

# **2011 Environmental Quality Incentive Program**

## **Local Work Group Summary for the Santa Fe Field Office**

### **Introduction:**

The following are recommendations from the Local Work Group representing the Santa Fe – Pojoaque Soil and Water Conservation District. The Santa Fe Field Office services the district. The area is typified by small farms along the tributaries to the Rio Grande in the north and large ranches in the southern part of the district. Crops grown are alfalfa, grass pasture, apples, truck crops and some specialty crops such as flowers.

### **Local Work Group:**

The Local Work Group represents the Santa Fe – Pojoaque Soil and Water Conservation District boundaries which consist of the northern three quarters of Santa Fe County, Los Alamos County, and a small area of southern Rio Arriba County. The area includes the cities of Santa Fe and Los Alamos, and four Tribal Governments. The Local Work Group has had representation from the Santa Fe – Pojoaque SWCD, Farm Service Agency, FSA County Committee, Santa Fe County Extension, Santa Fe County Open Space, State Land Office, New Mexico Game and Fish, Santa Cruz Irrigation District, NMDA, BLM, Pojoaque Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo Northern Pueblos Agency BIA, and various other entities. The Local Work Group held its last meeting on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

### **Priority Resource Concerns:**

The Local Work Group prioritized the areas resource concerns as follows:

1. Water Conservation – Major Resource Concern Water, Water Quantity-Inefficient Water use on Irrigated Land, Cropland Hayland, Pasture
2. Water Quality – Major Resource Concern Water, Water Quality-Excessive Suspended Sediment and Turbidity in Surface Water, All Land Uses
3. Riparian Restoration – Major Resource Concern Plants, Plant Condition-Noxious and Invasive Plants, Rangeland, Pasture
4. Rangeland Management – Major Resource Concern Plants, Condition-Productivity, Health and Vigor, Rangeland
5. Flooding – Major Resource Concern Water, Water Quantity-Excessive Runoff, Flooding, or Ponding, All Land Uses
6. Urban Expansion – Major Resource Concern Soil, Soil Erosion – Road, roadsides and Construction Sites, All Land Uses
7. Noxious Weeds/Invasive Plants – Major Resource Concern Plants, Plant Condition-Noxious And Invasive Plants, All Land Uses

**Funding Considerations:**

The Local Work Group has decided to allocate funds utilizing a 60% water resources and 40% Grazing lands formula. No cost caps will be in place. All practices currently the Field Office Technical Guide with cost associated in the cost docket, including selected management incentives, will be available for all resource concerns, all land uses. It will be the responsibility of the planner to provide accurate resource management system alternatives to the client. Land Management incentives will be in place for Prescribed Grazing and IWM. The rates for Land Management Incentives will follow the NW Practice Schedule rates.

**Cost Share Rate Factor:**

The Local Work Group recommends continuing with the 75% cost share rate for all practices.

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

**Ranking Criteria:**

Same issues and points will be used in 2011 as was used in 2010. No changes.

The Local Work Group adopted Local Ranking Criteria for two land uses Irrigated Cropland and Grazing Lands, with points assigned for practices that address the Priority Resource Concerns. Ties will be broken using FIRS efficiency score as highest priority on Irrigated Cropland and highest Percent Deferment on Grazing Lands. Applications not attaining a minimum of 75 points on Irrigated Cropland and 100 points on Grazing lands will be considered low priority.

Please refer to the ranking criteria links for specific information.

**Watershed Initiative:**

**The LWG did not recommend a watershed initiative for FY 2011.**

**Small Acreage Initiative:**

**The LWG did not recommend a small acreage initiative for FY 2011.**