




**2010 (Year 3) Monitoring Report
Santosh Landfill
Wetland Mitigation Project
Scappoose, Oregon**



**Prepared for
Oregon Department of
Environmental Quality**



**December 28, 2010
15563-03/Task 2**





**2010 (Year 3) Monitoring Report
Santosh Landfill
Wetland Mitigation Project
Scappoose, Oregon**

**Prepared for
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality**

**December 28, 2010
15563-03/Task 2**

Prepared by
Hart Crowser, Inc.

Celina Abercrombie
Wetland Biologist

Craig A. Dockter, RG
Task Order Manager

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 <i>Background</i>	1
1.2 <i>Project Goals and Objectives</i>	2
2.0 MONITORING LOCATIONS AND METHODS	3
2.1 <i>Wetland Hydrology Monitoring</i>	3
2.2 <i>Vegetation Monitoring Transects</i>	3
2.3 <i>Photo Points</i>	4
3.0 RESULTS	4
3.1 <i>Hydrology</i>	4
3.2 <i>Vegetation Monitoring</i>	5
3.3 <i>Cattle Exclusion Fencing</i>	8
3.4 <i>Wildlife Observations</i>	8
4.0 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS	8
5.0 REFERENCES	9

TABLES

1	Schedule for Annual Monitoring
2	Summary of Year 3 Monitoring Results Compared with Performance Standards
3	Summary of Year 3 Vegetation Survival Monitoring Results
4	Summary of Year 3 Vegetation Monitoring Results

FIGURES

1	Site Location Map
2	Wetland Monitoring Plan

APPENDIX A VEGETATION MONITORING DATA SHEET

APPENDIX B PHOTOGRAPHS

**2010 (YEAR 3) MONITORING REPORT
SANTOSH LANDFILL
WETLAND MITIGATION PROJECT
SCAPPOOSE, OREGON**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Year 3 monitoring report documents the mitigation site conditions in 2010 at the Santosh Landfill in Scappoose, Oregon. The Santosh Landfill is currently being maintained by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The project area is located west of Hogan Ranch Road across from the Glacier Northwest facility, and is located in Section 31 of Township 4 North, Range 1 West in Scappoose, Oregon (Figure 1).

In this report, we summarize the site conditions for the wetland enhancement area and present results of the monitoring compared to the performance standards described in the approved mitigation plan. This monitoring report is being submitted to comply with permit conditions. We will complete future mitigation monitoring reports in years 4 and 5. The monitoring schedule is presented in Table 1.

1.1 Background

In 2007, we completed repair of leachate seeps observed at three locations along the southern perimeter of the landfill. The repair work resulted in the filling of 0.04 acres or 1,900 square feet of wetland used as grazed pasture.

We identified an area located near the southwestern corner of the landfill as a mitigation site for the permanent wetland impacts. The mitigation site includes 0.13 acre (5,700 square feet) of wetland enhancement. The wetland mitigation plan was designed to replace the lost wetland area and provide additional wetland functions by enhancing the existing degraded wetland. The approved mitigation plan which included grading, plantings, and fencing was implemented in 2007.

Prolonged surface water inundation from November 2007 through a large portion of 2008 resulted in plant loss within the mitigation area. While the high water levels appeared to affect many of the trees and shrubs planted in the mitigation area, the emergent (herbaceous) vegetation remained healthy and growing well. In November 2008, replacement plant stock was installed

throughout the site. The replanting efforts appear to have been largely successful resulting in increased coverage of native plants.

This compensatory wetland monitoring report has been prepared to meet the permit requirements for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) under wetland fill application number 38390-RF. We present the results of our Year 3 monitoring in Section 3.

1.2 Project Goals and Objectives

The project goals and objectives include providing mitigation for project impacts in the form of enhancement of the existing wetland complex adjacent to the Santosh Landfill to achieve “no net loss” of wetland functions and to increase wetland functions through the creation of more diverse habitat and plant communities. The project provides vegetation and hydrologic enhancements by improving water quality, increasing flood storage, and enhancing the natural biological support functions of the wetland compared to pre-construction conditions.

