UF IFAS Extension UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

UF/IFAS PEER REVIEWED SL552

doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-SS768-2026

From Reactive to Proactive Stormwater Pond Management: Practical Guidelines for HOA Leaders, Contractors, Developers, and Environmental Practitioners[1]

Cody Gusto, Paul Monaghan, and Basil V. Iannone III[2]

Introduction

Residential stormwater pond (SWP) management is often treated exclusively as a technical maintenance issue: identify and diagnose the pond problem, select the appropriate best management practice (BMP), and apply a solution. While technical recommendations are important, they may not produce lasting management changes in residential communities without a broader consideration of a community's governance structure and norms. As a result, many SWP challenges persist because recommended BMPs may not account for homeowners association (HOA) budgets, contractor selection and practice, leadership turnover, and deeply entrenched community norms about what a "well-maintained" pond should look like. Therefore, this publication focuses on the social and structural dynamics that may affect BMP adoption or implementation. It examines why environmentally effective SWP management practices are often delayed, resisted, or inconsistently applied in residential communities, as well as what interested stakeholders can do to make proactive pond management more routine. We offer these insights for HOA board members, community association managers (CAMs), pond and landscape management contractors, developers, Extension professionals, water quality advocates, and other practitioners involved in residential SWP management in Florida.

Readers seeking more information on intended SWP functions, common technical maintenance challenges, homeowner understanding and perceptions of SWP function, and recommended BMPs may consider the following publications:

- For a general explanation of stormwater wet pond function, algae, erosion, household-level prevention strategies, and common maintenance concerns, see Ask IFAS publication AEC807, "Frequently Asked Questions About Stormwater Wet Ponds."
- For findings on Florida homeowners' knowledge of pond functions, low-maintenance buffer zones, and pond plant selection, read Ask IFAS publication FE1172, "People and Ponds: How Can Homeowners Better Understand and Manage Stormwater Ponds?"
- See Ott et al. (2015) for strategies to encourage homeowner BMP adoption, including visible indicators, demonstration plantings, public signage, education events, and communication with landscape professionals.
- For guidance on effective SWP planting design and the selection of appropriate pond plants, refer to Ask IFAS publication FOR347, "A Database on Trait-Based Selection of Stormwater Pond Plants."

This publication builds on those resources by focusing on the implementation challenge: how communities can integrate and operationalize SWP BMPs as routine decisions, budget priorities, contractor expectations, and resident-supported norms. Drawing on a structured expert consensus process reported in Gusto et al. (2026), we identify key challenges and success strategies to help HOA leaders, contractors, developers, Extension professionals, and water quality advocates move communities from reactive pond maintenance toward proactive, sustained management.



Figure 1. Retention pond in a neighborhood in the Villages, Florida. Photo taken 10-21-21.
Credit: UF/IFAS Photo by Tyler Jones.

Key Challenges for Residential Communities: Why SWP Management Often Becomes Reactive

SWP management becomes reactive when communities lack the mechanisms or routines to prompt action before problems become visible or noticeably concerning to the average resident (Gusto et al. 2026). In other words, pond-related decisions are often delayed until algae, erosion, sediment buildup, drainage issues, or resident complaints force action. Several recurring dynamics contribute to this pattern.

SWPs Are Often Treated as Visual Amenities Rather than Essential Infrastructure

SWP management decisions are shaped by how residents and boards understand pond function (Monaghan et al. 2016). In many HOA communities, SWPs are viewed primarily as scenic amenities, even though their primary purpose is functional—to manage runoff, reduce flooding, and help protect water quality. These expectations ultimately shape what residents are willing to support or resist. If residents consider turfgrass to the shoreline and unobstructed views to be hallmarks of a "good" pond, then BMPs such as shoreline plantings, low-mow zones, or vegetated buffers may be interpreted as neglect rather than intentional management. Existing UF/IFAS resources explain SWP function in more detail and can be used to support resident education (Asanzi et al. 2024; Haque et al. 2026).

Existing Aesthetic Norms Can Work Against Pond Health

A frequent barrier to the adoption of environmentally effective, pond-friendly BMPs is pressure within HOAs to maintain pristine lawns and waterscapes through conventional practices such as frequent mowing, irrigation, and fertilization. This trend underscores a central implementation challenge: Communities may already be aware of certain recommended practices, but those practices can be difficult to adopt when they conflict with shared expectations about how a neighborhood landscape should look. Consequently, communities should introduce pond-friendly practices gradually and in a way that the average resident would still consider visually appealing. Prior research on residential SWPs supports this point, showing that homeowner preferences, shoreline appearance, and neighbor expectations influence acceptance of pond plantings and other BMPs (Hu et al. 2017; Monaghan et al. 2016).

