

Final Minutes
Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group
Trinity County Library, 211 Main Street, Weaverville, CA

Thursday, June 15, 2006

The meeting was open to the public.

9:30 A.M. convene

Members in attendance:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Arnold Whitridge (Chairman)	Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment
Ed Duggan	Willow Creek Community Service District
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Steve Anderson	Bureau of Land Management
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Serge Birk	Central Valley Project Water Association
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Byron Leydecker	Friends of the Trinity River
Dana Hord	Big Bar Community Development Group
James Feider	City of Redding Electric Utility Department

Members that did not attend:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Tom Weseloh	California Trout, Inc
Elizabeth Soderstrom	Natural Heritage Institute
Pat Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Spreck Rosekrans	Environmental Defense
Joan Hartmann	Local Landowner
Dan Haycox	Miners Alliance

In Tom Weseloh's absence, Abbey Stocktwell attended as a member of the public.

Designated Federal Officer: Randy Brown, Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA.

1. Introduction, Agenda, Approval of Minutes

Arnold Whitridge, chairman of the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG), opened the meeting.

Changes to Agenda

The discussion of CVPIA (Item 7) would be dropped since Ed Solbos was not able to attend this meeting. A presentation on wildlife by Rod Wittler was inserted following Item 9.

Changes to March 2006 minutes

A couple of edits were offered to the March 2006 minutes.

Richard Lorenz made motion to accept the minutes as edited.

Seconded by Jim Feider.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Open forum; public comment

No comments from the public.

At this time, Arnold Whitridge offered this opportunity for Randy Brown, the Designated Federal Officer to make some comments to the group. Brown reported on the progress of the new TAMWG charter, specifically on revisions to the charter that were emailed out. Brown also provided some clarification regarding potential conflicts of interest by TAMWG members, especially where there is opportunity for financial gain. Ed Duggan asked for a copy of this information. Brown provided copies later this afternoon (Attachment 1).

Brown also noted the Fish and Wildlife's website address change: www.fws.gov/arcata.

3. Flow schedule update

Douglas Schleusner, executive director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) gave a Power Point presentation "May 2006 High Flows" and showed photos of the river and discharges from Lewiston Dam. Schleusner noted that the spring discharges from Lewiston Dam reached 10,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) for a four-day period in late May. The original plan was to increase to 7,700 cfs, but the discharge inadvertently increased to 10,000 cfs. The exact cause of the higher discharge is still not known. However, these higher discharges seemed to go fine and once monitoring showed there were no essential damages, discharges were allowed to proceed at 10,000 cfs.

Schleusner also made several other notes of interest. He noted that, due to recent wet years, there have been relatively high releases from Lewiston Dam during the last five years. He noted that the model predictions of river heights were quite accurate—it predicted to within one or two tenths of a foot of actual water levels at 10,000 cfs

releases. Schluesner also noted that a couple of structures (a private retaining wall and a garage) were just above the 10,000 cfs flood levels and no damage was done. One of the reasons the river accepted 10,000 cfs so well was that there was no major tributary flows contributing to the mainstem. He showed photos of flow damage that occurred to a culvert under to Browns Mountain Road. The road collapsed and repairs are estimated at about \$400,000.

Schluesner noted that this and more information is available on: www.trrp.net.

Andreas Kraus of TRRP gave a Power Point presentation entitled "Photo Tour of the 2006 High Flow Releases." These slides showed sediment monitoring that was carried out during the high flow releases. The crews sampled over nine days at four locations. One of the main purposes of the high flow release was to flush fine sediment and sands down river. Quantitative data are not yet in but Kraus thought that lots of sediment was moved by the high flows. He showed photos of the collection process. The collections of sand, gravels and cobbles traveling along the bottom of the channel constitute the estimates of bedload transport. They want to develop sediment budgets to see if the river is moving more sediment out than the tributaries are bringing in. Kraus showed an underwater video of the sediment moving at 6500 cfs of flow. At Lewiston, bedload transport included large cobble up to 10 inches in diameter. Below Grass Valley Creek, sediment gets smaller. At Douglas City the crews were collecting lots of sand was collected.