The main project goals include: 1) enhancing the degraded wetland through installation of native vegetation; 2) creating a permanently inundated area; and 3) providing wildlife habitat. We identified performance criteria and established standards for each criterion to evaluate the success of the wetland mitigation in the approved Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plan (Hart Crowser 2007). The four performance criteria and their standards for this wetland enhancement project include:

- Total areal cover of native plants: 60 to 80 percent in Year 3 to a minimum of 80 percent in Year 5;
- Survival of installed plants: 80 percent in Year 3 and each subsequent year;
- Total areal cover of invasive species: less than 20 percent each year; and
- Presence of inundation within the open water portion of the mitigation area during the early growing season and late summer.

This monitoring report describes the project’s progress in achieving the goals and objectives outlined in the approved mitigation plan as well as the above performance standards to measure the project’s success over time.

2.0 MONITORING LOCATIONS AND METHODS

The DSL requires a minimum 5-year monitoring period for mitigation activities (OAR 141-085-0151(3)). Mitigation site monitoring includes quantitative and qualitative data collection to measure the success of the proposed mitigation.

2.1 *Wetland Hydrology Monitoring*

A number of qualitative and quantitative observations on hydrology were recorded during our spring hydrology site visit and fall vegetation data collection. Hydrology observations included surface water coverage, surface water depth, and depth to groundwater in each planting area.

2.2 *Vegetation Monitoring Transects*

The wetland enhancement plant communities were sampled along three permanent vegetation transects that provide coverage of the forested, scrub/shrub, and emergent plant communities. A tape measure was extended along each vegetation transect to locate the sample plots. Transect lengths measured 90 feet for transects T1 and T3, and 57 feet for transect T2 (Figure 2). Within each transect, we established 5 permanent quadrants. We used the sample plot locations from Year 1 in order to monitor and compare progress along each transect. Sample plots for native herbs were measured using a 0.25-square meter rectangular quadrant, and sample plots for trees and shrubs were measured using a 1-meter circular quadrant. We used the cattle exclusion fencing as a base point for each transect location to ensure the same locations are monitored each year.

We visually evaluated the wetland enhancement plantings along each transect to determine the rate of survival, health, and vigor. Plants were recorded as live, stressed, or dead/dying. Plant survival was calculated by dividing the number of installed living plants by the number of initially installed plants.

We visually estimated the percent cover of individual plant species present within each quadrant. Data collection consisted of species composition and percent cover, total percent plant cover, percent cover of volunteer plants, and percent cover of invasive species. Species coverage values were summed to determine the total areal coverage in each quadrant.

2.3 Photo Points

We established two photo points (P1 and P2) within the mitigation area. We used the cattle exclusion fencing as a base point and permanent location for the photo points (Figure 2).

3.0 RESULTS

Conditions at the Santosh Landfill mitigation site shows improvement since Year 1, and mitigation activities have been successful on many levels over the past two years. In general, the wetland mitigation area has met two out of four performance criteria (areal cover of invasive weeds, and hydrology) set forth in the mitigation plan.

3.1 Hydrology

A field visit was completed by DEQ on April 14, 2010, to observe water levels in the mitigation area. At the time of the site visit, water covered the northern (approximately one half) portion of the mitigation area. The surface water levels measured in the wetland mitigation area were an average of 6 inches in depth along the northwestern boundary, and approximately 3 feet deep in the open water (central) portion of the site and at the northern corner of the mitigation area. Where surface water was not present in the mitigation area, several soil pits were dug to examine groundwater levels. Groundwater levels within the southern, eastern and higher elevation portions of the mitigation area ranged from approximately 6 to 11 inches below ground surface.

In addition to examining wetland hydrology, soils were evaluated for hydric indicators in the hydrology soil pits. Soils consisted of grey silt (gleyed) with many, medium to coarse, prominent redoximorphic concentrations (mottles).

Hydrology observations were also completed during our late summer vegetation monitoring site visit. During the visit, we observed full inundation of the hydrology enhancement or open water area of the mitigation site. In addition, the soil was saturated in the root zone and saturated within approximately 8 to 14 inches of the soil surface throughout the majority of the site.

