AD

Award Number: DAMD17-99-2-9051

TITLE: Riparian Woodland Restoration Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Patricia Delwiche, Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: California State University, Chico Chico, California 95929-0870

REPORT DATE: October 2001

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

# 20020107 001

•			F	Form Approved
REPORT DC	CUMENTATION P	AGE	ON	//B No. 074-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of informatic the data needed, and completing and reviewing this c reducing this burden to Washington Headquarters Se	on is estimated to average 1 hour per response collection of information. Send comments rega rvices, Directorate for Information Operations (	<ul> <li>including the time for reviewing instruct rding this burden estimate or any other a and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highy</li> </ul>	ions, searching exists spect of this collect way, Suite 1204, Ar	sting data sources, gathering and maintaining tion of information, including suggestions for lington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of
Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projection 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	ect (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503	3. REPORT TYPE AND DA	TES COVERE	D
	October 2001	Annual (1 Octobe:	r 00 - Se	eptember 01)
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	ation Project	5.		UMBERS
Riparian woodiand Rescor	acion Project		AMD17-99-	-2-9031
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Patricia Delwiche, Ph.D.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAM	ME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8.	PERFORMING	G ORGANIZATION
California State Univers	sity, Chico		REPORT NUI	MBER
Chico, California 95929	9-0870			
E-Mail: pdelwiche@csuchico.edu				
9 SPONSORING / MONITORING AGE	NCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(E	s) 1(	). SPONSORI	
		-,	AGENCY R	EPORT NUMBER
U.S. Army Medical Research and N	Aateriel Command			
For Detrick, Maryland 21702-301	2			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
				126 DISTRIBUTION CODE
Approved for Public Rele	ease; Distribution Un	limited		125. DISTRIBUTION CODE
± ±				
12 ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Word				
The objectives of this project	t are to restore a parcel	of land in Beale Air F	orce Base.	California, to native
habitat, and to compare the est	fficiency of high, medium	and low-input methods	of plant es	stablishment. The present
report summarizes the finding: nursery-grown seedlings. Both	s resulting from monitorin h groups of trees were pro	g of oaks established : tected, subsequent to (	from field- establishme	ent in the field, with one
of three different kinds of the	ree protectors. Monitorin	g at two dates included	d survival	and vigor. Statistical
than for seedlings, but when a	survival is assessed over	a 12-month period, the	re is no st	atistically significant
difference. Type of tree prot effect on plant vigor. Challe	tector did not have a sign enges at the site include	ificant effect on surv extremely low plant su	ival, but d rvival, the	lid have a significant bught to be due to high
vertebrate pest populations.	Comparable planting techn	iques used at other si	tes have re	esulted in survivals of 85
includes suggestions for futu:	re plantings.	ge survival of approxim	matery 20%	at this site. Report
			<u>_</u>	
14. SUBJECT TERMS		oction		15. NUMBER OF PAGES
Kiparian restoration oak	s survival tree prot	ecton		16. PRICE CODE
17 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION 1	8 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICA		20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
OF REPORT	OF THIS PAGE	OF ABSTRACT		
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassifie	d d	Unlimited
NSN / 540-01-280-5500			Stan Prescr 208-10	ibed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

# **Table of Contents**

Cover	1
SF 298	2
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Body	4
Key Research Accomplishments	9
Conclusions	9
Appendices	10

•

.

## INTRODUCTION

Current riparian restoration efforts utilize a variety of materials and methods, all of them aimed at optimizing plant growth and survival. Some restoration efforts are very costly. Amont the variables that are likely to have a significant effect on project cost and plant performance are method of plant propagation, irrigation method, weed control, and protection of plants from herbivores, herbicide and the elements. Our experience has suggested that there are some more cost-effective ways of restoring a parcel of land than the commonly utilized ones. To be sure, some methodologies will be appropriate for some situations and not for others. The project that is currently under way at Beale Air Force Base in California (Award No. DAMD17-99-2-9051) is an effort to restore a parcel of land there while investigating the economics of efficient restoration methodology. We are planting oaks of different ages, and nurturing and protecting them in various ways, in order to identify the factors that might be responsible for optimal and economical plant growth.

# BODY

Protocol: Nov. 2000 - Oct. 2001

- 1. Dec. 2000: Locally collected acorns planted in rows 2, 5, 9, 10, 14, 18 and 21 of Field 7 to supplement the low plant numbers surviving from the first planting of Dec. 1999. Acorns planted ten feet apart, in planting sites adjacent to original planting sites, so that the same drip emitter could still be used.
- 2. May 2001: Germinated seedlings protected with one of three different kinds of tree protectors, with these treatments randomly assigned in groups of five seedlings, in such a way that each treatment was represented in each treatment row. (Attachment 1)
- 3. Overwintering survival data collected for acorns and seedlings, May 2001.
- 4. Routine maintenance (irrigation and weed control) conducted throughout the growing season, 2001.
- Oct. 2001: all plants monitored to assess overall survival (from planting date up to Oct. 2001) and survival from the period May 2001 through Oct. 2001. Vigor assessed on a 1 3 scale (1 = low vigor: few leaves, minimal branching, poor leaf color; 2 = high vigor: numerous leaves, moderate extensive branching, healthy leaf color) for all plants still alive at monitoring date.