4. TRRP fiscal year 2007 budget & program of work

Douglas Schlessner presented the proposed budget for the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) for fiscal year 2007 (FY2007). He passed out three handouts: a printout of his Power Point presentation (Attachment 2), a copy of a memo send out two days earlier explaining his proposal for the budget (Attachment 3), and the budget (Attachment 4). Schluesner mentioned possible increases to the budget via Congressional "add ons." He also noted that Browns Mountain Road repair will need approximately \$400,000 in funds and Reclamation is pursuing other sources for this. The TRRP will be unable to award the Indian Creek channel restoration project in FY2006. (This project is designed to enlarge the river channel to accept the greater flows at Indian Creek. It is hoped that an additional 1.5 feet of flood height may be prevented by this project and would prevent flooding of most of the structures.) Schluesner cited time constraints due to other urgent tasks that created a lack of staff manpower to get all the prior paperwork in place. They hope to award in early FY2007. They do not think they will lose the state-funding portion for this project. Given all these uncertainties, he proposed that the budget not be approved at this time but approve the FY2007 budget by September.

Schluesner next went over the details of the FY2007 budget. The total amount budgeted for the TRRP for FY2007 is \$10.1 million. The full program budget (if all elements of the ROD were followed) would be \$14.1 million. The current budget includes \$1.9 million for program administration, \$4.5 million for rehabilitation implementation, \$3.7 million for modeling and analysis. Given that there is not enough money to complete all elements of the ROD, some channel implementation projects are put off to future years and portions of funding of ongoing projects are postponed to the next year's budget.

Schluesner noted that this is ok for a while, but if this postponing continues for too long, payments will eventually fall short and the program will suffer. Because of these budget shortfalls, they are reluctant to start new projects.

Schluesner finished up by highlighting the priorities for the FY2007 as based on B Team discussions and comments. Schluesner also described some possible FY2006 year-end adjustments that could be made.

Arnold Whitridge asked if there were any comments on the budgets from those TAMWG members that attended the B Team meetings.

Byron Leydecker noted that the science program is important and was satisfied that monitoring programs are being funded. He also noted the importance of watershed studies that would eventually help to keep sediment from entering the river in the first place. He thought that most concerns of the B Team had been addressed.

Serge Birk noted the importance of the independent review for the TRRP. He thought that things were “moving in the right direction,” but that the \$10,000 budgeted for Independent Review Panel was “really light.” He said that he would like to have a message sent to the Trinity Management Council (TMC) that independent review is important. Rod Wittler responded that there is a need to have the integrated monitoring plan before the science review can make significant progress.

Rich Lorenz commented on the concept of a budget split of 20:50:30 for administration, implementation, and analysis, respectively. He favored in-stream work and was therefore concerned about the reduction of rehabilitation and implementation being at 45 % of the total budget. This prompted a discussion about the pros and cons of a 20:50:30 budget split and delays of in-stream work. Byron Leydecker did not like such a strict rule to drive the budget. Steve Anderson commented that the trend of in stream work appeared to be downward. Anderson felt that most of the budget is actually analysis. Douglas Schluesner favored flexibility on a strict 20:50:30 rule, especially if there are budget cuts. Jim Feider asked questions about the schedule for implementation. Feider posed the question that, given this “good water year,” can the budget get “good work done?” Schluesner agreed that postponements and deferring of costs are becoming a “looming problem.” Schluesner further commented that the program cannot defer any more construction costs further into the future. Feider asked about the sites that may be compromised by deferring expenses. Schluesner replied that Lewiston and Bucktail are two. It was suggested that the TRRP try to accomplish design and environmental work as soon as practical in order to be prepared to implement them incase funding does become available.

5. Integrated Assessment Plan; Science Framework

Rod Wittler of the TRRP gave a Power Point presentation entitled “Proposed Schedule for Completion of TRRP: Integrated Assessment Plan” (Attachment 5). Jim Spear asked for clarified that the science was already laid out in the Flow Study, was encapsulated by the ROD, and that the TRRP was to perform this science. Wittler confirmed this and noted that his presentation described the TRRP plan to carry out the science. Wittler noted that Tables 8.6 and 8.7 of the Flow Study provide “targets.” The Integrated

Assessment is the “nuts and bolts” that wasn’t worked out during the Flow Study. Serge Birk added that the goals are statements of what should be met and that this is what the success of the program will be judged on. Birk offered to Wittler that Birk could go over an earlier document prepared by TAMWG members that gave guidance on use of science in the program.

