1   **Properties of native plant communities do not determine exotic success**

2   **during early forest succession**

3

4

5   **Aldo Compagnoni* and Charles B. Halpern**

6   *College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Box 352100,*

7   *Seattle, Washington, 98195-2100, USA*

8

9

10   *Email: aldo_compagnoni@yahoo.com, chalpern@u.washington.edu*

11

12

13   *Current address: *College of Natural Resources, 5230 Old Main Hill, Utah State University,*

14   *Logan, Utah 84322-5230, USA*

Abstract. Considerable research has been devoted to understanding how plant invasions are influenced by properties of the native community and to the traits of exotic species that contribute to successful invasion. Studies of invasibility are common in successionally stable grasslands, but rare in recently disturbed or seral forests. We used 16 yr of species richness and abundance data from 1-m^2 plots in a clearcut and burned forest in the Cascade Range of western Oregon to address the following questions: (1) Is invasion success correlated with properties of the native community? Are correlations stronger among pools of functionally similar taxa (i.e., exotic and native annuals)? Do these relationships change over successional time? (2) Does exotic abundance increase with removal of potentially dominant native species? (3) Do the population dynamics of exotic and native species differ, suggesting that exotics are more successful colonists? Exotics were primarily annual and biennial species. Regardless of the measure of success (richness, cover, biomass, or density) or successional stage, most correlations between exotics and natives were non-significant. Exotic and native annuals showed positive correlations during mid-succession, but these were attributed to shared associations with bare ground rather than to direct biotic interactions. At peak abundance, neither cover nor density of exotics differed between controls and plots from which native, mid-successional dominants were removed. Tests comparing nine measures of population performance (representing the pace, magnitude, and duration of population growth) revealed no significant differences between native and exotic species. In this early successional system, local richness and abundance of exotics are not explained by properties of the native community, by the presence of dominant native species, or by superior colonizing ability among exotics species. Instead natives and exotics exhibit individualistic patterns of increase and decline suggesting similar sets of life-history traits leading to similar successional roles.

1 Introduction

2 Plant invasions have become the focus of considerable societal concern and ecological research.

3 This reflects the increasing impacts of invasions, both ecological (Vitousek et al. 1997) and

4 economic (Pimentel et al. 2005), and the opportunity to use invasive species to explore

5 fundamental questions in ecology (Sax et al. 2007). Considerable research has examined how

6 invasibility is influenced by properties of the recipient community, and in particular, by the

7 richness of native species (e.g., Tilman 1997, Levine and D'Antonio 1999, Stohlgren et al. 1999,

8 Levine 2000). Elton (1958) first hypothesized that invasibility is inversely related to species

9 richness, with species-rich communities better able to preempt resources. This view has been

10 supported by subsequent theories (e.g., MacArthur 1970, Tilman 2004) that highlight the

11 importance of resource competition in structuring natural communities. These posit that

12 biodiversity should limit invasion of non-native species through competition for resources.

13   Field studies have generally documented negative relationships between richness of native

14 and non-native species at small spatial scales (e.g., plots of one to several square meters;

15 Stohlgren et al. 1999, Levine 2000), but positive relationships at larger scales (e.g., landscapes;

16 Stohlgren et al. 1999, Levine 2000). The consistency of empirical and theoretical studies at

17 small, but not large spatial scales reflects the short distances over which plants compete for

18 resources (Levine and D'Antonio 1999). Although resource competition is central to theories on

19 non-native plant invasions, few studies have considered how community properties other than

20 richness or evenness limit the success of invasive species. If resource availability varies with

21 competition intensity (Davis et al. 1998), community properties related to resource preemption,

22 such as plant cover or biomass, should exert strong controls on invasion.

23   In addition to the effects of native plant abundance, the traits of resident species may be

1   critical to limiting invasions. Theoretical models (Tilman 2004) and field experiments (Fragione

2   et al. 2003) suggest that invaders should be most limited by natives that share similar functional

3   traits (e.g., timing of life-history events, responses to disturbance, and resource use). Thus,

4   exotic annuals should be most responsive to the diversity or abundance of native annuals. At the

5   same time, invasion success may be linked to the abundance of community dominants,

6   regardless of their functional traits. Dominant species can suppress invaders because they are

7   highly competitive (Fargione and Tilman 2005), or because they can modify other ecosystem

8   processes or properties (e.g., herbivory, soil biota, or allelochemicals; Emery and Gross 2007).

9   An alternative line of research has explored how the life-history traits of exotic species

10   contribute to successful colonization. Exotics could have an advantage over natives because they

11   (1) are able to escape natural enemies outside of their native ranges (Keane and Crawley 2002),

12   (2) have traits or combinations of traits that are not represented in the resident community

13   (Vitousek et al. 1987b), or (3) are competitively superior to natives (Funk and Vitousek 2007).

14   Alternatively, exotics and natives might not show consistent differences in functional traits

15   (Thompson et al. 1995) but instead, both could be colonists with similar traits and processes

16   leading to successful establishment (Davis et al. 2000, Meiners 2007).

17   An underlying assumption of most theoretical and empirical studies of invasibility is that

18   recipient communities are stable systems. However, this assumption has limited application

19   given the prevalence of disturbance in both natural and human-modified systems. Studies

20   addressing invasibility in recently disturbed or successional communities are sparse (but see Sax

21   2002; Meiners et al. 2002, 2004; Belote et al. 2008), which is surprising because successional

22   systems are globally common, exhibit enhanced resource availability, and commonly face strong

23   invasion pressure, allowing comparison of native and non-native colonists (Meiners et al. 2002,

1   2004; Meiners 2007).

2   In this study, we use 16 yr of successional data from a study of competitive interactions

3   among plant species following a stand-replacing disturbance in an old-growth coniferous forest

4   (Halpern et al. 1997, Rozzell 2003). Annual observations made at small spatial scales (1 m^2

5   plots) in control and plant-removal treatments provide opportunities to test whether community

6   properties related to resource preemption (or functional similarity) influence invasion success,

7   whether these relationships change over successional time, whether community dominants limit

8   success of non-natives, and whether natives and exotics differ in their colonizing abilities. We

9   address the following questions:

10   *Q1. a. Is invasion success, as measured by the richness or abundance of exotics, correlated*

11   *with properties of the native community? b. Are these correlations stronger among communities*

12   *of functionally similar taxa (i.e., exotic and native annuals/biennials)? c. Do the directions or*

13   *strengths of these relationships change over successional time?* We hypothesized that

14   competitive interactions would be minimal (non-significant relationships between natives and

15   exotics) during the early stages of succession when plant cover and biomass were low (Grime

16   1974), but that with time, increasing competition for space or resources would yield significant

17   negative relationships between natives and exotics. We also predicted that negative relationships

18   would be strongest between annuals/biennials due to similarities in life history.

