Published in final edited form as:

Can J For Res. 2018 November ; 48(11): 1366–1372. doi:10.1139/cjfr-2018-0131.

Scale and strength oak-mesophyte interactions in a transitional oak-hickory forest

David Allen^{1,*}, Christopher W. Dick^{2,3}, Ethan Strayer¹, Ivette Perfecto⁴, and John Vandermeer^{2,4}

¹Department of Biology, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT 05753

²Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

³Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panama City, Republic of Panama

⁴School of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Abstract

Forests in eastern North America are undergoing rapid compositional changes as they experience novel climate, disturbance, and pest conditions. One striking pattern is the replacement of canopy oaks (*Quercus* spp.) by mesic, fire-sensitive, shade-tolerant species like red maple (*Acer rubrum*). To gain insight into the successional patterns driving stand-level canopy oak replacement we ask two questions: (i) What is the spatial association of oak and mesophyte recruitment compared to oak and mesophyte overstory individuals, and (ii) How do oaks and mesophytes differentially respond to canopy openings. We analyzed census data from a 23 ha forest plot surveyed in 2003, 2008 and 2014. We show that oak recruits are negatively associated with overstory red maples and black cherries (*Prunus serotina*), while mesophytic recruits were positively associated with overstory oaks. Second, we found that proximity to a dead overstory tree increased growth and survival for black cherries, increased growth for red maples, but had no effect on oaks. Black cherries and red maples are therefore better suited than oaks to take advantage of canopy openings and the moderate light available under adult oaks. These same fine scale competitive processes are contributing to canopy oak replacement across eastern North America.

Keywords

oak replacement; succession; pair correlation function; red maple; mesophication

INTRODUCTION

Hardwood forests across eastern North America are experiencing rapid shifts in species composition associated with changes in climate, disturbance regimes, land use, as well as changes in pest, pathogen, and herbivore populations. The effects of these changes have been particularly striking in oak-dominated stands (Abrams, 1996). Since the 1930s, elevated mortality of large oaks coupled with limited oak recruitment has resulted in a

*Corresponding author: dallen@middlebury.edu, 1-802-443-5218.

decline in their role as canopy dominants (McEwan et al., 2011). Over the last thirty years, this trend has been observed in most oak species and most regions in the eastern United States (Fei et al., 2011). An understanding of this canopy oak loss and the resulting changes to stand composition will inform a discussion of the future of oak-dominated forests and their management.

The exact mechanism for this canopy oak replacement is debated (McEwan et al., 2011). One hypothesis attributes the oak loss to decreased drought severity, suggesting that it has facilitated the recruitment of drought-sensitive, shade-tolerant species, which in turn have displaced oaks from the understory (Pederson et al., 2015). Another hypothesis proposes that fire suppression has provided fire-sensitive, shade-tolerant species, like red maple, with a competitive advantage over oaks (Nowacki and Abrams, 2008; 2015). This could lead to a process of mesophication, a positive feedback between mesophytic species and the abiotic conditions these species both favor and cause (Nowacki and Abrams, 2008). The increased abundance of shade-tolerant, drought- and fire-sensitive species limits light availability in the understory because of their higher leaf area. Heavier shade decreases the temperature and wind speed on the forest floor, while increasing the relative humidity. These abiotic changes reduce the susceptibility of the stand to fire, which create a positive feedback further favoring mesophytic species.

There is support for this putative positive feedback. Juvenile red oaks grow slower and have lower survival in low light environments than juvenile red maples and other mesophytic species (Pacala et al., 1996). Furthermore, while light is generally the limiting resource for red oak sapling growth, soil moisture can be a limiting resource for red and sugar maple (Kobe, 2006). Therefore, if forest floors become darker and wetter maple regeneration should be favored over oak. Once the process starts dense understory mesophytes are then a major obstacle to oak seedling growth and survival (Lorimer et al., 1994). Experimental evidence supports this conclusion. Iverson et al. (2008) report that prescribed thinning and burning favored oak recruitment over maple and that oak recruitment was the greatest in areas of high light and xeric conditions. Finally, evidence comes from oak-dominated stands across eastern North America in which recruitment histories were reconstructed. These studies found continuous oak recruitment prior to the early twentieth century which was largely replaced by mesophyte recruitment thereafter (Abrams and Copenheaver, 1999; Abrams et al. 1995; Hart et al., 2012; Hutchinson et al., 2008; Shumway et al., 2001). In a subset of these studies the fire history of the stand was also reconstructed, and fires were frequent during the period of oak recruitment while they were rare or absent during subsequent mesophyte recruitment (Hutchinson et al., 2008; McEwan et al. 2007; Shumway et al. 2011).

