

Nonnative Fish Management Workshop
December 18-19, 2007
Holiday Inn, Grand Junction, Colorado

Purpose of Workshop – The purpose of this year’s workshop is to (1) examine the results from 2007; (2) compare those results with previous years’ data; (3) recommend changes to 2008 nonnative fish management efforts; and (4) recommend a process to evaluate the Program’s ability to reduce the threat of nonnative species on a river-wide or population scale.

Symbols used in this workshop summary:

* Indicates a recommendation for Biology Committee discussion/consideration

> Indicates an action item (not first requiring Biology Committee discussion or consideration)

1. **Introduction** (Rich Valdez and Tom Chart)

- Workshop purpose (see above) and desired outcome: 1) Provide recommendations that may affect scopes of work; 2) recommend a cohesive approach as to how to best develop synthesis reports; 3) recommend action items (including carrying forward actions not yet implemented from past workshops)
- Workshop structure, process, rules
- Workshop participants’ roles/responsibilities
- Relationship of nonnative fish management to recovery goals
- Workshop expectations (feedback, is everyone OK with how we are to proceed?)

>The Program Director’s office will make all presentations available on the Program’s website.

2. **Umbrella Presentation** (Melissa Trammell and Tom Chart)

- Review history / timeline of nonnative fish management efforts.
- Decision points and how we moved through time.

>Tom Chart provide a written summary of this presentation. Tim Modde noted that Old Charley was rotenoned for northern pike in ?, which prevented a problem from getting out of control. Tom Nesler added that an effort to try to block backwaters permanently on Yampa failed. Now we’re working on provenance; controlling sources may be a major shift in the future that could offer a more permanent solution to Yampa northern pike control. Melissa Trammell noted that this history shows how we’ve changed our approach considerably over time.

3. **Review Recommendations and Progress from Workshop 2006** (Melissa Trammell)

Rich suggested what Melissa presented to follow-up on 1) recommendations to the Biology Committee; 2) ideas that have come up an how those translate into actions; and 3) long-term recommendations. Need to be able to convert “what to do” to “how (and who) to do.”

4. **Summary of Researcher’s Pre-Workshop Meeting** (John Hawkins and Sam Finney)

John Hawkins reviewed the idea behind having a pre-meeting. The researchers realized they need to discuss and agree on what they're seeing, develop fact sheets, brainstorm what needs to be done, and have technical discussions about logistics, mechanics, etc.

- Review the development of cohesive reports (to be presented later in the workshop).

John said that as they prepared their reports, they looked at densities of bass and pike, length-frequencies. Tom Chart said he thinks the BC suggestion of group presentation has really helped pushing this to the next step of understanding (on the subbasin and species, rather than project level). Kara commented that consolidation of this kind hasn't happened in GCMRC yet, but that this multiple year and spatial synthesis is very important.

- Open discussion of the purpose and need for a pre-workshop meeting(s) in the future.

Tim Modde suggested significant time is needed to accomplish all the things John mentioned. Others agreed. *Additional time/meetings are probably in order. Rich said yesterday was a good oppty to compare technical notes, but also was very valuable in beginning to compare results in different reaches. These meetings also offer an opportunity to compare, and begin to establish common, metrics. Conclusion: These meetings are very valuable and more should be held (focus on technical aspects, look at what the data are telling us, make suggestions for *how* things can be done differently). Bob Muth emphasized the importance of having reports complete in order to be able to look at the data and then take it to the next level. Researchers from the San Juan and Grand Canyon should be invited, as well.

- Field schedules; reporting schedules; workshop schedules – does something have to give?

Dave Speas suggested *perhaps we need a standing nonnative fish committee to work on planning, data analysis & archiving, strategizing, etc. and provide input to the Biology and Management committees so that ideas can get implemented. We fall down in determining *how* to accomplish actions and then actually getting them implemented. *We need to bring more analytical horsepower to bear on this issue. Rich noted the need for analytical horsepower feeds into the discussion of second-level synthesis.

5. Update / Discussion of Nonnative Fish Management in the San Juan River (Jim Brooks; USFWS – New Mexico Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office)

Questions/observations. Wes - fewer smaller carp, just a few large carp and they're skinny.

