

## *Preface*

**W**ATER POLICY SEEMS in perpetual crisis. The water conflicts familiar to the arid Western states are increasingly commonplace even in the water-rich East. For example, an unresolved “water war” pits Florida against Georgia and Alabama over waters of the Apalachicola/Chattahoochee/Flint system, while the cities and counties surrounding Tampa Bay cannot decide how to secure sufficient supplies for their near-term future. New conflicts extend beyond the statutory authority, competence, geographical jurisdictions, and political constituencies of highly specialized water authorities. Everglades’ restoration has strained Florida’s relationship with the federal government for a decade, and involves dozens of federal, state, and local authorities ranging from water management districts, agricultural and transportation agencies to the Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the National Park Service, and many others. Increasingly, water demands for population and economic growth confront limitations imposed by poorly understood natural systems, even in states where rainfall exceeds four feet each year.

Some see the answer in technology, and indeed technological fixes have come to the rescue in quite a few instances. Others think we can craft solutions through pork barrel trades, and sometimes we do. To us, however, the incessant cry of crisis suggests structural deficiencies. Our fragmented federal system of partisan mutual adjustment governing a Keynesian-style regulated market economy seems to give insufficient priority to a life-giving renewable natural resource whose price is kept artificially low. Overconsumption is encouraged; efficiency is not particularly prized; externalities abound. Institutions responding to these problems fight an uphill battle to meld diverse statutory authorities and to cross jurisdictional boundaries amidst scientific uncertainty and rapid technological change.

The Water Governance Project at Florida State University began with the belief that the new water conflicts provide important lessons about institutional

viii • Preface

changes necessary to adapt existing water policies and water management institutions to the needs of the twenty-first century. By studying the successes and failures of the innovative processes that evolved to deal with conflicts, we sought a clearer understanding of the challenges of *Adaptive Governance*—the kind of governance structure that can both preserve the strengths of existing specialized authorities to exploit natural resources and explore alternatives in order to ensure the sustainability of both human and natural systems. Our plan was to research the recent history of a sample of Florida's intractable water conflicts and analyze these experiences through a wide variety of theoretical and practical lenses.

The two editors brought different intellectual backgrounds to this work: Scholz, a political scientist; Stiftel, an urban planner. We quickly assembled a larger team that included administrators, engineers, lawyers, policy scientists, and a geologist, as well as other political scientists and planners. The interdisciplinary mix has caused strife at times, but in the end, we think the product is much richer and more than a little wiser for the debates we've had.

In the spring of 2003, eight investigators prepared studies of water conflicts in Florida. What quickly emerged when we compared these cases to previous studies of environmental conflicts was that Florida's conflicts had much in common with water conflicts throughout the nation, and that the innovative, adaptive governance structures that emerged had much to say to the nation about the governance of other natural resources and environmental issues as well. These cases provided the background for analysis of Florida's water policy system by an insightful group of policy leaders and nationally prominent scholars who met in a public conference in Tallahassee in November. Revisions of the case studies and papers presented at that conference led to the chapters in this book.

Our intent is to include in one volume a set of cases and analyses that will be valuable to water professionals who are searching for new directions to reform policymaking structures that no longer work; to policy scientists who work to understand the dynamics of natural resource decisionmaking and management; and to advanced undergraduate and graduate students with environmental interests in economics, engineering, geography, law, political science, public administration, and urban planning. By blending case histories with analytical essays, scholarly with policy-oriented analyses, we hope to reach student, scholar, and professional alike in ways not often possible in works that present either experience, theory, or pragmatic analysis.

We seek to fill a gap in the literature of environmental policies and the governance of natural resources—how to govern conflicts that extend beyond the authority, competence, and interest of existing authorities, but cannot be readily resolved by political or judicial institutions. The policy literature provides useful background for environmental policies, politics, and the relevant institutions of governance; adaptive management and conflict resolution provide insight into conflicts and decision processes to resolve them. Our task is to integrate both perspectives to understand the role of emergent institutions of adaptive government in the American federalist system.

For teaching purposes, our case studies focus on Florida water conflicts to provide a context that is limited enough for students to master yet multifaceted enough to encompass the issues important for understanding adaptive governance. Each case tells the general story of one selected conflict, beginning with the origins and institutional settings and focusing on the innovative institutional arrangements—some successful, some not—that evolved to grapple with five challenges to adaptive governance as outlined in Chapter 1.

The subsequent analyses by practitioners and researchers view the case studies from different experience-based and theoretical perspectives, all written for an educated general audience. Each analyst highlights different challenges and different solutions; some emphasize the limitations imposed by the existing institutional structures, some expand on collaborative decisionmaking as applied to these conflicts, and some clarify a particular perspective for analyzing these processes. The final chapter provides a brief summary and assesses the current conditions for the theory and practice of adaptive governance.

This work would not be the same without the insights of Aysin Dedekorkut, who piloted the first of the case studies and was instrumental in three others. The initial selection of cases and the organization of the conference would not have been possible without the cooperation of FSU colleagues Andrew Dzurik (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Richard Feiock (Public Administration), Robert M. Jones (Conflict Resolution), David Markell and J.B. Ruhl (Law), and Eberhard Roeder (Geology), and David Rasmussen, then director of FSU's DeVoe Moore Center for Critical Issues in Economic Policy and Government, who saw value in supporting this work with endowment funds from the Center. We are indebted to Florida State's Jeff Dickey, Keith Ihlanfeldt, Susan Ihlanfeldt, Mike McDaniel, Jacqueline Martin, and Sherry Rice, Don Reisman of Resources for the Future Press, Bruce Ritchie of the Tallahassee *Democrat*, Stuart Langton, David Moore of the Southwest Florida Water Management District, and Terrance Salt of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The errors, of course, are our own.

JOHN SCHOLZ  
BRUCE STIFTEL