MEETING SUMMARY | Dinkey Collaborative Full Group

April 21, 2011

Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, Sierra National Forest

Action Items

1. All Collaborative members to submit short autobiographical statements to Pamela Flick pflick@defenders.org
2. Alan Gallegos to work with Mosé to make the Soils Ecological Unit Inventory data available for review.
3. Julie Gott to work with Mosé to bring the road connectivity protocol into the planning process when appropriate.
4. Marc Meyers to add documents on bat restoration to the living library.
5. Kim Sorini-Wilson to work with Mosé to make the 2010 bat survey update accessible once available.
6. Craig Thompson to add reference that air quality protocols will be followed in the F16 Fisher Research Proposal.
7. Stephanie Barnes to prepare a one-page fact sheet on the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout and their history.

Table of Contents

Action Items 1
1. Welcome and Introductions 1
2. Informational Updates 2
3. Charter Adoption and Request for Biographical Statements 3
4. Landscape Evaluation Part 2 4
5. Dinkey Strategy Brief #1: Near-Term Planning for 2013 Projects 7
6. F16 Fisher Research Project Update 9
7. Orientation to and Direction for 2013/2014 Projects 10
8. Presentation on First Option: Cow Creek 10
9. Closing Remarks 12
10. Attendees 12

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mosé Jones-Yellin, Dinkey Collaborative project manager for the Sierra National Forest, welcomed the participants to the full Collaborative meeting. Facilitator Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy, reviewed the agenda and the ground rules for the day's meeting. Mr. Fougères passed out a half-page survey regarding meeting day preferences.

2. Informational Updates

Monitoring

Mr. Fougères noted it would be beneficial to have a Collaborative lead to work alongside Marc Meyers, USFS, identified at the February Collaborative meeting as the Forest Service lead for the monitoring work. He noted that Stan van Velsor had volunteered to play this role, and the group agreed to Mr. van Velsor playing this role. Mr. Fougères noted that two monitoring webinar meetings have been scheduled for upcoming weeks.

Information Sharing

Mr. Meyer explained that the Forest Service has been exploring different website options for sharing information and data among the Collaborative members. The front runner is a website called "Data Basin" which is run by the Conservation Biology Institute. He explained the site is user friendly and has the capacity to store and display large and complex data sets. He explained it is web-based so users have to register but it does not require the support of any program. Mr. Meyer is currently waiting for approval from the website administrator. Mr. Fougères mentioned that when the site is set up they will hold a webinar training for the Collaborative members.

Budget

Mr. Jones-Yellin announced that the CFLR budget for the year is anticipated to be approximately $25 million, which will provide funding for all ten CFLR projects. He mentioned that the program has the support of Congress. He suggested that further discussion be allocated to this topic when more detailed budget information is available and the Collaborative can provide recommendations on how to direct funding. Craig Thomas articulated that collaborative groups from around the country have submitted letters of support for this process, which has gone a long way for securing funding from Congress.

Soaproot Project

The technical work group met the previous day and decided on a two-stage planning approach for the Soaproot project. The approach, which is consistent with the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Standards and Guidelines, will focus on surface and ladder treatments in the fisher den buffer areas (the first stage); in areas without den buffers, the approach can include other treatments to meet project objectives (the second stage). Mr. Jones-Yellin explained that due to disagreement about how to define ladder fuels and their importance for treating fisher den buffer areas, the technical work group will initiate a joint fact-finding process around this term and its application. All Collaborative members will be welcome to participate in this process. He also mentioned that the group is going to provide comments on a draft table of Soaproot Desired Conditions compiled by staff by Friday, May 6.

Snowy Patterson

Mr. Jones-Yellin explained that the Forest Service is using a consultant to assist in writing the analysis report for the Snowy Patterson project area (based on data collected by the Forest Service). The analysis will be completed by May 10th and does include the Bear Fen area, although the Forest Service will continue to adhere to the agreement from the Collaborative's February meeting, which was to not

conduct any treatments in 2012 in the Bear Fen units. The analysis may continue to be relevant to future planning; this will have to be assessed at that time.

