


REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: November 9, 2015
Item No.: 10.b

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Consider Adoption of Ordinance Regarding Wildlife Management in Roseville

1 **BACKGROUND**

2
3 On August 10, 2015, Staff brought forward a draft of a wildlife management ordinance that prohibited
4 the feeding of wild animals. Both the City Council and the members of the public felt that the draft
5 ordinance was inadequate as it didn't directly address the high deer population and mitigation efforts to
6 reduce the number of deer in Roseville.

7
8 Based on this direction, staff has drafted a more complete ordinance that prohibits the feeding of
9 wildlife and establishes a deer management plan that allows for deer hunts within the City. The deer
10 management plan requires a deer population count at least every two years, the determination of suitable
11 deer habitat, educational outreach to the public about coexisting with deer, and the provision for the City
12 Council to order a deer hunt within the City.

13
14 Staff has also drafted a Deer Population Management Program and Policy document for City Council
15 review and approval. This document more specifically lays out the deer population management
16 program. It should be noted that Police Chief Rick Mathwig does not recommend the use of
17 sharpshooters to manage the deer population.

18
19 On October 5, 2015, the City Council reviewed the revised draft ordinance and directed staff to make
20 additional changes to the draft ordinance and policy. These revisions have been made and are shown in
21 Attachment B.

22 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

23 The intent of the proposed ordinance is to limit the concentration of wild animals that can cause damage
24 to gardens and landscaping and create a public safety danger for the traveling public.

25 **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

26 The enforcement of the ordinance will require an undetermined amount of additional staff time to
27 enforce and communicate the wildlife feeding ban, the deer management program, and any potential
28 hunt. Communication about the wildlife management ordinance and plan will be included in existing
29 public outreach tools and materials. The Community Development Department will enforce violations
30 of the wildlife feeding ban. The Administration Department, working along with other City
31 Departments, will oversee the deer management program.

33 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

34 Staff recommends that the City Council adopt the draft ordinance regarding wildlife management and
35 adopt the proposed “Deer Population Management Program and Policy”. In addition, the City Council
36 should adopt an ordinance summary for publication.

37 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

38 Motion to adopt the draft ordinance regarding wildlife management

39 -and-

40 Motion to adopt an ordinance summary for publication.

41 -and-

42 Motion to adopt the proposed “Deer Population Management Program and Policy”.

43

44

45 Prepared by: Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager, (651) 792-7021 pat.trudgeon@cityofroseville.com

46

47 Attachments:

- 48 A. October 5, 2015 City Council Minutes
- 49 B. Draft Wildlife Management Ordinance & Draft Deer Population Management Program and Policy
- 50 C. Ordinance Summary

Roseville. The Roseville City Council may also [generate] topics. Commissions may suggest topics for staff to include in discussion or forum sections of the module. Inclusion of suggested topics made by commissions shall be determined by the City Manager. Residents' ideas and discussion items shall be posted in the ideas section of the module; however, should staff determine that an idea should be escalated to a discussion or forum item it may choose to do so after consultation with the City Manager. Staff or commissions interested in employing the survey function of Speak Up, Roseville shall do so only after receiving approval from the City Council. Staff will also make it known that the surveys are for informational purposes and are not meant to serve as scientific measurements of public opinion."

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

Nays: None.

15. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

a. Discuss a Draft Ordinance regarding Wildlife Management in Roseville

As previously directed by the City Council, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed a draft of the more complete and broader ordinance prohibiting the feeding of wildlife and establishing a more specific policy and program for a deer management plan (Attachment B) allowing for deer hunts with the City of Roseville, as detailed in the RCA dated October 5, 2015 and related attachments; and subject to periodic adjustment accordingly.

Councilmember McGehee referenced various sections of the draft ordinance for clarification or questions as follows:

- In section 411.03, line 37, the definition of intentional feeding didn't specifically address the specific period (e.g. day, month or year).
- Line 44 – 45 regarding feeders 5' above ground, and how that addressed those in wheelchairs wishing to feed birds, opining that there was no reason why a feeder needed to be specified at that level
- Beginning with Line 49: she expressed her complete opposition to fees or ordinances, opining it was ridiculous from the beginning to try to manage deer
- In Section 411.04 Deer Management Plan, and the first 3 items (lines 66 – 70), opined there was no reason to include those items or pretend the City was doing so when agencies or governmental bodies with more authority than the City of Roseville (e.g. Ramsey County and/or the DNR) were already doing so.
- The most important component to here was that addressed in Item 4 related to education to residents
- Item 5: opined that while an annual report was a fine goal, it didn't need to state that a hunt was planned, again since Ramsey County was charged legislatively by the DNR whether or not to have a hunt, and they can ask if they

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 27

feel it is needed in Roseville as well, without the City needing to overstep its authority.