# Results

1. Survival in May 2001 of trees planted as acorns in Fall 2000 was significantly different than the survival of trees planted in Fall 2000 as seedlings (**Table 1**). Survival of acorns was 44%; this figure would also include germination and emergence of acorns. Survival of seedlings was 67%. There was a significant replication effect. Survival in the ten replications varied from 25% to 84%.

- 2. Survival in October 2001 of trees protected in May 2001 was very significantly different for seedlings than for acorns (**Table 2**). Survival for acorns at this time was 57%; survival for seedlings was 37%. The variation due to replication was not significant for this variable.
- 3. There was not a significant difference in survival between seedlings and acorns, when the time period examined was from planting (Fall 2000) through October 2001 (**Table 3**). For this time period, the survival rate for trees planted as acorns was 27%; that of trees planted as seedlings was 28%. There was, however, a highly significant replication effect (replications reflecting positions in the field); survival in Field 1 (reps 1, 2 and 3) and in the northern portion of Field 7 (rep 10) was markedly higher than in the remainder of Field 7.
- 4. There was not a significant effect of type of tree protector on survival, when survival was assessed in October 2001 (**Table 4**). Percent survival with the three kinds of tree protectors was 46%, 45% and 51%, with milk cartons, Treepees® and Tree pros®, respectively.
- 5. Type of tree protection device had a significant effect on tree vigor, when vigor was assessed subjectively in October 2001 (**Table 5**). Trees protected by milk cartons, Treepees®, and Treepros® had vigor scores of 1.58, 2.15 and 2.03, respectively.

**Table 1**: Survival in May 2001 of oaks planted in summer and fall 2000 as acorns or seedlings.Anova: Two-Factor Without Replication

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Acorns	10	4.42	0.442	0.056507
seedlings	10	6.7	0.67	0.031178
rep 1	2	1.54	0.77	0.0338
rep 2	2	1.67	0.835	0.00045
rep 3	2	1.65	0.825	0.00245
rep 4	2	1.03	0.515	0.06845
rep 5	2	0.73	0.365	0.06125
rep 6	2	0.49	0.245	0.01805
rep 7	2	1.15	0.575	0.01805
rep 8	2	0.91	0.455	0.00245
rep 9	2	0.95	0.475	0.08405
rep 10	2	1	0.5	0.0578

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Trts	0.25992	1	0.25992	26.92541	0.000572	5.117357
Reps	0.70228	9	0.078031	8.083333	0.002323	3.178897
Error	0.08688	9	0.009653			
Total	1.04908	19				

**Table 2**: Survival in October 2001 of trees planted in the field as acorns or seedlings, and protected in May 2001. Data collected in Oct. 2001 only on those plants that had been alive in May 2001.

Anova: Two-Factor Without Replication

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
acorns	10	5.74	0.574	0.023516
seedlings	10	3.77	0.377	0.049357
rep 1	2	1.25	0.625	0.00045
rep 2	2	1.49	0.745	0.00245
rep 3	2	1.3	0.65	0.0002
rep 4	2	0.62	0.31	0.0032
rep 5	2	0.84	0.42	0.0338
rep 6	2	0.77	0.385	0.06125
rep 7	2	0.68	0.34	0.0162
rep 8	2	0.56	0.28	0.08
rep 9	2	0.78	0.39	0.1152
rep 10	2	1.22	0.61	0.045

ANOVA

٢

Source of Variation	ss ss	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
trts	0.194045	1	0.194045	10.668	0.009742	5.117357
reps	0.492145	9	0.054683	3.006292	0.05832	3.178897
Error	0.163705	9	0.018189			
Total	0.849895	19				

**Table 3:** Survival of oak trees planted in Fall 2000 and monitored Oct. 2001.Anova: Two-Factor Without Replication

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
acorns	10	2.67	0.267	0.037023
seedlings	10	2.82	0.282	0.046551
rep 1	2	2 0.97	0.485	0.00845
rep 2	2	2 1.24	0.62	0.0008
rep 3	2	2 1.08	0.54	0.0018
rep 4	2	2 0.33	0.165	0.01125
rep 5	2	2 0.26	0.13	0.0018
rep 6	2	2 0.15	0.075	5E-05
rep 7	2	2 0.38	0.19	0.0008
rep 8	2	2 0.24	0.12	0.0128

	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL		
rep 10	2 0.56	0.28	0.0018
rep 9	2 0.28	0.14	0.0018

•

. . . . . . .