Summary statements: 1) mistake to focus on very discreet areas; must have a broad approach; 2) it's going to take longer than we expect (these fish live ~30 years). Tom Nesler countered that we make two reach-wide passes, then focus on concentration areas. Tim – with such a large area to cover, we have to focus our resources on concentration areas.

6. Update / Discussion of Nonnative Fish Management in the Grand Canyon (Kara Hilwig; Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center)

Mechanical removal (six trips per year with 5-6 passes in each, with budget of ~\$650K) appears to be effective to control salmonids in the mainstem Colorado River, but so is warmer water, and they can't really separate the two effects. Native fish trends: 1) relative abundance assessments are no substitute for mark-recapture; 2) large increases in juv humpback chub relative abundance (and flannelmouth and bluehead suckers also displaying positive catch trends; 3) relative influence of nonnative fish versus temperature still unknown. Appears that trout are recovering in the Little Colorado River removal reach; so mechanical removal might be reinitiated. Future water temperature predictions: model projections of an imminent transition to a more arid climate in southwestern North America – would result in more warm water, presents

potential problem with warmwater nonnatives such as channel catfish, smallmouth bass, crayfish, and cyprinids. Grand Canyon nonnative fish management plan: 1) short-term approach with annual field studies (may try using occupancy models, must quantify effectiveness and response); and 2) long-term approach (expand monitoring). Would like to be able to manage upper reach below the dam for trout and lower reaches for native fishes. Unlike the lower Colorado River, we have little overlap between trout and endangered fishes in the Upper Basin (with the exception of Lodore Canyon).

7. Synthesis Reports – Northern Pike

- Cohesive report on overall strategy and success in managing NPK by Finney (98b, Yampa River), Martin (98a, Yampa River), Hawkins (125, Yampa River), and Monroe (109, Green River); including 2007 results.
- NPK population distribution and size, effectiveness of control, refinements, progress toward removal criteria

Annual sampling timeline is “a snapshot in time.”

98 c Steamboat to Hayden. Some habitat work ongoing. Mark/recapture in 2004-2005 only. 600-700 fish caught per year (20-25 fish per mile; high capture prob.). Fairly large fish where the sloughs were. Kayak park reach had very few fish, with some good size adults on down.

98 b Hayden to Craig (39 mi). Thought to be a nursery area. Intensive removal 04-07. High density of pike in this reach (40+ pike/mile). Number of big pike has been greatly reduced, even though they are still catching large numbers. Concomitantly, they’ve seen a notable decrease in pike bite marks on native fishes. Wes – Huge decrease in fecundity below

98a large middle Yampa reach. Little reproduction. Intensive removal 04-07. CPM critical habitat. 8-14 pike/mile.

Middle Green removal 01-07 with drastic declines in catch rates.

Areas of concern for source populations: Old Charley Wash, Catamount Reservoir, Elkhead Reservoir, off-channel wetlands, Loudy Simpson/SWA.

Pike concentrations are low in much of the basin, but high in the Yampa River, increasing as you move upstream (esp. above critical habitat)

Length data summary: 1) influx of small fish into 98a in '06 & '07; 2) more small fish present as you move upstream; 3) few small pike in other areas of the basin.

NPK movement 2004-2007 very complex (movement within & among studies; direction upstream, downstream, within/among; time within years, among years, within/among, ...

Pike have been moving into critical habitat from upstream, but number has decreased since 2004.

NPK escapement & reproduction – Known escapement from and reproduction in Catamount (seen moving down in Yampa and into critical habitat in 2006 and into Green in 2007). Yampa SWA ponds, Loudy-Simpson ponds (escapement or angler translocation). Muth – thought we'd agreed to translocate npk into the bermed Loudy-Simpson ponds, and not translocate into Yampa SWA until after runoff. Sherm – We use Yampa SWA until water is high enough to connect, then go to Loudy-Simpson. If both unsuitable, they'd go to Rio Blanco. Tim – why translocate fish until it connects knowing there's a chance of escapement? Nesler – Four fish over two years not thought to be a big enough deal. If we change the protocol, then need to evaluate what kind of flow year we expect. Melissa – Thought Sam's synthesis report said 21 fish. Sam – Yes, only 4 moved into a *different* reach. Sam – 21 fish may be an underestimate, of course. Nesler – berming may be another option. *Need to further evaluate potential escapement rates and appropriate course of action, if any. Sherm – Any advantage to not transporting npk <10"? Sam – Definitely. Sherm – we'll consider that. If we better predicted runoff, alternative would be to use Craig Criminal Justice Center ponds with npk >10" if connection expected. There seemed to be some support for this; *>CROW will discuss and other options; we'll discuss tomorrow afternoon. Muth – Has data from tags returned to box at Yampa SWA been analyzed?