Two main points of Wittler’s presentation were a series of guiding principles that are used to resolve differences (Attachment 5a) and a schedule for developing the plan (Attachment 5b).

6. Federal tribal trust responsibilities & TRRP—Perspectives of the Hoopa Valley Tribe and Yurok Tribes

Troy Fletcher, Mike Orcutt, and Daniel Jordan presented some of the tribal views of the Trinity River, some of the background of the tribal agreements with the United States government, and a statement of their dissatisfaction over the rate of progress with restoration. Troy Fletcher is a currently a consultant with the Yurok Tribe and had a long prior history with both tribes. Mike Orcutt is a Hoopa Valley Tribe member and Fisheries Director for Hoopa Valley Tribe. Daniel Jordan is also a Hoopa Valley Tribe member involved with watershed issues and former member of tribal council. The three were invited to speak to the TAMWG.

Orcutt provided background on the Hoopa Valley Tribe and their fisheries program. The Hoopa Valley represents the largest tribal landholding in California. They have depended on the fish and have been responsible managers of the fisheries. He cited the concept of “co-management” as involving relationship between the tribes and federal government in protecting the fisheries of the river. He cited legal decisions such as executive orders, the Boldt case, and the solicitor’s opinion in 1993. These decisions essentially defined the tribes’ rights to the fisheries as 50 %. Therefore, tribes really need to be involved in management with the US government. The tribe’s vision is to ensure meaningful access to fish for tribal, recreational, and commercial fisheries.

Fletcher provided background on the Yurok Tribe and their fisheries program. The Yurok Tribe was created in 1988. The Tribe is the largest tribe in California in terms of numbers of members (4800 members). The fisheries program does a number of scientific and monitoring studies. They have 15 fisheries biologist and employ up to 50 technicians. He pointed out a serious concern in that the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) had previously established a minimum “floor” of 35,000 fall chinook salmon that should be allowed to spawn in the Klamath River basin. The PFMC is currently considering to lower this floor 21,000 fish.

Jordan stated that the tribes are not satisfied with the lack of progress of implementing the ROD and that they consider the low fish returns a direct result of this lack of progress (Attachment 6). If the PFMC decisions lead to the cutting of the brood stock levels, this will make a bad situation worse. The TRRP program needs to address the habitat and flow issues.

The three presentations prompted questions from TAMWG members and a discussion about problems with the current state of the river, its management, and the TRRP. Serge

Birk asked if the increased flows were helping the river. Fletcher answered that increased flows in the river are not as effective if the in-stream work isn't also being carried out. Byron Leydecker noted that the problems in the Klamath are being "horrendous" and that such problems can't be solved on the Trinity side. Fletcher noted that the same federal government oversees both the Trinity and Klamath. He also noted that he has not seen PFMC consulting with the TMC or TAMWG about changing the floor. He cited the need for a more "holistic approach."

Jordan said that the Hoopa Tribe is mad that they agreed to withdraw one of their lawsuits in 2004, based on the Department of Interior promise to conduct meaningful discussions with the Tribe. However, the Tribe believes that no meaningful progress has been made. He asked why the FY2007 budget shows \$0 coming from Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). He asked why is there not a meaningful way for the tribes to participate in the restoration program. The tribes do not think the Weaverville office is being operated in the way described by the ROD. The Weaverville office should not be the sole keeper of information but instead they should be partnering with the tribe. The office designs the program and this creates conflict.

The discussion moved to lack of funds for the TRRP. Ed Duggan echoed the sentiments of lack of in-stream restoration actions by the TRRP, but noted the lack of funds is the main reason for lack of progress. Arnold Whitridge asked whether Congress can provide those funds. Jordan responded that the federal agencies on the TMC voted against a motion asking for full funding for the program. He said as long as flows go from the Trinity to the Central Valley, the \$6/acre foot tax on water should provide money back to the Trinity (e.g., the FY2007 CVPIA budget line item). If the TAMWG and TMC don't ask for that money, it won't come. The program cannot rely on supplemental Congressional funds given the wars in Iraq and the large federal deficits. Jim Feider commented that \$0 from CVPIA is a surprise CVPIA restoration funds should be paid to the Trinity and that they should be used for restoration in the river. He commented that perhaps the power users will see about how this can be rectified.

