

NM Strategicplan

From: swcd@carlsbadsoilandwater.org [swcd@carlsbadsoilandwater.org] **Sent:** Mon 7/18/2005 8:36 AM
To: NM Strategicplan
Cc:
Subject: Form posted from Microsoft Internet Explorer.
Attachments:

Contact_Name=Nathan Jurva
 Street_Address1=3219 S Canal
 Street_Address2=
 City=Carlsbad
 State=NM
 Zip=88220
 Phone=(505)628-1532
 Contact_Email=swcd@carlsbadsoilandwater.org
 General_Comments=In the titles of both this plan and the Forest and Watershed Health Plan there appears to be separation of non-native phreatophytes or forests from watersheds, when in reality these are vegetation types within a watershed. It may be more appropriate to change the title and call this a watershed plan with special emphasis on non-native phreatophyte management or a watershed plan with special emphasis on forests.

There is not a budget or cost estimate to carry-out the list of actions in this plan. Financing the actions in a plan is the only way to keep it from being just another plan on the shelf. The agencies and organizations assigned responsibilities in the plan need an estimate of cost to adjust their budgets and the legislature will need an estimate of funds needed to carry out the plan. None of the plan can be adequately addressed without a budget with proper funding. Once the funds are released, prioritization can take place.

Executive Summary, page 5, "it has no natural enemies." Although this statement is presently true in the United States, salt cedar does have natural enemies in other countries. Those natural enemies have now been introduced to the United States. The acreage numbers of 500,000 in New Mexico and 1,500,000 throughout the west are questionable. Texas also claims to have 500,000 acres of salt cedar. California and Arizona both have extensive populations of salt cedar. These are unverified numbers and probably should not be quoted.

Executive Summary, page 6. The Team Tamarisk Conference held in Albuquerque was jointly sponsored by the US Dept of Interior and the US Department of Agriculture. First bullet, "We support the concept of forest and watershed health". Again forests are a part of the watershed and the office probably should be for watershed health unless it is specific to the parts of watersheds that support forests. If that is the case, then it should not be noted in this plan. Another layer of bureaucracy is not supported by everyone, but may gain support if duplication of effort does not occur and a better outline of the duties of that office were made available.

Findings, item 7, 4th bullet, page 13. Change the wording to "academic and scientific community".

Recommendations_Comments=Management, item 4, page 18. If NMDA is doing the oversight and program administration, can they provide independent assessment of projects? An independent assessment could better be provided by the Advisory Committee.

Monitoring, item 2 pages 20, and 21. Throughout the development of the strategic plan the need for reliable scientific data from monitoring has been stressed. Is the use of high school students (BEMP) to collect data really good, defensible scientific data collection?

Research, item 2, page 21. The central database needs further clarification. Who is going to pay for this database? Who is going to establish and maintain the database? What are the benefits to be derived from this database and where will it be located at?

Implementation_Comments=Implementation of Recommendations, page 23. There are sum typographical errors that need to be cleaned up. "2005 Actions for NMDA", item 4, page 23. Does NMDA have the staff to complete the tactical plans? What are the estimated costs? Did the legislature appropriate funds for this work?

"2005 Actions for NMDA", item 5, page 24, first bullet. Why is the advisory panel reviewing the local site specific plans? We believe you have outlined a full time workload for a volunteer panel. What would be the meeting schedule for the panel? What kind of delay will this create for time sensitive projects?

"2005 Actions for NMDA", item 5, second bullet, page 24. Is GIS software that is able to use this data available? To date we have not seen anything that is truly reliable.

"2005 Actions for NMDA", item 6, page 24. The Carlsbad SWCD believes a cost-share policy should be specific. Much of the control or treatment work has been done on the perception that it is a benefit to the State. Many landowners see little benefit to them from the treatment and a required investment by them will have a negative impact on the state's goals. On the other hand, restoration or rehabilitation will directly benefit the landowner and they would probably be willing to support that work.

"2005 Actions for NMDA", item 7, page 24. Does this statement remove the ability of individual Soil and Water Conservation Districts to work directly with the Federal agencies? If so, this needs to be changed.

"NMDA Actions Within the Next 5 Years", item 2, page 24. Best Management Practices guides exist and those guides could be developed into a handbook. Some practices may have to be tailored to specific areas since there is a great difference from one river to another or even from one part of a river to the other.

"NMDA Actions Within the Next 5 Years", item 3, page 24. The idea of a living demonstration laboratory raises questions. It may be more applicable to use ongoing projects as teaching and training areas.

Templates_Comments=Control Templates and Protocols, table 1, page 25.

The project objectives are not addressed anywhere and the general plan needs to be noted.

Control Templates and Protocols, table 1 item 6 page 27. The maintenance should be the last item discussed and should be moved to the last of the table.

Revegetation and Rehabilitation Templates and Protocols, table 2, item 4, page 30. A preliminary should be broad and not address specific needs. Is a preliminary plan needed?

"Monitoring Templates and Protocols", page 32. We believe there should be an intermediate level of monitoring that is specific to a project area. This monitoring can give project managers quicker access to needed data for making decisions within a project. Using "New Mexico's highly regarded scientific community" can lead to long delays while reports are completed, reviewed, etc. Landowner monitoring will not provide the project specific data to make broad decisions on.

Table 3, Landscape-scale level monitoring templates and protocols, item 6, page 36. Sociological and Cultural. Who is qualified to determine these impacts? Those that are writing the plans are probably not qualified to make these assessments.

Table 4, Landowner monitoring templates and protocols, item 1 page 36. Are landowners capable of making the determination of effectiveness of control measures and provide a photo history of pre-control and post-control? The entire section on landowner monitoring is based on assumptions. Is this good to put in a plan?