"Letter of Support" to Document Decisions

Mr. Fougères explained that the Forest Service staff wanted a means to document decisions by the Collaborative to make them more accessible and clear. Mr. Jones-Yellin had drafted a standard letter of support that the work group reviewed yesterday. The decision was to move forward with the letter of support that would allow members to (1) indicate on a scale their level of agreement or support for the decision, and (2) if applicable, submit documentation or further explanation of their concerns as an attachment to the letter. Mr. Fougères also mentioned that the draft letter would be revised, and that the Charter section on decision-making would be updated to reflect this additional documentation.

Near Term Update

Ray Porter, District Ranger, explained that there are a number of ongoing projects being implemented within the CFLR area including prescribed burnings, road projects, hazard trees sales, and OHV events. He affirmed these projects predated the Collaborative and are just now being implemented. He wanted to share this with the members for transparency. In response to a question about ongoing prescribed burning activities, Mr. Porter offered that staff will compile and share a list of such ongoing projects with the Collaborative at their May meeting, as part of the near-term landscape evaluation process.

- One member asked what the Forest Service's position was for unplanned or naturally ignited fires within the CFLR area. Mr. Porter explained that any fire out there would most likely be suppressed.
    - Mr. Van Velsor mentioned that one management action recommendation from this group could be that when there is an opportunity such as a naturally started fire that the Forest Service allows it to burn.
    - Carolyn Ballard, Sierra National Forest, explained that this depends a lot on the seasonality, point of ignition, and other variables.
    - Mr. Porter added that the budget for fire fighting and protection as been reduced, so with fewer resources allowing unplanned fires to burn may not always be an option.
- Mr. Thomas asked if there is an existing decision making structure for evaluating this before a fire is suppressed. Ms. Ballard responded that there is.

3. Charter Adoption and Request for Biographical Statements

Mr. Fougères reviewed the changes made to the draft Charter (all the changes were noted in the revised the Charter handout). He explained the only change not represented in the text is the addition of the letter of support to the decision making process.

- Ms. Ballard pointed out that page 5 under Transition to Collaborative Planning, bullet #4 is written explicitly for the EIS process which may not always be necessary. Mr. Thomas suggested the language be changed to "…release them for public review through <u>a public notice to initiate scoping."</u>

- Also on page 5 under Transition to Collaborative Planning one member suggested adding "…circulate to the collaborative for review" to the first bullet.

Agreement to Adopt the Collaborative Charter: At this time the facilitator asked each member of the Collaborative whether they would adopt the Charter, and each person present agreed. Ray Porter, District Ranger, agreed to adopt the charter on behalf of Sierra National Forest. Members present at this time who agreed to adopt the Charter included Rich Bagley, Susan Britting, Kent Duysen, Larry Duysen, Patrick Emmert, Shawn Ferreria, Pamela Flick, Rich Kangas, David Konno, Ray Laclergue, Matt Meadows, John Mount, Craig Thomas, Mandy Vance, Stan van Velsor. Follow-up: On May 8, 2011, Rich Kangas provided additional email confirmation that he adopted the Charter. On May 9, 2011, Chad Hanson, who was not present at the meeting, provided verbal confirmation that he would adopt the Charter.

During discussion the facilitator also noted that people in the room had a wealth of expertise yet knew little about each other's background. He suggested, and the group agreed, that people would submit short autobiographical statements to help build their relationshiops.

Action Item: Members to submit short biographical statements to Pamela Flick, pflick@defenders.org

4. Landscape Evaluation Part 2

These additional presentations provide the Group with foundational information on various topics not covered at the March 17 Collaborative meeting. The goal of these presentations was to provide a starting point for characterizing the different areas of the landscape, and their priority needs and restoration opportunities. Mr. Fougères asked people to focus on questions of clarification and requests for additional information, and noted that the presentations would be distributed after the meeting.

Soil, presented by Alan Gallegos

Mr. Gallegos began by reviewing the soil ecology and how soils are distributed across the landscape. He explained the contents of the ecological unit's existing inventory, including soils and the physical properties and the potential vegetation. He went on to review the desired conditions for soil resources including (1) retaining soil stability and maintaining site productivity, (2) creating favorable infiltration characteristics, (3) maintaining soil reaction class, buffering or exchanging capacities or microorganism populations. He outlined the soil reference variability and soil indicators. He then went on to review the existing conditions including mixed conifer zones, some treated areas that do not meet the desired conditions, as well as untreated areas that do meet desired conditions mostly in the Dinkey drainage. He presented the additional data and materials needs specifically that the Ecological Unit Inventory has been added to the CFLR planning area.