While the underlying drivers of mesophication have been characterized, there are still gaps in our knowledge of stand-level oak-mesophyte interactions. First, as mesophytes replace oaks in the canopy, we need to understand how oak and mesophyte recruitment patterns respond to canopy changes. One way to do that is by measuring the species-specific spatial association between recruits and overstory individuals (Cowell et al., 2010; McDonald et al., 2003). Here, we present a better way to measure those associations through non-cumulative spatial statistics and comparison to a null dispersal model. Second, as canopy gaps form, we

need to understand how oak and mesophyte survival and growth differentially respond. Here, we measure these species-specific responses with data from a large forest dynamics plot that has been censused three times.

This study was conducted in a 23 ha research plot in a transitional oak-hickory forest in southeast Michigan. The plot was censused three times over an 11-year period. The most recent census captured >45 000 stems > 1 cm diameter at breast height (DBH). We used the census data to address these questions: (1) What is the spatial association between the overstory *Acer rubrum*, *Prunus serotina* and *Quercus* spp. and recruits of these taxonomic groups; and (2) How does the growth and mortality of individuals of each of these three groups respond to the death of a neighboring overstory tree?

METHODS

Site and data collection

This study was conducted at the Big Woods plot within the University of Michigan's Edwin S. George Reserve in Pinckney, MI (42°27'24.36"N, 84°00'40.03" W). The plot has steep moraine and basin topography and is dissected by a large esker. Upland portions have well-drained sandy loam or loamy sand soils, while portions below 275 m elevation have soils of organic deposits and muck. Oaks and hickories dominate the forest overstory. The oaks are predominantly white oak (*Quercus alba*), black oak (*Q. velutina*), northern red oak (*Q. rubra*), and Hawkins' oak (*Q. × hawkinsiae* Sudw. [*rubra* × *velutina*]). The hickories are pignut (*Carya glabra*), shagbark (*C. ovata*), and bitternut hickory (*C. cordiformis*). The overstory (trees ≥ 20 cm DBH) is 36% red oak group (*Quercus* section *Lobatae*), 20% white oaks, 16% hickories, 14% black cherries (*Prunus serotina*), 10% red maples (*Acer rubrum*), and less than 4% remaining species. The mid- and sub-canopy (trees <20 cm DBH) are 32% witch hazel (*Hamamelis virginiana*), 21% black cherry, 16% red maple, and less than 2% each oaks and hickories. See Allen et al. (2009) for more description of the forest.

Historical pre-settlement vegetation reconstructions suggest a large fraction of what is now the George Reserve was covered by black oak barren, mixed oak forest, wet prairie, and mixed hardwood swamp (Comer et al., 1995). The Big Woods plot area was likely largely covered by black oak barren and mixed oak forest. Kost et al. (2007) described southern Michigan's black oak barrens and oak-dominated dry forests as fire-dependent communities. This suggests the region could have had a history of fire prior to European settlement, although we do not have a documented fire history of the George Reserve. The current forest composition of oak-hickory canopy and red maple-black cherry understory does not have a historical analogue, as Dodge (1987) found that red maple and black cherry were not common in the pre-settlement oak forests of southcentral Michigan. Dodge (1987) also suggests that the rise in importance of these species is related to fire suppression. This history is also supported by the abundance of large red maples in the swamps and along wetland borders, which would have had some protection against ground fires.

The Big Woods plot was originally set up in 2003 as a 12 ha plot with all individuals larger than 10 cm circumference (≈3.2 cm DBH) identified, measured, and mapped. This plot was re-censused in 2008 and an additional 11 ha were added. In 2014 the full 23 ha plot was re-

censused and individuals down to 1 cm DBH were added, following the protocols of the Forest Global Earth Observatory network (ForestGEO) (Condit, 1998), of which the Big Woods plot is now a member (<http://www.forestgeo.si.edu/>).

For the following analyses all oak species were grouped together and compared to the dominant mid-canopy mesophytic species, red maple and black cherry. The results were largely unchanged when the analyses were conducted separately on white oaks and oaks in the red oak section (*Q.* section *Lobatae*).

Statistics

Recruitment—We measured the spatial association between overstory trees for each group and the recruits of each group with an inhomogeneous bivariate pair correlation function (PCF). The PCF, $g(r)$, is the density of points in a ring of radius r around a focal point divided by the average density of those points (Velázquez et al., 2016). The bivariate version measures the spatial association of points of two different types, so it measures the density of type A points around focal points of type B divided by the average density of type A points. In either the bivariate or univariate case, the PCF is preferable to the more commonly used Ripley's K because it is non-cumulative (Perry et al., 2006; Velázquez et al., 2016). In cumulative spatial statistics the value of that statistic at radius r is the cumulative effect from 0 to r , rather than the effect just at r . This makes it hard to interpret the true scale of an association. We used the inhomogeneous PCF because none of the point patterns was homogenous across the plot. See Velázquez et al. (2016) for a discussion of the importance of using inhomogeneous spatial statistics.

