



Forest edge responses present a variety of patterns in southwestern France

Audrey Alignier, Marc Deconchat

► To cite this version:

Audrey Alignier, Marc Deconchat. Forest edge responses present a variety of patterns in southwestern France. 9th Annual Meeting of the British Ecological Society, Sep 2009, Hertfordshire, United Kingdom. 22 p. hal-02812985

HAL Id: hal-02812985

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02812985>

Submitted on 6 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

FOREST EDGE RESPONSES PRESENT A VARIETY OF PATTERNS IN SOUTHWESTERN FRANCE



Audrey Alignier & Marc Deconchat

UMR 1201 Dynafor INRA/INPT-ENSAT – Toulouse - FRANCE


FOREST EDGES IN LANDSCAPE: A CRITICAL ROLE FOR VEGETATION BIODIVERSITY

- Spatial dynamics of landscape modified by human activities:
Fragmentation/ Defragmentation
 - Loss of habitat (e.g. by forest cutting)
 - Isolation of patches



➡ Increase of discontinuity proportion in landscape



Ex. Progressive fragmentation of a woodlot since 1750, in southwestern France (Arrignon, 2003)



FOREST EDGES IN LANDSCAPE: A CRITICAL ROLE FOR VEGETATION BIODIVERSITY

- Edge = zone, in the forest, under discontinuity influence (Murcia, 1995)

Discontinuities influence environmental conditions to which vegetation respond (richness, abundance, composition).



Theoretical pattern of response to discontinuity, widely accepted.

OUR QUESTIONS

- How do forest vegetation (richness, abundance and composition) and abiotic variables respond to edge effect ?

Method



Comparing vegetation response curves to forest edges between several transects

- Can we characterize a common pattern of response to edges ?

Method

Attributing a statistical model to responses of vegetation and abiotic variables

STUDY SITE



Site LTER « Vallées et coteaux de Gascogne »

Subatlantic climate with mediterranean influence
(average annual $T^{\circ}\text{C} = 11^{\circ}\text{C}$; average annual rainfall = 800mm)

Woodlots managed by private owners ; coppice with standards


Dominant species: oaks (*Quercus robur*, *Q. pubescens*, *Q. petraea*),
hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*), wild cherry (*Prunus avium*)

SAMPLING DESIGN

- 28 transects, extended from the border to 40m into the forest interior


Border = line formed by the first tree trunks (Murcia, 1995)

- 40m away from clearcut or other discontinuities



Localisation map of 28 transects studied (in red)

One transect:



Alignier – Response patterns to forest edge

DATA ANALYSIS: MODEL APPLICATION PER TRANSECT


Vegetation data:

- Total species richness
- Total abundance (cover percent)
- Composition

(Scores on Axis 1 of centered PCA
on presence/absence matrix)


Environmental data:

- Soil temperature
- Soil moisture (RH)
- Soil pH
- Soil penetrability
- Canopy openness (%)





*** 28 transects**


DATA ANALYSIS : BEST MODEL SELECTION



v = tested variable
 d = distance from border
 β_x = constant



Selection on AIC
 criterion






« Simple » models

- Complexity → +

Widely accepted
 theoretical model

RESULTS: VEGETATION

123 species from 42 families ; 75 herbaceous perennials, 42 woody species and 6 annual species



80% of species have an occurrence frequency <10%.

➔ High variation in species richness between transects (similar results for abundance).

RESULTS: ABIOTIC VARIABLES

High variation of soil temperature **between transects**:

variation between transect (up to 4°C) > variation within a transect (max 1.3°C)

pH was **stable** with distance from border except for 7 transects with a slight decrease in forest interior as in Marchand & Houle (2006).


Soil moisture was **stable** with distance from border, except for 6 transects which present an increase of soil moisture in forest interior.

General **decrease of % canopy openness** with distance from border.

➡ High variation of abiotic variables between transects, often > variation within transect.
Results consistent with previous studies.

RESULTS: VEGETATION RESPONSE MODELS

Example for transect n°19:




➡ Different models between vegetation descriptors

RESULTS: ABIOTIC RESPONSE MODELS


Example for transect n°19:

Soil temperature



LOGISTIC

pH




EXPONENTIAL

(Penetrability)

(Canopy openness)


Soil moisture



NULL


➡ Different models between abiotic descriptors

RESULTS: FREQUENCY OF MODELS FOR ALL TESTED VARIABLES



Model « null » dominant **BUT**
Edge effects in the majority of cases
(model « linear » + model « exponential » + model « logistic »)

RESULTS: MODELS ADJUSTMENT



Simple models are dominant for the majority of variables.

« Logisitic » model dominant for botanical composition





DISCUSSION

- How forest vegetation (richness, abundance and composition) respond to edge effect ? And abiotic variables ?

No unique (general) model but different models between vegetation descriptors and abiotic variables.



DISCUSSION



DISCUSSION

- How forest vegetation (richness, abundance and composition) respond to edge effect ? And abiotic variables ?

No unique (general) model but different models between vegetation descriptors and abiotic variables.

- Can we characterize a common response pattern to edges ?

High variability of edge responses between transects:

- Different adjusted models according to tested variables
- Null model predominant for overall transects ➡ NO EDGE EFFECT
- Selection among 4 models ➡ not always the best adjustment to data

DISCUSSION

How to explain the absence of edge effects ?

- Small woodlots (from <0.05 to 5ha)

- Human management

Frequent perturbation over years


Management by private owners



Perspectives :

To integrate forest management (cuttings) and forest continuity as explicative variables in data analysis

To develop monitoring (air temperature and humidity) in edges



Thanks to:

L.Burnel, M.Fakorellis, J.Willm for their field assistance

A.Cabanettes, M.Goulard for their helpful comments on statistical analysis

Private woodland farmers and owners

SEVAB for financial support in participation of this meeting


This work was granted by the French Ministry of Research and Education.



Thanks for your attention

audrey.alignier@toulouse.inra.fr



Hemispherical photography





RESULTS: MODELS ADJUSTMENT

For all transects:

