

I support the updated draft to the weed ordinance.	Please provide your comments on the draft.	I live in the City of Columbia.
Unsure	After looking at the draft, I see a couple of areas of concern to neighbors of the native landscapes and Vermin harborage. Under 11-252,b,1&3:public nuisance...we need at least an annual regulation/check to make sure that these managed landscapes are within the definition of a managed landscape and if they are not what does the landowner have to do to either bring it back to a managed landscape or something else within an exact period of time. We are dealing with that issue right next door. It is not 90% devoid of the plants listed, it has been checked by your native garden consultant that stated it is not maintained properly, does not have a 3 foot buffer and it was not cut down/cultivated this past fall so not only does it look absolutely horrible now but will not properly grow into a managed landscape in the spring as well. As far as vermin harborage, I think we need to expand beyond just mice and rats. There are so-called beds next door that are composed of things that will attract other forms of problems such as termites. Also were is the regulation on composting containers vs what has been allowed next door which is on the ground? Also a finer regulation on chicken coops maintainance and proper disposal of the feces is necessary because since the chicken coop has been next door, we now get snakes, fox and other forms of vermin. Is that a health department issue?	Yes
Unsure	I also think it is necessary to inform neighbors of the hearing for the property that is being summoned for the hearing because without input from the neighbors as well as the city employee, I feel that we have no input in how it effects our lifestyle and property value.	Yes
Yes	This is a very much improved ordinance! I am so glad that this is being revised. I do have a question regarding this part: "Managed landscapes of native and/or ornamental plants that comprise ninety percent (90%) or more... and it contains a three (3) foot buffer area of vegetation that does not exceed a height of twelve (12) inches or a hardscape border including, but not limited to, a fence or wall that borders the perimeter of the landscape area where residential or commercial property boundaries meet" Does this mean that I cannot have a line of native shrubs inside my property line that adjoins a neighbor's property, if there is not a fence between us? That I must plant the shrubs far enough inside my property boundary so that when they are mature, there is a 3 foot buffer of turf grass (yuck) or mulch (yuck) or gravel (yuck)?	Yes
Yes	This is a big improvement. I appreciate the good work of Danielle Fox and Leigh Kottwitz engaging with the public and producing this proposal.	Yes
Yes		Yes
Unsure	I like where you're going with this, however, Sec 11-252.b.3 needs more clarification before I can support the updated draft of the "weed" ordinance. It is not clear what is actually required for managed landscapes that have all native vegetation. You could read this as a *requirement* that a buffer or wall be installed at *all* boundries of a managed landscape with native vegetation. If that is the intention, the section should say so in more plain language, or add additional clarifying language. Also, the terms "fence" and "wall" probably need defining, much as you've defined other terms used in the ordinance.	Yes
Yes	Nuisance plants: Is there a list? Could a neighbor's allergy make any plant a nuisance plant, perhaps a trumpet vine? And what about a mature oak tree? 11-252 b) 1), Managed Landscapes: What about plants that grew to 12" but have not yet reached maturity? Rephrase to "...height to allow going to seed or developing to maturity ...". Turf weeds could be part of a native landscape. Turf grass could benefit from occasionally going to seed. Strike "turf weeds or turf grasses,". 11-252 b) 3), Managed Landscapes: "... that comprise 90% or more of total landscape" makes no sense. Was it meant to read "...90% or less...". Use "or less" or delete entire phrase, since it is an unnecessary and burdensome requirement, as written. Rest of paragraph refers to "landscapes" (plural) and should use plural verbiage. Disallow sales of Invasive Plants within city limits. Are there any fines for violating the ordinance and not allowing abatement? As written, simply ignoring the order and not allowing removal would be the cheapest and easiest option for the violator. This is the part that makes me unsure of support. Otherwise I support it.	Yes
Yes	I have a few concerns with the draft: 1) the continent is a large geography from which to consider native vs exotic as they relate to MO. 2) i'm not sure MDC maintains a particularly up to date list of invasives, nor that MDC defines habitat types or lists indigenous plants to regions or habitats in geologic time. The USDA noxious weed list is typically very out of date	Yes
Yes		Yes