We defined recruits as individuals that were too small to be included in the 2008 survey (<3.2 cm DBH) but large enough to be included in the 2014 census (≥ 3.2 cm DBH). We defined overstory trees as those with a DBH of at least 20 cm. We calculated nine bivariate inhomogeneous PCFs, one measuring the spatial association of each taxonomic group's recruits to each group's overstory individuals. The taxonomic groups were red maple, black cherry, and all oaks.

We compared each PCF to the expected PCF under a null dispersal model in which recruits were randomly dispersed from adult individuals of that group. The null dispersal models were based on species-specific dispersal functions from Martin and Canham (2010). For each group the same number of recruits as observed were randomly attributed to adults based on species-specific DBH-recruits produced relationships from Martin and Canham (2010). These recruits were then 'dispersed' in a random direction from that adult with distance drawn from species-specific lognormal dispersal kernels, also taken from Martin and Canham (2010). They gave these functions for black cherry, red maple and red oaks. The red oak DBH-recruits produced relationship and dispersal kernel were used for our oak group. We ran the null dispersal model 100 times for each taxonomic group. The result of each random recruit placement was then compared to the actual spatial pattern of overstory individuals for the three groups with a bivariate inhomogeneous PCF. We created 95% confidence intervals of these PCF values. This allowed us to compare the actual spatial arrangement of recruits to the expectation if their arrangement was derived solely from

dispersal from adult individuals. This analysis was done with the spatstat package in *R* (Baddeley and Turner, 2005; R Core Team, 2017).

Proximity to dead overstory tree—We tested the effect of being within 10 m of a tree larger than 20 cm DBH that died between 2003–2008 on the growth and mortality of individuals between 2008–2014. We took 20 cm DBH as the cut-off for overstory trees. We had to restrict this analysis to individuals in the original 12 ha of the plot, as those are the only ones for which we had the 2003 census. The growth and mortality response was measured separately for black cherries, red maples, and oaks. The species of the dead overstory tree was not considered.

We modeled average annual DBH growth from 2008 to 2014 as a lognormal function of 2008 DBH. The lognormal function has the flexibility of taking many empirically observed shapes with a low number of parameters (Uriarte et al., 2004):

$$\text{DBH growth} = g_i * \exp(-0.5 * \log((\text{DBH}/\mu_i)^2/\sigma_i)) \quad (\text{eq 1})$$

Where $i = 1$ for individuals within 10 m of an overstory tree that died between 2003 and 2008, and $i = 2$ for individuals farther than 10 m for such a tree. Parameters g_i , μ_i , and σ_i determined the shape of the lognormal growth function. We fit this separately for each species. We then fit a simpler version of the model in which $g_1 = g_2$, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. In other words, for each species we fit two models: one in which the DBH-growth relationship is different for individuals within 10 m of a dead overstory tree and those not, and a second model in which all individuals have the same DBH-growth relationship. The second simpler model is nested within the full model, so we compared them with the likelihood ratio test (Bolker, 2008). If the more complex model fit significantly better, we could say that proximity to a dead overstory tree had an effect on tree growth for that species. This analysis was done in *R* with the package bbmle (Bolker, 2017; R Core Team, 2017).

We took a similar approach to measuring how proximity to a dead tree affected mortality. We modeled the probability of mortality between 2008 and 2014 as an exponential function of 2008 DBH. In some cases, tree mortality is U-shaped with tree size (Lines et al., 2010). But for our three groups mortality decreased with size, so we used an up-shifted exponential function for the DBH-mortality relationship:

$$P(\text{mortality}) = a_i * \exp(-b_i * \text{DBH}) + c_i \quad (\text{eq 2})$$

Again, $i = 1$ for individuals within 10 m of an overstory tree that died between 2003 and 2008, and $i = 2$ for individuals farther than 10 m for such a tree. Parameters a_i , b_i , and c_i determined the shape of the exponential mortality function. We fit this model separately for each species, and then for each species a simpler version where $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 = b_2$, and $c_1 = c_2$. The two models were compared with the likelihood ratio test. This analysis was done in *R* with the package bbmle (Bolker, 2017; R Core Team, 2017).