19   *Q2. Do the presence or abundance of exotics increase with the removal of potentially*

20   *dominant native species?* We hypothesized that exotic colonists would respond positively (i.e.,

21   increase in density and cover) with removal of potentially dominant native species. We expected

22   these effects to be greatest at times when exotics achieved peak abundance in the unmanipulated

23   community.

1   *Q3. Do the population dynamics of exotic and native species suggest that exotics are more*

2   *successful colonists in this system?* We hypothesized that greater colonizing abilities and growth

3   rates would allow exotic species to increase more rapidly and to achieve greater density than

4   native colonists.

5   **Methods**

6   **Study area**

7   The 4-ha study site is at 730 m elevation on a gentle, east-facing slope in the valley of the south

8   fork of the McKenzie River in the Cascade Range of western Oregon. The surrounding

9   landscape includes mature to old-growth forests and plantations originating from clearcut

10   logging in 1970s and 1980s.

11   The climate is characterized by mild, wet winters and warm, dry summers. At the central

12   meteorological station (450 m elevation) at the nearby H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest,

13   annual precipitation averages ~2300 mm, with 6% falling between June and August (Bierlmaier

14   and McKee 1989). Snowfall is common but does not persist at this elevation. Soils are deep

15   (>1.5 m), loamy Andisols (frigid typic Hapludand) formed from weathering of andesite, breccia,

16   and volcanic ash.

17   Prior to harvest, the site supported a mix of mature and old-growth forest dominated by

18   *Pseudotsuga menziesii*, with *Tsuga heterophylla*, *Thuja plicata* and *Taxus brevifolia* in the

19   subcanopy. Understories were dominated by woody species, primarily *Rhododendron*

20   *macrophyllum, Gaultheria shallon,* and *Berberis nervosa* (nomenclature follows Hitchcock and

21   Cronquist 1973). The site was clearcut logged in May and June 1991 and broadcast burned on

22   11 September 1991 in a moderate- to high-intensity fire (Halpern et al. 1997).

Experimental and sampling designs

The full experiment consists of a randomized complete-block design with a control and eight treatments in which one or more species with different life histories and population dynamics are removed (for details see Halpern et al. 1997). Treatments were assigned randomly to nine 2.5 m x 2.5 m experimental units (treatment areas) replicated in each of 25 blocks. Within each block, treatment areas are arranged in a 3 x 3 array with 1-m spacing. For this study, we excluded one block due to its unusual species composition associated with a distinctly shallower, rockier soil.

Plots were established and sampled in June 1990, prior to timber harvest. Vegetation measurements were made in a 1 m x 1 m plot centered within each treatment area. Cover (%) of ground surface conditions (e.g., bare ground, fine litter, and logs) and of each vascular plant species was recorded annually through 2007 (year 16). In addition, stems were counted and measured for height and/or basal diameter annually through year 8 (except for year 5). Above-ground biomass was estimated using species-specific allometric equations developed for this site (Halpern et al. 1996). For most species with distinct shoots, biomass was predicted from height and/or basal diameter. For species without distinct shoots or with a trailing growth form, biomass was estimated from cover or a combination of cover and height.

Removal treatments were initiated in June 1992, synchronous with the first post-disturbance measurement. For the first 7 yr, removals were done monthly between April and June to minimize competition; seedlings were pulled by hand and vegetative shoots were clipped at the ground surface. Subsequently, removals were conducted at the time of vegetation sampling.

Six of eight removal treatments were discontinued early in the study when removal or target species became uncommon (Halpern et al. 1997). We restrict the analyses to the control and the two removal treatments that were maintained continuously: removal of *Rubus ursinus* and

1 combined removal of *Berberis nervosa* and *Gaultheria shallon*. These species were chosen

2 because they represent potentially dominant taxa with distinctly different successional dynamics.

3 *Rubus* is a subordinate forest subshrub with a trailing habit that responds rapidly to overstory

4 removal and can achieve very high post-disturbance cover via stoloniferous growth (Halpern

5 1989). In contrast, *Berberis* and *Gaultheria* are low, evergreen shrubs that dominate the forest

6 understory, but recover more slowly through vegetative resprouting from extensive rhizome

7 systems (Halpern 1989).

8 **Statistical analyses**

9 *Q1. Correlations between invasion success of exotics and properties of the native community*

10 We ran a series of Pearson correlations and multiple linear regressions with data from the control

11 plots to explore relationships between measures of exotic success and properties of the native

12 community (*Q1a, b*) and whether these relationships changed over time (*Q1c*). We first

13 examined exotic and native communities as a whole (*Q1a*), then limited the analyses to annuals

14 and biennials (i.e., short-lived monocarpic species — "annuals" for simplicity) (*Q1b*). For each

15 analysis we used data from four times (years 2, 4, 7, and 16; *Q1c*) that were chosen to represent

16 successional stages with progressively greater cover and biomass of native plants (reflecting

17 correspondingly greater resource competition).

18   At the community level, exotic success was measured by four variables: species richness

19 (number of species per 1 m^2 plot), total cover, total biomass, and total density of stems (*Q1a*).

20 At the population level, success of individual exotic species was measured by three variables:

21 stem density, cover, and biomass. Population-level analyses were limited to species present in at

22 least five (20%) of the control plots (*Crepis capillaris*, *Cirsium vulgare*, *Lactuca serriola*, and

23 *Senecio sylvaticus*). Properties of the native community included species richness, total cover,

1   and total biomass; density was not used because cover and biomass are better indicators of

2   resource utilization by perennial species. For correlations between exotic and native annuals

3   (*Q1b*), species richness was not considered because it varied minimally among plots.