I support the updated draft to the weed ordinance.	Please provide your comments on the draft.	I live in the City of Columbia.
Unsure	Does this mean that landowners are obligated to remove all exotic invasive plants (e.g Bush Honeysuckle) from their property or face a fine?	Yes
Yes	I am very much in favor of encouraging the planting of native plants. They are beautiful and provide food and habitat for native butterflies and other pollinators. The city staff should be educated about what a native planting looks like at different times of the year. That way if a neighbor is uninformed and complains about a native planting the staff can help the neighbor understand. I am excited about having Danielle Fox on staff as she has been a valuable resource. Please keep this position going long term.	Yes
Yes		Yes
Yes	Well Done! I see that you have gone to considerable thought in defining the difference in native vegetation and weeds. I think these changes will provide freedom for home owners to landscape with pollinator- and bird-friendly naturally tall-growing natives. I think if homeowners get a consult from your office, they will understand the parameters of a managed native garden. From the other side - I certainly hope you will educate TrueGreen and other lawn services to be seriously aware and respectful of native vegetation and fruit gardens down wind of the sterile lawns they are treating with herbicide and insecticide.	Yes
Yes	Pg 3, (b) Exceptions:(3)..... The buffer distance between the landscapes of native and/or ornamental plants that comprise more than 90%.... instead of a (3) foot buffer area of vegetation that that does not exceed (12) inches, this should be increased from 3 foot to 15 foot, similar to agricultural.	Yes
Yes	The only issue I see is that poison ivy, poison oak, and poison sumac should be eliminated. These are native and provide significant sources of protein to birds. I understand that these plants should not be threatening other adjacent property, impeding traffic, etc. but I feel they should not be eradicated from Columbia's native landscapes. Controlled? Yes, but not eradicated. Maybe change the wording to managing these species.	Yes
Yes	Very responsive to my concerns. Thank you.	Yes
Unsure	<p>I'm having trouble supporting the wording of the exception for agricultural crops.</p> <p>As proposed Sec. 11-252 (b)(2) reads...</p> <p>"Cultivated agricultural crops exceeding twelve (12) inches in height and which have gone to seed are permitted provided there is a fifteen (15) foot buffer maintained free of turf weeds, nuisance plants, invasive plants or noxious weeds on the perimeter of the property wherever the property adjoins property used for residential or commercial purposes."</p> <p>The second half of this is unnecessary / confusing for a few reasons:</p> <p>*nuisance plants, invasive plants, and noxious weeds are already listed as a nuisance in the previous section</p> <p>*why does there have to be a buffer free of turf weeds? turf weeds are allowed in other places so long as they're less than 12 inches?</p> <p>I'd propose that Sec. 11-252 (b)(2) be changed to simply read... "Cultivated agricultural crops."</p> <p>Thanks, Billy Polansky Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture billyp@columbiaurbanag.org 540-226-3806</p>	Yes
Yes	Allowing wildflowers helps feed the bee population as well as producing seeds that provide food for migrating birds. The more native flowers the better!	Yes
Yes	I'm all for missouri natives in city landscaping.	Yes

I support the updated draft to the weed ordinance.	Please provide your comments on the draft.	I live in the City of Columbia.
Yes		Yes
Yes	My only concern is that people confuse rats with voles and other native wildlife. I am very pleased about the changes.	Yes
Yes	Thank you! This is much needed to empower Columbia residents to create and maintain landscapes with a sense of place. It allows individual creativity, and provides wonderful environmental benefits.	Yes
Yes	I'm fully supportive of allowing residents to grow vegetable gardens and native and/or edible plants freely throughout our city! They provide self-reliance, beauty, and many conservation benefits that make our city more resilient. Residents growing these plants in their front lawns, side lawns, and back lawns, however visible, should be protected in doing such practices from neighboring residents that complain out of ignorance of the gardeners' intentions. This update to the ordinance maintains rules to keep poorly managed landscaping in-check, while allowing gardeners more freedom to maximize food production and ecological conservation benefits in planting more diverse species than are often described as 'ornamental'.	Yes
Yes	Overall I support the updated draft. I would like clarification on the part concerning agricultural crops that have gone to seed. I believe residents should be able to have a garden up to the edge of their property line without a 15 ft gap. In a small yard, 15 ft would take the majority of the yard. I have a small vegetable garden in my yard but I don't have enough space or enough sun to allow 15 ft between it and the property line. My garden is maintained. So perhaps the issue is what it means to have "gone to seed". Maybe that needs a definition. With climate change upon us and temperature extremes forecast to get worse, we need native plants in our landscapes so this is an excellent change. We also need to be able to grow our own food that is free of pesticides and herbicides. It is important that we be prepared with local food options in case climate disasters force a breakdown in the food supply system at some future point.	Yes
Yes	I am submitting comments for the Osage Group of the Sierra Club. We support revising the ordinance to allow native plants and gardening for food in yards. Both uses have environmental benefits. We question the need for buffers, though, and would prefer that homeowners could use all their land for plantings. Apparently a vegetable garden requires no neighbor buffer if allowed to go to seed but an agricultural crop would require a 15 ft buffer? It would be helpful to define agricultural crops. Thank you for your work on this!	Yes
Yes		Yes
Unsure	I think it should be a property owner's right to have a vegetable garden, even without a 15 foot buffer. In my property, the front yard has good access to sunlight, and a raised bed garden could be very attractive there. But the distance from the edge of the sidewalk to the front of the house (which has rose bushes) would severely limit the garden to maybe only 1-3 foot row. I can't be sure from reading this weed ordinance if I would be allowed to have a garden in the front yard. Richard Shannon, 712 W. Green Meadows Rd.	Yes