and the healthier we are as a society.</p>
<p>I would like to speak out in favor of my CSA farms and their current residential pick up for our family.</p>
<p>I would like to see farms in the city. We have a few. Many schools need vegetable gardens too. Kids need gardening skills and interest. See the following books: The Edible City, by Richard Britz, 1981 The City It's Growth It's Decay It's Future by Eliel Saarinen and The Living City by Frank Lloyd Wright In all of these you will see cities with agriculture as a major economic activity.</p>
<p>I would like to be part of a citizen's committee on this if you would like. I have no vested interest do so other than to be a good citizen. Lived here for 51 years.</p>
<p>I would expand the scope of the City's engagement with food to looking at the food items people consume within the City. Such as soda, calories, saturated fats- inexpensive but far-reaching policies such as requirements for calorie counts on receipts at fast food establishments.</p>
<p>I would encourage those making the decisions to think through the larger economic impacts certain zoning restrictions may make on households but also on smaller businesses and farms that support those households with wholesome food. I realize the concern of some in allowing lax standards to lower property values, but the kind of community development that healthy local food develops will boost desirability for the city far more than hindering it.</p>
<p>I would be interested in learning more about participation on an advisory group. I think discussion of the various single family residential zones separately in the concept document would have been helpful The zones vary quite significantly in character and function.</p>
<p>I think we should change the historical approach to zoning by having it be more integrated. People need to satisfy basics within their immediate area. Supporting food buying clubs, csas & gardens in every way possible will support health, community and less energy use. Big stores and parking lots are the problem.</p>
<p>I think this is a great direction for Portland to go, however, we need to be mindful as we do this. Neighborhood gardens and markets that result in heavy use of pesticides or other soil management practices are worse than no gardens or markets at all. And if the system allows some to abuse these activities in ways that harm neighborhood livability, then we're only harming the long-term goal of localizing and democratizing our food supply.</p>
<p>I think this is a really good direction for Portland to move in and I applaud this effort. Thanks!!</p>

I think the more we encourage and allow the growing and distribution of food within our neighborhoods, the more we build community and sustainable, secure food systems. It is a good thing all around and any way that we can ease restrictions around urban agriculture (within reason) is a positive move.
I think the city's regulations need to be moving in a direction to allow absolutely as much local production, distribution, and consumption of fresh, healthy, affordable food as possible. It helps the health of our communities, our economy, and our populace to be able to produce and join together to purchase local healthy food. And in the case of an emergency such as an earthquake in this area, local food networks and producers could save lives when non-locally-based corporations are unable to deliver to the city or to parts of the city.
I think the city needs to support the citizens by allowing us to have control of the food we grow or raise!!!! Please to make restrictions!!! We don't think the food at the stores is fresh, nutritious. Food from our gardens, community garden or local farmer is the best.....
I think Portland is great in that it permits as much as it does for local food production. I look forward to greater participation by its citizens....especially as we go further into local production of food, eliminating distance delivery.
I think it's great that the City of Portland is updating zoning codes to encourage local, sustainable chemical-free food production. There is such possibility for our health, economy, neighborly community, emergency food resilience, and local spirit. Keep asking questions and seeing possibilities. You are already providing some garden education...consider more permaculture classes since gardeners can learn more pest-free naturally nourishing methods of food and flower production.
I shop at the Cully Market. It's small at this point, but I love being able to buy food from my neighbors.
I sense this is a knee jerk reaction to single complaints. Can't you direct single neighbor/neighborhood complaints to mediation rather than regulate an entire community level farm practice?
I really hope that these efforts result in the encouragement of community food, such as food buying clubs, residential gardens, and farmer's markets. It would be a shame to see that the Code Updates resulted in holding back or killing the community/local food movements.
I need to be allowed to use my home to distribute my foods. I am not big enough and I don't want to be big enough to have to rent or pay fees to feed my people. It will put me out. I am applying permaculture to all aspects of my life and using it in my home life and business plan.
I love the idea of urban farming and turning all available land into productive use. I would encourage a way to allow owners of vacant lots to make them available to farming.
I love the direction Portland, Oregon takes to continually provide what the public is looking for. I believe this IS a step towards our future.
I love that you are trying to allow sustainability, green, and money saving ways for the community.
I love that Portland is concerned and pro-active in being a front-runner in supporting these sorts of issues!
I love living here because of opportunities to keep chickens, bees, etc. exist, along with the focus on local and affordable food options.
I live in Lents
I just want to say I generally support all of the directions, and really wanted to respond to the concept report, appendix A, page 37, definitions. I have some concerns with the use of "diverse communities" which implies that communities that are diverse are at disadvantage. I think it would be ideal to have diverse communities, and that where communities are truly "diverse," with a range of socio-economic status, race, cultures, religions, family structure etc, that we actually see greater health outcomes and improved access to all social determinants of health: food, transportation, jobs, greenspace etc. It is communities that are specifically made up of concentrated poverty, race etc that are disadvantaged. My suggestion in the future would be, as some other groups have tried, to use language like, "Food disadvantaged" or "low income and communities of color" etc. I also think it's a bit much to imply that the definition of "healthful" food, means that it is equitably accessible. While I applaud and would love to see that definition more uniformly understood, I don't think that currently is the case. Just my 10 cents
I hope that we increase opportunities for citizens to raise their own food and animals in urban settings. This is an important contribution to the furtherance of sustainable practices in the Portland, Oregon