4   For each of the selected dates, Pearson correlations were run ($\alpha = 0.05$) for combinations of

5   variables representing exotic success and properties of the native community. However,

6   analyses using biomass or stem density were limited to years 2, 4, and 7; analyses also were not

7   conducted for years when natives and/or exotics were infrequent (present in <20% plots). This

8   yielded a total of 153 correlations (134 for *Q1a*, 19 for *Q1b*).

9   Following correlation analyses, we used multiple linear regression (stepwise selection with a

10   significance threshold of 0.05) to tease apart the contributions of native herb and shrub layers to

11   exotic success. The herb layer included herbaceous and low woody species <1 m tall, and the

12   shrub layer, taller woody species. Total cover or biomass of native plants within each layer

13   served as predictors; native richness was not considered because the shrub layer consisted of

14   only three species (*Arctostaphylos columbiana*, *Rhododendron macrophyllum*, and *Pseudotsuga*

15   *menziesii*). We only analyzed data for years 7 and 16 because at earlier dates there were too few

16   plots with cover in the shrub layer. In total, 23 regression models were run (13 predicting exotic

17   success at the community level and 10 for individual exotic species).

18   All data were log transformed to meet the assumptions of normality. All tests were

19   considered significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. Although analyses involved many non-independent tests with

20   the possibility of spurious significance for a proportion of these, our objective was to identify

21   general patterns of correlation and how they might change through time, rather than to test

22   specific hypotheses about particular pairs of variables.

23

1   *Q2. Consequences for exotics of removing key native species*

2   To test whether exotic colonists responded positively to removal of potentially dominant native

3   species, we used one-way analysis of variance (randomized complete-block design) to compare

4   the total density (or total cover) of exotic species in the control and the two removal treatments.

5   Comparisons were made for the years that exotics peaked in density (year 5) or cover (year 6).

6   These dates coincided with near-peak cover of the removal species (*Rubus*: year 5, 7.4%, year 6,

7   11.9%; *Berberis* and *Gaultheria*: year 5, 12.6%, year 6, 13.6%). Data were log transformed to

8   meet the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance.

9   *Q3. Population dynamics of exotic vs. native species*

10   To assess whether exotics were more successful than natives as colonists, we compared nine

11   measures of population performance with a series of Mann-Whitney tests. We used data from

12   the control plots with individual exotic and native species as samples (e.g., Meiners 2007). We

13   considered only those species present in at least 20% of the control plots. Thus, we used the

14   same four exotics as in *Q1* and five natives (*Collomia heterophylla*, *Conyza canadensis*,

15   *Epilobium paniculatum*, *Madia gracilis* and *Lotus purshianus*); all are annuals or biennials. The

16   nine measures of performance represent different aspects of the pace, magnitude, or duration of

17   population growth: (1) maximum annual increase in frequency (percentage of plots occupied),

18   (2) maximum annual increase in stem density, (3) average increase in frequency (computed

19   between first appearance and peak frequency), (4) average increase in stem density (computed

20   between first appearance and peak frequency), (5) maximum frequency, (6) maximum density,

21   (7) years to peak frequency (number of years between first appearance and peak frequency), (8)

22   years to peak density (number of years between first appearance and peak density) and (9)

23   duration (number of years with frequency >20%).

1   All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS ver. 13.0 (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois,

2   USA), except for Mann-Whitney tests conducted in R ver. 2.6.2 (R Foundation for Statistical

3   Computing, Vienna, Austria).

4   **Results**

5   **General successional trends**

6   Logging and broadcast burning consumed most plant cover, but vegetation recovery was rapid.

7   In control plots, total plant cover averaged 15% in year 1 and increased to >70% in year 2 due to

8   rapid growth of species in the herb layer (Fig. 1a). Subsequent increases were more gradual

9   reflecting continuous growth of species in the shrub layer. Total biomass (estimated through

10   year 8) changed similarly to cover, averaging ~20 g/m^2 in year 1, 145 g/m^2 in year 2, and >300

11   g/m^2 in year 8 (Fig. 1b).

12   In total, 78 species were observed. Of these, 60 were native and 18 were exotic (Appendix

13   1). Among natives, 17% were annuals; among exotics, 50% were annuals. Temporal trends in

14   the richness of natives and exotics were similar, although natives were consistently more diverse

15   (Figs. 2a,b). Mean values for both groups peaked early in succession, then declined slowly. In

16   contrast to cover and biomass, the range of richness values changed little over time for either

17   group. Natives were more abundant and persistent than exotics and showed a much wider range

18   of abundance values among plots (Figs. 2c-f).

19   Most native and exotic species selected for comparison of population trends showed rapid

20   increases in abundance (Fig. 3). Species varied, however, in the timing of peak abundance and

21   rate of disappearance from plots. Some were highly transient (e.g., *Senecio sylvaticus*, *Lactuca*

22   *serriola*, and *Conyza canadensis*); others were more persistent (e.g., *Crepis capillaris*, *Epilobium*

1 *paniculatum*, and *Collomia heterophylla*). *Lotus purshianus* (native) was unique in its invasion

2 pattern, characterized by a continuous increase in frequency.

3 **Relationships between native and exotic species**

4 *Q1. Correlation between success of exotics and properties of the native community*

5 We hypothesized that natives and exotics, as groups, would show few correlations early in

6 succession when plant cover was low, but significant negative correlations later in succession

7 when resource competition became more intense. Temporal trends were only partly consistent

8 with these predictions. In year 2, we detected only one marginally significant relationship

9 between natives and exotics (Tables 1 and 2). In year 4, however, two (17%) of the community-

10 level comparisons were significant (both negative correlations; Table 1) as were seven (19%) of

11 the species-based tests (all negative correlations; Table 2). *Crepis capillaris* was the species

12 most frequently correlated with properties of the native community (Table 2). After year 4,

13 however, we detected few significant relationships between natives and exotics. Significant

14 correlations were uncommon in year 7 and by year 16, only *Crepis* was present with sufficient

15 frequency to include in the analyses (Table 2).

16 Multiple linear regressions designed to tease apart the contributions of native herb and shrub

17 layers to exotic success also yielded few significant models. Two of 10 community-level models

18 were significant, with negative relationships driven by the shrub layer (exotic density in year 7: b

19 = -0.65, p = 0.001; exotic cover in year 16: b = -0.46, p = 0.03, respectively). Three of 13

20 species-level models were significant (all involving *Crepis capillaris*); these were also driven by

21 negative relationships with the shrub layer (biomass in year 7: b = -0.54, p = 0.007; density in

22 year 7: b = -0.65, p = 0.001; cover in year 16: b = -0.56, p =0.005).