RESULTS

Recruitment

Recruitment was highly uneven among the three groups. Between 2008 and 2014 over the 23 ha plot there were 244 black cherries, 295 red maples, and 32 oaks that recruited into the 3.2 cm DBH size class. Figure 1 shows the results from the PCF analysis, which measures the spatial association between recruits and overstory individuals. Take Figure 1C as an example; it shows the association between black cherry recruits and overstory oaks. The black line shows the actual data. When the PCF, $g(r)$, is greater than one there were more black cherry recruits than average black cherry recruit density r meters away from overstory oaks. For example, $g(2.5 \text{ m}) \approx 1.5$ means that 2.5 meters away from the average overstory oak there are 1.5 times more black cherry recruits than the average overall density of black cherry recruits. The gray bands show the expected results under the null black cherry dispersal model. At all scales between 0–20 m there were more black cherry recruits around overstory oaks than the average black cherry recruit density (>1) and than expected by the black cherry dispersal model (above the gray band). This effect was strongest at small spatial scales ($< 2 \text{ m}$).

Overall from this analysis we can see there are fewer recruits found close to conspecifics than expected under the dispersal model (Figures 1A, 1E, and 1I). For black cherries (Figure 1A) and oaks (Figure 1I) this was significant from 0–2.5 m, while for red maples it was significant from 0–20 m.

For interspecific interactions we see that both black cherry and red maple recruits were positively associated with overstory oaks (Figures 1C and 1F). The effect was strongest between 0 and 5m, but it was significant for all spatial scales considered. Oak recruitment was negatively associated with overstory black cherries at all spatial scales considered (Figure 1G). But oak recruitment was not as affected by overstory red maples (Figure 1H). Between 0 and 3 m oak recruits' association with overstory red maples was no different from that expected under the null oak dispersal model. At spatial scales farther than 3 m there was only a marginally significant reduction in oak recruit density with overstory red maples.

Proximity to dead overstory trees

Between 2003 and 2008, 113 overstory trees died. For both black cherry ($\chi^2 = 12.7$, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.005$) and red maple ($\chi^2 = 37.4$, d.f. = 3, $p = 3.8 \times 10^{-8}$) the more complicated model, which included proximity to dead overstory tree, fit better than the simpler one that did not. Thus, for those two species individuals within 10 m of a dead overstory tree had a significantly different DBH-growth relationship than those farther than 10 m. In both cases those individuals grew faster (Figure 2A–2B). The fit curves show that for red maple this difference was greatest for individuals of ~10–15 cm DBH, while for black cherry the difference increased with the size of the tree. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in growth for oaks based on proximity to dead overstory tree ($\chi^2 = 5.6$, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.13$, Figure 2C). This means that while black cherry and red maple individuals were able to take advantage of canopy openings with faster growth, oaks were not.

For mortality we found a similar pattern for black cherries. For that species the more complicated model which, included proximity to dead overstory tree, fit better than the simpler one that did not ($\chi^2 = 11.6$, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.009$). There was a reduction in 2008 to 2014 mortality for black cherries within 10 m of an overstory tree that died between 2003 and 2008. This reduction was most pronounced for individuals less than 10 cm DBH (Figure 3A). On the other hand, the model that included proximity to a dead tree did not do a significantly better job describing red maple ($\chi^2 = 4.7$, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.20$) or oak mortality ($\chi^2 = 4.8$, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.19$). For those individuals the single model performed just as well at describing mortality (Figure 3B–3C).

DISCUSSION

In this study we measured stand-level oak-mesophyte interactions in a forest experiencing mesophyte replacement of canopy oaks. While other studies (Cowell et al., 2010; McDonald et al., 2003) have measured the spatial association between oak and mesophyte recruitment compared to overstory trees, we were better able to interpret the spatial scale of that association with a non-cumulative spatial statistic. We were also able to measure the differential response of oaks and mesophytes to canopy openings. With three censuses of the same forest plot we used the first to second census to identify canopy tree deaths and then second to third to measure the response of surrounding trees to those deaths (and the light gaps produced).

Previous studies have measured the spatial association of oak recruitment and overstory or midstory density (Cowell et al. 2010; McDonald et al., 2003). These studies use Ripley's K to show a negative association between mid-canopy density and oak recruitment at very large spatial scales (> 20 m). However, Ripley's K is a cumulative spatial statistic, so the value at a given scale, r , is the cumulative value between 0 and r distance. Thus, it is hard to tell whether a measured association at distance r is due to a process that truly has an effect at r distance away or from the cumulative effect at shorter distances (Perry et al., 2006). Here we are able to measure the association at each distance using the non-cumulative PCF.

These results show that oak recruitment is negatively associated with proximity to both overstory black cherries and red maples, although the effect of the black cherry is stronger. McDonald et al. (2003) also found that oak recruitment was negatively associated with adult red maples, but they did not look at black cherries. Presumably the main reason for this negative association is that red maple and black cherry canopies block more light than oak canopies do (Pacala et al., 1996), and thus there is less oak recruitment under the deeper shade of the mesophyte canopy. It may also be that areas of higher overstory black cherry and red maple density have dense midstories of those species as well, and that it is those midstory individuals which are directly affecting oak recruitment. Lorimer et al. (1994) found that the shade of a dense mesophyte midstory decreases oak seedling growth and survivorship.