- From line 22 on specific to intentional feeding, expressed strong support of the personal responsibility of residents to manage their own yards and protect their properties as needed, whether a hobby they enjoyed and engage in. Councilmember McGehee opined that for the City to attempt to add a lot of expense and another fee to its system, or spy in private backyards, was not necessary. While agreeing that intentional feeding of wildlife was not responsible, including deer or exceeding that feeding beyond a certain amount in one day, may be prudent to enforce, Councilmember McGehee stated that anything else beyond the educational aspect and encouraging responsibility of private property owners to manage their own yards, was both inadequate and unnecessary.

Councilmember Willmus stated, other than his agreement with Councilmember McGehee specifically on line 37, Item B regarding the need for a specific time frame, he had no problems with this latest draft brought forward by staff and would support it.

Under the Deer Management Plan referenced in Section 411.04 and development and maintenance of such a program, Councilmember Etten recognized Councilmember McGehee's question on who was performing the deer hunt, suggesting that information needed to be incorporated as part of the Plan.

City Manager Trudgeon concurred, and advised that staff anticipated using existing data and resources, not its own deer counts.

Mayor Roe noted the need to include that provision in language of the Plan to clarify that the City was not going to be undertaking the counting.

With that clarification, Councilmember Etten offered his support of this latest draft.

Mayor Roe suggested that in line 37 related to intentional feeding, adding "at any one time," may address that concern.

Public Comment

Timothy Callaghan, 3062 Shorewood Lane

Mr. Callaghan suggested some residents may not be happy if deer were coming into their yards specifically due to waste feed, with this proposed document not addressing their concerns and changing nothing. Mr. Callaghan brought up various diseases that result from animals and referenced studies about those tick borne or Lime disease issues and questioned how this might impact those concerns. In reading this ordinance and in view of past ordinances and decisions, Mr. Callaghan questioned whether those already feeding wildlife shouldn't be "grandfa-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 28

thered in” and exempt from this ordinance unless the City Council intended to declare them a public nuisance. In his personal review of state law, he questioned how that would be addressed. Mr. Callaghan further questioned where funding for enforcement of this proposed ordinance would come from, and stated that it wasn’t going to come from him due to his religious belief that you do no harm to wild animals, and therefore was not going to pay for anything the City charged for hunting, including data gathering, suggesting the cost should not be borne by anyone objecting to such actions. Mr. Callaghan noted this ordinance, which didn’t say much, supported bow hunting, which was known to be one of the most painful and lengthy ways for an animal, which he found further objectionable.

Mr. Callaghan opined that residents needed to protect their own flowers and landscaping from deer hazards rather than the City attempting to enact an ordinance due to a few objecting to deer present that they knew were present when they moved into Roseville, or basically as a pre-existing condition.

Since he may consider legal action if forced to pay for such an ordinance and plan, Mr. Callaghan asked for a specific legal opinion on the grandfathering issue he brought forward.

Jim Bull, 3061 Woodbridge Street

As long-time residents who enjoy deer, Mr. Bull recognized that there was a growing deer population, and opined that people understood they were becoming a nuisance. Mr. Bull disagreed that a solution for preventing migration was fencing when limiting migration and numbers were much more obvious. Mr. Bull stated that his biggest concern was the cost factor and the enforceability of the ordinance. Based on his understanding of previous City Council discussions, staff was to discuss with Ramsey County their deer management program and how Roseville could become part of it. If the City of Roseville enacted this ordinance, Mr. Bull questioned if Ramsey County would exclude the city from their hunt; opining he would prefer to remain a part of theirs. Mr. Bull opined that this draft ordinance still had too many holes in it even though great progress had been made since the first iteration. Mr. Bull asked if vole management would be included in the next iteration for their management or eradication.

