

**ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**  
**YEAR 2 (2011)**  
**HEATH RIPARIAN BUFFER MITIGATION SITE**  
**CRAVEN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA**  
**(EEP Contract No. 002280)**



**Prepared for:**

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES**  
**ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**  
**RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA**



**Prepared by:**

**Restoration Systems, L.L.C.**  
**1101 Haynes Street, Suite 211**  
**Raleigh, North Carolina 27604**

**And**

**Axiom Environmental, Inc.**  
**218 Snow Avenue**  
**Raleigh, North Carolina 27603**



**October 2011**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Restoration Systems, LLC completed riparian buffer restoration at the Heath Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site (hereafter referred to as the “Site”) through the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) Full Delivery Process (RFP 16-001383) to provide 59.45 Riparian Buffer Mitigation Units. The Site is located approximately 3.4 miles southeast of Dover in Craven County within United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit and Targeted Local Watershed 03020202080010 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-04-08) of the Neuse River Basin. Site streams drain to Core Creek (Stream Index 27-90), which is included on the draft 2008 303(d) list for impaired biological integrity and low dissolved oxygen resulting from agricultural crop production.

Prior to construction, the Site was characterized by ditched agricultural land used for row crop production. Land use practices including the maintenance and removal of vegetation, regular plowing, and use of agricultural chemicals had resulted in degraded water quality.

The goals and objectives of this project focused on improving local water quality, enhancing flood attenuation, and restoring aquatic and riparian habitat. These goals were accomplished by the following.

1. Removing nonpoint sources of pollution associated with agriculture production by a) ceasing the application of agricultural herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and other agricultural materials into and adjacent to Site ditches and open waterways and b) providing a vegetative buffer adjacent to ditches and waterways to treat surface runoff that may be laden with sediment and/or agricultural pollutants.
2. Reducing sedimentation/siltation within on-Site and downstream receiving waters by a) increasing retention time for surface waters entering and leaving the Site, b) reducing erosion associated with vegetation maintenance and agricultural plowing to Site ditches, and c) planting a forested vegetative buffer adjacent to Site ditches and waterways.
3. Promoting floodwater attenuation by ripping compacted soils and revegetating the Site to increase frictional resistance on floodwaters crossing the Site.
4. Providing terrestrial wildlife habitat including a forested riparian corridor within an area that was previously cleared and highly dissected by agricultural land use.

This project was constructed in late winter/early spring 2010. Planting of the entire 60.632-acre Site resulted in 59.45 Riparian Buffer Mitigation Units. The Site will be protected by a permanent conservation easement. As a whole, the densities of vegetation plots across the Site were above the required 320 stems per acre with an average of 837 planted stems per acre in the Second Monitoring Year (2011). In addition, each individual plot met success criteria based on planted stems alone.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Location and Setting .....	1
1.2 Project Goals and Objectives .....	1
1.3 Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach.....	1
2.0 MONITORING PLAN .....	2
2.1 Vegetation Success Criteria .....	2
2.2 Maintenance and Contingency .....	2
2.3 Vegetation Sampling Results and Comparison to Success Criteria.....	2
3.0 CONCLUSIONS.....	2
Summary of Planted Stem Vegetation Plot Results.....	3
4.0 REFERENCES .....	4

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Figures

Figure 1. Site Location

Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View

### Appendix B. General Tables

Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

Table 4. Project Attributes Table

### Appendix C. Vegetation Data

Table 5. Planted Woody Species

Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photographs

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Location and Setting

Restoration Systems, LLC has completed riparian buffer restoration at the Heath Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site (hereafter referred to as the “Site”) through the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) Full Delivery Process (RFP 16-001383) to provide 59.45 Riparian Buffer Mitigation Units. The Site is located approximately 3.4 miles southeast of Dover in Craven County (Figure 1, Appendix A). The Site is located in United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit and Targeted Local Watershed 03020202080010 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-04-08) of the Neuse River Basin (USGS 1974).