Number of NPK moving: 1) min of 235 tagged npk moved among studies from '04-07. What is the proportion of this # relative to the total # of fish marked?

Distance and time of travel: 1) npk travel long distances, 2) npk are stationary, not moving within years or among years; 3) npk can travel long distances in relatively short time frame; 4) can travel long distances over a greater time frame.

NPK movement is predominantly downstream; saw movement into critical habitat from outside critical habitat.

Size of NPK that moved: varied in size and distance traveled.

No npk tagged in Elkhead, so can't assess escapement. 3 fish captured (one each in 05-07) that were translocated into Rio Blanco, so anglers may be moving those fish (need to verify data).

Are we doing any good & how. Do we change?

- There is a change in size structure
- Lack of change in pop size

Is there a more eff approach (reallocate or add effort)?

Can you manage/affect a pop. by attacking at a certain point (there's promise in certain areas; do we move upstream?)

Nesler - Why recaptured so many fewer fish in '06 and '07? Sam – think it's because we've reduced to smaller size structure that don't recruit to the gear as well.

Sherm – 98c reach has real problem with landowner access. When Sam & Billy were doing 98c, there was a major push by CDOW to obtain access to the river. Steamboat landowners have too much money to entice with incentives; most said they could come on their land, but not take any fish out. If we were to want to remove fish in the future, we would have to get landowner permission for access for that purpose.

Billy Atkinson described his work in Steamboat, Catamount, and the surrounding river habitat. Trying to convert Catamount (private lake) to a whirling-disease resistant trout and eradicate pike. Not connected to recovery program efforts. Escapement from Catamount documented. Removal would provide CDOW with oppty to introduce desired replacement sportfish. Yampa Valley Land Trust interested in partnership oppty's. Catamount and Yampa are WD positive, ideal site for a WD resistant rainbow trout research oppty. Billy hopes the trout success will provide public buy-in for similar work downstream below Catamount and Steamboat. Management scenarios for pike control: water level manipulations (could be unpopular downstream); chemical eradication costly and temporary; mechanical removal (traps, gillnets, e-fishing, encourage harvest (Catamount has mandatory harvest on pike). >Researchers are asked to please save any orange-tagged fish (which indicates they are of Catamount origin) for CDOW. Removed 1050 pike from Catamount in fall 2007. Rehabilitating Chuck Lewis SWA with goal of reducing pike and increasing trout. Have eliminated the big backwater.

Given the success they had with 5 boats on the reservoir, Billy suggested we might *consider the possibility of putting 4 boats in Sam's reach for 3 weeks with no marking pass, then repeating the same approach downstream. Winkelman has suggested *injecting a female with eggs with barium and strontium which would mark all the offspring.

Rich - What progress are we seeing; what's working; what hasn't worked; do we need to do anything different in the next year and beyond. What commonalities are being observed? Leisa and Trina report seeing pike just down to Stewart Lake/Jensen area now. Mostly concentrated in 3-4 miles from Thunder Ranch to Ashley Creek, but that concentration may be moving upstream. In Brown's Park, pike have been caught periodically, beginning in 2005. Caught pike in 2006, but none in 2007. They're all young-of-year, indicating reproduction. On Colorado, catch is very incidental, probably only one a year over the last 4 years (Rich – similar to what they found there in the late 70's and early 80's). None captured in the Gunnison since '96 or '97. Habitat like that between Craig and Hayden just isn't there. Pat Martinez - however, gravel extraction around Rifle could result in connected areas that could harbor pike. Sam – think we're having some affect on pike basinwide. Hawkins – don't think we've gotten to our interim criterion of less than 2.7 pike per mile yet, though (Chart agreed). Tim - We're having an impact, but recruitment is coming from upstream, which is harder to address. What's the most efficient way to reach our goal? Trina – There's potential spawning habitat in the Green; believes their control efforts are preventing significant spawning. What's working best? Lori – electrofishing jetboats; fyke-netting when there's enough flow to get into the backwater. Cameron said the electric seine has worked to some extent, also, would like an opportunity to try it in the Steamboat area. Rich - are there enclosed areas where we could use local piscicides? No. Tim – For some of the big