23 Patterns of correlation between native and exotic annuals were distinctly different from

1 those of the broader plant community (*cf.* Tables 3 and 1) and did not support our hypothesis that

2 negative relationships would be strongest between annual species because of their functional

3 similarity. Early in succession (years 2 and 4), only one of 12 correlations yielded a significant

4 result (negative in sign; Table 3). In years 7 and 16, however, all correlations were significant,

5 but positive in sign. We tested whether this latter result could be explained by a shared positive

6 association of natives and exotics with bare ground (which was not limiting early in succession).

7 For cover (year 7 and 16) and biomass (year 7), only native annuals showed a positive

8 correlation with bare ground; however, for density (year 7), both groups did.

9 *Q2. Consequences for exotics of removing key native species*

10 We hypothesized that exotics would respond positively to removal of native dominants.

11 However, at peak cover (year 6) and stem density (year 5), abundance of exotics did not differ

12 between controls and either removal treatment (non-significant main effects from one-way

13 ANOVAs on exotic cover: $F_{2,69} = 0.015$, $P = 0.99$ and density: $F_{2,69} = 0.406$, $P = 0.67$).

14 *Q3. Population dynamics of exotic vs. native species*

15 We hypothesized that greater colonizing abilities and growth rates would allow exotic species to

16 exhibit more rapid invasion and achieve greater densities than native colonists. However, for

17 none of the metrics considered did exotics and natives show a significant difference in

18 performance (Table 4).

19 **Discussion**

20 On average, exotic species played a relatively minor and transient role in the post-disturbance

21 vegetation. Most were annuals, biennials, or short-lived perennials that, at peak abundance,

1   accounted for ~20% of local (plot-scale) richness and plant cover. This general result is

2   consistent with previous studies of post-harvest succession in the Pacific Northwest, where

3   exotics contribute minimally, or only briefly, to the post-disturbance flora (e.g., Halpern and

4   Spies 1995, Tyler and Peterson 2006). It is also consistent with the roles of exotics in other

5   forest ecosystems in western North America (e.g., Haeussler et al. 2004, Klinger et al. 2006,

6   Sumners and Archibold 2007, Nelson et al. 2008), where they tend to be short-lived ruderals

7   limited in time and space by their intolerance of shade (e.g., Meiners 2002, but see Martin et al.

8   *in press*). Despite low average abundance, exotics exhibited a wide range of richness and cover

9   values among sample plots, providing an opportunity to explore the potential for interactions

10   with native species at small spatial scales.

11   **Correlations between success of exotics and properties of the native community**

12   We hypothesized that relationships between natives and exotics would be non-significant early in

13   succession, but significant and negative later in succession, reflecting increasing potential for

14   competitive interactions over time. However, we observed few significant correlations for any

15   of the metrics considered over the broad range of dates tested. Later in succession, when it was

16   possible to separate effects of herbaceous from taller woody plants, negative relationships

17   suggested that any competition-induced declines were likely to have been driven by taller shrubs

18   and regenerating trees, not by native herbs. Several factors may contribute to these declines:

19   shading by taller growth forms (Kochy and Wilson 2000), root competition for soil resources

20   (Coomes and Grubb 2000), and physical burial or inhibition of germination by leaf litter (Facelli

21   and Pickett 1991). Litter effects may be particularly strong given dominance of the shrub layer

22   by *Arctostaphylos* and *Rhododendron* which both produce sclerophyllous, highly recalcitrant

23   leaves.

1   A number of factors may explain the absence of strong interactions between native and

2   exotic herbs. First, despite considerable variation in development of exotics among plots, the

3   range of richness and abundance values may have been inadequate to yield significant

4   relationships with natives. Second, in a study of pairwise associations among individual species

5   from the same experimental plots, Rozzell (2003) demonstrated that positive correlations were

6   more common than negative ones (although the proportion of positive associations declined over

7   time). Thus, competitive interactions between individual native and exotic species may be

8   balanced, in part, by positive associations among other pairs of species. Both types of

9   associations may contribute simultaneously to structuring plant communities (Callaway and

10   Walker 1997, Holmgren et al 1997). Third, individual exotic species may differ in their

11   responses to natives (Meiners et al. 2004), thus reducing the potential for strong community-

12   level patterns. Likewise, the pool of natives included species with a diversity of life-history and

13   functional traits (short-lived ruderals to clonal, shade-tolerant herbs) — species that are likely to

14   respond in diverse ways to disturbance, resource availability, and environmental stress.

15   Variation in the abundance of these species among plots could lead to variation in the types and

16   strengths of interactions with exotics (Meiners et al. 2004).

17   We attempted to distinguish among some of these possibilities by considering relationships

18   between a functionally similar pool of natives and exotics (i.e., annuals), and the responses of

19   individual exotic species. We expected negative relationships between native and exotic annuals

20   to be stronger than those observed for the full community of species given similar life-history

21   and resource-use strategies. However, we found few significant correlations early in succession

22   (years 2 and 4), and consistently strong positive associations in later years (7 and 16). Positive

23   associations among annuals later in succession could suggest facilitation of natives by exotics (or

1 the reverse), however, this is unlikely. Facilitation would be more likely early in succession

2 (soon after broadcast burning) when environmental stress was greater (e.g., Callaway and

3 Walker 1997, Callaway et al. 2002). Moreover, densities of both native and exotic annuals were

4 positively correlated with cover of bare ground in year 7. Positive associations at a time when

5 germination sites are limiting suggests a shared affinity for this substrate rather than facilitation

6 of one group by the other. A common response to environmental variation is often used to

7 explain patterns of richness among natives and exotics (e.g., Levine 2000, Davies et al. 2005),

8 but rarely patterns of abundance (but see Sax 2002).

9   Analyses at the population level suggest that the few negative correlations observed between

10 natives and exotics were attributable to *Crepis capillaris*, the most abundant and persistent of the

11 exotic species. Significant community-level correlations coincided with the timing of significant

12 correlations with *Crepis*. The paucity of similar relationships among the remaining species

13 suggests that controls on invasion may be highly individualistic and dependent on factors other

14 than simple community traits (Troumbis et al. 2002, Meiners et al. 2004).

