



Microtopography is a fundamental organizing structure of vegetation and soil chemistry in black ash wetlands

Jacob S Diamond, Daniel McLaughlin, Robert Slesak, Atticus Stovall

► To cite this version:

Jacob S Diamond, Daniel McLaughlin, Robert Slesak, Atticus Stovall. Microtopography is a fundamental organizing structure of vegetation and soil chemistry in black ash wetlands. *Biogeosciences*, 2020, 17 (4), pp.901-915. 10.5194/bg-17-901-2020 . hal-03253458

HAL Id: hal-03253458

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03253458>

Submitted on 8 Jun 2021

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



Supplement of


Microtopography is a fundamental organizing structure of vegetation and soil chemistry in black ash wetlands

Jacob S. Diamond et al.


Correspondence to: Jacob S. Diamond (jacdia@vt.edu)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.

1
2 We used a random walk study design as opposed to a hummock-hollow stratified sampling design
3 because one of our hypotheses was that elevation above water table—not just microsite category—
4 is an important predictor of understory richness (and overstory biomass and soil chemistry). Hence,
5 a random walk design allowed us to sample the entire site elevation distribution instead of a
6 potentially bimodal, clustered elevation distribution. To create the plot-level random walk design,
7 we generated a sequence of 12 random integers between 1 and 10 that represented the number of
8 steps to take between sampling points. Sampling point 1 was always the plot center, from which
9 we proceeded to sample at a central point in the northern half of the plot (point 2 in S1). We then
10 sampled at points orthogonal to this central point (e.g., points 3 and 4 in S1), and repeated this
11 clockwise in cardinal directions (i.e., sample point at a central point along cardinal direction with
12 two sample points orthogonal to the central point). To summarize, we randomly sampled 13 points
13 per plot, with three plots per site, for 39 samples per site, and 390 points across all sites.



14
15 *Figure S1 Example of plot-level (3 per site) quasi-random walk sampling design with 13*
16 *sampling points per plot. Points are the samples (numbers are the sequential sampling order)*
17 *and black, solid line segments refer to walking path, where path length was determined by a*
18 *sequence of 12 random generated integers. White points indicate central points along cardinal*
19 *directions and blue point indicates plot center and first sampling point. Dotted lines demarcate*
20 *circle quadrants, which this design allowed us to sample approximately equally.*



21

22 *Figure S2: NMDS ordination of understory vegetation communities, grouped by sites (text*
 23 *labels) and microsites, with hummocks in black and hollows in grey. Ellipses indicate 95%*
 24 *credible intervals around the group centroid.*

25

26

27

28

29

30

31


32

33

Table S1 Results of indicator species analysis for hummocks and hollows, including rare species

Microsite	Species	Specificity	Sensitivity	IV	p-val
Hummock	<i>Climacium dendroides</i>	0.91	0.59	0.53	0.001
	<i>Rhizomnium magnifolium</i>	0.83	0.60	0.50	0.001
	<i>Rubus pubescens</i>	0.83	0.42	0.35	0.001
	<i>Funaria hygrometrica</i>	0.84	0.40	0.34	0.001
	<i>Carex trisperma</i>	0.86	0.31	0.27	0.001
	<i>Galium triflorum</i>	0.89	0.24	0.22	0.001
	<i>Aster lateriflorus</i>	0.80	0.24	0.20	0.001
	<i>Carex bromoides</i>	0.91	0.16	0.14	0.001
	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	0.93	0.11	0.10	0.001
	<i>Sphagnum angustifolium</i>	0.97	0.11	0.10	0.001
Hollow	<i>Maianthemum canadense</i>	1.00	0.09	0.09	0.001
	<i>Calla palustris</i>	0.95	0.09	0.08	0.001
	<i>Dryopteris carthusiana</i>	1.00	0.08	0.08	0.001
	<i>Pleurozium schreberi</i>	0.98	0.08	0.08	0.001
	<i>Carex retorsa</i>	0.94	0.08	0.08	0.003
	<i>Circaea alpina</i>	0.93	0.08	0.07	0.001
	<i>Trientalis borealis</i>	0.89	0.05	0.04	0.005
	<i>Corylus cornuta</i>	0.95	0.04	0.04	0.006
	<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	0.99	0.04	0.04	0.004
	<i>Calliergon cordifolium</i>	0.72	0.61	0.44	0.001
	<i>Lemna minor</i>	0.98	0.27	0.27	0.001

36
37



38
39
40
41
42


Figure S3 Understory species richness on hummocks and hollows for (top) mosses and (bottom) understory vascular plants for each study site. BC text values indicate Bray-Curtis dissimilarity, with a 0–1 range, spanning identical (0) to completely dissimilar (1) vegetation communities. p-values indicate Welch's two sample t-test significances.

43

Table S2 Forestry and hydrology metrics for sites


Site	Midstory basal area ($\text{m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$)	Midstory <i>Fraxinus</i> fraction	Overstory basal area ($\text{m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$)	Overstory <i>Fraxinus</i> fraction	Mean daily water table (m)	Median daily water table (m)	Mean conf. layer depth (cm)	Trees per hectare
L1	2.60	0.70	46.74	0.97	-0.26	-0.05	28.8	729
L2	1.60	0.45	44.79	0.92	-0.35	-0.05	19.6	650
L3	2.77	0.48	46.44	0.98	-0.37	-0.08	24.5	683
D1	1.12	0.4	39.59	0.98	0.01	0.09	28.9	1425
D2	2.94	0.95	39.97	0.97	-0.01	0.04	27.7	1600
D3	1.25	0.25	37.79	0.76	0.05	0.14	69.8	1067
D4	1.83	0.29	27.67	0.76	-0.01	0.00	60.6	700
T1	6.42	0.66	26.87	0.44	0.00	0.03	>150	1038
T2	1.53	0.52	25.69	0.91	-0.05	0.04	80.2	756
T3	3.10	0.48	23.31	0.74	-0.07	0.02	53.6	781

44



45


46 *Figure S4 a)* site-level random effects for intercept and slope for the richness-elevation GLMM,
 47 and *b)* raw data of overall (vascular and moss) richness-elevation relationships for each site
 48 with GLMMs fitted.



49

50 *Figure S5: Stacked histograms of DBH size classes across sites. Black bars represent trees on*
 51 *hummocks and grey bars represent the remaining proportion of trees on hollows. Fraction of*
 52 *bars that are black indicate the fraction of trees that are on hummocks in that DBH size bin. Text*
 53 *refers to the fraction of observed trees that occupy hummocks at each sampling area for 1) the*
 54 *total sampling distribution (f_{hum}), 2) the sampling distribution for trees $\leq 20\text{cm DBH}$ ($f_{hum,<20}$),*
 55 *and 3) the sampling distribution for trees $>20\text{ cm DBH}$ ($f_{hum,>20}$).*

56



57

58 *Figure S6 Site-scale individual tree base elevation versus individual tree basal area. Basal area*
 59 *was estimated from DBH measured with TLS using a circular model.*

60

61
62
63

Table S3 Paired Levene tests for variance in soil chemistry concentrations among hydrogeomorphic categories. Bolded values are significant at p=0.05 level. Note that for most analytes, lowland sites (L) have lower variance than D or T sites.

Analyte	Comparison	Estimated differences in variances	Lower 95% confidence interval	Upper 95% confidence interval	Adjusted p-value
Ca²⁺	L-D	-0.056	-0.931	0.819	0.987
	T-D	-0.182	-1.116	0.751	0.889
	T-L	-0.126	-1.021	0.768	0.941
Cl⁻	L-D	-0.305	-0.473	-0.138	0.000
	T-D	-0.032	-0.206	0.141	0.901
	T-L	0.273	0.106	0.441	0.000
Mg²⁺	L-D	0.283	-0.055	0.621	0.120
	T-D	0.771	0.418	1.125	0.000
	T-L	0.488	0.147	0.829	0.002
NO₃⁻-N	L-D	0.505	0.324	0.687	0.000
	T-D	-0.069	-0.262	0.123	0.672
	T-L	-0.575	-0.754	-0.396	0.000
PO₄³⁻-P	L-D	-0.453	-0.739	-0.167	0.001
	T-D	-0.309	-0.609	-0.009	0.042
	T-L	0.144	-0.144	0.432	0.467
SO₄²⁻	L-D	0.788	0.045	1.530	0.035
	T-D	0.131	-0.652	0.913	0.918
	T-L	-0.657	-1.409	0.095	0.100
%C	L-D	0.900	-0.981	2.782	0.497
	T-D	-2.266	-4.240	-0.292	0.020
	T-L	-3.166	-5.039	-1.293	0.000
%N	L-D	-0.163	-0.300	-0.026	0.015
	T-D	-0.232	-0.374	-0.089	0.000
	T-L	-0.069	-0.206	0.068	0.464
C:N	L-D	-0.846	-1.266	-0.426	0.000
	T-D	-0.548	-0.985	-0.112	0.009
	T-L	0.298	-0.127	0.722	0.224

64
65
66
67

68
69

Table S4 Average (\pm standard deviation) soil extraction concentrations for hummocks and hollows across sites. Values are in mg L⁻¹ except for %C, %N, and C:N, which are unitless.