Directions to the Site from Kinston, North Carolina:

- Take 70 East for approximately 8 miles
- Take the Dover exit and follow Old 70/Wilson Street for approximately 4.3 miles east
- Turn right over the railroad tracks to wire gate.
- Site coordinates:
  - Latitude 35.19627°N, Longitude 77.38060°W (NAD83/WGS84)

### 1.2 Project Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of this project focused on improving local water quality, enhancing flood attenuation, and restoring aquatic and riparian habitat. These goals were accomplished by the following.

1. Removing nonpoint sources of pollution associated with agriculture production by a) ceasing the application of agricultural herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and other agricultural materials into and adjacent to Site ditches and open waterways and b) providing a vegetative buffer adjacent to ditches and waterways to treat surface runoff that may be laden with sediment and/or agricultural pollutants.
2. Reducing sedimentation/siltation within on-Site and downstream receiving waters by a) increasing retention time for surface waters entering and leaving the Site, b) reducing erosion associated with vegetation maintenance and agricultural plowing to Site ditches, and c) planting a forested vegetative buffer adjacent to Site ditches and waterways.
3. Promoting floodwater attenuation by ripping compacted soils and revegetating the Site to increase frictional resistance on floodwaters crossing the Site.
4. Providing terrestrial wildlife habitat including a forested riparian corridor within an area that was previously cleared and highly dissected by agricultural land use.

### 1.3 Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach

Prior to construction, the Site was characterized by ditched agricultural land used for row crop production. Land use practices including the maintenance and removal of vegetation, regular plowing, and use of agricultural chemicals had resulted in degraded water quality.

As constructed, Site activities restored historic riparian buffer functions by planting the entire 60.632-acre Site with native riparian vegetation. This resulted in 59.45 Riparian Buffer Mitigation Units (Table 1, Appendix B and Figure 2, Appendix A). Approximately 0.632 acres of the Site is surface water associated with Site ditches and 0.55 acres of the Site received no credit due to diffuse flow requirements. These areas were planted; however, the area is not eligible to provide credit. The target natural community consisted of Coastal Plain Bottomland Hardwood Forest (Schafale and Weakley 1990). Table 5 (Appendix C) outlines

woody species planted within the Site. Completed project activities, reporting history, completion dates, project contacts, and background information are summarized in Tables 2-4 (Appendix B).

## **2.0 MONITORING PLAN**

Monitoring of Site restoration efforts will be performed for vegetation components of the Site for five years or until success criteria are fulfilled. After planting was completed, an initial evaluation was performed to verify planting methods were successful and to determine initial species composition and density. Twenty-nine sample vegetation plots (10-meter by 10-meter) were installed within the Site as per guidelines established in CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0 (Lee et al. 2006). In each sample plot, vegetation parameters to be monitored include species composition and species density. Visual observations of the percent cover of shrub and herbaceous species will also be documented by photograph.

### **2.1 Vegetation Success Criteria**

Characteristic Tree Species include woody tree and shrub species planted at the Site (Table 5, Appendix C) or outlined for the appropriate plant community in Schafale and Weakley (1990). An average density of 320 stems per acre of Characteristic Tree Species must be surviving after year 5 monitoring.

### **2.2 Maintenance and Contingency**

In the event that success criteria are not fulfilled, a mechanism for contingency will be implemented. If vegetation success criteria are not achieved based on average density calculations from combined plots over the entire restoration area, supplemental planting may be performed with tree species approved by regulatory agencies. Supplemental planting will be performed as needed until achievement of vegetation success criteria.

### **2.3 Vegetation Sampling Results and Comparison to Success Criteria**

Quantitative sampling of vegetation was conducted in August 2011. Results are provided in Appendix C. Vegetation success criteria for year 2 (320 stems per acre) were exceeded for the 2011 annual monitoring year with an average density of 837 planted stems per acre across the Site. In addition, each individual plot met success criteria based on planted stems alone. Average densities of planted stems went up in year 2 in several plots including Plots 1, 3-5, 8, and 10-11. During year 1, browse by deer and rodents on young planted stems was abundant throughout the Site. Several stems within these plots were not counted, or counted as missing in year 1; however, many survived and were doing well in year 2. In addition, several stems that were thought to be dead during year 1 monitoring resprouted from the base and were counted during year 2 monitoring. Deer browse was prevalent again during year 2 monitoring.