Mr. Bull expressed appreciation for the one gallon feed designation and a timeframe; but expressed opposition to enforcement and feeding (line 39) attracting wild animals, using fall displays and decorations that may attract wildlife (e.g. squirrels) and hoped people didn’t avoid decorating because of wildlife access. If this is taken to an extreme, Mr. Bull opined that residents may be subject to fine, and if hunts are only held bi-annually, would the City’s ordinance language be changed accordingly.

Mr. Bull stated his preference in participating and cooperating with Ramsey County’s management of deer without a separate Roseville ordinance.

Regarding his previous recommendation for inserting language “at any one time,” Mayor Roe recognized that it may not suffice and directed legal counsel and staff to work out revised language.

Regarding the grandfathering question from Mr. Callaghan, Mayor Roe, with concurrence from City Attorney Gaughan, clarified that this referred specifically to land use and zoning codes.

Regarding working cooperatively with Ramsey County, Mayor Roe asked staff to respond to how that was envisioned.

Parks & Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke

Mr. Brokke advised that the City of Roseville had been working with Ramsey County over the years and intended to continue doing so, with the county performing a count for which Roseville paid an annual participation fee to be included. Mr. Brokke noted that the county hired a helicopter during the winter for better visibility after a fresh snowfall, to take a county representative around for that count, whether or not it was scientific or not. However, Mr. Brokke clarified that Ramsey County only did a hunt on their property, and in Roseville that would include any county-owned property (e.g. Lake Josephine Park), which they would conduct after having alerted and received authorization from the City. For any hunts on city-owned property, Mr. Brokke clarified would be the responsibility of the City of Roseville, but would still be coordinated with Ramsey County in their work with the DNR.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Brokke confirmed that Ramsey County conducted the deer count annually unless a lack of snowfall prevented them from doing so, thus the minimum standard of bi-annual counts referenced in ordinance language and as noted by Mayor Roe.

Since Ramsey County hunts on their land and in surrounding jurisdictions, Councilmember Laliberte asked if there was an identity of those properties, what cities and how often that may be driving the deer population to Roseville. Councilmember Laliberte opined that a broader understanding of that regional picture was needed if not tonight then asked that staff provide it at a later date.

Mr. Brokke responded that the annual Ramsey County hunt identified a number of sites, with ten identified this fall after which they would perform hunts in those areas indicated after receiving applicable individual community authorization for those hunts on county-owned property within those respective jurisdictions.

Since Ramsey County is charged in managing this herd, Councilmember McGehee asked if there was any reason they wouldn't ask to hunt on property they owned in Roseville if they thought it was necessary.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 30

Mr. Brokke clarified that Ramsey County managed the deer population only on their property and tracked it accordingly, with other cities performing hunts and providing that information to Ramsey County so they are aware of that other harvesting occurring in Roseville.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Brokke confirmed that Ramsey County would still need to seek authorization from the City of Roseville before conducting their hunt on county-owned properties in Ramsey County, providing that check still in place; but them not currently doing so because such a hunt is not allowed anywhere in Roseville at this time without some type of ordinance like this in place.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Brokke advised that Ramsey County had strongly encouraged the City of Roseville to look at some type of control mechanism.

Councilmember Willmus opined that an ordinance of this type would be good and would start to help the City gain control of the deer population. Regarding placement of ornamental displays referenced by Mr. Bull, Councilmember Willmus opined that was a totally different situation than intended with this ordinance, and targeted to deliberate feeding. If the City Council wished to be responsible to concerns expressed by some residents in the community regarding the growing deer population, Councilmember Willmus opined that some type of control mechanism was needed to limit exposure to or availability of food for wildlife, as well as options available if and when the City needed to look at physically reducing their number. Therefore, Councilmember Willmus further opined that this ordinance helped set in place that path; and again expressed his support for such an ordinance.

In terms of a policy, Mayor Roe noted that while the draft ordinance talked about bow hunts, he wasn't sure the policy excluded other means; referencing his hearing today about another community's approach to trap deer and euthanize them at that time. Mayor Roe noted that any ordinance could be revised as needed by a majority vote.

Councilmember McGehee expressed her agreement with both speakers; opining that the original intent was to address those feeding deer, and now it had morphed into something else; and suggested reverting to a simple deer management plan.

Councilmember Etten disagreed with that synopsis, opining public testimony had indicated otherwise as heard over the last few months.