<p>I have to say I really like living in Portland, and I've lived here for 7 years. I am grateful of the city planning that has gone into the city to make it what it is today, but I don't think it currently needs any additional regulation in the area of food production or distribution. It seems it is doing fine without the regulation, with more urban gardens than any other large city I know of. My recommendation would be for the planning department to move along, and work on something else, unless somehow you could convince citizens that the regulations will HELP add MORE of the various food organizations discussed. On reading your current direction, for the most part it sounds like the added regulations would HINDER, not help them.</p>
<p>I enjoy seeing the gardens in my neighborhood and hearing my neighbors hens clucking (no roosters!)</p>
<p>I currently purchase 50% of my food from community agriculture and hope to continue to do this conveniently in my neighborhood.</p>
<p>I cannot stress enough that Portland is a city that prides itself on independence, forward thinking, and sustainability. Limiting our ability to purchase food at farmers markets and in CSA/buying clubs due to further regulation would be a tragic mistake. If there is an issue, can't we file that under a public nuisance?</p>
<p>I believe that the long-term impact should be taken into consideration as to how this will impact existing farmers. There is a needed overhaul of state farming zones which is beyond the scope of city planning, but could have a negative impact on farmers.</p>
<p>I believe overall we are moving in the right direction. My concern is overregulation. It's very tempting to just regulate everything because we can. We need to be smart and realistic as well.</p>
<p>I believe in regulations. I like order and mindfulness and I don't think it can be contained otherwise. I am, however, very afraid of the negative impacts some regulations will have on people's desire to reconnect with a more basic way, and mindful way of living when we have lost so much of that knowledge our grandparent's and previous ancestors had as a way of life. My biggest concern though, is making sure these regulation move toward a greener and environmentally sustainable community. That is really the only concern I ultimately have. Thank you for asking us and good luck! :)</p>
<p>I appreciate that Portland is looking at making improvements to the way residents can access healthy, local food and am only concerned about undue restrictions being placed on food buying clubs.</p>
<p>I appreciate Portland's openness to hearing the community's viewpoint.</p>
<p>I appreciate being able to add something to this discussion and I hope more people will be able to appreciate our environment by becoming more aware of their food and its source. Anything we can do to get past people's unreasonable fear of a simple but vital honeybee is a good thing, as well.</p>
<p>I applaud your efforts to address the appropriate production of food within the urban setting. Please keep access barriers in mind when developing the code -- it is important to keep them as low as possible.</p>
<p>I apologize for the potential misspellings or grammatical errors in this comment. I only became aware of the opportunity to comment a few hours before I have to go to work on the day of the deadline, but I obviously feel strongly about the ideas presented by the Urban Food Code Update Concept Report. Please feel free to contact me for clarifications, resources, literature references, or more ideas. In regards to the potential impacts of urban farm: Health Impacts: Concerns with "Fertilizer and Pesticide Safety" can be disregarded with organic producers. The organic method of growing food is building topsoil, which increases the organic matter in the soil with allows for more water retention which in turn eliminates dust and improves runoff by filtering water before runoff and actually minimizes runoff by storing water directly in the soil which has an enormous capacity for water storage. This likewise eliminates impacts in the "Environmental Impacts" heading under the subheading "Waterways". "Air Quality" The environmental impacts associated with home & commercial landscaping with their gas powered array of machinery: lawnmowers, string-trimmers</p>
<p>I am very happy to see the City work on this issue. We really need to improve food access. Many of the impacts that some are worried about can be mitigated by limitations on the different activities.</p>
<p>I am very excited to see Portland push to increase food accessibility esp. in underserved communities such as Cully, St Johns, and far East Portland.</p>
<p>I am very concerned about any limitations with both types of distributions. We need availability for more means of affordable and fresh food not less. Requiring rental of space for distribution of food would mean an increase in prices. We should encourage more urban farming, not less.</p>