Feider also asked how Jordan thought EIS processes could be streamlined and how the budget might be adjusted. Jordan didn't believe 50:30:20 should be applied if they reduce the effectiveness of the science programs. The science will build one of the base pillars of the program.

Birk noted that the CVPIA restoration tax generates about \$50 million per year but much of this is already allocated to existing programs. For example, \$30 million is spent a year purchasing water for fish and wildlife purposes in the Central Valley. Jordan stressed it is not acceptable to divert water, to commit to restore problems caused by the diversions, but then decide not to pay for it. Arnold Whitridge suggested the TAMWG do some thinking about reimbursability maybe get clarification on these issues.

Arnold Whitridge asked is there a role for a stakeholder group. Jordan thought there ought to be a process that describes the roles and responsibilities. He suggested the TRRP design a dispute resolution process where disputants write down an issue and provide this to the other party to create a dialog.

Adjourn for the day

Friday, June 16, 2006

7. TRRP perspective on watersheds and tributaries

David Gaeuman of the TRRP gave a presentation on watershed issues of the Trinity River. Gaeuman noted that the TRRP has a mandate to support watershed issues and they provide support to the Trinity River CRMP. The main goal of watershed efforts is to identify source areas of sediment delivery to the mainstem and then determine whether they are treatable. Gaeuman said they think they should have a terrain database that captures the sediment information up and running in about a year. The \$35,000 budgeted should cover the costs as a lot of information already exists and the data only need to be compiled.

Serge Birk asked whether CVPIA mitigation money should be spent on these new sorts of problems that appear to be independent of CVP activities (e.g., construction of the dam). Rod Wittler noted that this sort of work directly effects and should improve fish habitat, specifically spawning habitat. He noted the purpose is not necessarily to restore the entire basin. Birk asked that it be made clear that any funds from CVPIA are being spent in ways that support the original ROD.

Jim Spear says that he and others have been frustrated with lack of progress in forming a CRMP. He hopes formation of such a program is not "held hostage to mitigation." He supports a holistic approach to restoration of the entire watershed. Successes of the watershed group and restored tributaries should help restoration of fish in the river. He also wants to emphasize the role of prevention as being as important as treatment.

Arnold Whitridge likes the approach as described by Jim Spear. He sees that some support by TRRP is necessary in order to get the program off and going.

Serge Birk noted that the landslides in the Lewiston are from a fire started by a federal agency. He asked has this federal agency contributed anything. Steve Anderson said that the BLM admitted fault and has spent millions of dollars. He noted that the particular photo shown by Gaeuman was of Sierra Pacific Industries land and that they will continue to harvest timber if they get state permits. He suggested that perhaps the permitting process be looked at and see what types of mitigation is required. He noted the need to look holistically and noted that the funds proposed for next year are relatively small. He cited lack of funds to fix many things on the ground. Arnold Whitridge noted that lack of funds seems widespread and they can't fix them, but maybe they can speak up when things do seem effective.

8. TRRP Strategic Plan

Jim Feider gave an update on current progress of the working group addressing the strategic plan. He noted that Joan Hartman is focused on public outreach. Another focus is to develop a specific problem statement on issues like wildlife and watershed tributaries. Feider's focus is to make sure the document clarifies strategic priorities for allocation of resources. He noted the need to have the TRRP staff to be engaged in any development of the strategic plan. Lately the TRRP staff has been occupied with budget

issues, development of the science frameworks - and ongoing tension in the government-to-government relationships. He was somewhat pessimistic about being able to develop a strategy given some of these overwhelming issues, but still believes that the strategic plan is worthwhile.