## **3.0 CONCLUSIONS**

As a whole, the densities of vegetation plots across the Site were above the required 320 stems per acre in year 1-2 (2010-2011). In addition, each individual plot met success criteria based on planted stems alone.

**Summary of Planted Stem Vegetation Plot Results**

Plot	Planted Stems/Acre				
	Year 1 (2010)	Year 2 (2011)	Year 3 (2012)	Year 4 (2013)	Year 5 (2014)
1	890	1052			
2	971	971			
3	850	1012			
4	1012	1052			
5	931	1012			
6	850	850			
7	1012	971			
8	688	769			
9	850	850			
10	1012	1053			
11	931	1093			
12	850	809			
13	728	728			
14	890	890			
15	850	850			
16	728	728			
17	931	850			
18	728	728			
19	728	647			
20	1052	1012			
21	1052	1052			
22	931	931			
23	1012	971			
24	971	971			
25	486	445			
26	486	486			
27	486	486			
28	445	445			
29	607	567			
<b>Average Plots 1-29</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>837</b>			

#### 4.0 REFERENCES


- Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.0. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Ecosystem Enhancement Program. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2007. Redbook, Surface Waters and Wetlands Standards. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2008a. Draft North Carolina Water Quality Assessment and Impaired Waters List (2008 Integrated 305(b) and 303(d) Report) (online). Available: <http://h2o.enr.state.nc.us/tmdl/documents/B.Draft2008303dList.pdf> [November 10, 2008]. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2008b. Draft Basinwide Planning Program: Neuse River Basinwide Water Quality Plan-June 2008. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Schafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. 1990. Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina: Third Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1974. Hydrologic Unit Map - 1974. State of North Carolina.

**Appendix A.  
Figures**

**Figure 1. Site Location**  
**Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View**




Vegetation Plot Origin	Longitude	Latitude
1	-77.38147	35.19677
2	-77.38110	35.19763
3	-77.38093	35.19847
4	-77.38056	35.19940
5	-77.38007	35.20032
6	-77.38282	35.19733
7	-77.38210	35.19741
8	-77.38161	35.19829
9	-77.38214	35.19869
10	-77.38166	35.19960
11	-77.38123	35.20033
12	-77.38086	35.20100
13	-77.38351	35.19770
14	-77.38322	35.19831
15	-77.38303	35.19901
16	-77.38275	35.19979
17	-77.38237	35.20036
18	-77.38203	35.20099
19	-77.38460	35.19776
20	-77.38437	35.19838
21	-77.38405	35.19902
22	-77.38349	35.19968
23	-77.38318	35.20029
24	-77.38264	35.20135
25	-77.38531	35.19867
26	-77.38485	35.19942
27	-77.38445	35.20012
28	-77.38407	35.20083
29	-77.38347	35.20135



**Legend**

- Site Boundary = 60.632 acres
- Planted, No Credit Areas = 0.55 acre
- Surface Water = 0.632 acre
- Vegetation Plots
- ☆ Vegetation Plot Origins




20 Enterprise Street  
Suite 7  
Raleigh, NC 27607  
(919) 215-1693

**MONITORING PLAN VIEW  
HEATH  
RIPARIAN BUFFER MITIGATION SITE  
Craven County, North Carolina**

Dwn. by: CLF  
Date: Aug 2010  
Project: 10-001

FIGURE  
**2**




**Directions (From Kinston):**  
 Take 70 East from Kinston. Travel approximately 8 miles to the Dover exit off of 70. Follow Old 70/Wilson Street approximately 4.3 miles East. Turn Right over the railroad tracks to a wire gate.