Discussion:

- Sue Britting asked if the EUI has been added to the Dinkey GIS database. As she would find it useful to have fine scale acres and the higher level EUI data
- **Action Item**: Alan Gallegos to work with Mosé to make the Soils EUI data available for review.

Watershed Resources, presented by Julie Gott

Ms. Gott reviewed maps displaying the sub-watersheds and sub-drainages. She explained the important controls on watershed function including geology and soils, perceptions quality and regime, disturbances and stream channel conditions and stability. She described the disturbances and indicators in more detail. She reviewed the stream condition indicators including type, stability macro invertebrates and mentioned the stream condition inventory. She showed examples of watershed improvement needs sites. She outlined the priority needs for example (1) inventory of road hydrologic connectivity to streams, (2) update stream channel inventory for baseline condition, (3) site specific watershed improvement needs evaluation process. She described the opportunities as updating and implementing existing restoration plans for Bear Fen, Soaproot and Providence areas; developing comprehensive restoration plans for major meadows; and using road connectivity inventory data that will be collected beginning this summer to prioritize road segments for treatment.

Discussion:

- Mr. van Velsor asked if the Forest Service has road connectivity protocols. Mr. Gott responded that they are going to be using a protocol developed by Region 5, which the Collaborative could also use in its planning.
    - **Action Item:** Julie Gott to work with Mosé to bring the road connectivity protocol into the planning process when appropriate.
- Rich Bagley asked what fraction of the meadows are in the condition Ms. Gott described. Ms. Gott explained the photos and examples she shared were dramatic examples, however she would guess that 80-90% of the meadows have similar issues.
- Dirk Charley, USFS, asked if restoring conditions to areas where illegal marijuana growing has occurred is another consideration. Ms. Gott explained that while those areas are difficult to access, they have set up a system for documenting the site and deciding if there is watershed restoration needs or opportunities.

Aquatics and Fisheries, presented by Stephanie Barnes

Ms. Barnes explained that there are eighteen sensitive species in the Sierra National Forest and six of those are within the Dinkey Landscape. She explained that three are at lower elevation species and three are at higher elevations. The species include:

- CA Red Legged Frog
- Western Pond Turtle
- Foothill Yellow Legged Frog
- Mountain Yellow Legged frog
- Lahontan Cutthroat Trout
- Yosemite Toad

Ms. Barnes outlined the priority needs including an inventory of steams and meadows to confirm habitat needs for restoration, species surveys, update species database, develop projects to improve aquatic species habitats, coordinate with hydrology and engineering for road improvement projects.

Discussion:

- One member asked if there is grazing allowed on the Snow Corral Meadow. Ms. Barnes responded yes.
- Pam Flick asked if there are historic sightings of Red Legged Frogs. Ms. Barnes replied that yes her map has identified areas where the frog could possible reside.
- Mr. van Velsor asked that the timeframe is for starting the priority work. Ms. Barnes responded that because aquatic species move within the system, there are priority needs in most areas of the Dinkey landscape. If projects are identified she can develop design criteria and actions that can take place within the project area to protect certain species.

Mr. Porter pointed out that this is an opportunity to do something about these issues, he explained that in recent years there has not been funding for addressing the soil, watershed and aquatics needs. He stressed that he hoped the Collaborative would identify the priorities and needs and allocated funding for these types of restoration projects.

Ms. Gott added in that much like aquatics, every project on the Dinkey landscape will have opportunities for watershed restoration.

Mr. Jones-Yellin mentioned that Snow Corral is a part of the Eastfork project area that the Collaborative is considering for a near-term project. Cow Creek is another possibility which staff will talk more about this afternoon.

Terrestrial Wildlife Presented by Kim Sorini-Wilson

Ms. Sorini-Wilson presented maps displaying where the threatened and sensitive species are on the landscape. She reviewed the needs and opportunities including meadow assessment (that others have talked about) and habitat enhancement that could occur such as great gray owl, willow flycatcher and deer. She also mentioned bats and aspen/willow enhancements needs.

Discussion:

- Ms. Britting asked if Markwood Meadow is an area occupied by aspen. Ms. Sorini-Wilson responded yes. Ramiro Rojas, Sierra National Forest, clarified that aspen populations occur so rarely they know where they are. He went on to explain that removing the conifers or any kind of root disturbance can cause sprouting in the aspen.
- Mr. Thomas suggested visiting aspen sites during a future field visit.
- **Action Item:** Marc Meyers to add documents on bat restoration to the living library.
- Jamie Tuitele-Lewis, Sierra National Forest, added that there has been some work done in willow restoration, but none within the Dinkey landscape.
- Mr. Thomas asked if there is written documentation of past bat restoration efforts. Ms. Sorini-Wilson replied yes from 2009. She explained that they conduct a bat survey every summer.

They will be getting an update from 2010 soon. She offered to share these reports with the Collaborative.

- **Action Item:** Kim Sorini-Wilson to work with Mosé to make the 2010 bat survey update accessible once available.

Recreation Presented by Robbin Ekman

Ms. Ekman reviewed the recreational uses within the landscape and the most common areas for visitors. She explained the seeing the most impact from camping on the project landscape. She showed where the OHV routes are within the landscape as well.

The recreation opportunities included:

- Rehabilitation and maintenance
- Clean up for human waste
- Camp group rehabilitation
- Ecological restoration for dispersed areas back to natural conditions
- Increased public education on recreation resource protection
- Desire and need to provide materials on the historical landscape

Discussion:

- Ms. Flick asked if partnering with nonprofits or volunteer organizations is a consideration. Ms. Ekman responded that the Forest Service partners with such groups, especially for cleanup and work along trails. She added that there are adopt a trail or adopt a camp site programs. Ms. Flick added that Defenders of Wildlife Volunteer Core has a large network and is always looking for new projects and partnerships.
- Mr. Van velsor asked if the Forest Service collects demographic data from visitors. Ms. Ekman explained that they do collect some data. She went on to share that they are beginning a new program where they will set up at certain locations throughout the forest to interview visitors to collect data.
- Ray Laclergue asked how the forest is dealing with problems created by OHV users. Ms. Ekman responded that the travel management plan is complete and will be implemented. This plan outlines where visitors can or cannot go within the forest. Mr. Porter added that the forest will produce maps to make the boundaries clear. He explained the enforcement will be transitional to give the public a chance to get used to the new rule. This rule will help law enforcement take action as appropriate.

5. Dinkey Strategy Brief #1: Near-Term Planning for 2013 Projects

Mr. Fougères presented the updated Dinkey Strategy Brief for near term planning for 2013-14 projects. He explained that this draft was revised based on input from the Collaborative at the previous meeting. Mr. Jones-Yellin clarified that these criteria are for the next phase of projects after Soaproot, Snowy Patterson and Eastfork, which are anticipated to be implemented during the 2013-14 field season. He reviewed the updates and changes to the criteria included:

- Criteria #1 was updated to add specificity such as calling out fisher rather than saying endangered species.
- Removed biomass from the criteria.
- Criteria #7 was added to tie research to management.

Discussion:

Natural/Historical Vegetation and Species

- Kent Duysen asked for specificity on what the term "restoration" denoted, and suggested adding an assessment for natural and native species and the potential for restoration to historical conditions.
    - Mr. Gallegos mentioned that through the ecological inventory they can do an analysis of existing vegetation and compare that to the potential natural vegetation showing the changes in vegetation clearly on a map.
- Mr. Thomas suggested that there should be a vegetation criteria and discussion on vegetation restoration conditions.

Consider/Account for Climate Change

- Matt Meadows suggested adding the consideration of species movement based on climate change.

Biomass

- Patrick Emmert mentioned that biomass is recognized as woody materials and not just fuel. He explained that it is all sizes and anything that was being removed from the forest.

Programmatic Considerations and Opportunities

- Ms. Flick suggested adding small diameter trees to be consistent with the CFLR Act.
- Ms. Flick also mentioned investigating partnerships and projects with the California Conservation Corps under youth engagement.

Living Library

- Ms. Flick asked that a format be provided to the group for submitting information in a standard way.

Avoiding Fisher Areas of 40% or Greater

- Larry Duysen felt that the first criterion conflicted with previous agreements to protect fisher buffers for active and historical dens, as this language says "avoid."
- The group noted the need to base decisions on best available science. In the coming years the group would have the flexibility to tailor its approach based on better information.
- Mr. Rojas added that agreements from the Collaborative on actions within the CBI model 40% probability area are most likely going to be based on the current science. He expressed the need to have more in depth conversation about the current science and how it relates to the

Standards and Guidelines. He did not think these discussions should affect the near-term projects for 2013.

- Mr. Porter affirmed that the Forest Service would stay out of the 40% fisher probability area for the near-term projects in 2013 and 2014. The Collaborative can help identify and move forward with projects outside of this area for the near-term, while starting the process of gathering better information to decide how to approach these areas in the future.
- Mr. Thomas pointed out that Mr. Thompson's work with the Forest Service will deliver a better understating of the fisher and likely provide something more refined than the CBI model.
- Mr. Thompson added that if there are questions the Group wants answered about the fisher habitat to please send them in ahead of meetings as they take time to research.

6. F16 Fisher Research Project Update

Mr. Thompson explained that the Forest Service is actively tracking fisher. Out of those they have been able to track, four to five will impact the planning and two to three will have significant impacts on the projects being planned, as they are found within proposed project boundaries. He reiterated that the technical work group met the previous day and, as mentioned previously, agreed on a two stage approach.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the F16 project proposal, and reminded the group that he provided an initial overview at the previous meeting and subsequently held a webinar to provide more information. He explained the idea behind the project was to figure a way out of the management stalemate. The guideline prohibits projects within the fisher areas, while the Forest Service and the Collaborative have an interest in doing research and collecting more data about the fisher, such as how they react to certain management actions. For the F16 project Mr. Thompson had asked the group to waive the guideline and standard provision to stay out of the area, and instead act as if there was not an animal there. The Forest Service would then proceed with a prescribed under burn project while carefully monitoring the animal and protecting her and her family as she moved. The findings would then come back to the Collaborative for discussion.

Previously Mr. Thompson had proposed conducting this project in the Clarence Unit. However, as new information has been discovered he no longer thinks this site will work. The denning female appears to have lost her litter due to the weather and has been moving around a lot.

He is now proposing the South Shaver Unit for this prescribed underburn, as there are two females in the area. He explained the Forest Service wanted to check in with the Collaborative to ensure members are still in support of this action in light of the location change.

Discussion:

- Shawn Ferreria asked if the air quality procedures will be followed, and if so, noted that these should be referenced in the document. Ms. Ballard responded that yes all normal procedures including air quality will be followed.

- **Action Item**: Craig Thompson to reference that air quality protocols will be followed in the F16 Fisher Research Proposal.

- Mr. Thompson clarified that the fisher only dens at a certain time of the year, and unfortunately they will not be able to conduct the study this year during the denning season as it is nearly over.
- As the action will not take place where a fisher is actively denning, Mr. Thomas asked if there still benefit. Mr. Thompson responded that they will be tracking the animals in the area; it is not known what fisher will do when there is a fire near, whether they are drawn to it or if they would move away. He still feels there are valuable things to learn from this action.
- The group inquired about how this action will be coordinated with the Forest Service's burning process. Ms. Ballard explained there are two options of sites in the South Shaver area, and will work with Mr. Thompson to decide on actions and will coordinate the effort with him to ensure public safety.
- The Collaborative agreed to proceed with the study action and preferred to be updated by briefings and emails, rather than form an additional work group.

7. Orientation to and Direction for 2013/2014 Projects

Mr. Jones-Yellin explained the Forest Service is working to identify possible priorities and opportunities on the landscape for potential treatments in 2013/2014. Mr. Jones-Yellin summarized the Collaborative's expressed interests to include (1) reintroducing mixed-intensity fire; (2) recruiting snags; (3) developing ecologically appropriate forest strcutures; (4) improving/avoiding terrestrial and aquatic habitat; (5) minimizing road impacts; and (6) managing for multiple benefits.. Additionally, such options must be outside the 40% fisher probability area. As staff work to identify possibilities they will share those options with the Collaborative. He explained that they have one such option to present on today.

8. Presentation on First Option: Cow Creek

The goal of this presentation is to provide details on the first of four potential projects to implement in 2013. Ms. Barnes presented on the first 2013 project option, Cow Creek. She explained that Cow Creek is an aquatic refugee that has been identified as a site for the only federally threatened species on the landscape, the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. She showed a map with the occupied habitat and roads in the area that are closed to vehicles.