Knowledge Gaps Matter, but They Are Not the Whole Problem

Many HOA board members and residents do not fully understand SWP functions, low-maintenance buffer zones, or plant selection guidance (Haque et al. 2026). While addressing technical knowledge gaps remains an important function of SWP-related educational outreach, limited knowledge should be treated as only a portion of the challenge for SWP BMP implementation efforts. Even when residents or board members understand the value of a practice, action can still be delayed by budget cycles, the limited availability of key leadership, fear of resident complaints, uncertainty about responsibility, or leadership turnover.

Contractor Expectations Are Often Unclear

Limited oversight of contractor practices reflects a practical reality in many HOA communities. Day-to-day maintenance decisions around ponds and pond-adjacent landscapes are often carried out by landscape crews, pond management companies, irrigation contractors, property managers, or other service providers with little to no communication among these parties (where two or more contractors are employed) or between contractors and HOA leadership. This lack of communication can lead to misunderstandings about why certain actions are needed and may even contribute to conflicting management situations in a community (e.g., pond plantings installed by a pond management contractor inadvertently damaged or killed by a landscape contractor).

Success Strategies: Priority Actions for Proactive SWP Management

Start with Nutrient/Pollution Source Control

Communities should prioritize reducing the amount of nutrients and/or pollutants that enter ponds through runoff to reduce reliance on reactive treatments after problems (e.g., harmful algal blooms) appear. For HOAs, control of nutrient and pollution sources should be more explicitly built into community standards, contractor expectations, and resident communication rather than treated only as an individual homeowner choice. Current UF/IFAS resources provide detailed guidance on household-level prevention practices such as reducing fertilizer and pesticide inputs, preventing irrigation overspray, keeping clippings and debris out of ponds and storm drains, and applying Florida-Friendly Landscaping™ (FFL) principles (Asanzi et al. 2024; Haque et al. 2026).

Practical actions include the following:

- Embedding source control expectations in landscape contracts
- Communicating recommended fertilization and irrigation guidelines during the dry and rainy seasons
- Installing message-tested, visually engaging signage near ponds or other common area amenities
- Encouraging residents to ask contractors how they manage clippings, fertilizer, and irrigation near ponds
- Aligning HOA landscaping standards with FFL principles
- Reviewing irrigation practices in common areas, especially near pond edges, sidewalks, streets, and storm drains

Use Visible BMPs to Shift Expectations

Communities that formally support and make BMPs such as no-mow zones, shoreline plantings, vegetated buffers, and Florida-Friendly groundcovers highly visible may have a better opportunity to shift residents' expectations and willingness to accept holistic SWP management. Prior research suggests that BMPs such as shoreline plantings are more likely to be accepted when they appear intentionally managed (Hu et al. 2017; Monaghan et al. 2016). For this reason, formally supported and successfully implemented BMPs do more than mitigate runoff or address other pond maintenance challenges; they also communicate what the community values and what it considers acceptable landscape management. Demonstration areas, signage, and well-maintained pilot projects (e.g., buffer zone vegetation installations) can help reset expectations for what effective pond care should look like. This is especially important in communities where turfgrass to the shoreline, unobstructed water views, and highly manicured landscapes have long served as visual markers of care. When visible BMPs are well-designed, maintained, and proactively promoted or communicated, they can make alternative management practices feel less risky and unfamiliar, as well as more consistent with existing community expectations around property stewardship and care (Ott et al. 2015).

Practices are more likely to gain support when they are

- Implemented or installed in visible common areas;
- Designed with clear borders or edges;
- Maintained regularly;
- Explained through signage or HOA communications; and
- Connected to benefits residents already value, such as erosion control, cost savings, wildlife viewing, and long-term property protection.

Build Proactive, Long-Term Pond Management into HOA Budgets

Reactive budgeting has been identified as one of the most urgent barriers to proactive SWP management (Gusto et al. 2026). Many communities delay spending until visible problems emerge, at which point, algae growth, erosion, sediment accumulation, or drainage issues may be too difficult or costly to correct (Asanzi et al. 2024). Findings from Gusto et al. (2026) translate that technical observation into a governance recommendation: Pond management should be treated as a recurring community asset expense, not as an infrequent emergency repair. In practice, this means making pond management part of the annual budget and reserve plan and shifting the pressing budget question from "can we afford pond improvements this year?" to "what will it cost if we wait until erosion, algae growth, sediment buildup, or system failure becomes severe?" This reframing positions proactive pond management as fiscal responsibility, rather than optional environmental spending.