However, neither of these would explain the negative association we see at larger spatial scales (> 5 m). This perhaps is a result of subtle edaphic factors. Canopy-sized red maples and black cherries are found more commonly in mesic sites, while oak recruitment is

generally limited to more xeric locations (Iverson et al., 2008). Thus the negative association between mesophyte overstory individuals and oak recruits at larger spatial scales, could be the result of this difference in soil water requirements. Although we did not measure any soil characteristics we do, anecdotally, note that the largest black cherry and red maple individuals are restricted to mesic sites near ponds and swamps, while oak recruitment is largely limited to more xeric sites with sandy soils and a thick *Vaccinium* ground cover. This pattern of oak regeneration limited to the xeric sites has been noted in other oak-dominated forests (Hart and Kupfer, 2011; McEwan and Muller, 2006).

The PCF analysis also showed a negative association between the overstory individuals and conspecific recruits of each group. This pattern is to be expected if there is Janzen-Connell density-dependent recruitment limitation (Connell, 1971; Janzen, 1970). This recruitment limitation was proposed as a mechanism for high levels of diversity in tropical forests (Janzen, 1970), and has been observed in many tropical species (Harms et al., 2000). However, it has also been observed in several temperate forest species as well (Hille Ris Lambers et al., 2002). Previous studies have documented recruitment farther from adult trees than expected by seed rain in black cherry, red maple, and red oak (Hille Ris Lambers et al., 2003; Packer and Clay, 2000). We found an especially strong pattern of negative density dependent for black cherry, which, could be the result of the soil pathogen *Pythium* spp (Packer and Clay, 2000).

In the second part of our study we found that mesophytes responded positively to the death of an overstory tree, while oaks did not. Previous studies have used gap-capture methods to predict which individual would capture a gap in oak dominated forests (Taylor and Lorimer, 2003; Richards and Hart, 2011). These studies find that even in forests where oaks dominate the canopy, gap capture is expected to be accomplished by non-oak, shade-tolerant mesophytes. Here we provide support and a possible explanation for these predictions. Black cherry individuals near dead overstory trees showed faster growth and higher survival and red maples individuals faster growth, but oaks did not show a response.

Shade-tolerant species often require multiple episodes of release and suppression before reaching the canopy (Canham, 1985; 1990). However, canopy oak trees were most likely to have originated in an opening and reach the canopy before canopy closure (Rentch et al., 2003). Again, our result helps to explain this finding; the small amount of additional light from one dead canopy tree did not provide enough resources for a release event for oaks as it did for the mesophytes. Based on personal observations, most of these canopy openings were relatively small. This suggests that they are more likely to be closed by lateral expansion rather than subcanopy recruitment (Richards and Hart, 2011; Weber et al., 2014). Overtopped subcanopy mesophytes may not fully capture the gap, but the opening may provide enough of an increase in growth to make them better able to take advantage of future ones.

We found differences between how the two mesophytic species responded to these canopy openings. For black cherry individuals the largest increase in size with proximity to canopy opening was for the largest DBH trees. These faster growing large black cherries may then capture the canopy opening by lateral expansion, though we did not predict canopy capture

in this study. On the other hand, 10–20 cm DBH red maples had the largest increase in size with proximity to canopy opening. Canham et al. (2006) found that 15 cm DBH red maples responded more strongly to crowding, while larger ones are less sensitive. As canopy opening form and preferentially support the growth of midcanopy red maples, these could in turn further decrease oak recruitment (Lorimer et al., 1994).

There was also a difference in how canopy openings affected the mortality of red maples and black cherries. While red maple mortality did not change with proximity to a canopy opening, black cherry mortality decreased. This decrease in mortality was especially large for black cherry individuals less than 10 cm DBH, which otherwise had a high mortality rate. This reduction in mortality was probably due to an increase in light availability, as black cherry saplings have relatively high mortality at low light levels (Kobe et al., 1995).

There is a general consensus that burning is required to maintain oak dominance in stands undergoing mesophication (Arthur et al. 2011). In a meta-analysis of 32 studies in mixed-oak forests Brose et al. (2013) found that prescribed fire can reduce midstory stem density and preferentially select for oak over mesophyte reproduction. However, they caution that single fire treatments were generally not enough, and multiple burns were needed to benefit oaks in the long term. Iverson et al. (2017) further suggest that an initial partial harvest was needed before the first burn to promote oak regrowth. They also found that even with thinning and three burns over 13 years, mesophyte recruitment is favored over oaks in mesic sites. As a result, they recommend that burning is only worth the cost on xeric sites. Our study does not directly test fire regimes, but generally supports these recommendations. We found that red maples and black cherries are better able to capture natural canopy gaps than oaks. Fires have been shown to control midcanopy mesophytes (Brose et al., 2013), which could allow oak capture of natural canopy gaps. Our results also support the recommendation that fire is only recommended for certain oak sites (Iverson et al., 2017). We found oak recruitment is greatly reduced with proximity to canopy mesophytes, but Arthur et al. (2011) note that large red maples survive prescribed burns. Thus in mesic areas with existing mesophytic canopies burning treatments may not support enough oak rather than mesophyte recruitment to be worth the cost.