Councilmember McGehee responded that other wildlife problems brought forward were the result of improper enclosure under their decking. While this com-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 31

munity chose not to support organized trash collection as an example, Councilmember McGehee questioned how they could be willing to spend money on this enforcement that impacted residents in their back yards and those liking the wildlife aspect, creating the overpopulation of deer that the City was now being asked to manage, but not encompassing management of turkeys or other wildlife, which she found an imposition and terribly offensive.

Councilmember Etten noted his receipt of another neighbor communication about experiencing raccoon problems and their safety concerns due to intentional feeding of wildlife by others in that neighborhood.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that she was uncomfortable with the end of c (line 22) that intentional feeding causes concentration of wild animals and other details, questioning the need to get into that much detail. If the main issue is a concern with public safety and health, Councilmember Laliberte opined that language should suffice without any further editorializing about impacts to front yards. Councilmember Laliberte further suggested not listing species or categorizing waterfowl; while supporting more specificity in Item B ((lines 37 – 39) in defining time. Regarding fines, without apply them, Councilmember McGehee opined that the ordinance became a suggestion with no enforcement mechanism, even though from the beginning she has referred to this as a “tattle tale” ordinance, while also recognizing the various passionate emotions on this topic. While not in general disagreement with the draft ordinance, with further revisions, and in line with tonight’s discussion, Councilmember Laliberte expressed caution regarding her concerns.

Deer Population Management Program and Policy

Specific to the Deer Management Plan section, Councilmember Laliberte questioned if the City should completely adhere to the DNR sustainable deer habitat numbers that the City always exceeded, opining that the City had already seemed to sustain a relationship with a higher number of deer above those established by the DNR.

As noted by Councilmember McGehee, Councilmember Laliberte supported the main focus of this ordinance being one of educating the public as the lead versus burying it within the document as it is now and in an effort to make it more successful in the long-term.

In addition to annual deer population counts from Ramsey County, Councilmember Laliberte stated that she also expected a proposal from Ramsey County hot the sites and communities for their annual hunts allowing for a more global look at the deer population beyond Roseville borders; and perhaps even resulting in joint meetings with City Council’s and/or Mayors with neighboring communities specific to that issue.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 32

Regarding ordinance language stating that the City Council will discuss from time to time safety precautions on a hunt, Councilmember Laliberte stated that she was not comfortable with that language and suggested removing it entirely from ordinance language.

In the annual report to the City Council, Councilmember Laliberte suggested it include reports from surrounding areas.

While generally supportive of the Program and Policy, Councilmember Laliberte suggested it needed further revision and was not yet ready for prime time.

With no objections, Mayor Roe directed staff to augment language to include the context of communities and jurisdictions around Roseville; and stated he would work with staff offline on proposed language accordingly.

Councilmember McGehee asked Councilmember Laliberte if she had any interest in not having a section for fines, and only an educational component to remove the “tattle tale” concept by working with other communities surrounding Roseville. Councilmember Laliberte responded that, without some repercussions, the tendency would be to continue doing as you had been to-date. With Councilmember McGehee noting the cost of enforcement, Councilmember Laliberte responded that if enforcement of this ordinance proved as tricky as some other enforcement efforts by the City, it caused her some hesitation as she looked at it in light of what more the Community Development Department could realistically take on with current staff resources.

Specific to Councilmember Laliberte’s comments related to deer population counts and getting along up to this point, Councilmember Willmus stated he would push back by responding that he could recall hearing from residents as far back as ten years ago related to the excessive number of deer and damage to their gardens. Councilmember Willmus opined that this ordinance and policy were both long overdue, and at this point, he would not go so far as to attempt to limit it or any options to physically reduce the number of deer currently within the boundaries of Roseville.

Councilmember Laliberte clarified that her comment about options to reduce the herd was intended to suggest leaving it at the discretion of the City Council regarding that method – in both the policy and ordinance – and not indicating any opposition from her as to management of the herd in itself.

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon advised that he would review his notes and the meeting minutes from tonight’s discussion in drafting changes as noted to the ordinance and policy, with more emphasis to education, 5’ off the ground for feeders depending on the judgment of staff in enforcing things specific to handicapped issues, and any changes related to specificity of wild ani-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, October 5, 2015
Page 33

mal lists and cognizant of addressing potential future wild animal issues (e.g. wild turkeys being experienced in the City of Shoreview). At that point, Mr. Trudgeon advised staff would return to the City Council with the next iteration.

