

## INVENTORY OF WASHINGTON CRM/CWMA GROUPS

February 7, 2008 D R A F T

**GROUP NAME:** Nisqually River CWMA

**YEAR FORMED:** 2007

**REGION:** WRIA #11, Nisqually River Watershed

**COUNTIES:** Pierce, Thurston, Lewis – all border the river

**CONTACT:** Sean MacDougall, (253) 798-7263  
smacdou@co.pierce.wa.us

**SIZE (Acres):** project area is about 2,600 acres,  
watershed is ~ 500,000 acres  
The effort is mainly in the 2600 acres for a practical outcome. This covers the main stem of the Nisqually River and the main tributaries. The main riparian corridor is a defined channel, steep canyons, ~ 200 feet on each bank of the river.

**LANDOWNERS** (to include estimates of acres or percentage of managed lands):

170 landowners in the 2600 acre zone in the basin.  
760 landowners if you increase the range to the upper reach of the watershed.  
In this watershed 45% is in public ownership, 55% private ownership.

Private, NPS - Mt Rainier, USFS- Gifford Pinchot, Wash DOT, DNR, State Parks, Pack Forest, Nisqually Land Trust, Nisqually Tribe, Fort Lewis, Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, Tacoma Power, Centralia City Light (owns diversion dam), Pierce, Thurston and Lewis counties.

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS, STAKEHOLDERS, PARTNERS:**

In the basin area – Nisqually River Council (parent org to Nisqually Land Trust), Pierce, Thurston and Lewis County Weed Boards, WSDA, WDFW, People for Puget Sound, US Fish and Wildlife Service, USGS (for predictive modeling).

**NATURAL RESOURCE ISSUES:** Knotweed control (because of available funding); may include butterfly bush control – because of pioneer populations in riparian corridor. Streamside restoration and salmon habitat restoration are natural resource issues. The ecological connections include fish and wildlife and water quality impacts.

**STATUS OF PLAN** (Please underline your choices):

<u>No plan</u>	<u>Help needed</u>	<u>In Process</u>	Not Written
Written	Implemented and functioning	Completed	

**CWMA STATUS:** (Please underline or circle your choices).

Brand new group, potential new group, or resurrected group.  
Mission accomplished and disbanded.  
Unable to overcome obstacles, disbanded.

Self-sufficient and functioning for foreseeable future. Currently, 2 grants. (WSDA, NIFWIF), with pretty good match from partners, but will be pushing partners to contribute more this year.

Some need for assistance, or resources need as indicated below.  
Moderate need for assistance, as indicated below.

Immediate or major need for assistance or additional resources.

In order for us to treat knotweed in the upper watershed out side of NPS – need education, outreach, volunteer coordination, and more money to support hiring contractors for on the ground treatment.

Need programmatic permission from each county in regards to their Critical Area Ordinance policies. This CWMA will need the necessary exemptions to do work on a broad scale, since this applies to major acreage control work. May be some problems for Thurston and Lewis Counties.

**ASSISTANCE OR RESOURCES NEEDED:**

Implementation Needs: funding

Facilitation Needs:

Technical Needs: Predictive modeling, research, see comments.

Administrative Needs: staff position. Last year the Tribe asked if Sean was interested in creating a position like a Basin Steward to address invasive and ecological issues. Sean felt that since there are three counties involved, the Tribe or a state agency would be a better house for this position. Sean is considering hiring for a  $\frac{3}{4}$  time position for aquatic weed issues.

Help to Develop or Produce a Written Plan: Yes, a neutral party to help with this. Might need help when they get to the CWMA big picture planning part – might need help with break out groups.

**2008 MEETINGS:** Jan 10, March or April, then end of season December.

We need more than book end meetings. We need info during the control season. Other partners have a voice and their needs to be met, and to stay on tope of things we cannot miss any good suggestions. Smaller meetings will help us address needs beyond knotweed.

**COMMENTS:** Currently good attendance and participation. The support and participation of the partners have been great.

The Tribes have good stewardship plans for salmon recovery. A lot of this work compliments our work to be done with invasive control.

Knotweed control is driven by funding available to us. But upland areas are not impacted by knotweed, so how do we keep these landowners/land managers involved in watershed stewardship for invasive species management?

We have surveyed the river. These surveys put us in a position to come up with a better plan, but it also identified needs (predictive modeling – below).

Potential mapping needs – to include clean areas and areas predicted to be bad. Education is cheaper than control. Start with knotweed education because of resources now, but we need room to talk about Scotch broom, blackberries, issues people are interested in now, for long term goals and strategies.

Research needs include developing a bio control for knotweed.

Predictive modeling is needed to identify specific distribution trends.

In the lower 38 miles of the river, there are 5 salmon species and currently a low level knotweed distribution. (<5 acres, roadside, treated entirely).

Alder Lake is a big settling pond with 15 miles of the Nisqually River from Mt. Rainier. In the area between Mt. Rainier to Elbe – extensive knotweed. 300 acres. There are 378 acres in whole watershed, but this could increase to 1000 acres in the upper watershed (up to Mineral Creek). The upper watershed is disturbed. Gravel bars all have knotweed, seedling size. Extensive patches starting in Elbe (where it is bad). But down stream, in public access areas, there is no knotweed, not along the shoreline. It shows up again, downstream of 2 sets of dams.

Is Alder Lake settling fragments out, drowning them?

How much fragment is moving through turbines?

Is lower knotweed coming in from independent introductions? Are these lower population not tied to upper populations?

Research needs include:

What is the connection between the lower and upper watershed populations?

What is the rate of spread from upper populations to lower watershed?