

Interactive comment on “Hydrological, ecological, land use, economic, and sociocultural evidence for resilience of traditional irrigation communities in New Mexico, USA” by A. Fernald et al.

A. Fernald et al.

afernald@nmsu.edu

Received and published: 13 May 2014

Response. We greatly appreciate the detailed comments. We provide specific feedback only on the ones that appear to call for comment or revision

General comments The paper deals with an important issue in sociohydrology, which is linking the “socio” and the “hydrology”, through a detailed case study in New Mexico. The title already reflects the ambition of this paper, but it also suggests the main pitfall at the same time. I agree that linking the diverse issues mentioned in the title are key to really develop an interdisciplinary approach based on socio-hydrological ideas, and it is

C1387

obvious that this is rather challenging. However, the paper itself reads like a summing up of evidence from those different fields, with many promises of connections between them, but without connecting them too much in this paper. In itself, I have no problem with research-agenda setting papers, especially for new fields, and especially not for the type of research suggested in the paper. However, I have my doubts whether this paper is the one to go for.

Response: Changed title to Linked hydrologic and social systems that support resilience of traditional irrigation communities. Will dedicate more effort to making connections by focusing on evidence and linkages.

Comment: First, the different paragraphs seem to be collected from the different authors. Style and language differ, but what is more problematic is that each new issue starts with a (new) introduction of the case under study, the acequia system. New (interesting) information on the case study is spread out in the text, and would need to be synthesized earlier. The same goes for the data sets used and discussed, and the specific questions on those data. This paper may propose interdisciplinarity, but it reads like a multidisciplinary effort as it is now.

Response: Will carefully bring together content by topic instead of relying on originating author.

Comment: Second, although it is clear that working on the socio-side of sociohydrology does require detailed understanding of those issues (labour, production strategies, organization), one would also expect that there is considerable attention for hydrology. The paper mentions hydrological issues a few times, but most of the hydrology seems to be based on the 2010 publication of the main author. The redistributing effects of irrigation on the natural hydrology (problematic as that term may be) are important indeed, but this new paper does not provide anything new on it, it seems to me.

Response: We provide new data in Fig. 2, 3, and 4. We will describe these new data as part of our renewed emphasis on evidence and data

C1388

Comment: Third, once connections with hydrology are made, the paper is full of “if” and “could”. Anytime a connection between hydrology and society is assumed or suggested, one of those two words pop up. Indeed, this would fit in an agenda-setting paper, but if that agenda is not detailed too much, I would think it does not really work. The modelling approach briefly mentioned in the final pages, could be a description for many systems; what makes it specific for this one? How does it build on the one already discussed in the 2012 Sustainability paper? How can the different data sets be related, what time steps are used, how to use both quantitative and qualitative data?

Response: In the paper we describe the evidence and data but we have not completed the modeling yet. We will describe in more detail our modeling approach.

Comment: Fourth, the suggestion is made that the acequia community is able to adapt pretty nicely. What I do miss, however, is more detail on the relevant socio-economic relations within that same community. I do not know that many social groups in which everyone wins in a process of change. I would be surprised this community would be the exception to that experience. But if so, more discussion would be needed.

Response: The suggestion that acequia communities may have adaptation capacity beyond those of more contemporary counterparts (e.g., urban and suburban neighborhoods) is not meant to imply that ‘everyone wins’ as the winds of change blow across the acequias. Rather, it highlights the reality that there has been a capacity shown by these communities to persist through long periods of time and to endure through significant stresses and challenges. The real question is whether or not those capacities remain intact under present circumstances, and is there any evidence that a ‘tipping point’ might be identifiable that could cause significant fissures that erode the long-enduring adaptive capacity of such communities.

Comments Abstract: to what extent can climate changes, “specific practices” and “community cohesion” be analysed on the same time scale?

Already on the first page, words like “benefits” and “threaten” show where the sympathy

C1389

of the authors is. That may be a little distracting?

Response: we will attempt to clarify these with edits in the abstract and the first page.

Comment: Page 1824, line 25: change is not just an issue for traditional irrigation systems.