16. City Manager Future Agenda Review

City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed upcoming agenda items.

Specific to the potential dissolution of the Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA) in light of the most recent bylaw changes provided by the HRA moving their authority to the City Council, Mr. Trudgeon noted the need to determine if and when to notice a public hearing accordingly or seeking further direction on how to proceed.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not to schedule the public hearing to allow the public to weigh in versus public comment at the time that discussion is held by the City Council; and whether to hold a hearing without a specific intent or conclusion to dissolve the HRA.

Councilmember Willmus stated that his position had remained clear in his focus on economic development and redevelopment, and rather than backtracking, his intent at this point would be to move forward with dissolution of the HRA with ongoing administration of remaining HRA programs by the Community Development Department.

Councilmember Laliberte recalled that the City Council took a vote to initiate the process of dissolution of the HRA and no subsequent vote had been taken not to do so; therefore from a community engagement standpoint, opined that it would be disingenuous of the City Council to seek public comment and then pull back without hearing from the community on what was most important to them.

Councilmember McGehee noted input had been sought by the City Council many times, but it didn't listen to residents; and further noted that the original HRA had become a very different entity over time, especially with the discussions previously held and restructuring from a non-elected to an elected body that had yet to be discussed by the public but having many public implications. Councilmember McGehee opined that dissolution of the HRA didn't only affect the residents of Roseville, but the development and metropolitan community as well. Councilmember McGehee opined that there was no rush to discuss the issue until the October 19 City Council Worksession to determine whether or not to schedule a public hearing based on additional information from that discussion.

Mayor Roe noted that, without having included an item on tonight's agenda to discuss this issue, the most recent discussion was to consider dissolution on October 26 at a public hearing, and therefore any further preliminary discussion should be held on October 19th rather than tonight.

48 3. Employees or agents of the City, County, State, the Federal government or veterinarians who
 49 in the course of their official duties have wild animals in their custody or under their
 50 management.

51 4. Persons caring for animals at the Roseville Wildlife Rehabilitation Center

52 5. Persons bringing wildlife into Roseville for educational purposes.

53 D. Violation of this ordinance provision will be subject to an administrative fine of \$100 for
 54 the first violation, \$200 for a second violation, and \$300 for each subsequent violation
 55 within a 24-month period. This section does not prohibit, prevent, or bar any other
 56 applicable remedies available at law for any conduct described in Section 411.03 including,
 57 but not limited to, nuisance abatement, civil injunction or criminal prosecution.

58 E. The Community Development Department is authorized to implement and enforce the
 59 provisions of 411.03. The Community Development Director shall promulgate rules,
 60 regulations, and/or policies consistent with all provisions herein.

61 F. Any person or persons against whom an administrative fine is imposed under Section 411.05
 62 may appeal such administrative penalty pursuant to Chapter 102 of City Code.

63

64 **411.04: DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN**

65

66 A. The City shall develop and maintain a deer management program to manage the
 67 number of deer that may be adequately supported by suitable habitat within the City of
 68 Roseville. At a minimum, the deer management plan shall contain the following:

69 14. Provision of education to residents on the best management practices for coexisting with
 70 the deer population.

71 24. A bi-annual deer population count, as weather permits, using methodology endorsed or
 72 utilized by Ramsey County.

73 32. Determination of the amount of suitable deer habitat utilizing Minnesota Department of
 74 Natural Resources information and resources.

75 43. Tracking of the location of vehicle/deer accidents.

76 ~~4. Provision of education to residents on the best management practices for coexisting with the~~
 77 ~~deer population.~~

78 5. Annual reports to the City Council on the deer management program, including
 79 information about other deer hunts conducted within Ramsey County.

80 B. Notwithstanding other provisions of this Code, for purposes of managing the deer population
 81 in accordance with the adopted deer management program, deer hunts may from time to time be
 82 approved by the City Council, including the timing, location, method, and safety precautions,
 83 among other provisions, for such hunts.