**Restoration Systems, LLC**  
 1101 Haynes St. Suite 211  
 Raleigh, NC 27604  
 tel: 919.755.9490

**Figure 1:**  
 Site  
 Location

**Heath Riparian Buffer  
 Mitigation Site  
 Craven County, NC**



**Appendix B.  
General Tables**

**Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives**

**Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History**

**Table 3. Project Contacts Table**

**Table 4. Project Attributes Table**

**Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives**

Component Summation	
<b>Restoration Level</b>	Riparian buffer mitigation was completed by planting the entire 60-acre Site with native forest vegetation; credit was received for 59.45 acres of the Site.
Riparian Buffer Restoration	
<b>59.45 Buffer Mitigation Units</b>	

**Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History**

Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery
Final Restoration Plan	--	April 2010
Site Planting	--	Late winter/early spring 2010
Mitigation Plan	April 2010	August 2010
Year 1 Monitoring	September 2010	October 2010
Year 2 Monitoring	August 2011	August 2011

**Table 3. Project Contacts Table**

<b>Designer</b>	Restoration Systems, LLC 1101 Haynes Street, Suite 211 Raleigh, North Carolina 27604 (919) 755-9490
<b>Planting Contractor</b>	Carolina Silvics 908 Indian Trail Road Edenton, North Carolina 27932 Dwight McKinney (252) 482-8491
<b>Monitoring Performer</b>	Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, North Carolina 27603 Grant Lewis (919) 215-1693

**Table 4. Project Attribute Table**

Project County	Craven County, North Carolina
Physiographic Region	Coastal Plain
Ecoregion	Carolina Flatwoods and Mid-Atlantic Floodplains/Low Terrace
Project River Basin	Neuse
USGS 14-digit HUC	03020202080010
NCDWQ Subbasin	03-04-08
Within EEP Watershed Plan Extent?	Yes-Targeted Local Watershed
WRC Class	Warm
% of project easement fenced	0 %
Beaver activity observed during design phase	No

**Appendix C.  
Vegetation Data**

**Table 5. Planted Woody Species  
Vegetation Survey Data Tables  
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photographs**

**Table 5. Planted Woody Vegetation**

Species	Quantity
American elm ( <i>Ulmus americana</i> )	6300
Black gum ( <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i> )	3200
Green ash ( <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i> )	9500
Ironwood ( <i>Carpinus caroliniana</i> )	3200
Mockernut hickory ( <i>Carya tomentosa</i> )	6300
Sugarberry ( <i>Celtis laevigata</i> )	3200
Swamp chestnut oak ( <i>Quercus michauxii</i> )	9500
Sweetbay magnolia ( <i>Magnolia virginiana</i> )	3200
Water oak ( <i>Quercus nigra</i> )	6300
Willow oak ( <i>Quercus phellos</i> )	9500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60,200</b>

**CVS Database Output**

Living planted stems, excluding live stakes, per acre: Negative (red) numbers indicate the project failed to reach requirements in a particular year.

Project Code	Project Name	River Basin	Year 1	Year 2
Heath	Heath	Neuse	826.12	838.68

Total stems, including planted stems of all kinds (including live stakes) and natural/volunteer stems:

Project Code	Project Name	River Basin	Year 1	Year 2
Heath	Heath	Neuse	909.8449629	1024.273317

**Vigor**

Vigor	Count	Percent
0	13	2
1	0	0
2	6	0.9
3	335	51.1
4	260	39.7

**Damage**

Damage	Count	Percent Of Stems
(no damage)	582	88.9
Insects	6	0.9
Deer	63	9.6
Unknown	2	0.3
Human Trampled	2	0.3

### Vigor by Species

Species	CommonName	4	3	2	1	0	Missing	Unknown
<i>Betula nigra</i>	River birch	1	1					
<i>Carya ovata</i>	shagbark hickory		1					
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	sugarberry	7	8			1		
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	39	66			1	7	
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	blackgum	11	36	2		2	2	
<i>Persea palustris</i>	swamp bay		1					
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	76	66			2	6	
<i>Quercus nigra</i>	water oak	30	33				4	
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	50	52				5	
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American hornbeam	4	4				1	
<i>Quercus</i>	oak	8	9			3	4	
<i>Carya</i>	hickory		5			1		
<i>Magnolia virginiana</i>	sweetbay	7	3			1	3	
<i>Nyssa</i>	tupelo	1	2	2		1		
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American	1						
<i>Ulmus</i>	elm	2	3	1				
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	23	44	1			7	
Unknown			1			1	2	
<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>41</b>	