Practical actions include the following:

- Creating a dedicated SWP or natural assets budget line
- Funding preventive maintenance, not only repair
- Including pond inspection and monitoring costs in annual planning
- Budgeting for plant replacement and buffer maintenance
- Including pond management in reserve planning where appropriate
- Reviewing pond-related costs before annual budget decisions are finalized
- Tracking past pond-related costs to help boards compare preventive maintenance with reactive repair

Form Pond or "Natural Asset" Committees

While HOAs can establish regular, routine service contracts with pond management companies, SWPs may receive the most maintenance attention when residents themselves identify perceived issues or solutions. Findings from Gusto et al. (2026) identified dedicated pond, landscape, or natural asset committees as a promising strategy for maintaining important continuity in HOA communities, where board turnover, seasonal residency, and shifting volunteer capacity frequently disrupt proactive, long-term planning. Committees do not need to become technical authorities, but they can play an invaluable role in ensuring pond management is visible, organized, and connected to recurring HOA decisions.

A committee can help

- Track pond conditions over time;
- Coordinate with contractors and property managers;
- Review maintenance recommendations;
- Maintain records across board transitions;
- Share updates with residents;
- Identify grant or partnership opportunities;
- Coordinate with Extension or local water quality professionals;
- Support demonstration projects or community pond walks; and
- Encourage new board members to understand and appreciate the value of proactive pond management decisions.

Strengthen Contractor Oversight and Contract Language

If existing landscape and pond management contracts in HOA communities emphasize only mowing, spraying, or short-term appearance, they may reinforce practices that undermine pond function. Findings from Gusto et al. (2026) support the need for improved oversight of contractor practices and wider adoption of contractor vetting as a critical twinned strategy for improving pond management outcomes. HOAs thus need clear bid criteria, contract language, maintenance expectations, reporting procedures, and review processes that make pond-friendly practices part of routine service delivery. Accordingly, contractor selection should not be based on price/service costs alone. Prior UF/IFAS guidance suggests that community associations should compare multiple bids, conduct on-site inspections with prospective contractors, verify licensing and insurance, check references, ask about Green Industries Best Management Practices (GI-BMP) certification, and clarify whether contractors can provide regular reports or attend board meetings when needed (Dale et al. 2018). These considerations are especially relevant for pond-adjacent landscape and maintenance work, where mowing, fertilization, irrigation, pruning, debris handling, and chemical applications can directly affect stormwater pond function.

HOAs should also designate a single point of contact to maintain active communication with contractors and require regular written reports describing completed work, planned activities, deviations from specifications, problems encountered, and recommendations for improvement (Dale et al. 2018). Moreover, HOAs should ensure that pond-friendly expectations are written into contracts, reviewed during contractor selection, and revisited during board meetings, contract renewals, and seasonal maintenance planning. The purpose is not to micromanage contractors, but rather to ensure that a community's long-term pond goals are reflected in the work being performed.

Questions to Ask Contractors

- How do you prevent fertilizer, clippings, and irrigation runoff from entering ponds?
- How do you distinguish desirable shoreline plants from invasive or nuisance vegetation?
- Do you avoid mowing or spraying all vegetation at the pond edge?
- Do you provide written maintenance reports?
- Do you notify the HOA before removing pond edge vegetation?
- Can you support low-mow zones, littoral plantings, or Florida-Friendly groundcovers?
- Are fertilizer applicators properly trained or certified where required?
- Do your recommendations prioritize prevention or mainly reactive treatment?
- How do you coordinate with other contractors working near the pond?