Given the positive observations and indications of inundation and saturation observed during the spring and late summer field visits, the site met the wetland hydrology requirements. Furthermore, positive indicators of hydric soils within the drier and southern portion of the mitigation area indicate that adequate

hydrology is present throughout the mitigation area in the early growing season as well as other times of the year.

3.2 Vegetation Monitoring

A late summer field visit was completed on September 21, 2010, to document vegetation conditions at the mitigation site. Areal cover provided by native plants was estimated using a sample plot method. Three transects (T1, T2, and T3) were evaluated in the wetland mitigation area (Figure 2). In addition, five sample plots along each transect were evaluated to estimate the cover of native and non-native trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation.

The site contains a variety of wetland plant communities including forested, scrub/shrub, and emergent areas. We describe plant survival and provide general observations in each of these three communities below followed by a summary of the site's overall performance.

The results of the vegetation monitoring compared to the performance standards are presented in Table 2. A summary of vegetation survival is provided in Table 3 and a summary of sample plot monitoring results in Table 4. Field data are presented in Appendix A. Photographs of site conditions during our monitoring visit are shown in Appendix B.

3.2.1 Forested Zone

Trees installed in the forested zone included Oregon ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*), Pacific willow (*Salix lasiandra*), and black cottonwood (*Populus balsamifera*). Survival of installed trees ranged from 30 to 78 percent, which includes the replanting efforts performed in late 2008. Pacific willow and black cottonwood performed the best within the forested zone, and only 30 percent of the Oregon ash survived. The majority of the remaining trees in the forested zone appeared healthy.

In general, the forested zone is performing at a moderate level. Due to the replanting efforts in 2008, growth of forested vegetation is progressing slower than expected; however, we anticipate that vegetation within this zone will continue to spread over time.

3.2.2 Scrub/Shrub Zone

Shrubs installed in the scrub/shrub zone included Hooker's willow (*Salix hookeriana*), Scouler's willow (*Salix scouleriana*), Columbia River willow (*Salix fluviatilis*), Sitka willow (*Salix sitchensis*), hardhack (*Spiraea douglasii*), and

swamp rose (*Rosa pisocarpa*). Survival of installed shrubs ranged from 9 to 92 percent. Willows and hardhack performed the best within this zone and had survival rates of greater than 75 percent. The majority of the shrubs appeared healthy and were spreading laterally and vertically.

In general, the scrub/shrub zone is performing at a moderate level. We anticipate that vegetation within this zone will continue to spread over time providing an increase in native plant coverage.

Our evaluation of plant survival is based on the quantity of live trees and shrubs in the mitigation area. The total percent survival of installed trees and shrubs is approximately 75 percent, a slight increase from Year 2.

The total native plant areal cover criterion includes trees and shrubs as well as emergent and grass species at the site. The average percent cover of trees and shrubs in the mitigation area is approximately 19 percent and did not change from Year 2. The total combined areal cover of native plants will be discussed in the Emergent Zone and Vegetation Summary sections (3.2.3 and 3.2.6) of this report. The percent coverage reflects a 13 percent increase in cover since 2008. Slow plant growth in the tree and shrub strata is directly related to the low rate of tree and shrub survival in Year 1.

3.2.3 Emergent Zone

Emergent and grass species were evaluated based on percent coverage in the established monitoring transects. We documented the average cover of native emergents and grasses to be approximately 28 percent along the wetland monitoring transects, and is a slight increase from Year 2. The most common emergent species included creeping spikerush (*Eleocharis palustris*) and pointed rush (*Juncus oxymersis*). In addition to these species, we observed sedge species (*Carex* sp.) and bulrush species (*Scirpus* sp.) throughout the site. These emergent species appeared healthy and spreading at a moderate rate. We also documented the percent cover of seeded grass species in the mitigation area. Native grass species were included in our evaluation of emergent and herbaceous vegetation. The most common grass species was water foxtail (*Alopecurus geniculatus*). The grass species also appeared to be colonizing the area at a moderate rate.