## Damage by Species

Species	CommonName	Count of Damage Categories	(no damage)	Deer	Human Trampled	Insects	Unknown
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	0	2				
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American hornbeam	1	8	1			
<i>Carya</i>	hickory	3	3	3			
<i>Carya ovata</i>	mockernut hickory	0	1				
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	sugarberry	3	13	2	1		
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	24	89	24			
<i>Magnolia virginiana</i>	sweetbay	0	14				
<i>Nyssa</i>	tupelo	2	4	1			1
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	blackgum	14	39	12	1		1
<i>Persea palustris</i>	swamp bay	0	1				
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	0	1				
<i>Quercus</i>	oak	1	23	1			
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	8	142	4		4	
<i>Quercus nigra</i>	water oak	3	64	2		1	
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	3	104	2		1	
<i>Ulmus</i>	elm	1	5	1			
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	10	65	10			
Unknown		0	4				
<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>



### Damage by Plot

plot	Count of Damage Categories	(no damage)	Deer	Human Trampled	Insects	Unknown
Heath-AXE-0001-year:2	2	26	1		1	
Heath-AXE-0002-year:2	1	28			1	
Heath-AXE-0003-year:2	2	24	2			
Heath-AXE-0004-year:2	2	25	2			
Heath-AXE-0005-year:2	1	27			1	
Heath-AXE-0006-year:2	3	23	2			1
Heath-AXE-0007-year:2	5	20	3		1	1
Heath-AXE-0008-year:2	5	15	3	1	1	
Heath-AXE-0009-year:2	3	20	3			
Heath-AXE-0010-year:2	1	29	1			
Heath-AXE-0011-year:2	2	25	1	1		
Heath-AXE-0012-year:2	2	20	2			
Heath-AXE-0013-year:2	1	21	1			
Heath-AXE-0014-year:2	1	24	1			
Heath-AXE-0015-year:2	4	17	4			
Heath-AXE-0016-year:2	0	19				
Heath-AXE-0017-year:2	4	19	4			
Heath-AXE-0018-year:2	0	20				
Heath-AXE-0019-year:2	2	18	1		1	
Heath-AXE-0020-year:2	4	22	4			
Heath-AXE-0021-year:2	3	23	3			
Heath-AXE-0022-year:2	4	20	4			
Heath-AXE-0023-year:2	3	26	3			
Heath-AXE-0024-year:2	1	26	1			
Heath-AXE-0025-year:2	3	9	3			
Heath-AXE-0026-year:2	7	5	7			
Heath-AXE-0027-year:2	2	10	2			
Heath-AXE-0028-year:2	2	9	2			
Heath-AXE-0029-year:2	3	12	3			
<b>29</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>

## Plot Information

Plot	Plot Level	Year	Planted Living Stems	Planted Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes	Dead/Missing Stems	Natural (Volunteer) Stems	Total Living Stems	Total Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes	Planted Living Stems per ACRE	Planted Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes PER ACRE	Natural (Volunteer) Stems PER ACRE	Total Living Stems PER ACRE	Total Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes PER ACRE	# species
0001	2	2	26	26	2	4	30	30	1052	1052	162	1214	1214	7
0002	2	2	24	24	5	26	50	50	971	971	1052	2023	2023	6
0003	2	2	25	25	1	1	26	26	1012	1012	40	1052	1052	6
0004	2	2	26	26	1	5	31	31	1052	1052	202	1255	1255	6
0005	2	2	25	25	3	7	32	32	1012	1012	283	1295	1295	6
0006	2	2	21	21	5	5	26	26	850	850	202	1052	1052	7
0007	2	2	24	24	1	4	28	28	971	971	162	1133	1133	10
0008	2	2	19	19	1	1	20	20	769	769	40	809	809	6
0009	2	2	21	21	2	2	23	23	850	850	81	931	931	7
0010	2	2	27	27	3	0	27	27	1093	1093	0	1093	1093	5
0011	2	2	27	27	0	0	27	27	1093	1093	0	1093	1093	4
0012	2	2	20	20	2	5	25	25	809	809	202	1012	1012	7
0013	2	2	18	18	4	13	31	31	728	728	526	1255	1255	6
0014	2	2	22	22	3	2	24	24	890	890	81	971	971	6
0015	2	2	21	21	0	3	24	24	850	850	121	971	971	6
0016	2	2	18	18	1	3	21	21	728	728	121	850	850	6
0017	2	2	21	21	2	0	21	21	850	850	0	850	850	6
0018	2	2	18	18	2	0	18	18	728	728	0	728	728	6
0019	2	2	16	16	4	5	21	21	647	647	202	850	850	4
0020	2	2	25	25	1	9	34	34	1012	1012	364	1376	1376	7
0021	2	2	26	26	0	3	29	29	1052	1052	121	1174	1174	5
0023	2	2	23	23	1	0	23	23	931	931	0	931	931	7
0023	2	2	24	24	5	0	24	24	971	971	0	971	971	6