15 **Consequences for exotics of removing key native species**

16 Species-removal treatments provided an opportunity to test whether exotic species were inhibited

17 by dominant species in the native community. Release of exotics would provide strong evidence

18 for direct or indirect controls on invasion by these community dominants (Fargione and Tilman

19 2005, Emery and Gross 2007). However, neither removal treatment increased the cover or

20 density of exotics. There are several possible explanations for the lack of response. First,

21 resources unexploited by plant removals may have been preempted by species with similar

22 successional roles rather than by exotic colonists; competition for resources should be more

23 intense among species with similar functional traits (Fragione et al. 2003, Tilman 2004). Thus,

1 native, mid-successional species may have benefited more than exotic annuals. This conclusion

2 is supported by the non-significant differences in total cover of natives between controls and

3 removals (ANOVAs on total native cover in year 5, $P = 0.957$; and year 6, $P = 0.254$), indicating

4 that removal of dominants was compensated for by growth of other natives.

5 　　　Another possible explanation for the lack of response to removals — one that is consistent

6 with the results of correlation analyses — is that the successional dynamics of exotics are driven

7 by factors other than interspecific interactions. In an earlier study in this experimental system,

8 entire community removals (more extreme than the removal of dominants) did not prevent loss

9 of the exotic, *Senecio sylvaticus*. Following peak density in year 2, *Senecio* declined abruptly

10 and at comparable rates in both community removals and controls (Halpern et al. 1997). Thus,

11 competitive interactions may not be responsible for displacement of early successional annuals.

12 Instead, declines may be related to allelopathic effects, pathogens, litter accumulation, or

13 changes in soils or ground-surface conditions (Jackson and Willemsen 1976, Vitousek et al.

14 1987a, Davidson 1993, Facelli and Pickett 1991, van der Putten et al. 1993). The availability of

15 germination sites (mineral soil) may be critical for persistence of these species as populations are

16 renewed annually or biannually from seed. Increasing resource availability resulting from

17 removals may thus offer minimal benefit if germination sites are limiting.

18 **Population dynamics of exotic vs. native species**

19 Exotics could have an advantage over natives because of inherent differences in functional traits

20 or competitive abilities, or in their ability to escape from natural enemies in new environments

21 (e.g., Keane and Crawley 2002, Fargione et al. 2003, Funk and Vitousek 2007). The alternative

22 proposition is that exotics and natives do not differ systematically in their traits (Thompson et al.

23 1995) or colonizing abilities (Davis et al. 2000).

1   A test of these competing theories in the current successional system revealed that natives

2   and exotics did not differ consistently for any measure of colonizing ability or population success

3   (i.e., rate of spread, rate or magnitude of increase in local density, or persistence). Clearly, our

4   ability to demonstrate differences between groups is constrained by the small number of species

5   with sufficient frequency to include in these tests. We were also unable to control for the

6   proportions of species with differing modes of seed dispersal, a trait that could affect rates of

7   spread. However, this cannot explain the absence of differences. All of the exotics were wind

8   dispersed, whereas natives also included "slower" dispersers, i.e. species with adhesive (*Madia*

9   *gracilis* and *Collomia heterophylla*) and ballistically dispersed seeds (*Lotus purshianus*).

10   Moreover, species with similar modes of dispersal showed varying rates of spread or increase.

11   In sum, population trends appeared as variable within as between groups. In a long-term study

12   of old-field succession with a much larger sample of species ($n = 25$), Meiners (2007) also was

13   unable to demonstrate a statistical difference in the population dynamics of native and exotic

14   species, leading to a similar conclusion — that natives and exotics possess similar sets of traits

15   and play similar ecological roles in early successional communities.

16   **Conclusions**

17   Studies of plant invasibility have been conducted primarily in grassland ecosystems (see review

18   in Levine et al. 2004), but rarely in forests or successional communities (but see Sax 2002,

19   Meiners et al. 2002, 2004; Meiners 2007). Long-term studies in disturbed forests, which are

20   common globally, exhibit rapid successional dynamics, and host a broader diversity of plant

21   functional types than do grasslands, broaden the scope of invasibility research.

22   In this early successional system, exotics behave as "weak" invaders, coexisting with natives

23   as a minor component of the post-disturbance vegetation (Ortega and Pearson 2005). They are

1   short-lived species (mostly annuals and biennials) that peak at relatively low abundance and

2   decline rapidly during succession. Community-level analyses provide little evidence that, at

3   small spatial scales ($1m^2$), invasion success relates to properties of the native community or that

4   relationships with natives change over time in predictable ways. The factors that promote

5   establishment and increases among exotics appear similar to those that promote successful

6   colonization of native ruderals: exposure of mineral soil by disturbance and local production of

7   an abundance of seed by an initial cohort of recruits. Declines over time reflect changes in the

8   biotic and abiotic environment that limit local seed production (e.g., shading by taller woody

9   plants) and inhibit recruitment (e.g., loss of germination sites to accumulating litter).

10   Comparable variation in population dynamics and individualistic patterns of increase and decline

11   suggest that exotics and natives possess similar combinations of functional traits that lead to

12   similar successional roles in these forests.

20

1 **References**

2 Belote, R. T. et al. 2008. Diversity-invasibility across an experimental disturbance gradient in

3   Appalachian forests. – Ecology 89: 183-192.

4 Bierlmaier, F. and McKee, A. 1989. Climatic summaries and documentation for the primary

5   meteorological station, H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest, 1972-1984. USDA For. Serv.

6   Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-242.

7 Callaway, R. M. and Walker, L. R. 1997. Competition and facilitation: a synthetic approach to

8   interactions in plant communities. – Ecology 78: 1958-1965.

9 Callaway, R. M. et al. 2002. Positive interactions among alpine plants increase with

10   stress. – Nature 417: 844-848.

11 Coomes, D. A. and Grubb, P. J. 2000. Impacts of root competition in forests and woodlands: a

12   theoretical framework and review of experiments. – Ecol. Monogr. 70: 171-207.

13 Davidson, D. W. 1993. The effects of herbivory and granivory on terrestrial plant succession. –

14   Oikos 68: 23-35.

15 Davis, M. A. et al. 1998. Competition between tree seedlings and herbaceous vegetation: support

16   for a theory of resource supply and demand. – J. Ecol. 86: 652-661.