The presence of a variety of native and non-native (naturalized) plant species were noted as dominating portions of the mitigation area. The dominant species included common purslane (*Portulaca oleracea*) and waterpepper (*Polygonum*

hydropiper). These species are also present within the adjacent wetland areas. We will continue to monitor these species within the mitigation area.

The total average areal cover of native plants (trees, shrubs, emergents, and grasses) in the mitigation area is approximately 47 percent. The current cover provided by native vegetation meets the Year 2 performance criterion but does not meet the Year 3 criterion. This is likely attributed to the low survival rates during Year 1.

3.2.4 Open Water Zone

The open water portion of the mitigation area was visually evaluated for aquatic and emergent plant species. A variety of aquatic species, emergent plants and grasses were observed colonizing the edge of the open water area.

3.2.5 Invasive Plants

Limited quantities of invasive plant species were observed in the wetland mitigation area. A few small patches of reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) were noted. We anticipate that regular maintenance of the area will maintain coverage of invasive plants below the required 20 percent performance criterion.

The areas containing bare ground and sparse vegetation that were observed throughout the wetland mitigation area in 2008 appeared to be colonized by emergent and grass species. Limited areas of bare ground were observed and were primarily attributed to cattle entering the mitigation area (see discussion in Section 3.3).

3.2.6 Vegetation Summary

The result of the vegetation inspection within the mitigation area is summarized below:

- Total areal cover of native plants was 47 percent, and does not meet the Year 3 goal of 60 to 80 percent;
- Survival of installed plants was 75 percent, and is slightly below the Year 3 goal of 80 percent; and
- Total areal cover of invasive species was less than 1 percent and easily meets the yearly goal of 20 percent.

We observed a variety of native tree, shrub, emergent and grass species that appear to be spreading, and we anticipate that these species will continue to colonize the area.

3.3 Cattle Exclusion Fencing

The cattle exclusion fence around the wetland mitigation area is effectively excluding cattle from the site. The loose wires observed in 2009 were repaired. We recommend examining the fence during the spring after water levels have dropped as well as during annual maintenance activities to ensure that it remains in good condition and effectively excludes cattle from the mitigation site.

3.4 Wildlife Observations

Wildlife observations were also recorded during the spring and late summer site visits. Species observed within the mitigation site within emergent and open water areas included a variety of wildlife including mallard ducks (*Anas platyrhynchos*), sandpiper (*Actitis hypoleucos*), rough legged hawk (*Buteo lagopus*), common egret (*Casmerodius albus*), wood duck (*Aix sponsa*), garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*), and Pacific chorus frog (*Pseudacris regilla*). Pacific chorus frog is a common species found throughout the adjacent wetland area. In addition, great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), common robin (*Turdus migratorius*), flicker (*Colaptes* sp.), and swallow (*Hirundo* sp.) were observed within the large wetland complex adjacent to the mitigation area.

We also noted the presence of nutria (*Myocastor coypus*) within the wetland mitigation area. Tracks and burrows were observed along the edge of the open water area. Burrows have resulted in soft area along the edge of the open water area. We recommend continued monitoring of this species and its use of the site.

4.0 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend regular maintenance of the mitigation area including weeding and invasive species removal. No additional plantings are recommended at this time.

Considering the positive determination of hydrology and soils, we request alleviation of the hydrology monitoring requirements at the mitigation site for the remainder of the monitoring period.

We will continue to monitor vegetation within the enhancement area in 2011 (Year 4).

5.0 REFERENCES

Hart Crowser, Inc., 2007. Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Plan for the Santosh Landfill. Beaverton, Oregon.

Hart Crowser, Inc., 2008. As-Built Report for the Santosh Landfill Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Project. Beaverton, Oregon.

Hart Crowser, Inc., 2008. 2008 (Year 1) Monitoring Report for the Santosh Landfill Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Project. Beaverton, Oregon.

Hart Crowser, Inc., 2009. 2009 (Year 2) Monitoring Report for the Santosh Landfill Compensatory Wetland Mitigation Project. Beaverton, Oregon.