Site	Microsite	%C	Ca ²⁺	Cl ⁻	C:N	Mg ²⁺	%N	NO ₃ ⁻ -N	PO ₄ ³⁻ -P	SO ₄ ²⁻
D1	hol (18)	39.4 \pm 7.7	9.8 \pm 3.8	1 \pm 0.6	16.7 \pm 2.1	1.9 \pm 0.9	2.2 \pm 0.9	0.3 \pm 0.27	2.13 \pm 1.38	7.3 \pm 3.1
D1	hum (8)	38.2 \pm 11.2	10.2 \pm 5	1.3 \pm 0.7	15.8 \pm 2.4	2.2 \pm 0.8	2.3 \pm 1	0.33 \pm 0.59	2.69 \pm 1.58	7.4 \pm 3.3
D2	hol (7)	33.2 \pm 8.2	12.8 \pm 2.7	1.3 \pm 0.6	15 \pm 0.5	3.1 \pm 0.7	2.2 \pm 0.5	0.06 \pm 0.03	1.96 \pm 1.05	9.7 \pm 3.2
D2	hum (7)	38 \pm 8.1	13.2 \pm 4	1.8 \pm 0.8	15.4 \pm 1	3.2 \pm 0.8	2.5 \pm 0.6	0.06 \pm 0.05	2.9 \pm 1.03	9.6 \pm 2
D3	hol (3)	45 \pm 0.5	13.7 \pm 0.9	2.7 \pm 1.4	14.1 \pm 0.9	3.3 \pm 0.7	3.2 \pm 0.2	0.18 \pm 0.08	2.97 \pm 0.6	9.5 \pm 1.6
D3	hum (10)	45.4 \pm 2.1	14.6 \pm 2.8	2.5 \pm 0.8	17 \pm 2	4.1 \pm 1.1	2.7 \pm 0.2	0.1 \pm 0.12	3.82 \pm 0.76	9.4 \pm 2.4
D4	hol (7)	45.4 \pm 2.4	14.7 \pm 2	1.1 \pm 0.5	16.9 \pm 2.6	2.8 \pm 0.6	2.7 \pm 0.4	0.15 \pm 0.11	2.67 \pm 1.61	7.9 \pm 0.9
D4	hum (6)	48.2 \pm 1.2	12.9 \pm 3	2.5 \pm 0.7	19.2 \pm 2.2	4 \pm 0.5	2.5 \pm 0.3	0.03 \pm 0.01	5.83 \pm 1.33	7.3 \pm 2.2
L1	hol (18)	38 \pm 3.8	19.2 \pm 2.6	1.3 \pm 0.5	14.2 \pm 0.6	8 \pm 0.9	2.7 \pm 0.3	0.63 \pm 0.52	2.24 \pm 0.83	10.8 \pm 2.7
L1	hum (8)	38.7 \pm 3.1	23.4 \pm 2.6	1.3 \pm 0.3	14.1 \pm 0.5	8.9 \pm 0.7	2.7 \pm 0.2	0.53 \pm 0.25	2.62 \pm 0.83	9.8 \pm 2.4
L2	hol (12)	26.1 \pm 9.7	14.7 \pm 2.7	0.8 \pm 0.3	13.3 \pm 0.7	5.4 \pm 1	2 \pm 0.7	1.71 \pm 1.06	1.25 \pm 0.66	6.3 \pm 1.7
L2	hum (13)	32.5 \pm 12.8	15.1 \pm 6.4	1 \pm 0.4	13.3 \pm 1.1	5.5 \pm 2.1	2.1 \pm 0.6	1.51 \pm 1.33	1.33 \pm 0.82	5.4 \pm 2.6
L3	hol (17)	37.8 \pm 3.5	19.2 \pm 1.4	1.1 \pm 0.4	13.9 \pm 1	9 \pm 0.8	2.7 \pm 0.3	0.97 \pm 0.72	2.76 \pm 0.9	14.5 \pm 4.1
L3	hum (9)	39.9 \pm 5.6	20.8 \pm 2.4	1 \pm 0.3	14.8 \pm 2.2	9.4 \pm 0.9	2.7 \pm 0.2	0.5 \pm 0.54	3.09 \pm 0.82	10.5 \pm 5
T1	hol (14)	47.2 \pm 0.9	20.6 \pm 3	1.3 \pm 0.3	16.5 \pm 0.9	8.7 \pm 1.7	2.9 \pm 0.2	0.15 \pm 0.06	3.21 \pm 0.65	10.3 \pm 2.5
T1	hum (12)	46.4 \pm 1	22.6 \pm 2.5	2.6 \pm 0.6	18.2 \pm 2.4	10 \pm 2	2.5 \pm 0.4	0.15 \pm 0.13	3.65 \pm 0.93	8.6 \pm 2.1
T2	hol (15)	44.9 \pm 3.3	27.8 \pm 3.4	1.4 \pm 0.5	14.9 \pm 0.9	7.9 \pm 1.2	3 \pm 0.2	0.11 \pm 0.05	3.15 \pm 0.78	11.7 \pm 2.9
T2	hum (11)	39.4 \pm 4.5	31.7 \pm 2	2.3 \pm 0.6	15.2 \pm 0.8	9.2 \pm 1.2	2.6 \pm 0.3	0.1 \pm 0.04	4.63 \pm 1.03	10.8 \pm 2.9
T3	hol (6)	43.2 \pm 1	15.5 \pm 4.6	1.4 \pm 0.7	16 \pm 1.1	3.5 \pm 2	2.7 \pm 0.1	0.12 \pm 0.04	3.54 \pm 1.54	10.6 \pm 1.9
T3	hum (7)	43.5 \pm 1.7	16.1 \pm 1.6	1.5 \pm 0.3	17.4 \pm 1.6	5.9 \pm 2.2	2.4 \pm 0.3	0.09 \pm 0.07	3.99 \pm 0.84	9.1 \pm 1.1

