

Julie,

I'm a self-employed landscape architect. I have been in the landscape industry as a contractor and architect for the past 35 years and have seen quite a few changes in the industry. In all that time I have seen the industry continue to look for ways to be more and more efficient both in the way projects are designed and the way they are maintained. This is especially true of the irrigation side of the industry. Long before there were any concerns with droughts, the industry has been making more and more efficient irrigation equipment. The industry has been looking for new and using new technology to be efficient with water mostly because we all know that water costs money so any cost savings were viewed by clients as an immediate benefit.

At this point in time we are faced with a cycle of drought where we need to cut back even further on the water we use which is something we all understand. In doing that however, we shouldn't look to essentially change the face of the landscape industry in order to limit water use. I encourage the use of responsible water management practices but I'm concerned with several points in the draft MWELO. They are as follows:

- Precipitation limits – The proposed limit of 1 in/hr is far too limiting. This will effectively eliminate some of the most efficient methods of irrigation available to the industry at this time. The precipitation rate is too low to allow for large scale irrigation which will hurt/eliminate all turf fields etc. The real answer is to limit the quantity of water used by the end user and allow them the opportunity to put the water down as efficiently as possible.
- Irrigation Efficiency – The proposed IE cannot currently be achieved because there are not irrigation products available on the market that will achieve what is being proposed. I don't see this as something where the industry needs to get better as far as the design of the equipment because I believe, as I noted above, the industry has continued to strive to become more efficient on their own but what is being proposed is not currently achievable. Here again I believe the answer is to limit the amount of water available to be used and allow the end user to be as efficient with it as they possibly can.

In closing I recognize that we are currently in challenging times with the amount of water that we have but I would encourage you to consider the landscape industry as one who has worked to be efficient in its use of water and not force the industry into requirements that are not able to be achieved and would thus result in the decline of the landscape industry. Also remember that as an industry, we are finally coming out of a time of a severe recession and are finally getting people back to work. If these proposed changes to the ordinance are allowed, I fear that many in the industry would end up on the unemployment rolls once again.

Thank you for your time.

Glen