Response: Deleted “traditional” to be inclusive of other irrigation systems that depend on surface water.

Comment: Page 1825, line 9/10: this is a strong statement, but not really surprising anymore, given the thematic issue . . . it is not about the relevance of the connection, but about the how.

Response: We agree, but also feel this bears stating particularly for people who have not been involved in this discussion

Comment: Page 1825, last paragraph of intro: the language is rather optimistic, and a little general.

Response: No response required

Comment:Page 1825, line 23: how does one “increase water distribution”? One can distribute more water, but is that meant here?

Response: Reword to “by distributing water across the landscape”?

Comment:Page 1825, line 26: biological diversity suddenly drops in.

Response: Will reword first sentence in paragraph to “impacts hydrologic and ecosystem processes”

Comment:Page 1826, first paragraph of 2.1: this may go to an earlier part of the paper?

Response: Will move to Introduction

Comment:Page 1826 and figure 2: can the claims made be seen from one image,

C1390

without comparing to another setting? I would need more explanation.

Response: In terms of setting, will describe transect. Text is illustrating point we are making with this example transect. We cite Ochoa 2013 that shows graphs from larger area of Alcalde-Velarde valley, right. We are simply using this one figure to cite other paper.

Comment:Page 1827, last paragraph of 2.1: again a very general paragraph, what about the case?

Response: Will move to Introduction

Comment:Page 1828, lines 19-21: only one example of the suggested results, but not based on any results, at least not explained.

Response: This is intended to be conceptual based on evidence of groundwater return flow and expected climate change impacts

Comment:Paragraph 2.3: the text does not really defend the species richness as a suitable proxy for the type of issues discussed in the paper, nor is the scenario selection explained. Are combinations of economic and environmental scenarios not taken into account?

Response: Text revisions incorporated. The completed system dynamics model will incorporate economic and environmental scenarios.

Comment:Page 1830, line 24: why is cattle reduction a sign of decreased stability? Why not see this as an indication of change, to which communities adapt?

Response: This is a good point. Perspective is important, as are the ranchers' specific reasons why they are decreasing numbers.

Comment: Paragraph 3.2: apart from some very general remarks, the direct link between land use and such to hydrology is completely absent in this part. I agree that the information presented would be useful, as it is hard to imagine no relation to hydrology,

C1391

but how that link works in this case remains hidden.

Response: an example of a direct effect of land use change on hydrology is now included in the paragraph.

Comment: Page 1834, line 25: the concept of "storages" for capital assets may work on community level – even though I am not sure the concept of storage would hold in theoretical terms – but the issue of political-economic power relations to contribute to or extract from the "reservoirs" would need to be introduced as well. "The community" does not exist.

Response: This relates to the other reviewer's comment on the usefulness and appropriateness of the 'balance sheet' concept. I am puzzled by the last statement that 'the community does not exist.' How so? Cultural traditions, relationships, family-ties, sharing of resources and responsibilities, shared governance and shared values, and history, etc., form the bonds and give rise to the notion of community and importantly for the notion of cultural wealth. The idea of storages and reservoirs for this 'cultural wealth' is intended to imply that the manifestations of culture can be strengthened or weakened. The addition to or subtraction from these community-based bonds and commitments can affect, for example, individual households mobility decisions and hence affect land and water values, and the patterns of land tenure and ownership.

Comment: Page 1836, line 25, to page 1837, line 12: linking economic data to stream flows seems to be at the heart of sociohydrology, and could be a topic this paper discusses much more. Where is the stream flow measured? Is that taking into account the redistribution effects? If so, how does the human-natural system allow for using those data, as the two data sets are not independent anymore? Can flow be used as proxy for economic success? The text seems to suggest that economic success is independent from the water: what does this mean for the connection suggested in the paper between water and acequia success? Looking at image 15 suggests that the links may be different for the two different communities shown. What is the cause-effect

C1392

direction? Does water drive the economy, or the other way around? This part of the text would be a possible focus for a deeper analysis. Although lines 4-7 on page 1837 suggest that not much is known yet about it?

