

7-12-2005

Saltcedar Eradication Along the Pecos River in Texas

Wayne Belzer

United States International Boundary and Water Commission

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ucowrconfs_2005

Abstracts of presentations given on Tuesday, 12 July 2005 in session 9 of the UCOWR conference.

Recommended Citation

Belzer, Wayne, "Saltcedar Eradication Along the Pecos River in Texas" (2005). 2005. Paper 11.
http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ucowrconfs_2005/11

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Conference Proceedings at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2005 by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

Saltcedar Eradication Along the Pecos River in Texas

Wayne Belzer

Environmental Protection Specialist
US International Boundary and Water Commission
4171 N Mesa, C-100
El Paso, TX 79902
Ph: (915) 832-4703
Fax: (915) 832-4166
waynebelzer@ibwc.state.gov

Charlie R. Hart

Ph.D., Assoc. Professor, Texas A&M Cooperative Extension

Background of Situation

Saltcedar (*Tamarix* spp.) is an introduced phreatophyte in western North America. The plant was estimated to occupy well over 600,000 ha of riparian acres in 1965 (Robinson 1965). Saltcedar is a vigorous invader of riparian, rangeland, and moist pastures. Saltcedar was introduced into the United States as an ornamental in the early 1800's. In the early 1900's, government agencies and private landowners began planting saltcedar for stream bank erosion control along such rivers as the Pecos River in New Mexico. The plant has spread down the Pecos River into Texas and is now known to occur along the river south of Interstate 10. More recently the plant has become a noxious plant not only along rivers and their tributaries, but also along irrigation ditch banks, low-lying areas that receive extra runoff accumulation, and areas with high water tables. In addition, many CRP acres in central Texas are being invaded with saltcedar.

Saltcedar is a prolific seeder over a long period of time (April through October). Early seedling recruitment is very slow but once established, seedlings grow faster than native plants (Tomanek and Ziegler 1960). Once mature the plant becomes well established with deep roots that occupy the capillary zone above the water table with some roots in the zone of saturation (Schopmeyer 1974). The plant can quickly dominate an area, out-competing native plants for sunlight, moisture, and nutrients. Mature plants can withstand prolonged drought or periods of inundation. The plant also brings salts to the surface through the plant and excreting it through the leaves dropping onto the soil surface below the canopy. Only extremely xeric or halophytic species of plants can tolerate the understory environment of saltcedar. As a result, the plant commonly forms a near monoculture where it grows.

Probably more important than any other fact about saltcedar is its hydrological implications. An invasion of a flood plain or river bank by saltcedar usually leads to depletion of stream/river flow, lowered water table, an increase in the area inundated by floods, and an increase in sediment production (Blackburn *et al.* 1982). The plant has an extremely high rate of evapotranspiration assists the plant to tolerate saline conditions. Numerous techniques have been used to estimate evapotranspiration rates of saltcedar including Bowen ration, eddy covariance, micro-meteorological data, evapotranspirometer, non-weighing lysimeter, tanks, sap flow, stemheat-balance, and

groundwater monitoring wells. Estimated evapotranspirational water use by saltcedar varied from 1.2 to 10.2 ft. per year. Major factors affecting volume of water transpired by saltcedar includes leaf area, plant density and size, depth to water table, and soil type. Two specific studies reported that saltcedar transpired 0.3 cm to 1.0 cm of water per day and from 1.2 m to 3.1 m (3.9 to 10.2 ft.) of water per year (Davenport *et. al.*, 1982), and 2.1 cubic meters/square meter (Carmen and Brotherson 1982).

Monotypic stands of saltcedar have a negative impact on wildlife and livestock. The plant provides little browse and no seed food source for native wildlife species. The wildlife habitat value of saltcedar is limited to screening cover for mammals, nesting sites for some birds, and a pollen source for bees. In most instances, the wildlife habitat value of a saltcedar monoculture is much less than that of its native counterpart that it has replaced (Cohan *et. al.* 1978; Anderson and Ohmart 1977).

Justification of Situation

The management of saltcedar infestations has, more than once, resulted in the return of surface water to an area. Two examples documented include the Eagle Borax Spring in Death Valley National Monument (Neil 1983) and Spring Lake in New Mexico (Duncan 1997). At Spring Lake in New Mexico, saltcedar was treated with Arsenal™ herbicide. Within 34 months after application, the water table had risen to the soil surface from a depth of greater than 6.0 m below the soil surface. This occurred even though the area had experienced a mild drought.

Fires burn easily through dead or green saltcedar and will almost always top kill the plants. However, due to its ability to re-sprout from the base, seldom does fire kill the plant as the root crown area is usually well protected from the fire. Mechanical control practices have shown only slightly greater success when compared to fire. Mowing or shredding have shown similar results to burning, while root plowing or bull dozing have provided some mortality. However, the soil surface is greatly disturbed causing high erosion potential, the plants have a high resprouting capability, and the associated costs are prohibitive in most instances. Because of these reasons, use of the root plow or other heavy equipment as a control method for saltcedar has become less frequent (Hollingsworth 1973).

The response of saltcedar to chemical control has historically been variable, with little satisfactory control except under specific conditions or repetitive applications. The most satisfactory control was provided by cut stump or basal bark treatments. These treatments tend to be very time consuming and not practical for larger acreage. Additionally, many of the herbicides historically used for saltcedar control are no longer approved or currently unavailable.

Research has been conducted recently (1987 to present) with Arsenal™ (Imazapyr) herbicide. Results indicate Arsenal™ applied alone or in combination with Glyphosate controlled Saltcedar to levels of 90% or greater within one year after application when applied in August or September (Duncan and McDaniel 1998). Their recommendations include 0.5 + 0.5 lbs. a.i./acre of Arsenal™ and Glyphosate, respectively, applied with a fixed wing aircraft.

Saltcedar occupies a near continuous buffer along both banks of the Pecos River from Red Bluff Dam southward for the entire area (approx. 180 river miles) of the Red Bluff Irrigation District. The width of the saltcedar band varied from 25 to 500 feet with

an average of 150 feet on each riverbank. Within this stretch of river, saltcedar occupies about 30 to 40 acres per river mile. Additionally, the Pecos River in Texas is a meandering stream with a ratio of river miles to air miles of about 3 to 1. Another primary concern of the project was to apply the herbicide with minimal contact of off-target vegetation. This situation created a real challenge for aerial application of herbicides.

Project History and Accomplishments

The Red Bluff Water and Power Control District proposed the Pecos River Ecosystem Project in 1997, to address saltcedar issues along the Pecos River. The initial objectives of the project were to increase efficiency of water delivery in the river to irrigation districts within the Red Bluff District and improve the quality of the water by decreasing the salinity. After four years of herbicide application on the saltcedar, the project has emerged as the first step to what could be important to the overall statewide plan for water conservation along Texas rivers by managing saltcedar infestations. Success of the Pecos River Ecosystem Project can be attributed mainly to its cooperative effort and organization. Numerous agencies, organizations, and companies were involved in the organizational efforts early in the project development, some of which are listed below.

- Upper Pecos Soil and Water Conservation District
- Texas Cooperative Extension
- Texas Department of Agriculture
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Red Bluff Water and Power Control District
- Irrigation Districts in Loving, Reeves, Ward and Pecos Counties
- US Environmental Protection Agency
- Pecos River Compact
- International Boundary and Water Commission
- BASF
- Local landowners

The first step undertaken by the group was to develop a section 24(C) special use label to use Arsenal™ herbicide on saltcedar within rangeland and aquatic areas in Texas. The label was prepared by the Pesticide Division of the Texas Department of Agriculture and approved for use in 1999. The project was setup with two major phases, saltcedar treatment phase and debris removal phase. Also of major concern to the project group was the revegetation of the riverbanks with native plants to complete the ecosystem restoration. Once the label and funding were secured, the project was ready to begin the first phase of herbicide treatments. The Upper Pecos Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors were selected to administer the project.

Phase one of the project began in October 1999. During the initial meetings to begin planning the process of saltcedar removal, several major concerns emerged. First, the treatment method selected should provide a high rate of saltcedar mortality while minimizing the detrimental effects on existing native vegetation. Second, this should be accomplished in the most economical way possible. And finally, soil loss from stream

banks should be minimized as much as possible. Another daunting task was to obtain permission from private landowners to treat saltcedar along the river. A “spray easement” was developed and used as a contract between the Project and private landowners, allowing access for treatment and follow-up management for a 10-year period. To date, over 800 easements have been signed by private landowners, with a rejection rate of less than 1%. Bids were solicited from aerial applicators in late summer 1999 with the project ultimately being awarded to North Star Helicopters from Jasper, Texas. With funding, landowner permission, and applicator contract in hand by August 1999, initial treatments began in September.

Applications of 4 pints a.i./acre of Arsenal™ were made with helicopter applying the herbicide with large droplets and high total spray volume. The helicopter had the advantage of being able to fly at slower air speeds compared to fixed-wing aircraft, which made the sharp turns of the river much easier to navigate. The helicopter application also provided for much higher precision of application by utilizing specialized nozzle and boom technology. The herbicide was applied in a total spray volume of 15 gallons per acre with a 1500 μ droplet. Less than 0.5% of the droplets were “driftable” fines (<200 μ). The boom was also sectioned into 3 – 15 ft. sections for an overall width of 45 ft. Combinations of the boom could be turned on to allow for a 15, 30 or 45 ft. swath width. This further reduced the amount of herbicide that came in contact with off-target vegetation. Another advantage of the helicopter over fixed-wing aircraft was its ability to land on loader trucks that were positioned near the river and eliminated the need of ferrying to and from a landing strip.

Helicopters were also equipped with GPS navigational equipment to aid in application. The use of on-board GPS allowed for near elimination of skips between spray swaths and allowed the pilot to easily return to the point where they finished spraying the previous batch load. The system was also tied into the sprayers flow control system so that rate of flow through the boom was varied to precisely match ground speed, eliminating the need to maintain a constant ground speed. After completion of treatments, GPS log files were downloaded to a computer to produce maps of the treated area and make calculations about the area treated.

Percent mortality estimates were made during the summer of 2002 at five sites along the river (Fig. 1). Multiple transects were conducted at each site to determine percent mortality of saltcedar by counting live and dead plants along transects on both sides of the river. A minimum of four transects were read at each site. Results indicate an average of 85-90% mortality of saltcedar from previous year applications. An extensive monitoring program was initiated prior to the beginning of the project in 1999. The specific objectives of the monitoring project are to determine the effects of saltcedar removal on water quality and quantity in the Pecos River and estimates of water salvage from control of saltcedar are being estimated. A separate 2004 Pecos River Monitoring Report highlights findings from these monitoring efforts.




Figure 1. Percent mortality estimates on saltcedar trees along several site locations on the Pecos River, Texas.

Red Bluff Water and Power Control District and irrigation districts along the Pecos River privately funded the project in 1999 and 2000. Approximately 66 river miles (Table 1.) or about 1344 acres of saltcedar were treated with an actual spray cost of \$253,555.

During the 2001 legislative session, \$1 million was allocated to the Pecos River Ecosystem Project by the State of Texas. Eight percent of these funds were used for project administration and monitoring with the remaining 92% used for saltcedar treatments in 2001 and 2002. Third year (2001) applications treated approximately 57 river miles or 1440 acres of saltcedar at a cost of \$263,000. From 1999 through 2001, 2774 acres of saltcedar were treated at a total cost of \$515,635.

Fourth year applications were completed in September 2002. Approximately 3567 acres were treated including segments of the river between Red Bluff and Grandfalls, TX that were not sprayed during the previous years, from the New Mexico/Texas state line to Red Bluff Lake (including areas around the lake) and 5 miles of Salt Creek from the convergence with the Pecos to the bridge over highway 285. About \$660,000 was spent during the 2002 spray season.

Applications in 2003 and 2004 were made through the USDA NRCS Environmental Quality Incentives Program. This is a private landowner based program for cost share of environmental practices. The program provided 75% of the saltcedar treatment costs to the landowner. The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

provided the remaining 25% of the cost through the Texas Brush Control Program. During 2003, approximately 3730 additional acres of saltcedar were treated within the Pecos Basin Watershed in Culberson, Reeves, Ward, Crane, Pecos, Crockett, Terrell, and Val Verde Counties. Of this acreage treated, approximately 76 miles of Pecos River or 2,667 acres were treated. The remaining acres were treated along tributaries and springs within the basin. Treatment cost during 2003 was \$210/acre for a total of \$783,300 spent (unofficial estimate of EQIP contracts). During 2004, an additional 2,698 acres were treated in Culberson, Pecos, Crockett, Terrell, and Val Verde Counties. This acreage treated approximately 70 additional river miles.

To summarize, from 1999 through 2004, 271 river miles of the Pecos River and various tributaries and springs within the basin have been treated for saltcedar control in Texas (12, 767 acres). Projected acreages and river miles treated are summarized in Table 1. Approximately \$2.5 million has been spent to date with local, state, and federal funds. Average percent mortality of saltcedar from aerial applications is estimated between 85 and 90. Debris removal and follow-up management continues to be a priority to complete the project. Prescribed debris burning activities are planned for 2005. The project directors are currently trying to secure funding to begin this second phase of the project.


Additional information on the project can be obtained from the Internet at the following web site:

<http://pecosbasin.tamu.edu>

Table 1. Saltcedar acreage and river miles treated along the Pecos River by year and river segment as measured with spray logs files.

Area Treated	Year Treated	Acres Treated	Total Acres	River Miles	Acres/Mile
Red Bluff Lake	2001	22			
	2002	1137			
	Total		1159		
Delaware River	2003	158			
	2004	567			
	Total		725		
Salt Creek	2002	151			
	2003	122			
	2004	24			
	Total		297		
Cottonwood Creek	2004	139			
	Total		139		
Salt Draw	2003	67			
	Total		67		
Leon Creek	2003	157			
	Total		157		
Toyah Creek	2003	410			
	Total		410		
Misc. off river	2003	149			
	Total		149		
Red Bluff to Mentone	1999	658			
	2000	47			

	2001	240			
	2002	1031			
	Total		1976	40	49
Mentone to Barstow	2000	527			
	2002	432			
	Total		959	26	37
Barstow to I-20	2000	102			
	2001	301			
	2002	224			
	Total		627	20	31
I-20 to Grandfalls	2001	876			
	2002	592			
	Total		1468	37	40
Grandfalls to Girvin	2003	936			
	2004	197			
	Total		1133	29	39
Girvin to Iraan	2003	641			
	2004	477			
	Total		1118	32	35
Iraan to I-10	2003	319			
	2004	143			
	Total		462	23	20
I-10 to Val Verde Co.	2003	645			
	2004	712			
	Total		1357	42	32
Val Verde Co. to Hwy 90 Bridge	2003	126			
	2004	438			
	Total		564	22	26
Pecos River by Year	1999	658			
	2000	676			
	2001	1417			
	2002	2279			
	2003	2667			
	2004	1967			
	Total	9664		231	Average 39
Pecos Basin by Year	1999	658			
	2000	676			
	2001	1439			
	2002	3567			
	2003	3730			
	2004	2697			
	Total	12767	12767		



Map showing general area of saltcedar treatments along the Pecos River in Texas from 1999-2003.

Literature Cited

Anderson, B.W. and Ohmart, R.D. 1977. *Vegetative structure and bird use in the Lower Colorado River Valley*. In Importance: preservation and management of riparian habitat; a symposium. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-43.

Blackburn, W., Knight, R.W., and Schuster, J.L. 1982. Saltcedar influence on sedimentation in the Brazos River. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 37(5):298-301.

Carmen, J.G. and Brotherson, J.D. 1982. Comparison of sites infested and not infested with saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*) and Russian olive (*Elaeagnus augustifolia*). *Weed Science* 30:360-364.

Cohan, D.R., Anderson, W. and Ohmart, R.D. 1978. *Avian population responses to Saltcedar along the Lower Colorado River*. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-12.

Davenport, D.C., Martin, P.E., and Hagar, R.M. 1982. Evapotranspiration from riparian vegetation: water relations and irrecoverable losses for saltcedar. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 37:362-364.

Duncan, K.W. 1997. *A case study in Tamarix ramosissima control: Spring Lake, New Mexico*. In: Plant invasions: Studies from North America and Europe. Ed. By J.H. Brock, M.Wade, P. Pysek, and D. Green. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden, The Netherlands. pp. 115-121.

Duncan, K.W. and McDaniel, K.C. 1998. Saltcedar (*Tamarix* spp.) management with Imazapyr. Accepted for publication, *Weed Science*.

Hollingsworth, E.B. 1973. Summary report phreatophyte research Los Lunas, New Mexico 1961-1972. USDA-ARS.

Neil, W. 1983. *The Tamarisk invasion of desert riparian areas*. Education Bulletin #83-4. Publication of the Education Foundation of the Desert Protective Council.

Robinson, T.W. 1965. *Introduction, spread, and real extent of saltcedar (Tamarisk) in the western states*. U.S. Geo. Sur. Prof. Paper 491-A. 12pp.

Schopmeyer, C.S. 1974. Agricultural Handbook No. 450. USFS-USDA, Washington D.C.

Tomanek, G.W. and Ziegler, R.L. 1960. *Ecological studies of saltcedar*. Unpub. Report. Division of Biological Sciences. Fort Hays State College, Kansas. 126pp.