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
trts	0.001125	10	0.001125	0.251709	0.627917	5.117357
reps	0.711945	90	0.079105	17.69907	0.000107	3.178897
Error	0.040225	90	0.004469			
Total	0.753295	19				

**Table 4**: Effect of type of tree protector on survival, when survival was assessed in October2001.

Anova: Two-Factor	Without Replication
-------------------	---------------------

EFFECT OF TREE PROTECTION AVERAGED OVER PLANTING MATERIAL

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
milk cart.	20	9.24	0.462	0.07668
tree pees	20	9.095	0.45475	0.082362
tree pros	20	10.16	0.508	0.063891
REP 1	3	1.8	0.6	0.01
REP 2	3	2.3	0.766667	0.043333
REP 3	3	2.03	0.676667	0.004933
REP 4	3	0.76	0.253333	0.029233
REP 5	3	1.28	0.426667	0.057633
REP 6	3	1.63	0.543333	0.033633
REP 7	3	1.28	0.426667	0.060933
REP 8	3	1.5	0.5	0.07
REP 9	3	1.64	0.546667	0.040833
REP 10	3	2.53	0.843333	0.027433
REP 11	3	1.97	0.656667	0.095633
REP 12	3	2.06	0.686667	0.022533
REP 13	3	2.07	0.69	0.0171
REP 14	3	1.02	0.34	0.0091
REP 15	3	0.92	0.306667	0.013433
REP 16	3	0.61	0.203333	0.029033
REP 17	3	0.775	0.258333	0.020208
REP 18	3	0.21	0.07	0.0037
REP 19	3	0.47	0.156667	0.022633
REP 20	3	1.64	0.546667	0.168533

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
trts	0.033361	2	0.01668	0.415265	0.663125	3.244821
reps	2.709325	19	0.142596	3.549979	0.000435	1.867331
Error	1.526389	38	0.040168			
Total	4.269075	59				

**Table 5**: Effect of type of tree protector on tree vigor, when vigor was assessed in October 2001.Some rows were omitted from the analysis, where plant numbers were very sparse.Anova: Two-Factor Without Replication

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance	
milk cartons	8	12.62	1.5775	0.204679	
treepees	8	17.2	2.15	0.153086	
treepros	8	16.24	2.03	0.258286	
rep 1 acorns	3	6.23	2.076667	0.050633	
rep 2 acorns	3	5.74	1.913333	0.495633	
rep 3 acorns	3	6.83	2.276667	0.112633	
rep 4 acorns	3	6.33	2.11	0.0103	
rep 1 seedlings	3	5.15	1.716667	0.090833	
rep 2 seedlings	3	6.14	2.046667	0.645433	
rep 3 seedlings	3	5.89	1.963333	0.373333	
rep 4 seedlings	3	3.75	1.25	0.0625	

ANOVA

¢

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Treatments	1.458433	2	0.729217	4.590049	0.029315	3.73889
Reps	2.088183	7	0.298312	1.877722	0.14952	2.764196
Error	2.224167	14	0.158869			
Total	5.770783	23				

# KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Identified significant effect of starting plant material (acorns vs. seedlings) on survival in the first over-wintering period after planting
- Identified significant effect of starting plant material on survival during the growing season.
- Identified significant effect of type of tree protector on seedling vigor
- Demonstrated the lack of a treatment effect of tree protector on seedling survival

# CONCLUSIONS

We have been able to demonstrate that Treepee® seedling protectors are statistically superior, based on the variables we measured. Acorns appear to perform better during the growing season, at least with respect to survival. However, performance overall was disappointing. A survival rate of 25% after the first year of growth is unacceptable by most standards. We have reason to believe that a large part of the poor performance was due to the challenges imposed by the supplemental irrigation provided by the creek relocation efforts of the Army Corps of Engineers (described in the last Annual Report); the lush vegetation resulting from this supplemental water appears to have resulted in high vertebrate populations in the summer of 2001 (and possibly in the preceding winter). We believe that it was these herbivores that were largely responsible for the low survival of oak seedlings.

However, the positive side of this is that we have developed a modification of the standard planting method, a method that we believe will be applicable to a variety of planting situations, and especially valuable where rodents inflict high plant mortality. While the plants are well-protected and they grow vigorously in the Treepees®, the cylindrical Treepros® (or Supertubes®, as they are called by some manufacturers) can be sunk directly into the ground to a depth of 12 inches or more. Preliminary results at this high-rodent-pressure site have suggested to us that the cylinders around the developing oak taproot offers sufficient barrier to permit improved survival and enhanced plant growth. The cylindrical shape of the tree protector above-ground encourages vertical growth up to a height of four feet or more.

Our goals are not the discovery of a radical new principal, but merely to demonstrate the performance effects of minor, cost-effective changes in planting methodology. We have demonstrated by periodic monitoring that the performance of acorns differs from that of seedlings at different times of the year. In years when acorns are plentiful, it would be more cost-effective to plant extra acorns and protect them effectively, than to start with expensive nursery-grown transplants. Treepees® and Treepros® are expensive, but they do make a difference. And we think that the underground protection that could be afforded by the cyclidrical Treepros®, using the correct installation and planting techniques, could improve plant performance even in the presence of damaging herbivore populations.

•



Figure 1: Field Layout of planting and treatments. Rows in Field 1 run in a generally northwest-to-southeast direction; those of Field 7 are perpendicular, and run generally northwest to southwest. Shading represents the three different tree-protection treatments, and is intended to convey the approximate arrangement, but not exact sizes, of the different blocks.