**Plot Information (continued)**






<b>Plot</b>	<b>Plot Level</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planted Living Stems</b>	<b>Planted Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes</b>	<b>Dead/Missing Stems</b>	<b>Natural (Volunteer) Stems</b>	<b>Total Living Stems</b>	<b>Total Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes</b>	<b>Planted Living Stems per ACRE</b>	<b>Planted Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes PER ACRE</b>	<b>Natural (Volunteer) Stems PER ACRE</b>	<b>Total Living Stems PER ACRE</b>	<b>Total Living Stems EXCLUDING Live Stakes PER ACRE</b>	<b># species</b>
0024	2	2	24	24	3	12	36	36	971	971	486	1457	1457	6
0025	2	2	11	11	1	8	19	19	445	445	324	769	769	5
0026	2	2	12	12	0	6	18	18	486	486	243	728	728	4
0027	2	2	12	12	0	7	19	19	486	486	283	769	769	6
0028	2	2	11	11	0	2	13	13	445	445	81	526	526	3
0029	2	2	14	14	1	0	14	14	567	567	0	567	567	7

Planted Stems by Plot





Species	Common Name	Stems	# plots	Avg # stems	0001	0002	0003	0004	0005	0006	0007	0008	0009	0010	0011	0012	0013	0014	0015	0016	0017	0018	0019	0020	0021	0022	0023	0024	0025	0026	0027	0028	0029	
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	2	2	1					1		1																							
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American hornbeam	8	5	1.6	2					3	1		1																				1	
<i>Carya</i>	hickory	5	4	1.25						1			1						2				1											
<i>Carya ovata</i>	shagbark hickory	1	1	1							1																							
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	sugarberry	15	6	2.5					3			4		2	2	1		3																
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	105	26	4.04		2	3	5	1	2	4	2	7	5		2	3	1		2	4	4	5	3	11	8	10	2	4	2	5	5	3	
<i>Magnolia virginiana</i>	sweetbay	10	8	1.25	1	2		2	1										1						1			1					1	
<i>Nyssa</i>	tupelo	5	2	2.5							1										4													
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	blackgum	49	12	4.08			2			4	2	6	5	9	6	3			3	1	4	4												
<i>Persea palustris</i>	swamp bay	1	1	1																			1											
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	1	1	1						1																								
<i>Quercus</i>	oak	17	12	1.42	2			1			1						3		2	1	1				1	1	1			1			2	
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	142	26	5.46	11	6	8	8	18	4	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	9	10	3	6	8	3	3	4	7	13	1		1			
<i>Quercus nigra</i>	water oak	63	19	3.32	2	3					10	3	1			2		1		5	1		6	5	5	3	5	2	3	1	4	1		
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	102	25	4.08	3	1	7	3		6	2	2	4	10	16	7	4	10	3	2		2	1	2	3	2	1	2		3	1		5	
<i>Ulmus</i>	elm	6	3	2			2										1	3																
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	68	19	3.58	5	10	3	7	1							1	7	1					2	9	4	2	2	1	3	4	3	2	1	
Unknown		1	1	1										1																				
<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>18</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	









**Heath  
Year 2 (2011)  
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos  
Taken August 2011**



**Heath  
Year 2 (2011)  
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos  
Taken August 2011  
(continued)**



**Heath  
Year 2 (2011)  
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos  
Taken August 2011  
(continued)**





**Heath  
Year 2 (2011)  
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos  
Taken August 2011  
(continued)**