I am sorry that there was so little representation/input from the food buying clubs before this point. The Montavilla Food Buying Club steering committee has met and discussed this (and also sent out requests to complete the survey to our members), as well as talked with a number of the other clubs. Hopefully, our collective input at this stage will be helpful to you and that you will invite us to stay involved as you finalize the code.

I am really excited about this survey and the possibilities of expanding people's access to fresh vegetables, milk, and eggs. I know that not much money can be made from producing these items in the city (from my own experience and that of the urban market gardeners around me), however it is still additional income that is a great opportunity for many families in the city. There have been days when friends and I wanted to sell our garden goods in front of our house and the notion that it was illegal seemed really sad and limiting, when so much good could come of it. I totally understand folk's concern about cleanliness or proper washing of vegetables, although still I believe the closer you buy them to their harvesting site, the better you are. Friends who have worked at OGCP and other distribution companies in the past have told me many stories of veggies falling off trucks, being around exhaust, etc... and I think that some lettuce from your neighbor is better even if there is a little slug or hint of mud hiding in there:) Thanks for conducting this survey!!

I am interested in being involved and keeping abreast of the Food Zoning Code Update.

I am in favor of all of these measures, but I am concerned about the restrictions you will place on some of them - as far as lot size. You own your property and as long as what you are growing or selling is not illegal, you should be able to use all of property. We have a flower grower in our neighborhood and he has added so much to area in a positive way - property improvements, community coming together, made the property beautiful when it was not, so many positives and no negatives to Mark growing and selling flowers - I do not want to see that taken away from him in any measure

I am in favor of all changes which INCREASE access to healthy food, INCREASE education about where healthy food comes from, and INCREASE city support for urban agriculture.

I am glad the Portland is reconsidering the zoning laws. Lawns are of a bygone era and it is time to rethink our food production and distribution systems to encourage low overhead distribution, food security and food budget savings. Let's use our available land to grow our food. The second part of many of the suggestions sounds quite limiting and I would like to see those limits removed for the actual zoning codes.

I am glad that these things are being considered. It seems that the intention is in the right place to make urban farming more accessible to more entities. I appreciate the thought and consideration going into this project and that feedback is being solicited by the general public. I realize it is challenging to compile and sift through the many thoughts and suggestions made in undertaking a project of this scale and I appreciate the willingness to obtain feedback nonetheless.

Thank you!

I am from Georgia, where things like food buying clubs are a real novelty. Everyone I know, from around the country, is amazed at how I buy and pick up my food, formerly from a residential site. This type of free system is one reason I moved to Portland. My health and my child's health have greatly improved through access to good food and knowledge gained from the community I encountered through a residentially located Food Buying Club. This idea is spreading throughout the country. Portland has a real chance to be a leader in this, as in so many other things. The objective stated in this report is to remove barriers to good, healthy food. By requiring food buying clubs to locate in non-residential areas, you are creating a huge barrier. None of these clubs makes any money to pay for a commercial location. They would all go out of business, thereby impacting health, economic viability of farms that deliver to the clubs, financial resources of families, and the sense of community we have all gained from being a part of a food-buying club. This report has so much in it that's good.

Don't over-regulate and ruin a good thing

I am disappointed that the Benefits section does not explicitly include the value of building food security for the community. It is vital that our community develop (greatly) increased food supply from within the community to increase the long-term resiliency of our food system, whether in the face of major distribution disruptions from disasters or for the long-term decline of cheap transportation.

I am concerned that this is an effort pushed forward by the grocery lobby.