The patterns found here are consistent with the basic pattern of oak replacement by more shade-tolerant species. These results were possible to measure in a forest research plot that has been sampled three times over the last 11 years. Much work has been done on research plots in old-growth forests to study processes and patterns at equilibrium. Here we highlight the importance of plots in transitional forests to give better insights into successional processes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the individuals who helped census the plot: Omodele Ajagbe, Bob Barretto, Hillary Butterworth, Richard Byler, Vera Chan, Ben Crotte, David Hudson, Lindsay Ford, Katie Gallagher, Jasmine Gramling, Kate Heflick, Rodica Kocur, Carley Kratz, Rachael Lacey, Isaac Levine, Kathleen Parks, Andrew Phillips, Jayna Sames, Margot Sands, John Schroeder, Leah Spaulding, Jordan Trejo, Justin Waraniak, Padhma Venkitapathy, Olivia Velzy, and Ash Zemenick. This work was supported by the Edwin S. George Reserve Fund and by a USDA McIntyre-Stennis Grant. E.S. was funded by the Middlebury College Millennium Fund. We thank Stuart Davies and Smithsonian staff for guidance in establishing a ForestGEO plot within the E.S. George Reserve.

REFERENCES

- Abrams MD 1996 Distribution, historical development and ecophysiological attributes of oak species in the eastern United States. *Ann. Sci. For* 53(2–3): 487–512.
- Abrams MD and Copenheaver CA 1999 Temporal variation in species recruitment and dendroecology of an old-growth white oak forest in the Virginia Piedmont, USA. *Forest Ecol. Manag* 124(2–3): 275–284.
- Abrams MD, Orwig DA, and Demeo TE 1995 Dendroecological analysis of successional dynamics for a presettlement-origin white-pine–mixed-oak forest in the southern Appalachians, USA. *J. Ecol* 83: 123–133.
- Allen D, Vandermeer J, and Perfecto I 2009 When are habitat patches really islands? *Forest Ecol. Manag* 258(9): 2033–2036.
- Arthur MA, Alexander HD, Dey DC, Schweitzer CJ, and Loftis DL 2012 Refining the oak-fire hypothesis for management of oak-dominated forests of the eastern United States. *J. Forest* 110(5): 257–266.
- Baddeley A, and Turner R 2005 spatstat: An R package for analyzing spatial point patterns. *J. Stat. Softw* 12(6): 1–42.
- Bolker B 2008 Ecological Models and Data in R. Princeton University Press Princeton, United States.
- Bolker B 2017 bbmle: Tools for general maximum likelihood estimation. R package version 1.0.19.
- Brose PH, Dey DC, Phillips RJ, and Waldrop TA 2013 A meta-analysis of the fire-oak hypothesis: does prescribed burning promote oak reproduction in eastern North America? *Forest Sci* 59(3): 322–334.
- Canham CD 1985 Suppression and release during canopy recruitment in *Acer saccharum*. *B. Torrey Bot. Club* 112: 134–145.
- Canham CD 1990 Suppression and release during canopy recruitment in *Fagus grandifolia*. *B. Torrey Bot. Club* 117: 1–7.
- Canham CD, Papaik MJ, Uriarte M, McWilliams WH, Jenkins JC, and Twery MJ 2006 Neighborhood analysis of canopy tree competition along environmental gradients in New England forests. *Ecol. Appl* 16(2): 504–554.
- Comer PJ, Albert DA, Wells HA, Hart BL, Raab JB, Price DL, Kashian DM, Corner RA, Schuen DW, Austin MB, Leibfreid TR, Korroch KM, Prange-Gregory L, Spitzley JG, DeLain CJ, and Scrimger LJ 1995 Michigan's presettlement vegetation, as interpreted from the General Land Office Surveys 1816–1856. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Lansing, MI.
- Condit R 1998 Tropical Forest Census Plots: Methods and Results from Barro Colorado Island, Panama and a Comparison with Other Plots. Springer Berlin, Germany.
- Connell JH 1971 On the role of natural enemies in preventing competitive exclusion in some marine animals and in rain forest trees. In *Dynamics of Populations*. Edited by Den Boer PJ and Gradwell GR. Centre for Agricultural Publishing and Documentation, Wageningen, Netherlands pp. 298–313.
- Cowell CM, Hoalst-Pullen N, and Jackson M 2010 The limited role of canopy gaps in the successional dynamics of a mature mixed *Quercus* forest remnant. *J. Veg. Sci* 21(1): 201–212.
- Dodge SL 1987 Presettlement forest of south-central Michigan. *Michigan Botanist* 26: 139–152.
- Fei S, Kong N, Steiner KC, Moser WK, and Steiner EB 2011 Change in oak abundance in the eastern United States from 1980 to 2008. *Forest. Ecol. Manag* 262: 1370–1377.
- Harms KE, Wright SJ, Calderón O, Hernández A, and Herre EA 2000 Pervasive density-dependent recruitment enhances seedling diversity in a tropical forest. *Nature* 404: 493–495. [PubMed: 10761916]
- Hart JL, Clark SL, Torreano SJ, and Buchanan ML 2012 Composition, structure, and dendroecology of an old-growth *Quercus* forest on the tablelands of the Cumberland Plateau, USA. *Forest Ecol. Manag* 266: 11–24.
- Hart JL and Kupfer JA 2011 Sapling richness and composition in canopy gaps of a southern Appalachian mixed *Quercus* forest. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc* 138(2): 207–219.