**Table 1 – Schedule for Annual Monitoring
Santosh Landfill Wetland Mitigation
Scappoose, Oregon**

Monitoring Element	Year				
	2008 (Year 1)	2009 (Year 2)	2010 (Year 3)	2011 (Year 4)	2012 (Year 5)
Hydrology Monitoring (Midspring)	✓	✓	✓	○	○
Vegetation Monitoring (Late Summer)	✓	✓	✓	○	○
Annual Monitoring Report (by December 31)	✓	✓	✓	○	○

✓ - completed to date

○ - scheduled for completion

**Table 2 – Summary of Year 3 Monitoring Results
 Compared with Performance Standards
 Santosh Landfill Wetland Mitigation
 Scappoose, Oregon**

Criterion	Performance Standard (Year 3)	Results Summary	Performance Standard Met?
Total areal cover of native plants in percent	60 to 80	47	No
Survival of installed plants in percent	80	75	No
Total areal cover of invasive weeds in percent	0 to 20	1	Yes
Hydrology	Permanent inundation in open water area 0 to 20 percent cover of invasive plants	Inundation and saturated soil at the surface 0	Yes

Note: Replacement trees and shrubs were installed in the mitigation area in November 2008.

**Table 3 – Summary of Year 3 Vegetation Survival Monitoring Results
Santosh Landfill Wetland Mitigation
Scappoose, Oregon**




Survival of Planted Native Trees and Shrubs						
Species	Live	Stressed or Dying	Dead	Total Quantity Survived	Total Quantity Planted	Survival Rate (percent)
Oregon ash (<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>)	3	---	---	3	10	30
willow (<i>Salix lasiandra</i> , <i>S. hookeriana</i> , <i>S.</i> <i>fluviatilis</i> , <i>S. sitchensis</i> , <i>S. scouleriana</i>)	140	---	---	140	179	78
Black cottonwood (<i>Populus balsamifera</i>)	6	---	---	6	10	60
Swamp rose (<i>Rosa pisocarpa</i>)	1	---	---	1	11	9
Hardhack (<i>Spiraea douglasii</i>)	46	---	---	46	50	92
Total	196	---	---	196	260	75


**Table 4 – Summary of Year 3 Vegetation Monitoring Results
Santosh Landfill Wetland Mitigation
Scappoose, Oregon**

Sample Plot Data in Average Percent Cover				
	Wetland Monitoring Transects			
	T1	T2	T3	Total Average
Native Plants (trees, shrubs, emergents and grasses)	59	63	19	47
Other Native and Non-Native Plants	34	60	68	54
Invasive Weeds ^a	1	2	0	1


^a Invasive weeds may include Himalayan blackberry, reed canarygrass, and bittersweet nightshade.

F:\Data\Jobs\DEQ\15563-03 Santosh Landfill\Task 2 Wetland Monitoring\3rd Year Report\Figures - Wetland Monitoring\155630302_001 (Site Location).cdr




Santosh Landfill Scappoose, Oregon	
Site Location Map	
15563-03/Task 2	12/10
	Figure 1

Note: Base map prepared from the USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle of St. Helens, Oregon, dated 1990.



- PFO Palustrine Forested
- PSS Palustrine Scrub/Shrub
- PEM Palustrine Emergent
- LWD Large Woody Debris
- P2 Photo Point Location and Number
- → Transect Location and Direction (Sample Plot Locations are Listed in Appendix A)
- S1 S1 Sample Plot Location



Santosh Landfill Scappoose, Oregon	
Wetland Monitoring Plan	
15563-03/Task 2	12/10
 HARTCROWSER	Figure 2

APPENDIX A
VEGETATION MONITORING DATA SHEET

**APPENDIX B
PHOTOGRAPHS**



Photograph 1 – Forested and scrub/shrub vegetation is growing and spreading at monitoring Transect T2 (view looking northwest).



Photograph 2 – Emergent area of wetland with a forested riparian area developing in the foreground, in contrast to the established forested and scrub/shrub plant community in the background (taken from Photo Point P1, view looking north).



Photograph 3 – The primarily emergent plant community along the edge of the open water from photo point P2 (view looking northeast).



Photograph 4 – An overview of the mitigation site from photo point P2 (view looking east).