17 Davis, M. A. et al. 2000. Fluctuating resources in plant communities: a general theory of

18   invasibility. – J. Ecol. 88: 528-534.

19 Davies, K. F. et al. 2005. Spatial heterogeneity explains the scale dependence of the native-

20   exotic diversity relationship. – Ecology 86: 1602-1610.

21 Elton, C. S. 1958. The ecology of invasions by animals and plants. – Methuen.

22 Emery, S. M. and Gross, K. L. 2007. Dominant species identity, not community evenness,

23   regulates invasion in experimental grassland plant communities. – Ecology 88: 954-964.

1   Facelli, J. M. and Pickett, S. T. A. 1991. Light interception and effects on an old-field

2   plant community. – Ecology 72: 1024-1031.

3   Fargione, J. E. and Tilman, D. 2005. Diversity decreases invasion via both sampling and

4   complementarity effects. – Ecol. Lett. 8: 604-611.

5   Fargione, J. et al. 2003. Community assembly and invasion: an experimental test of neutral

6   versus niche processes. – Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 100: 8916-8920.

7   Funk, J. L. and Vitousek, P. M. 2007. Resource-use efficiency and plant invasion in low-

8   resource systems. – Nature 446: 1079-1081.

9   Grime, J. P. 1974. Vegetation classification by reference to strategies. – Nature 250: 26-31.

10   Haeussler, S. et al. 2004. Succession and resilience in boreal mixedwood plant communities 15-

11   16 years after silvicultural site preparation. – Forest Ecol. Manag. 199: 349-370.

12   Halpern, C. B. 1989. Early successional patterns of forest species: interactions of life history

13   traits and disturbance. – Ecology 70: 704-720.

14   Halpern, C. B. and Spies, T. A. 1995. Plant species diversity in natural and managed forests of

15   the Pacific Northwest. – Ecol. Appl. 5: 913-934.

16   Halpern, C. B. et al. 1996. Equations for predicting above-ground biomass of plant species in

17   early successional forests of the western Cascade Range, Oregon. – Northwest Sci. 70: 306-

18   320.

19   Halpern, C. B. et al. 1997. Species replacement during early secondary succession: the abrupt

20   decline of a winter annual. – Ecology 78: 621-631.

21   Hitchcock, C. L. and Cronquist, A. 1973. Flora of the Pacific Northwest. - University of

22   Washington Press.

23   Holmgren, M. et al. 1997. The interplay of facilitation and competition in plant communities. –

1   Ecology 78: 1966-1975.

2   Jackson, J. R. and Willemsen, R. W. 1976. Allelopathy in the first stages of secondary

3   succession on the piedmont of New Jersey. – Am. J. Bot. 63: 1015-1023.

4   Keane, R. M. and Crawley, M. J. 2002. Exotic plant invasions and the enemy release hypothesis.

5   – Trends Ecol. Evol. 17: 164-170.

6   Klinger R. et al. 2006. The role of environmental gradients in non-native plant invasion into

7   burnt areas of Yosemite National Park, California. – Divers. Distrib. 12:139-156.

8   Kochy, M. and Wilson, S. D. 2000. Competitive effects of shrubs and grasses in prairie.

9   – Oikos 91: 385-395.

10   Levine, J. 2000. Species diversity and biological invasions: relating local process to community

11   pattern. – Science 288: 852-854.

12   Levine, J. and D'Antonio, C. M. 1999. Elton revisited: a review of evidence linking diversity and

13   invasibility. – Oikos 87: 15-26.

14   Levine, J. M. et al. 2004. A meta-analysis of biotic resistance to exotic plant invasions. – Ecol.

15   Lett. 7: 975-989.

16   MacArthur, R. H. 1970. Species-packing and competitive equilibrium for many species. – Theor.

17   Popul. Biol. 1: 1-11.

18   Martin, P. H. et al. *In press.* Why forests appear resistant to exotic plant invasions: intentional

19   introductions, stand dynamics, and the role of shade tolerance. – Front. Ecol. Environ.

20   Meiners, S. J. 2007. Native and exotic plant species exhibit similar population dynamics during

21   succession. – Ecology 88: 1098-1104.

22   Meiners, S. J. et al. 2002. Exotic plant invasions over 40 years of old field successions:

23   community patterns and associations. – Ecography 25: 215-223.

1 Meiners, S. J. et al. 2004. Beyond biodiversity: individualistic controls of invasion in a self-

2   assembled community. – Ecol. Lett. 7: 121-126.

3 Nelson, C. R. et al. 2008. Thinning and burning result in low-level invasion by nonnative plants

4   but neutral effects on natives. – Ecol. Appl. 18: 762-770.

5 Ortega, Y. K. and Pearson, D. E. 2005. Weak vs. strong invaders of natural plant communities:

6   assessing invasibility and impact. – Ecol. Appl. 15: 651-661.

7 Pimentel, D. et al. 2005. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-

8   invasive species in the United States. – Ecol. Econ. 52: 273-288.

9 Rozzell, L. R. 2003. Species pairwise associations over nine years of secondary succession:

10   assessing alternative explanations and successional mechanisms. Master's thesis. Utah State

11   University, Logan, Utah, USA.

12 Sax, D. F. 2002. Native and naturalized plant diversity are positively correlated in scrub

13   communities of California and Chile. – Divers. Distrib. 8: 193-210.

14 Sax, D. F. et al. 2007. Ecological and evolutionary insights from species invasions. – Trends

15   Ecol. Evol. 22: 465-471.

16 Stohlgren, T. J. et al. 1999. Exotic plant species invade hot spots of native plant diversity. – Ecol.

17   Monogr. 69: 25-46.

18 Sumners, W. H. and Archibold, O. W. 2007. Exotic plant species in the southern boreal forest of

19   Saskatchewan. – Forest Ecol. Manag. 251: 156-163.

20 Tilman, D. 1997. Community invasibility, recruitment limitation, and grassland biodiversity. –

21   Ecology 78: 81-92.

22 Tilman, D. 2004. Niche tradeoffs, neutrality, and community structure: a stochastic theory of

23   resource competition, invasion, and community assembly. – Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 101:

1   10854-10861.

2   Thompson, K. et al. 1995. Native and alien invasive plants: more of the same? – Ecography 18:

3   390-402.

4   Troumbis, A.Y. et al. 2002. Components of short-term invasibility in experimental

5   Mediterranean grasslands. – Oikos 98: 239-250.

6   Tyler, M. W. and Peterson, D. L. 2006. Vascular plant species diversity in low elevation

7   coniferous forests of the Western Olympic Peninsula: a legacy of land use. – Northwest. Sci.

8   80: 224-238.

9   van der Putten, W. H. et al. 1993. Plant-specific soil-borne diseases contribute to succession in

10   foredune vegetation. – Nature 362: 53-56.

11   Vitousek, P. M. et al. 1987a. Nitrogen availability and nitrification during succession: Primary,

12   secondary, and old-field seres. – Plant Soil 115: 229-239.

13   Vitousek, P. M. et al. 1987b. Biological invasion by *Myrica faya* alters ecosystem development

14   in Hawaii. – Science 238: 802-804.

15   Vitousek, P. M. et al. 1997. Introduced species: a significant component of human-caused global

16   change. – New Zeal. J. Ecol. 21: 1-16.

17

1   Table 1. Pearson correlation coefficients between properties of native and exotic

2   communities at different times during succession. All data were log transformed.

3   Asterisks denote significant ($P \leq 0.05$) and plus marks denote marginally significant

4   ($0.05 \leq P \leq 0.10$) relationships. Blank cells indicate that density and biomass were not

5   sampled in year 16 (see Statistical analyses).

Native community	Exotic community	Year 2	Year 4	Year 7	Year 16
Species richness vs.	Species richness	-0.14	-0.19	0.02	-0.13
	Total cover	0.16	-0.45*	-0.23	-0.19
	Total biomass	-0.19	-0.38[+]	-0.23	
	Total density	0.22	-0.49*	-0.14	
Total cover vs.	Species richness	0.07	0.05	0.03	-0.32
	Total cover	-0.25	-0.29	-0.35[+]	-0.38[+]
	Total biomass	-0.32	-0.22	-0.32	
	Total density	-0.14	-0.34	-0.12	
Total biomass vs.	Species richness	-0.12	0.05	0.17	
	Total cover	-0.22	-0.40[+]	-0.42*	
	Total biomass	-0.32	-0.15	-0.32	
	Total density	-0.15	-0.28	-0.26	

6

1   Table 2. Pearson correlation coefficients between properties of the native community and

2   measures of invasion success for individual exotic species at different times during succession.

3   All data were log transformed. Asterisks denote significant ($P \leq 0.05$) and plus marks denote

4   marginally significant ($0.05 < P \leq 0.10$) relationships. Dashes indicate that correlations were not

5   computed due to low frequency of exotics. Blank cells indicate that density and biomass were

6   not sampled in year 16 (see Statistical analyses).

Native community	Exotic species	Metric	Year 2	Year 4	Year 7	Year 16
Species richness vs.	*Crepis capillaris*	cover	—	-0.52*	-0.32	-0.32
		biomass	—	-0.55*	-0.26	
		density	—	-0.62*	-0.13	
	Cirsium vulgare	cover	—	0.07	0.12	—
		biomass	—	0.18	0.11	
		density	—	0.19	0.27	
	Senecio sylvaticus	cover	0.24	-0.04	—	—
		biomass	-0.15	-0.02	—	
		density	0.25	0.21	—	
	Lactuca serriola	cover	-0.28	0.00	—	—
		biomass	-0.28	-0.00	—	
		density	-0.34	-0.13	—	
Total cover vs.	*Crepis capillaris*	cover	—	-0.50*	-0.14	-0.31
		biomass	—	-0.51*	-0.22	
		density	—	-0.54*	-0.12	

7

Table 2. Continued.

Native community	Exotic species	Metric	Year 2	Year 4	Year 7	Year 16
.	*Cirsium vulgare*	cover	—	0.06	-0.22	—
		biomass	—	0.09	-0.17	
		density	—	0.05	-0.13	
	Senecio sylvaticus	cover	-0.28	-0.01	—	—
		biomass	-0.37$^+$	-0.06	—	
		density	-0.15	0.23	—	
	Lactuca serriola	cover	-0.10	0.13	—	—
		biomass	0.11	0.14	—	
		density	-0.02	-0.12	—	
Total biomass vs.	*Crepis capillaris*	cover	—	-0.34$^+$	-0.49*	—
		biomass	—	-0.25	-0.45*	
		density	—	-0.24	-0.29	
	Cirsium vulgare	cover	—	0.11	0.03	—
		biomass	—	0.16	0.12	
		density	—	0.08	0.21	
	Senecio sylvaticus	cover	-0.22	-0.08	—	—
		biomass	-0.34	-0.20	—	
		density	-0.15	0.08	—	
	Lactuca serriola	cover	-0.13	-0.33	—	—
		biomass	0.04	-0.30	—	
		density	-0.08	-0.48*	—	

1 Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients between properties of native and exotic annual

2 communities at different times during succession. All data were log transformed.

3 Asterisks denote significant ($P \leq 0.05$) and plus marks denote marginally significant

4 ($0.05 \leq P \leq 0.10$) relationships. Blank cells indicate that biomass and density were not

5 sampled in year 16. Correlations between richness of natives and exotics were not

6 computed because of the small range of richness values (see Statistical analyses).

Native annuals	Exotic annuals	Year 2	Year 4	Year 7	Year 16
Total cover vs.	Total cover	-0.35 [+]	0.25	0.48*	0.45*
	Total biomass	-0.29	0.12	0.34*	
	Total density	-0.44*	0.14	0.62*	
Total biomass vs.	Total cover	-0.16	0.11	0.55*	
	Total biomass	-0.18	0.06	0.44*	
	Total density	-0.30	0.05	0.67*	

7

1   Table 4. Results of Mann-Whitney tests comparing population metrics of native ($n = 5$) and

2   exotic ($n = 4$) species present in at least 20% of control plots.

Population metric	Native species		Exotic species		
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	*P*
Maximum annual increase in frequency (%)	48.8	10.1	63. 0	9.6	0.45
Maximum annual increase in density (no./m^2)	115.1	20.9	78.4	41.3	0.49
Average increase in frequency	25.1	8.0	28.8	6.3	0.79
Average increase in density (no./m^2)	53.4	14.8	28.5	13.3	0.20
Maximum frequency (%)	84.8	11.4	93.0	4.1	0.87
Maximum density (no./m^2)	167.1	37.6	95.6	53.4	0.49
Years to peak frequency	5.4	1.8	3.7	0.6	0.70
Years to peak density	3.5	0.9	3.5	0.6	0.97
Duration (years with frequency >20%)	10.6	2.0	7.5	2.2	0.37

3

Figure captions

Figure 1. Changes in total plant cover and biomass over 16 yr of succession. Values are means of the control plots ($n = 24$). Biomass data were not collected in year 5 or after year 8.

Figure 2. Changes in total richness, cover, and biomass of native and exotic species in control plots ($n = 24$) over 16 yr of succession. Points are individual plots illustrating the range of variation over time; solid lines are means. Biomass data were not collected in year 5 or after year 8.

Figure 3. Changes in frequency and density of native and exotic species in control plots ($n = 24$) over 16 yr of succession. The species presented are those that occurred in at least 20% of plots. Density data were not collected after year 8. Note the variation in density scales among species.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Native species

Exotic species

Epilobium paniculatum

Crepis capillaris

Conyza canadensis

Senecio sylvaticus

Madia gracilis

Cirsium vulgare

Collomia heterophylla

Lactuca serriola

Lotus purshianus

Density (stems/m²)

Frequency (%)

Frequency

Density

Time (yr)

33

1 Appendix 1. Native and exotic species observed in the control plots over 16

2 yr of succession. Nomenclature follows Hitchcock and Cronquist (1973).

3 Growth form codes: h = herbaceous, w = woody; life-history codes: ann =

4 annual, bien = biennial, per = perennial.

Species name	Family	Growth form	Life history
Native species			
Abies grandis	Pinaceae	w	per
Acer circinatum	Aceraceae	w	per
Agoseris grandiflora	Compositae	h	per
Agrostis exerata	Gramineae	h	per
Anaphalis margaritacea	Compositae	h	per
Anemone deltoidea	Ranunculaceae	h	per
Arbutus menziesii	Ericaceae	w	per
Arctostaphylos columbiana	Ericaceae	w	per
Asarum caudatum	Aristolochiaceae	h	per
Berberis nervosa	Berberidaceae	w	per
Campanula scouleri	Campanulaceae	h	per
Cardamine oligosperma	Cruciferae	h	ann
Castanopsis chrysophylla	Fagaceae	w	per
Ceanothus sanguineus	Rhamnaceae	w	per
Ceanothus velutinus	Rhamnaceae	w	per

5

1   Appendix 1. Continued.

Species name	Family	Growth form	Life history
Native species (continued)			
Collomia heterophylla	Polemoniaceae	h	ann
Conyza canadensis	Compositae	h	ann
Deschampsia elongata	Gramineae	h	per
Eburophyton austinae	Orchidaceae	h	per
Elymus glaucus	Gramineae	h	per
Epilobium angustifolium	Onagraceae	h	per
Epilobium minutum	Onagraceae	h	ann
Epilobium paniculatum	Onagraceae	h	ann
Epilobium watsonii	Onagraceae	h	per
Equisetum telmateia	Equisetaceae	h	per
Festuca occidentalis	Gramineae	h	per
Fragaria vesca	Rosaceae	h	per
Galium triflorum	Rubiaceae	h	per
Gaultheria shallon	Ericaceae	w	per
Gnaphalium microcephalum	Compositae	h	per
Gnaphalium purpureum	Compositae	h	ann
Hieracium albiflorum	Compositae	h	per
Liliaceae sp.	Liliaceae	h	per

2

1   Appendix 1. Continued.

Species name	Family	Growth form	Life history
Native species (continued)			
Linnaea borealis	Caprifoliaceae	w	per
Lotus crassifolius	Leguminosae	h	per
Lotus purshianus	Leguminosae	h	ann
Lupinus latifolius	Leguminosae	h	per
Luzula campestris	Juncaceae	h	per
Madia gracilis	Compositae	h	ann/bien
Montia perfoliata	Portulacaceae	h	ann
Osmorhiza chilensis	Umbelliferae	h	per
Petasites frigidus	Compositae	h	per
Polygonum sp.	Polygonaceae	h	ann
Pseudotsuga menziesii	Pinaceae	w	per
Pteridium aquilinum	Polypodiaceae	h	per
Rhododendron macrophyllum	Ericaceae	w	per
Ribes lobbii	Grossulariaceae	w	per
Rosa gymnocarpa	Rosaceae	w	per
Rubus nivalis	Rosaceae	w	per
Rubus parviflorus	Rosaceae	w	per
Rubus ursinus	Rosaceae	w	per

2

1   Appendix 1. Continued.

Species name	Family	Growth form	Life history
Native species (continued)			
Sambucus cerulea	Caprifoliaceae	w	per
Taxus brevifolia	Taxaceae	w	per
Thuja plicata	Cupressaceae	w	per
Trientalis latifolia	Primulaceae	h	per
Trillium ovatum	Liliaceae	h	per
Tsuga heterophylla	Pinaceae	w	per
Veronica serpyllifolia	Scrophulariaceae	h	per
Viola sempervirens	Violaceae	h	per
Whipplea modesta	Hydrangeaceae	w	per
Exotic species			
Agrostis tenuis	Gramineae	h	per
Aira caryophyllea	Gramineae	h	ann
Arrhenatherum elatius	Gramineae	h	per
Cerastium vulgatum	Caryophyllaceae	h	per
Chrysanthemum leucanthemum	Compositae	h	per
Cirsium vulgare	Compositae	h	bien
Crepis capillaris	Compositae	h	ann/bien
Festuca myuros	Gramineae	h	ann

2   Appendix 1. Continued.

Species name	Family	Growth form	Life history
Exotic species (continued)			
Holcus lanatus	Gramineae	h	per
Hypericum perforatum	Hypericaceae	h	per
Hypochaeris radicata	Compositae	h	per
Lactuca muralis	Compositae	h	ann/bien
Lactuca serriola	Compositae	h	ann/bien
Myosotis discolor	Boraginaceae	h	ann
Prunella vulgaris	Labiatae	h	per
Senecio jacobaea	Compositae	h	per
Senecio sylvaticus	Compositae	h	ann
Veronica arvensis	Scrophulariaceae	h	ann

1