Serge Birk thought that the program will continued to be criticized until a strategic plan is developed. He encouraged continuing work on the plan. Serge offered to email examples of strategic plans, so TAMWG members can read these. There was a consensus for bringing forward the basic outline. Douglas Schluesner noted that they are not opposed to development of the strategic plan. He noted that the ROD, the implementation plan, and the flow study are already in place. Rod Wittler noted that the flow study is very clear in providing strategy. Some issues are unresolved, such as wildlife, but overall, there may not be a compelling need for another strategic plan. Birk noted that the documents cited by Wittler are 1,000 pages and that, yes, there is a need to have a concise statement of a plan.

9. Wildlife

Rod Wittler gave a Power Point presentation “A Proposal for a New Wildlife Policy to the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group & Trinity Management Council” (Attachment 7). The program will assess response of riparian species (birds, amphibians, reptiles, and mammals) to rehabilitation activities. He presented the strategy of how this program fits into the TRRP and gave rationale for the timing of the program. He noted that the wildlife assessments are budgeted at \$155,000 for FY2007 and these make up less than 2 % of the program budget. He also gave an example of how the problem of disposal of dredge spoils was turned into an opportunity to create turtle habitat.

Rich Lorenz commented that previously he had been a “detractor” of wildlife efforts. He had thought it was mostly focused on birds and with undue influence by outside groups with little integration to the river issues. He has changed his position as a “detractor” now that he has seen the efforts including aquatic species such as frogs and turtles.

Jim Feider also noted he previously had been somewhat of a “skeptic” but also his change of mind following this presentation.

There was consensus among TAMWG members of support for the wildlife program and its effort and there was interest in making a motion. Arnold Whitridge noted that some of the TMC members voiced opposition to wildlife efforts. Serge Birk noted that, as this program is promoted, his constituents do not support too much work in tributaries (i.e., out of the mainstem).

10. Reports from TRRP work groups

Arnold Whitridge asked for reports or updates from the various work group leaders.

B Team. Byron Leydecker noted that, as a result of B Team meetings, Douglas Schluesner has incorporated their comments into their presentations.

Flow team. Ed Duggan thought their meeting worked well. They were able to get data on historic flows. Conversations seem good. There may have been an oversight to exclude Flow Team on the ramp down discussions. However, Douglas Schleusner noted that TMC allowed him to make day-to-day decisions and the almost hourly consultations precluded involving the Flow team members.

Implementation team. Rich Lorenz sent emails to the TRRP staff.

Fish team. Ed Duggan reported that the group met, but no actions to bring back at this time.

Riparian Wildlife. No meeting.

Watershed. Jim Spear commented on this group being hampered by decisions about the watershed effort within the TRRP.

ID team. Arnold Whitridge said he went to this meeting and it is well attended but overall mission is not yet clear.

There was consensus that attendance to these meetings is good and perhaps a better effort should be made to attend.

11. Roles and responsibilities of TRRP participants

Douglas Schleusner passed out a handout (Attachment 8) that summarized the roles various groups should play as outlined in the ROD. He emphasized a diagram that showed a flow chart of operations. He next went over a chart that detailed roles and responsibilities as outlined in the ROD. The main actors are Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, TMC, Executive Director, AEAM (Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management) Team, TAMWG, and the Scientific Advisory Board.

There was a discussion about how the tribes have dispute resolution. There were some comments that the tribal trust issue is an issue that lies at a higher level than the TAMWG. It was noted that the TAMWG may have a somewhat nebulous role as viewed by some participants in the entire TRRP. Arnold Whitridge commented that his recommendations to the TMC are listened to more on their merit as opposed to that the comments are coming from a collective group of stakeholders. The value of the TAMWG passing motions and passing them forward was noted. The strategy of design of the TAMWG as based on the Grand Canyon model was briefly described by Rod Wittler. He noted the design of parallelism between the AEAM and the TAMWG in providing advice to the TMC. However, lack of technical background in the TAMWG makes this concept different from the Grand Canyon model. Whitridge noted some changes to the proposed new charter that may limit the TAMWG's opportunity to write letters to DOI. He thought that perhaps this is a small issue and may not materially effect on how the TAMWG operates. In fact, Whitridge thought that the greatest effect of the TAMWG is the indirect influence on Douglas Schleusner and how the discussions may influence his actions as the executive director of the TRRP.