I am an urban farmer. I have a booth at a farmer's market. I see how eager people are to reconnect with the natural cycles involved in "our daily bread". I only wish for more people to become involved, to catch a new idea, to have that special "farmer's market" feeling of community and for all of us to begin to build food security into our daily lives.

I am a member of a food club that regularly has drops in a residential area. This saves us all huge amounts of money. We hardly take any parking (at the heaviest 30 minutes of a strawberry drop, we might take up 4 or 5 parking spaces on an otherwise vacant street. Please don't add more unsustainable restrictions and create an unenforceable situation. We all need to be able to operate in a spirit of openness and cooperation, not in a lock-down. We all need MORE opportunities to support farmers and help our local economy and communities, not less.
I am a member of a CSA -- they deliver to a central location about a mile away. I LOVE it and don't want the regulations to change my ability to be part of the CSA. Many of your explanations are unclear and vague so I'm not sure how to respond
I am a CSA member of a local farm, and feel it has been a huge benefit to me and my family, and has allowed us to support local agriculture while still living in Portland.
I also have a home orchard and wonder whether the group will consider fruit and nut trees. I am a master gardener and in my pest control research, I find that some counties in OR and WA require home owners to care for their fruit trees - otherwise, orchardists in some place such as Hood River County can be vulnerable to pests such as apple maggot and codling moth that are harbored in home gardens that aren't well managed.
I agree with the general goal of increasing our local food supply. This provides resilience in the event of emergency situations and economic recession.
Hope this all turns out well for residential edible gardeners. There is nothing more important than taking advantage of our local bounty and food independence.
Help us become more self reliant in taking care of our neighborhood issues. Especially please encourage resourcefulness and cooperation between neighbors. We need to know and help each other as community members. That is what "community" is supposed to mean.
Having many opportunities for local food production will enhance livability, create jobs, and keep us more self-reliant in case of disaster or other system failures.
Growing significant amounts of food inside city will require a commitment to farmers and farming above and beyond the 5000 square foot size garden. As a beekeeper, orchardist and sometimes-farmer, I would like to see Portland lead the country in promoting agriculture inside the city limits. Agriculture will not stand in the way of development and will increase the beauty, ecology and utility of unused or under-used land all around the city.
Growing food locally for ourselves or for a true local market should be the most allowed and generally least-regulated thing we do in this world.
Great outreach. Thank you.
Great effort! Keep up the good work and remember that everyone deserves easy access to affordable, good food. Thanks!
government should support the community in becoming as self sufficient as possible with their food needs
Good work, people
Glad to see this happening! Was surprised not to see any questions on this survey regarding median and sidewalk strips. Great space that I hope will still be available to gardeners for food production!
Generally I am concerned about any regulations that would get in the way of me making my own food decisions. Through my own experience, I have come to realize the importance of locally organically grown whole foods.
expand the state-level coding to over-ride Home-owners Associations, local small family-farming needs this help as "New Victory Gardens"
Err in the direction of making it easier to support the local food system.
Enjoy participating in all the markets available. Gives us variety and need specific resources with fresher & healthier product.
Encouraging the local and self sustaining food movement is very important.
Encouraging our community to support walkable neighborhoods, with farmers markets and other amenities can lead to a higher quality of life for all socioeconomic levels.
Don't clamp down on these sorts of spontaneous efforts at organization for better food quality and security.
Don't cave to the vocal minority who want to put so many restrictions on these types of activities as to make them infeasible.
Do not only speak to the person asking the question! With the two main women speakers having soft voices why don't they use a microphone?