HOA contracts can include the following expectations:

- No routine mowing to the waterline in designated buffer areas
- Grass clipping control near ponds and storm drains
- Fertilizer setbacks or restrictions near pond edges
- Defined maintenance plans for planted shoreline areas
- Written approval before removing beneficial vegetation
- Regular reporting on erosion, algae, invasive plants, and drainage blockages
- Coordination between landscape contractors and pond management companies
- Seasonal review meetings before high-rainfall periods

Plan Early During Development and HOA Transition

Some SWP challenges begin before residents move in. Developers, planners, landscape architects, and engineers shape the baseline landscape that residents come to expect. If ponds are initially marketed and maintained as turfgrass to the shoreline, later attempts to add vegetation or reduce mowing may be perceived as a loss. Therefore, early integration of pond-friendly design during the development phase of communities should be a high-priority strategy (Gusto et al., 2026). This includes establishing native or Florida-Friendly plantings during initial development, designing visible common-area examples of functional pond edges, and communicating pond maintenance responsibilities during HOA transition. Changing expectations in long-established communities is difficult. Establishing strong "baselines" for how ponds (and residents' expectations) are managed early can reduce conflict, lower retrofit costs, and make proactive pond management feel normal from the beginning.

Recommendations for Developers and Designers

- Install shoreline plantings before homes are sold.
- Avoid establishing turfgrass to the shoreline expectations around every pond edge.
- Use Florida-Friendly and pond-appropriate plant palettes.
- Design common area ponds as demonstration sites.
- Provide residents with plain-language pond function and maintenance information.
- Transfer maintenance plans, planting specifications, and permit responsibilities to the HOA.
- Consider resident visibility and aesthetics when designing planting zones.
- Clarify who is responsible for pond maintenance after developer turnover.

Proactively Communicate Before Anticipated Problems Become Controversies

SWP communication should not begin only when residents complain about perceived issues. Community leadership should proactively explain what the ponds are, how they function, what maintenance practices are being used, and why certain changes are being proposed. This should not involve flooding residents with technical information, but rather using clear, timely, practical communication that connects pond management to resident concerns. Ultimately, timing is critical: Outreach may be most effective in specific periods when boards and/or CAMs are planning and executing decisions.

Consider communicating at these time periods:

- Before annual budget meetings
- Before contract renewals
- Before the rainy season
- Before shoreline planting or buffer installation
- During HOA board onboarding
- After storms reveal erosion, drainage, or sediment issues
- When new residents receive welcome materials
- When residents raise concerns about the pond appearance

Conclusion

Improving SWP management in Florida residential communities depends on making recommended technical practices easier to implement and sustain through internal governance. For HOA leaders, contractors, developers, Extension professionals, and water quality advocates, the priority is to transform pond management from a reactive pattern into a proactive routine. This might entail reducing nutrient inputs before problems appear, making BMPs visible and acceptable, building pond care into budgets and contracts, creating continuity regardless of board turnover, and communicating before conflicts arise.

Communities do not need to solve every pond issue at once. A practical starting point is to clarify responsibility by identifying who manages the pond, who maintains the shoreline, who oversees contractors, and who communicates with residents. From there, communities can review existing practices—fertilization, irrigation, mowing, spraying, plant management, and debris handling near ponds—and prioritize source control by reducing fertilizer use, adjusting irrigation, and keeping grass clippings and yard debris out of ponds and storm drains.

Once these practices are in place, communities can begin institutionalizing or formalizing proactive management. This may include creating a dedicated pond budget line for preventive maintenance, monitoring, plant management, and incremental improvements; using common area ponds or pilot sites to demonstrate what well-maintained pond-friendly landscapes look like; updating contracts so contractor expectations align with long-term pond goals; and maintaining plans, maps, records, vendor expectations, and communication templates across board transitions. Regular communication through newsletters, signage, pond walks, and brief meeting updates can help normalize these practices before pond appearance or maintenance decisions become controversial.

SWP health, quality, and environmental effectiveness are ultimately shaped by both ecological processes and a complex web of community decision-making. Many existing communities with SWP "success stories" are those that have made pond management an intentional and routine part of governance, budgeting, communication, and landscape care. By shifting from reactive treatment to proactive stewardship, Florida communities can better protect water quality, reduce long-term costs, and maintain SWPs as functional, attractive, and valued neighborhood assets.

These six practical actions can enhance the sustained adoption of SWP BMPs:

1. Reducing nutrient inputs at the source
2. Making pond-friendly practices highly visible, clearly managed, and socially acceptable (i.e., in line with community values)
3. Formally prioritizing proactive pond management in HOA budgets, contractor selection, and committee structures
4. Improving contractor oversight and clarifying maintenance expectations
5. Timing pond management communication strategically, especially during development, HOA transition, board turnover, and contract renewal periods
6. Framing proactive pond management as long-term cost control and liability/risk reduction

These priorities align with existing research demonstrating that residential SWP outcomes are shaped not only by design features and local ecological conditions, but also by social norms, aesthetic expectations, landscape practices, contractor relationships, and HOA governance (Cannon et al. 2024; Hu et al. 2017; Monaghan et al. 2016; Persaud et al. 2016).