- Hille Ris Lambers J and Clark JS 2003 Effects of dispersal, shrubs, and density-dependent mortality on seed and seedling distributions in temperate forests. *Can. J. For. Res* 33(5): 783–795.
- Hille Ris Lambers J, Clark JS, and Beckage B 2002 Density-dependent mortality and the latitudinal gradient in species diversity. *Nature* 417: 732–735. [PubMed: 12066182]
- Hutchinson TF, Long RP, Ford RD, and Sutherland EK 2008 Fire history and the establishment of oaks and maples in second-growth forests. *Can. J. For. Res* 38: 1184–1198.
- Iverson LR, Hutchinson TF, Prasad AM, and Peters MP 2008 Thinning, fire and oak regeneration across a heterogeneous landscape in the eastern U.S.: 7-year results. *Forest Ecol. Manag* 255: 3035–3050.
- Iverson LR, Hutchinson TF, Peters MP, and Yaussy DA 2017 Long-term response of oak-hickory regeneration to partial harvest and repeated fires: influence of light and moisture. *Ecosphere* 8(1): e01642.
- Janzen DH 1970 Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests. *Am. Nat* 104: 501–528.
- Kobe RK 2006 Sapling growth as a function of light and landscape-level variation in soil water and foliar nitrogen in northern Michigan. *Oecologia* 147: 119–133. [PubMed: 16208492]
- Kobe RK, Pacala SW, Silander JA, and Canham CD 1995 Juvenile tree survivorship as a component of shade tolerance. *Ecol. Appl* 5(2): 517–532.
- Kost MA, Albert DA, Cohen JG, Slaughter BS, Schillo RK, Weber CR, and Chapman KA 2007 Natural communities of Michigan: classification and description. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report No. 2007–21, Lansing, MI.
- Lines ER, Coomes DA, and Purves DW 2010 Influence of forest structure, climate and species composition on tree mortality across the Eastern US. *PLoS One* 5: e13212. [PubMed: 20967250]
- Lorimer CG, Chapman JW, and Lambert WD 1994 Tall understory vegetation as a factor in the poor development of oak seedlings beneath mature stands. *J. Ecol* 82(2): 227–237.
- Martin PH and Canham CD 2010 Dispersal and recruitment limitation in native versus exotic tree species: life-history strategies and Janzen–Connell effects. *Oikos* 119(5): 807–824.
- McDonald RI, Peet RK, and Urban D. I. 2003 Spatial pattern of *Quercus* regeneration limitation and *Acer rubrum* invasion in a Piedmont forest. *J. Veg. Sci* 14(3): 441–450.
- McEwan RW, Dyer JM, and Pederson N 2011 Multiple interacting ecosystem drivers: toward an encompassing hypothesis of oak forest dynamics across eastern North America. *Ecography* 34(2): 244–256.
- McEwan RW, Hutchinson TF, Long RP, Ford DR, and McCarthy BC 2007 Temporal and spatial patterns in fire occurrence during the establishment of mixed-oak forests in eastern North America. *J. Veg. Sci* 18(5): 655–664.
- McEwan RW and Muller RN 2006 Spatial and temporal dynamics in canopy dominance of an old-growth central Appalachian forest. *Can. J. For. Res* 36(6): 1536–1550.
- Nowacki GJ, and Abrams MD 2008 The demise of fire and “mesophication” of forests in the eastern United States. *BioScience* 58(2): 123–138.
- Nowacki GJ, and Abrams MD 2015 Is climate an important driver of post-European vegetation change in the Eastern United States? *Global Change Biol* 21(1): 314–334.
- Pacala SW, Canham CD, Saponara J, Silander JA, Jr., Kobe RK, and Ribbens E 1996 Forest models defined by field measurements: estimation, error analysis and dynamics. *Ecol. Monogr* 66: 1–43.
- Packer A and Clay K 2000 Soil pathogens and spatial patterns of seedling mortality in a temperate tree. *Nature* 404: 278–281. [PubMed: 10749209]
- Pederson N, D’Amato AW, Dyer JM, Foster DR, Goldblum D, Hart JL, Hessl AE, Iverson LR, Jackson ST, Martin-Benito D, McCarthy BC, McEwan RW, Mladenoff DJ, Parker AJ, Shuman B, and Williams JW 2015 Climate remains an important driver of post-European vegetation change in the eastern United States. *Global Change Biol* 21(6): 2105–2110.
- Perry GLW, Miller BP, and Enright NJ 2006 A comparison of methods for statistical analysis of spatial point patterns in plant ecology. *Plant Ecol* 187(1): 59–82.
- R Core Team. 2017 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