backwaters, maybe we could try the configuration described by Scott that was used by Russian poachers. (Scott may make presentation at researchers meeting.) Kara – would it help to do movement study of pike with radio or sonic tags? Sam – Probably more useful for smb than npk. Anita – a “flotilla” has been suggested in the past, maybe we should try that. Melissa – acknowledgement that recruitment is from upstream suggests we need to find a way to target that (Chart concurred). Kevin Gelwicks – Billy mentioned flotilla idea w no marking pass; if we took that approach, we could try getting a depletion estimate. Hawkins – since npk use margins of the river, not sure flotilla approach would be that beneficial. Billy said they have found npk midstream. Billy – perhaps 5 boats in 151 slough. Sam – think flotilla would be a waste of time in main channel in his reach and downstream for npk. Pat M. – upper reach is clearly the pike factor. 30 miles upstream of Hayden to Catamount (capture efficiencies very high in this reach as opposed to lower efficiencies downstream). Move work upstream to shorter segment, might only need 3-4 passes with one or two boats. Bottom line – we probably would need to *expend far less effort upstream in the “factory” with potentially much more lasting effects. Could well be far more efficient economically and ecologically. Then could focus all the downstream effort on smallmouth bass. Sam agreed, but suggested the “pike factory” is Craig upstream. Recommend reallocating effort to 98b, and if possible, 98c. Kara – this is consistent with all the invasive control literature. Dave Speas – we’ve talked about hitting these concentration areas before and now we’ve had the data, so now we need to *figure out *how* to get access and work in that area. Hawkins agreed – let’s identify what we need to do to solve this. Chart – can probably *show quantitatively this cost/benefit of working upstream in the “factory,” which might help us make the case from the social perspective.

What’s the prognosis for pike: can we reach at least the interim criteria or below with our current level of effort? Dave – maybe need analysis of how many years it would take with our current effort. Tim – probability of capture is pretty good, so we’re headed in the right direction, but we may not be allocating our resources as efficiently as possible, getting the most bang for our buck. Pat M. – we have compensatory effect to consider, but environmental factors and other species, as well. Illicit introductions are increasing, with northern pike the most frequently introduced fish. We have to *be vigilant to watch/manage this species in other areas. Melissa – What about *rotenoning the backwater in 98b since there are no native fish. Billy – it’s a temporary fix. Melissa – then repeat it again and again. Billy – what about tiger muskie in off-channel ponds to eat the northern pike?

8. **NPK Synthesis – Open Panel Discussion** (see above)

- Focus discussion on how best to tie these efforts together to assess Program effect throughout the Yampa / Green River Basin
- Where are we with this species, what is working, what is not working, do we need to do anything different, what is commonality among researchers?
- Long-term prognosis for managing NPK in Yampa River and Green River
- Recommendations

Wed. a.m. – Kevin - Need more comprehensive analysis of movement data.

9. Synthesis Reports – Smallmouth Bass

- Cohesive report on overall strategy and success in controlling SMB by Hawkins (125, Yampa River smallmouth bass Craig to Dinosaur), Fuller (110, Yampa River smallmouth bass and channel catfish in Dinosaur), Badame (123, Green River smallmouth bass), and Burdick (126, Colorado River centrarchids); including 2007 results
- SMB population distribution and size, effectiveness of control, refinements, progress toward removal criteria

Highest bass densities in Yampa River appear to be in Lily Park. In 2007 in the Green, effort was moved upstream (above Duchesne R.) where bass are more concentrated. Densities have decreased over time in the 26-mile Echo-Split reach (Whirlpool and Split Mtn Canyons). Need to decide how small a fish to put in abundance estimate (YOY aren't caught until August or September). Number of passes was increased significantly in the second and third reaches in the Green (removed 7 times as many fish with almost 5 times as many passes). John thinks smallmouth are moving from the Yampa up into Lodore. Need to compare length-frequencies early and late in sampling season. Mark suggests we need to ask if it's worthwhile to target small fish when they may not survive over-winter (that's what John Hawkins second sampling period with electric seines is meant to determine). On the Colorado River, removal seems to be having an effect. Haven't sampled off-channel habitats (e.g., gravel pits that may connect at higher flows) on Colorado or Green. Tim said he's not seen smallmouth in his floodplain sampling (Trina has seen lots of crappie in floodplains, though). Bob Burdick said there is a large, connected backwater at West Rifle that has smallmouth bass. Bass movement: remain in localized areas over years; move among reaches within and among years; move long distances often when very young and small. Movement was both upstream and downstream from Little Yampa Canyon and Lily Park. Movement data is interesting and complex, yet is only a small snapshot in time for a small number of fish.

Need to: unify data when possible; decide on min size for abundance estimation; segregate abundance by size groups to monitor changes in each; determine what sizes have ecological significance and make sure we adequately target and monitor that group; adjust segment size or agency reaches as needed.

Group agreed to tag all fish above 100mm (can also tag smaller fish, if possible); for abundance estimates call juveniles 100-200mm juveniles, adults 200mm and above. Tag losses are fairly high in smallmouth (Trina and Leisa found 27% tag loss over the 2007 sampling period [they used some old pit-tags to double-tag]). Researchers need to determine how tag loss may affect their abundance estimates. How do they affect the longer-term exploitation estimates. Might consider PIT tags. Nesler – need real clarity in the synthesis reports. Badame – It appears that our estimates aren't as good as we think or something is going on with tag loss or fish movement. Trina – are we tagging fish at the best time of year, since they're not as available in July (seems like fish were more available in the spring). Paul – Seems like the “bass factory” is all over the place geographically, but temporally we might be missing opportunities, so maybe we should be going out in April-May-June. Kevin Bestgen – may be able to look at movement data in certain reaches for smallmouth bass with

the better confidence limits. Would be more responsible to report our range of removal rates based on the confidence limit bounds. The inconsistency of catch effort data among in Yampa Canyon suggest something is wrong. Need to be very careful about these abundance estimates. Hawkins – we know the populations aren't closed. Researchers need to talk to Gary White, Ken Burnham, or Ron Ryel to work through these issues. Dave Speas – think we need to more formally secure that kind of help. Rich – need to determine what to do with these synthesis reports in terms of second-level synthesis, but right now we need to figure out what to do with the data we have now and how we can make sure we provide something that Nesler can discuss with the Wildlife Commission, for example.

Does one-mark one-recapture technique with one week in between work for this species? Hawkins – if you go back too soon, the fish haven't resettled and catch rates go down. Boyd – timing was critical. Difficult to predict best timing for first pass. Burdick – The quicker they got out for the first removal pass, the better, but they're using a different mark (caudal fin punch) to reduce mortality. (Do still find marks 2 months later.)

Are we affecting smb? Pat Martinez – by comparison to pike, we only have a couple of years of experience, so it seems to early to tell. Bruce – agree it's too early to tell.

What can we do to accelerate our affect on smb? How much more time do we need to determine the prognosis? Paul – not sure we can answer yet. Canyon is continuous from just below South Beach... Can we consider this one unit and remove bass in the whole unit?

10. SMB Synthesis – Open Panel Discussion (see above)

- Focus discussion on how best to tie these efforts together to assess Program effect throughout the Yampa / Green / Colorado River Basins
- Where are we with this species, what is working, what is not working, do we need to do anything different, what is commonality among researchers?
- Long-term prognosis for managing SMB in Yampa, Green, Colorado Rivers
- Recommendations

11. Native Fish Response Synthesis Reports

- Cohesive report on native fish response(s) by Bestgen (140, Yampa River) and Hedrick (144, Green River); including 2007 results

SMB densities high in the discrete Yampa R. habitats, but removal is having an affect. However, no apparent substantial native fish response in the main channel habitats. Native fish more abundant and smallmouth less abundant in isolated pools as compared to main channel habitats. Bass increased markedly since '99, Native fish reduction and increased smb assoc w lower flows and warmer water temps that began in 2000... Definitive resp;onse of small-bodied native fish in Yampa main channel not detected. Mottled sculpin reappeared in '07, Isolated pools support native fish but only when smb few or none. SMB may be limiting survival and recr. Other factors such as env. changes and reduced ab of adults and larvae may also be limiting the response of native fishes to pred removal. Rec: continue,

more spatially extensive pred removal and changes in environmental conditions may benefit native fishes. Can adult native fish elicit a response to predator removal? Milk Creek as possible source. Investigate smb early life history.