Do not limit buying clubs or CSA based on only one persons complaint. The majority of people do not have problem with the club and are not impacted by it. When I pick up my food, I am often the only one there at the time.
Developing decentralized distribution in support of home-scale production and processing sales, including pickup and delivery. Willing to serve on advisory body mentioned to me this evening by Jessica. Make a distinction between sales on-site and pickup of food produced on-site, potentially by a 3rd party carrier.
CSA members do not by shares of the farm, they buy shares of the harvest. The distinction between growing for market in contrast to growing for direct consumption or donation is a misleading one. Combine the first two categories. Better yet, ask about impacts that concern people, not why they are occurring. (Noise, traffic, smell, contamination by materials used, etc.)
Could some of the new code be made as a "pilot" and tested? Then permanently adopted? If not - then how easy would the codes be "tweaked?"
Change the laws surrounding beekeeping to notifying neighbors rather than asking for their permission. Also farm animals and bees should not be regulated by vector control. They are not pests. I understand the need to make sure that they are <u>being kept in humane and healthy ways, but the process need to be updated.</u>
<u>Bring a growth economy back to the middle class, and out of the grip of large corporations~</u>
<u>Beekeeping regulation should not be grouped under Vector Control as it is now.</u>
Be very careful with this. It's our future.
As we move forward and need to produce more of our own food locally to reduce transportation costs, it is important that we increase the options for people in terms of food security.
As to neighborhood CSA drops, of there are local neighborhoods whig seek to disallow them, it seems that should be done locally, not by broad-sweeping one size fits all regulation. What works in my neighborhood (Sellwood/Moreland) would not work in the Pearl. Our CSA literally improves our family health and economy (local, fresh food at a price we could not otherwise afford), and in today's economy and our nation's state of malnutrition (obesity) we must be vigilant and maintain <u>and expand access to local, fresh foods wherever we can.</u>
As stated, I am concerned about over-regulation in terms of a top-down approach. Cooperation among neighbors and using what precious little space so many of us poorer folk are left with must be encouraged - not quashed. In terms of community gardening - MORE! MORE!! and Post-Haste! Community gardens really need to have a much higher <u>priority than BTA projects. Please let me know how I could further this.</u>
As Portland lies at the forefront of progressive cities, I think it is absolutely crucial that adequate regulations and plans be made to create a local food system that can sustain itself. Food is an issue of public health, ecological sustainable, economic development and community vitality. Portland should actively work to create and maintain an urban agriculture food component to the comprehensive plan and then consistently take action to make local food production a top priority.
As is probably obvious by now, I am not a fan of over-regulation. I think far too often it cause more problems than anything. I am actually a little shocked to see some of these issues here as under consideration for "zoning" (like a farm stand in my yard, c'mon!). If anything, you should be looking for a way to get out of people's way and make it easier for them to explore possibilities in and with their communities. If you are worried about neighborhood conflicts--of course there will be some, thus is life--instead of trying to "zone" them from happening (which will simply NOT work), develop ways to allow neighborhoods and the people in them to come together in a neutral space and air their concerns. Let the NEIGHBORHOOD and NEIGHBORS decide what is working, or not, for them. Portland's neighborhoods are much too diverse for across the board zoning. It's just an undue burden of paperwork, worries, permits, fees, obstacles, hoops, etc to go through--just to access healthy, local food. Why? Why? Why not instead offer a way or a place for people to come <u>together and share concerns and resolve problems--as they arise. You should be doing everything in your power to allow n</u>
As an an eighth generation Oregonian born from a long agricultural heritage and as a landscape architect and now city-dweller, I am keenly interested in the progress of these efforts. I have worked to promote awareness, education, and support regarding local and sustainably produced food (www.sustainablefoodforthought.com), and I also facilitate the PDX Food Swap (https://www.facebook.com/pdxswappers) which celebrates locally grown/produced/preserved foods and the members of the community who swap them. Best of luck to the team guiding this effort!
Anything Portland can do to increase local food production short of turning over all our parks to become farms is fine with me.

All of these food producing/ distribution system should be less restricted and promoted so that fresh food, local food is more available and convenient to purchase.

All actions and legislation that move toward sustainable gardening and food production is headed in the right direction. Raising our own food and having food that we know is safe, and raised by ourselves, or our neighbors, or at least locally is the direction that the Portland Metropolitan Area and the country as a whole should be moving toward.

Again, some of these questions were confusing as to what the current regulation are and what would be changing. Please clarify next time. I basically would like the city to keep allowing us to grow buy and eat what we want. Now is the time for people to become more connected with what they eat as well as find ways to get healthy food inexpensively.

Again, please see that one of the things that makes Portland such a great place to live is its openness to new ideas, decentralization of corporate power, encouragement of local farmers and a high desire of its residents to buy healthy food creatively from local farmers in a non-corporate manner. This is the Portland health food ethos and a reason that many of us live here. This ethos is very fragile and thrives when city planners and regulators stand down and allow it to happen. It is strangled and maimed by regulation. Please do not do harm by adding more regulation to this informal, harmless activity.