Response: The present analysis of the correlation between agro-economic performance and streamflow is limited by available historical data. I agree that the relationship between the agro-economy and surface water patterns deserves additional and far deeper exploration, including a wider investigation beyond the current study area. It is clear that the strength and pattern of such a correlation is highly variable across communities if for no other reason than comparative reliance on surface and aquifer diversions is highly variable. The relationship is also complicated by the relative balance of irrigated crops and livestock enterprises. The latter being less susceptible to streamflow variations, and more easily supplemented by the importation of feed (and 'virtual water').

Comment: Page 1837 and further: the start of paragraph 4.1 is another example of a new introduction, with information that might have been used for a general introduction.

Response: Most of this section was moved to the introduction.

Comment: Page 1837, line 14: the concept of "traditional local knowledge" is highly problematic. I would not suggest that the authors show all details about the debate on such knowledge, but using the term here in such standard way does not do credit to the richness of issues and data sets this paper proposes to be of relevance. The paragraph is of rather general nature as well (eg lines 23-26 on page 1838, and lines 11 to 22 on page 1839).

Response: We have edited and moved this paragraph. Doing this should also help with the concern of repeating introductory information at the beginning of sections.

Comment: Paragraph 4.2: the survey results suggest that community members are concerned about participation, irrigation and infrastructure. What does this say about

C1393

community resilience? How do community members use that concern? It at least shows that human agency is needed, but the paper does not take up that issue.

Response: The purpose of the two example charts from the NMAA survey was to highlight both important values that hold the members together, as well as elements that need strengthening. The NMAA in fact does take action to resolve needs and concerns by way of programs, workshops, and leadership development projects intended to assist acequias in recruiting youth (Sembrando Semillas project), train the next generation of mayordomos (Mayordomo Project), strengthen acequia administration (Governance Workshops) and recruit community leaders to take active roles in policy development (Escuelita de las Acequias project). With respect to infrastructure repairs, the NMAA holds workshops on how member acequias can qualify for ditch rehabilitation financing available from state and federal agencies. Lastly, the entire survey was designed and conducted by the NMAA with the explicit purpose of gathering information about "the overall concerns and trends of acequias in order to generate effective governance program planning and strategies that benefit acequias." This additional information is now included in a revised paragraph.

Comment: Page 1841, lines 7-9: "adaptability is self-evident" etcetera: this short sentence hides a larger problem, at least to me. Those acequia communities we find today are the winners per definition; they are the ones that survived. That may yield interesting data on what they did, but one would need some evidence of the "loosing groups" to be able to analyze success factors properly (?).

Response: The paragraph as written substantiates the historical record: acequias have demonstrated resilience despite changes in political administration and water law regimes of four historical periods (Spanish Colonial, Mexican Period, U.S. Territorial, and NM Statehood). The fact that they have not disappeared is testimony in and of itself. The reviewer does not quote this paragraph completely, since we also bring attention to "other disturbances, unexpected events, or changing climate that affects water supply." We say that "adaptability" is self evident by acequias as "human and

C1394

social institutions." So, we don't claim that 100% of all acequias have survived, but that the institution of the acequia still operates and functions. The purpose of our study was not to compare winners and losers, or to determine factors of success versus failure. We recommend that the paragraph remain as written. This was also touched on in the response to the comment above, "Fourth, the suggestion is made that the acequia community is able to adapt pretty nicely. . ."

Comment: On the modelling approach, basically paragraph 5: how does one avoid that the proposed explanations of acequia resilience are not already included in the system dynamics? In other words, how to avoid that the modelling results are self-evident?

Response: This comment is unclear, because the intent is to include resilience in the system dynamics model.

Comment: Page 1846, lines 14 to 16: are acequias resilient because they are in line with nature (first sentence) or because they adapted/manipulated nature to be in line (second sentence)? What does this debate tell us about the human and the natural?

Response: Interesting question, and it is really both (in line with nature and adapted to nature).

Comment: Figure 1: why is the top-category "Growth"?

Response: We will indicate the kind of growth in the figure - it is population growth

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, 1821, 2014.