70

71

72




73

74 *Figure S7 Scaled soil extract concentrations versus relative elevation above water table for all*
 75 *concentrations were scaled and centered to allow easy comparison across*
 76 *sites and geomorphic categories. Best-fit linear regressions with 95% confidence shading are*
 77 *shown. Site are split by geomorphic category in columns and by analyte in rows.*

78

79

80



81

82 *Figure S8: Linear mixed effects model-predicted soil extract concentration as a function of
 83 elevation above mean water table, split by analyte, without random site effects. Shaded ribbons
 84 indicate 95% confidence intervals about the estimate. Text are p-values for linear mixed effects
 85 model regressions.*

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

Table S5 Linear mixed effect model results for soil chemistry analytes versus relative elevation above water table with site as a random effect.

Solute	Effect	Term	Estimate	SE	Z-score	P(Z>z)
%C	Fixed	Intercept	42.9	1.51	28.45	<0.001
		z	-7.7	4.93	-1.56	0.120
	Random	SD Intercept	2.9			
		SD z	9.6			
Ca ²⁺	Fixed	Intercept	15.9	1.73	9.19	<0.001
		z	3.9	4.19	0.94	0.350
	Random	SD Intercept	4.8			
		SD z	10.4			
Cl ⁻	Fixed	Intercept	1	0.23	4.27	<0.001
		z	2	0.6	3.36	0.001
	Random	SD Intercept	0.6			
		SD z	1.3			
C:N	Fixed	Intercept	14.4	0.61	23.72	<0.001
		z	4.5	1.99	2.27	0.025
	Random	SD Intercept	1.5			
		SD z	5.2			
Mg ²⁺	Fixed	Intercept	4.8	0.79	6.12	<0.001
		z	3.5	1.4	2.48	0.014
	Random	SD Intercept	2.3			
		SD z	3.2			
%N	Fixed	Intercept	2.8	0.13	21.71	<0.001
		z	-1.0	0.28	-3.54	0.001
	Random	SD Intercept	0.3			
		SD z	0.0			
NO ₃ ⁻ -N	Fixed	Intercept	0.8	0.34	2.25	<0.001
		z	-1	0.6	-1.64	0.103
	Random	SD Intercept	1			
		SD z	1.4			
PO ₄ ³⁻ -P	Fixed	Intercept	2.6	0.18	14.39	<0.001
		z	3	1.41	2.16	0.032
	Random	SD Intercept	0.2			
		SD z	4			
SO ₄ ²⁻	Fixed	Intercept	11.9	1.04	11.45	<0.001
		z	-8.1	1.77	-4.57	<0.001
	Random	SD Intercept	2.7			
		SD z	0			