

Summary of Minutes: Agricultural Workgroup Meeting (Conference Call)

05/11/16

Time Start: 2:00 PM

Time Stop: 3:00 PM

Members	Alternates	Interested Parties	TWDB Staff
Jay Bragg Kevin Wagner	David Villarreal Brian Wenberg	Aaron Wendt C.E. Williams	Mindy Conyers Antonio Delgado Cameron Turner

1. Introductions /Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM and roll call was taken.

2. Discuss TWDB comments on proposed revisions to the Brush Control BMP

Jay Bragg asked TWDB staff for a summary of the comments (posted on Ag Workgroup [website](#)) sent from TWDB to the Water Conservation Advisory Council (WCAC).

Cameron Turner advised that including water yield numbers from feasibility studies was not appropriate for a best management practice (BMP) and that if numbers are included, they should represent measured results. C. Turner also stated the multiple perspectives regarding the science of brush control as a water supply enhancement practice should at least be mentioned in the best management practice. C. Turner will meet with the authors of the revised BMP in person to discuss further and will report back to the workgroup.

3. Discuss whether any existing BMPs need revisions

The group mentioned the possibility of updating the BMP on Irrigation Scheduling to include the newest technologies.

4. Status of prospective BMPs discussed during prior workgroup meetings

a. Use of SCADA systems by irrigation districts

Kevin Wagner mentioned the possibility of using existing information provided on the Texas Project for Ag Water Efficiency ([Texas AWE](#)) website as source material for potential best management practices on SCADA (supervisory control and data acquisition) and Narrow Border Flood.

b. Use of water audits by irrigation districts

Discussion centered on the possibility of writing a BMP on system operation reviews and/or irrigation district water audits.

c. Others?

Other potential BMPs mentioned in the discussion include the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) to detect leaks in irrigation canals; selection of drought tolerant crop varieties; irrigating with brackish water; and land stewardship.

5. Timeline for BMP Submission

TWDB staff clarified that the timeline for submission of BMPs for consideration by TWDB is not related to the timeline for the development of the WCAC's biennial report to the legislature.

6. Input needed for the WCAC report to legislature
 - a. Charge 1 – Monitor Trends in Implementation
 - b. Charge 7 – Monitor targets and goal guidelines for TWDB & TCEQ
 - c. Items in previous report:
 - i. Water Conservation Incentives
 - ii. Research Opportunities
 - iii. Conservation Training
 - d. Recommendations to the Legislature

The group discussed the first draft of the WCAC report to the legislature. TWDB staff clarified that work should focus first on the content related to the specific legislative charges and then on the recommendations. The “items in previous report” sections are not required for the report. Discussion then turned to the recommendations. Kevin thought research, incentives, and education should be considered. Jay will draft recommendations and distribute to the workgroup.

7. Other Discussion

David Villarreal mentioned that the Texas Department of Agriculture plans a communication blast in May related to the Blue Legacy Awards for Agricultural Water Conservation.

The group discussed the status of the revised BMP on Brush Control/Management, and Cameron Turner noted that the revised document was under review by staff at the Texas Water Development Board.

8. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Note: Topics were taken up in random order but are presented here in order of the posted agenda.