

Park Service is responsible for all site improvements and maintenance following Fall 1998.

A visit to the site during the summer of 2000 showed continued good establishment. The protective cages had been removed and some of the species had been heavily browsed. Those that were thorny like the *Ribes* and *Rubus* had not been browsed and were of good size.

### CONCLUSION

Short-term project management and propagation objectives were accomplished. Follow-up monitoring over the next several years will assess the long-term success of this approach and project.

---

## Questions/Answers: General Session IV

**Martha Booz:** Did you water the salt marsh plants with salt water?

**Patricia Kreiberg:** They were all irrigated with fresh well water. We used 44 parts per thousand in the salt-water soak since in a salt marsh situation the water can get as high as 55 parts per thousand. Sea water is 35 parts per thousand so we chose an intermediate concentration.

**Kristin Yanker-Hansen:** Do you ever use soil from a restoration site to start the plants before they are permanently planted in the field?

**Truman Young:** That's an intriguing idea. As soon as you dig field soil up you change its structure. This can affect the success of the restoration project.

**Amelia Pohl:** What containers were used in your study?

**Truman Young:** There were several different kinds, rose pots and tree pots.

**Truman Young for Ann Chandler:** I have a question about Glacier Point. Was soil compaction a problem at that site and, if so, was anything done about it?

**Ann Chandler:** The soil was very compacted and it was extensively reworked.

**Melanie Baer-Keeley:** Were the horticultural requirements for the plants primary in the planning and development of the project?

**Ann Chandler:** This project went like clockwork which isn't always the case. Plant selection was excellent as was the site plan. Plenty of time (2 years) was given for selecting and propagating plants that were used in the project.