References

Asanzi, A., M. C. Martin, M. Atkinson, et al. 2024. "Frequently Asked Questions About Stormwater Wet Ponds: AEC807/WC468, 8/2024." *EDIS* 2024 (5). https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-wc468-2024

Cannon, S., A. L. Prochaska, K. Stewart, T. Callahan, and M. C. Nowlin. 2024. "Identifying Barriers Preventing Stormwater Pond Buffer Implementation in Coastal South Carolina." *Journal of South Carolina Water Resources* 9 (2): 7. https://doi.org/10.34068/JSCWR.09.02.07

Dale, A. G., C. Lewis, E. A. Momol, et al. 2018. "Florida-Friendly Landscaping™ Guidelines for Community Associations: Considerations for Selecting a Landscape Contractor and Writing an Effective Landscaping Contract: ENH1080/EP347, rev. 4/2018." *EDIS* 2018 (3). https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-ep347-2018

Gusto, C., P. Monaghan, and B. V. Iannone III. 2026. "Facilitating Expert Consensus on Stormwater Pond Management: Mapping Critical Dynamics to Improve Communication and Clarify Outcome Targets." *Journal of Public Interest Communications* 10 (2). https://doi.org/10.32473/jpic.v10.i2.p39

Haque, S., H. Khachatryan, and M. K. Atkinson. 2026. "People and Ponds: How Can Homeowners Better Understand and Manage Stormwater Ponds? FE1172, 1/2026." *EDIS* 2026 (2). https://doi.org/10.32473/EDIS-FE1172-2026

Hu, S., G. Hansen, and P. Monaghan. 2017. "Optimizing Shoreline Planting Design for Urban Residential Stormwater Systems: Aligning Visual Quality and Environmental Functions." *HortTechnology* 27 (3): 310–318. https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTTECH03580-16

Monaghan, P., S. Hu, G. Hansen, E. Ott, C. Nealis, and M. Morera. 2016. "Balancing the Ecological Function of Residential Stormwater Ponds with Homeowner Landscaping Practices." *Environmental Management* 58: 843–856. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-016-0752-9

Nighswander, G. P., M. E. Szoka, K. M. Hess, E. Z. Bean, G. Hansen, and B. V. Iannone. 2019. "A New Database on Trait-Based Selection of Stormwater Pond Plants: FOR347/FR416, 6/2019." *EDIS* 2019 (4). https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-fr416-2019

Ott, E., P. Monaghan, O. Wells, G. Hansen, L. Warner, and M. Atkinson. 2015. "Strategies to Encourage Adoption of Stormwater Pond Best Management Practices (BMPs) by Homeowners: AEC552/WC214, 7/2015." *EDIS* 2015 (7). https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-wc214-2015

Persaud, A., K. Alsharif, P. Monaghan, F. Akiwumi, M. C. Morera, and E. Ott. 2016. "Landscaping Practices, Community Perceptions, and Social Indicators for Stormwater Nonpoint Source Pollution Management." *Sustainable Cities and Society* 27: 377–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2016.08.017

[1] This document is SL552, one of a series of the Department of Soil, Water, and Ecosystem Sciences, UF/IFAS Extension. Original publication date November 2026. Visit the Ask IFAS website at https://ask.ifas.ufl.edu/ for the currently supported version of this publication. © 2026 UF/IFAS. This publication is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

[2] Cody Gusto, former research study coordinator, UF/IFAS Department of Agricultural Education and Communication, Gainesville, FL; Paul Monaghan, associate professor, Extension education, UF/IFAS Department of Agricultural Education and Communication, Gainesville, FL; Basil V. Iannone III, associate professor and state Extension specialist, residential landscape ecology, UF/IFAS School of Forest, Fisheries, and Geomatics Sciences, Gainesville, FL; UF/IFAS Extension, Gainesville, FL 32611.

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) is an Equal Opportunity Institution authorized to provide research, educational information, and other services only to individuals and institutions that operate in compliance with applicable federal and state non-discrimination laws and policies. For more information on obtaining other UF/IFAS Extension publications, contact your county's UF/IFAS Extension office. U.S. Department of Agriculture, UF/IFAS Extension Service, University of Florida, IFAS, Florida A&M University Cooperative Extension Program, and Boards of County Commissioners Cooperating. Andra Johnson, Dean for UF/IFAS Extension.