84

85 **411.05 SEVERABILITY**

86

87 If any provision of this ordinance is found to be invalid for any reason by a court of
 88 competent jurisdiction, the validity of the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

89

90 SECTION 2: Title I, Chapter 503.10 of the Roseville City Code is hereby amended:

91

92 **503.10 USE OF BOW AND ARROW**

93

94 As used in this chapter, the term “bow and arrow” is defined as a bowed shaft of material such

95 as metal, wood or plastic, the ends of which are pulled into a bow formation by a string, cord,
96 wire or any other type of material and used for the purpose of propelling an arrow by means of
97 the power developed in pulling the string against the tension of the bow and further provided
98 that the arrow used is pointed or is equipped with a pointed head of metal, plastic or other
99 material capable of penetrating an object when propelled by the bow.

100
101 It is unlawful for any person to shoot a bow and arrow except: in a school program, on school
102 grounds and supervised by a member of its faculty, a community class, a City Council
103 authorized deer hunt pursuant to City Code Section 411.04, or on a bow and arrow range
104 specifically authorized by the Chief of Police.

105
106 SECTION 3 : Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage and
107 publication.

| _____

1 5 *Ordinance – Title of Ordinance* 20 -
2 6
3 7
4 8
 9 (SEAL) 24
 10
 11
 12 28
 13 29
 14 30
 15 31
 16 32
 17
 18 ATTEST:
 19

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BY: _____
 Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

1
2
3 **City of Roseville**
4 **Deer Population Management Program and Policy**

5 **Purpose of Policy:**

6 Based on the City of Roseville's desire to balance the need for urban services with the
7 protection and management of our natural surroundings, the city hereby authorizes its deer
8 management program. The program is intended to maintain deer as an asset to the
9 community; prevent starvation and disease from overpopulation of deer; reduce the number
10 of motor vehicle accidents involving deer; and preserve and protect the land of property
11 owners;

12
13 **Scope**

14 City staff will administer a program of deer management within the parameters established
15 by this policy.
16

17 **Deer Population Count**

18 Bi-annually, an estimate of the deer population will be made using methodology endorsed by
19 the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and conducted by Ramsey County.
20 This information will also be shared with the DNR.
21

22 **Suitable Deer Habitat**

23 The amount of suitable deer habitat within Roseville will be determined by staff and updated
24 periodically based on development trends. Suitable habitat within Roseville includes city-
25 owned open space, private open space, wetlands (excluding water bodies), flood plains, and
26 any other undeveloped land. Minnesota DNR wildlife specialists establish an upper limit on
27 the number of deer that can be supported per square mile of suitable habitat.
28

29 **Removal of Deer**

30 The city may from time to time conduct a hunt in order to remove a portion of the deer within
31 Roseville. The City Council may order a hunt at their discretion after reviewing the most
32 recent deer population counts and amount of suitable deer habitat within Roseville. ~~Deer may
33 be removed through the use of an archery hunt.~~
34

35 The city must comply with DNR regulations regarding the removal of deer. This includes
36 receiving any applicable permits and removing deer during periods authorized by the DNR.
37 Removal methods must be approved by the DNR and must ensure the highest degree of
38 safety to residents.
39

40 **Vehicle/Deer Accidents**

41 Staff will review the locations of vehicle/deer accidents and take reasonable steps to improve
42 the safety of these areas when possible and feasible.
43
44

45 **Educating Residents**

46 The city will provide education to residents on the best management practices for coexisting
47 with the deer population. Other community education efforts will be undertaken to inform
48 residents about the deer management program.

49

50 **Annual Report to City Council**

51 Annually, city staff will provide the city council with a report on the status of the deer
52 management program, including information about other deer hunts conducted within
53 Ramsey County.

54

55

56

57

Approved by Roseville City Council: _____

58

**CITY OF ROSEVILLE
OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF ORDINANCE NO.**

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE IN THE CITY

The City Council of the City of Roseville adopted Ordinance No. _____ on November 9, 2015 which is summarized as follows:

The Roseville City Code, Title 4, Health and Sanitation; and Title 5, Police Regulations has been amended to create wildlife management regulations for the City of Roseville.

A printed copy of the ordinance is available for inspection by any person during regular office hours in the office of the City Manager at the Roseville City Hall, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, Minnesota 55113. A copy of the ordinance and summary is also be posted at the Reference Desk of the Roseville Branch of the Ramsey County Library, 2160 Hamline Avenue, Roseville, MN. 55113, and on the internet website of the City of Roseville (www.cityofroseville.com).

Ord – Chapters XXXX & XXXXX

Attest: _____
Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

Date: _____