12. Executive Director's report

No separate report was presented at this time.

13. Further discussion/action (if needed) on '07 budget

Douglas Schleusner asked for input on three issues. First, whether they should ask TMC to approve budget at next week's meeting. Second, the TAMWG's general feeling about the RIG and TMAG budgets. Third, if they cannot award the \$1.4 million Indian Creek project, how to use these funds. Half this amount is grant money.

Douglas Schleusner walked through the budget and explained a number of specific line items and their costs.

Byron Leydecker made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC wait to adopt the final budget until September, as advised by the TRRP Executive Director.

Jim Spear seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Jim Feider made a motion that the chairman send a letter to TMC stating that the TAMWG supports full program funding of the approx \$14 million, and at minimum TMC seek funding at the FY2006 levels. The chairman should also send copies of the letter to the regional directors.

Byron Leydecker seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Overall, there were concerns about how the \$10 million budget was prioritized. However, it was difficult to say where the budget should be changed. Many of the unknowns regarding the budget should be removed by September. Jim Feider noted that the budget is not properly balanced to achieve restoration. He wants to avoid "over-science" and/or "over-engineering." Feider thought that trying to complete the science studies simply delays the restoration program. Steve Anderson and Rich Lorenz agreed and stated that they desire more dollars be put towards implementation.

Arnold Whitridge thought more effort should be put to the Science Advisory Board as they may help to provide overall guidance. Byron Leydecker defended the science and cited past problems where science was not guiding the implementation. He also thought the independent review panels are important.

Steve Anderson suggested that the TRRP staff start the NEPA process on some of the planned projects so they are ready to go if funding becomes available.

Arnold Whitridge made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC recognize wildlife riparian monitoring is worthy and should be funding at least at the level shown in this FY 2007 budget.

Ed Duggan seconded

Passed unanimously.

14. Open forum; public comment

No comments.

15. Tentative date and agenda topics for next meeting

No discussion at this time.

Adjourn

LIST OF MOTIONS

Richard Lorenz made motion to accept the minutes as edited.

Seconded by Jim Feider.

Motion passed unanimously.

Byron Leydecker made a motion that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC wait to adopt the final budget until September, as advised by the TRRP Executive Director.

Jim Spear seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Jim Feider made a motion that the chairman send a letter to TMC stating that the TAMWG supports full program funding of the approx \$14 million, and at minimum, TMC seek funding at the FY2006 levels. The chairman should also send copies of the letter to the regional directors.

Byron Leydecker seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Arnold Whitridge made a motion that the TAMWG recommend the TMC recognize wildlife riparian monitoring is worthy and should be funding at least at the level shown in this FY 2007 budget.

Ed Duggan seconded

Passed unanimously.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Department of the Interior Trinity River Adaptive Management Working Group Draft Charter. Revision 5/06. By Randy Brown

Attachment 2: FY 2007 Program of Work. June 15, 2006. Trinity River Restoration Program. Printout of Power Point Presentation, by Douglas Schluesner.

Attachment 3: Memo "Subject: FY2007 Draft Budget Proposal." June 13, 2006. Trinity River Restoration Program.

Attachment 4: Proposed FY2007 Budget and Estimated FY2008. 6/15/2006.

Attachment 5: Proposed Schedule for Completion of the TRRP: Integrated Assessment Plan. Printout of Power Point presentation. By Rod Wittler.

Attachment 5a: Guiding Principles for All Involved in Finalizing the IAP

Attachment 5b: Integrated Assessment Plan (IAP) – Schedule of Events 2006

Attachment 6: Outstanding Issues and Concerns of the Hoopa Valley Tribe Regarding Trinity ROD Implementation. June 15, 2006. By Daniel Jordan.

Attachment 7: A Proposal for a New Wildlife Policy to the Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group & Trinity Management Council. June 15, 2006. Printout of a Power Point presentation. By Rod Whittler.

Attachment 8: Roles and Responsibilities as Outlined in the Record of Decision and Appendix C—Implementation Plan for the Preferred Alternative of the Trinity River EIS/EIR. June 15, 2006. By Douglas Schluesner.

Attachment 9: Trinity River Restoration Program FY2007 Project Descriptions