Ms. Barnes consulted with staff regarding other concerns within the same area. She checked in with Mr. Rojas who explained the forest type is red fir, mixed conifer and alpine. Due to the high density, high inspect mortality and the fact that the majority of the critical aquatic refuge (CAR) is at an elevation risk 35% or above, there is a higher tree mortality resulting in more fuels on the ground.

Ms. Barnes checked on the fire history of the area, finding that fires have been low intensity and that the area has missed some fires over the years. There has only been one major fire recorded in the area, which occurred on the western side of the boundary. She explained that today most of it the area is a

plantation. She reviewed the potential fire type and fire conditions in the CAR, which is mostly conditional crown fire conditions.

There are other species of concern in CAR including the spotted owl. However, the area is outside of the 40% fisher probability area. After reviewing a summary of the Collaborative's interests in near-term projects, she stated she thought this site encompassed many of them.

As a federally threatened species the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout, while introduced to the forest and not native, must still be managed as federally threatened. Ms. Barnes explained that the forest has been monitoring the species since 1999 and that they have found smaller counts in the last two years.

She reviewed the desired outcomes and the landscape opportunities, and mentioned that if this project is completed the held off road obliteration could move forward.

Discussion:

- Have the trout been found in other areas within the forest? Could the population be moved to another location within the forest? Ms. Barnes explained that only the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service could move them. The species came from the Tahoe area in the 1800s and they are in isolation within the Sierra National Forest; staff did not know specifically where the species was located until 1975. Even though the population within the Dinkey landscape is not native, it is still a priority to protect them especially as they are threatened within their historical range. This population is a genetically pure stock.
    - **Action Item**: Stephanie Barnes to prepare a one-page fact sheet on the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout and their history.
- Mr. Thomas pointed out that the fire history provided does not sound consistent with the red fir forest type. He mentioned that generally it would be a mixed intensity fire, and emphasized that the group needs to carefully investigate the area's fire history.

The facilitator asked the group to work in their table groups to identify key concerns and key recommendations.

Issues and recommendations reported out by the tables:

- The past management history of the area, including prescribed fires, is needed.
- Spotted owl habitat needs and considerations need more attention.
- Some members questioned whether to focus on a high elevation project when other areas were more accessible. Others felt that the project should move forward as it is outside of the 40% probability area.
    - It was suggested that Focusing on the lower elevation plantation could be beneficial.
    - It was suggested to explore the potential for stand thinning existed at lower elevations.
- Members had significant concern about the characterization of the project area's fire history and expressed the desire to discuss this topic in detail.
- Members wanted more information about the cultural resources within the area and how they should be managed.

- A site visit would be beneficial, and people are always welcome to arrange their own field visits.
- It was suggested to bring in other partners such as CalTrout, and federal and state agencies.

9. Closing Remarks

Mr. Porter asked explained the staff had worked hard to providing the Collaborative with the right level of information – not so much that options were eliminated, and not so little that people could not understand the options. He asked members for feedback on the level of information provided throughout the presentations. Many members expressed that they felt the level of detail was appropriate and helpful for this exercise.

In response to a question about the time of the actual meetings, members expressed their preference for meeting earlier in the day rather than starting at 1 pm.

10. Attendees

1. Rich Bagley
2. Carolyn Ballard
3. Keith Ballard
4. Stephanie Barnes
5. Sue Britting
6. Nevia Brown
7. Dirk Charley
8. Charlotte Chorneau
9. Kent Duysen
10. Larry Duysen
11. Patrick Emmert
12. Shawn Ferreria
13. Pamela Flick
14. Allan Gallegos
15. Dorian Fougères
16. Ron Goode
17. Julie Gott
18. Andy Hosford
19. Mosé Jones-Yellin
20. Rich Kangas
21. David Konno
22. Ray Laclergue
23. Tom Lowe
24. Matt Meadows
25. Marc Meyer
26. John Mount
27. Ray Porter
28. Ramiro Rojas
29. Greg Schroer
30. Kim Sorini-Wilson
31. Craig Thomas
32. Craig Thompson
33. Jamie Tuitele-Lewis
34. Mandy Vance
35. Stan Van Velsor
36. Cindy Whelan