Green R native fish response (Jensen to Sand Wash area) – Less than 1% native fish in each of 2005-2007. SMB abundance in these backwaters also very low. Would be interesting to add in results from ISMP data between 1988 and 2005 to see when native fishes began dropping out. Native fish reductions since 80's, mostly pikeminnow. CPM simply not making it in the middle Green. Backwaters and cpm larvae are present. Reasons for native fish decline may include smb, but likely other factors. Recruitment of pikeminnow in the Green is one of the things being looked at in the research framework. Perhaps small-bodied nonnatives coupled with lower reproduction are combining to have a significant effect on cpm. More smb in backwaters upstream in Lodore. Cameron – saw more roundtails earlier in the season, but they apparently didn't persist.

12. Native Fish Response Synthesis – Open Discussion

- Focus discussion on how best to tie these efforts together to assess Program effect
- Recommendations

Green R. will have different smb criteria. Chart – need to look at Colo. R where we still have a strong native population and a lower density of smb. *Doug – overdue for a YOY sample in the Colorado.

13. Simulated Effort Needed to Remove SMB (Haines and Modde)

Exploitation rates. Problems: tag loss; biased estimates; best estimate – tags captured / tags released; maximize the number of tags released.

Allocation of effort among reaches: spread effort or concentrate on specific reaches? Need to know utility function (linear or “crash”); relative value of each reach; production parameters; probability of capture; connectivity among reaches (key variable)

Recs: improve accuracy of expl. Rates; 07 results suggest that we can achieve needed exploitation rates for short reaches, next step reqs basin-wide anal; drainage-wide removal action plan should be developed.

Can model be used to set better criteria? No.

15 passes on the whole reach would be 2.8 times '07 effort.

There is there a danger of getting only halfway to exploitation and actually increasing productivity.

Maybe use PIT tags in enough reaches to get a better handle on tag losses. Is there a certain age-class where tag loss is most prevalent? Maybe cinch-type floy tags (takes longer to apply, but no longer than inserting and reading a PIT tag). >Need to look into alternative

tagging systems. Kara – perhaps radio or sonic tag a component of the tagged fish. We could use batch marking, so what about freeze-branding? (Requires cooler with dry ice and a freeze brand).

May be too early to tell, but not too early to think about whether we can get the smb pop low enough with mechanical removal. Pat M. – May have to pull out all the stops like we have in conquering WD in trout. Sherm – With regard to targeting concentration areas, he would like to see a map of UCRB showing hot spots for smb and their repro areas (and for NP, also).

14. Second Level Synthesis/Analysis – Open Discussion

- Discuss approach for synthesizing data, analyses, information, reports among investigators for entire subbasins
- How to we synthesize information at population level?
- Basin-wide synthesis (e.g., tag/movement data summary)
- Are data sets compatible, accessible?
- Incorporate recommendations into syntheses
- Roles of Recovery Program, Program partners
- Develop framework of how to do this
- (a) designate someone within the Program; (b) reassign PIs to focus on synthesis; (c) retain outside assistance/expertise
- How do we best report progress and successes to Congress?

15. Workshop Recommendations (Rich Valdez)

- Action items, recommendations to BC
- Address grab bag of ideas (i.e. should any be deleted, do they need to be re-ranked and prioritized, better classified)
- Yampa River NNF Strategy (next steps)
- Suggestions for next year's workshop

PARTICIPANTS

Tom Chart
Angela Hill
John Hawkins
Cameron Walford
Tate Wilcox
Tom Iseman
Bruce Haines
Sam Finney
Wes ? USFWS
Derek Elverud UDWR
Paul Badame
Krissy Wilson
Kevin Gelwicks
Dave Speas
Tim Modde
Chuck McAda
Patty Gellat
Bob Burdick
Sherman Hebein
Bob Muth
Kevn Bestgen
Angela Kantola
Rich Valdez
Shane Capron
Tom Nesler
Steve Yamashita
Pat Martinez
Sharon Whitmore
Cassie Melon, UDWR
Kara Hilwig, GCMRC
Dave Irving
Melissa Trammell
Trina Hedrick
Leisa Monroe
Mark Fuller
Jim Brooks
Anita Martinez
Bill Atkinson
Lori Martin
Boyd ?
Doug Osmundson
George Smith
Al Pfister
Tom Blickensderfer

Brent Uilenberg