- Rentch JS, Fajvan MA, and Hicks RR, Jr. 2003 Oak establishment and canopy accession strategies in five old-growth stands in the central hardwood forest region. *Forest Ecol. Manag* 184: 285–297.
- Richards JD and Hart JL 2011 Canopy gap dynamics and development patterns in secondary *Quercus* stands on the Cumberland Plateau, Alabama, USA. *Forest Ecol. Manag* 262: 2229–2239.
- Shumway DL, Abrams MD, and Ruffner CM 2001 A 400-year history of fire and oak recruitment in an old-growth oak forest in western Maryland, U.S.A. *Can. J. For. Res* 31(8): 1437–1443.
- Taylor SO and Lorimer CG 2003 Loss of oak dominance in dry-mesic deciduous forests predicted by gap capture methods. *Plant Ecol* 167: 71–88.
- Uriarte M, Canham CD, Thompson J, and Zimmerman JK 2004 A neighborhood analysis of tree growth and survival in a hurricane-driven tropical forest. *Eco. Monogr* 74(4): 591–614.
- Velázquez E, Marínez I, Getzin S, Moloney KA, and Wiegand T 2016 An evaluation of the state of spatial point pattern analysis in ecology. *Ecography* 39(11): 1042–1055.
- Weber TA, Hart JL, Schweitzer CJ, and Dey DC 2014 Influence of gap-scale disturbance on development and successional pathways in *Quercus-Pinus* stands. *For Ecol. Manag* 331: 60–70.

Figure 1.

The bivariate inhomogeneous pair correlation functions (PCF) measuring the spatial association of recruits to overstory, >20 cm DBH, trees. The analysis is separated by taxonomic group, with the recruit groups in rows and the overstory groups in columns. The PCF value, $g(r)$, is the density of recruits in rings of radius r (meters) around overstory individuals divided by the expected density of recruits. The black solid lines show the data and gray intervals show the 95% expectation under the assumption that recruitment patterns are solely the result of dispersal from adults.

Figure 2.

Relationship between 2008 DBH and average annual DBH growth from 2008 to 2014. For each group we compared two models: one fit separately for individuals within 10 m of a dead overstory tree and those farther; and a second simpler model which fit the same relationship for all individuals. For black cherry and red maple the more complex model fit better, while for oaks the simpler model did just as well. For black cherry and red maple, the dotted line is the model fit for trees within 10 m of a dead overstory tree and the solid for those farther. For oaks the single fit relationship is shown. We show binned data rather than all data points for easier interpretation. For each species we binned individuals into deciles based on 2008 DBH and then calculated the average growth and DBH for each bin. Error bars indicate the standard error of growth for each bin. We do this separately for individuals within 10 m of a dead tree (exes, x), and those farther (open circles, o). Note different axis scales for each subgraph: A) black cherry, B) red maple, and C) oaks.

Figure 3.

Relationship between 2008 DBH and 2008 to 2014 mortality. For each species we compared two models: one fit separately for individuals within 10 m of a dead overstory tree and those farther; and a second simpler model which fit the same relationship for all individuals. For black cherry the more complex model fit better, while for red maple and oaks the simpler model did just as well. For black cherry, the dotted line is the model fit for trees within 10 m of a dead overstory tree and the solid for those farther. For red maple and oaks, the single fit relationship is shown. We show binned data rather than all data points for easier interpretation. For each species we binned individuals into septiles based on 2008 DBH and then calculated the average mortality and DBH for each bins. Error bars indicate the standard error of mortality for each bin. We do this separately for individuals within 10 m of

a dead tree (exes, x), and those farther (open circles, o). Note different axis scales for each subgraph: A) black cherry, B) red maple, and C) oaks.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript