

2011 Environmental Quality Incentive Program

Local Work Group Summary for the Roswell Field Office

Introduction:

The Roswell Field Office is located in SE New Mexico in the lower Pecos River valley. It encompasses approximately 100,000 acres of irrigated cropland and a little less than 3,000,000 acres of rangeland. The cropland is irrigated by wells pumping from underground aquifers. All irrigation water is adjudicated, regulated by PVACD, and limited to 3.5 ac ft per acre per annum. There are about 43 AFO operations serviced out of the Roswell office averaging 2500 milking cows each. Rangeland is mostly a patchwork of Federal, State, and private lands intermingled. The average size ranching operation is 18,000 acres.

Local Work Group:

A meeting of the Roswell Field Office Local Work Group was held on July 13, 2010 at 3:30 PM at the local Farm Service Center 1011 S Atkinson in Roswell. Participants included any who had an interest in participating. 14 individuals representing federal, state, and special districts and organizations were present. A copy of the mail out list and the attendees are enclosed or held in the local FO.

Priority Resource Concerns:

Primary concerns within the area include rangeland hydrology, irrigation water efficiency, and ground and surface water pollution prevention. Specific resource concerns are listed below in order of priority by land use:

	<u>Resource Concern</u>	<u>Rangeland</u>	<u>Irrigated Cropland</u>	<u>AFO</u>
1.	Water Quantity	1	1	2
2.	Water Quality	2	2	1
3.	Domestic Animals	5	7	5
4.	Plant Condition	3	3	4
5.	Soil Condition	6	4	3
6.	Soil Erosion	4	5	6
7.	Fish & Wildlife	7	8	8
8.	Air Quality	8	6	7

The top four will be addressed under each land use - minimum

Funding Considerations:

Funds received are to be allocated at 50% to rangeland and 50% to irrigated cropland, The LWG would prefer that separate funding for AFOs be set aside at the state level so that it would not cut into rangeland and irrigated cropland funding. Practice caps were recommended set at \$150,000 for structural

practices. At least one complete viable project is to be funded in each contract. The group recommended that the payment schedule used for the 2010 program be used again for 2011.

Cost Share Rate Factor:

The payment schedule was recommended to be based at the 65% level of average total installation cost. Brush management recommended at the 75% level. It was also noted that manure transfer component items related to dairy and dairy/farm operations were missing from the 2010 payment rate list, and need to be reinstated on the list. All those on the 2009 list need reinstated with the addition of the slurry undersling pivot line @ \$10.25 per LF. The average total cost on this item is \$13.50 per LF.

Please refer to the FY 2011 EQIP cost list for final practice payment rates.

Screening:

The group was in favor of screening applicants into low, medium, and high priorities based on the addressing resource concerns. As per Contracting Manual part 512.25 (iv) and (v) applicants proving past poor contract performance will immediately be put into low priority. These are applicants that required modifications for rescheduling or cancellation without good reason.

(iv) Considering readiness of applicant to complete all contract items within 2 years after contract obligation.

(v) Considering participant's prior adoption of management practices on other active or completed contracts

Ranking Criteria:

No changes to the ranking criteria were recommended.

Please refer to the ranking criteria links for specific information.

CCPI:

No new CCPIs were recommended.

Watershed Initiative:

The LWG did not recommend a watershed initiative.

Small Acreage Initiative:

The LWG did not recommend a small acreage initiative.