Climate modifies competitive interactions in a late-seral Douglas-fir forest

Student Research Symposium April 12, 2018

> Student: Sara Germain Adviser: Dr. Jim Lutz





BIOTIC shading crowding physical damage pathogens herbivory es constitution pestsuccess

toxicity

nutrition topography

d mass flow runoff

energy

water wind

Wind River Forest Dynamics Plot







Ē

Research Objectives

Quantify interactive effects Does tree mortality depend on biotic, edaphic, climatic contexts?

Project into future Will population trends change with changing climate?



Ē

1. Interactions

Biotic

Hegyi (conspecific) Hegyi (heterospecific) Species richness

$$H_{i} = \sum \frac{DBH_{j}}{(1 + Distance_{ij})(DBH_{i})}$$

Edaphic N Fe Elevation P Al TEB

Climatic Climatic water deficit Snowpack



1. Interactions

Cox Regression time-invariant predictors time-variant predictors Hazard = instantaneous probability of event at time (t)

$$h(t) = e^{(\beta_i X_i + \dots + \beta_k X_k)} \lambda(t)$$

Ē

2. Projections

CCSM4 GFDL-CM3 GFDL-ESM2M GFDL-ESM2G HadGEM2-CC HadGEM2-ES National Center for Atmospheric Research, USA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research, UK Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research, UK







1. Interactions



| Interactive Effects | s Mo | bdel |
|---------------------|------|------|
| Al | — | |
| Fe | + | |
| N | + | * |
| Р | | |
| TEB | - | * |
| Elevation | | * |
| Deficit | + | * |
| Snowpack | - | * |
| Hegyi (con) | | |
| Hegyi (het) | + | * |
| Richness | - | * |



2. Projections





2. Projections









Sparsely heterospecific + drier site tissues acclimated to low water low competition for water



Conclusions

• Hypothesis-generating study Unique mechanisms per interaction

Interactions must be considered

• Inter-annual climate variability matters *Extrapolation to long-term trends uncertain, but in agreement with mortality projections* (Das et al. 2013)



Acknowledgements

Photo Credits:

Sara Germain Tucker Furniss Jim Lutz James Freund Kaitlyn Schwindt Marcia Rosenquist Erika Blomdahl



Advising: Jim Lutz

Data: Lutz Lab - USU PRISM

| past.def | | |
|----------|-------|-------|
| Min. | Mean | Max. |
| 71.9 | 144.9 | 250.5 |

future.def

| Min. | Mean | Max. |
|-------|-------|-------|
| 154.9 | 196.9 | 236.3 |

past.snow

| Min. | Mean | Max. |
|-------|--------|--------|
| 42.67 | 252.57 | 494.72 |

future.snow

| Min. | Mean | Max. |
|-------|-------|--------|
| 30.62 | 76.49 | 104.38 |

1. Interactions

Cox Regression time-invariant predictors time-variant predictors

Hazard = instantaneous probability of event at time (t) $h(t) = e^{(\beta_i X_i + \dots + \beta_k X_k)} \lambda(t)$

Hazard ratio = predictor effect on hazard

 $HR_i = e^{n * \beta_i}$

 $HR_{i} = e^{n \cdot \left[\mathfrak{K}_{i} + \left(\mathfrak{K}_{i,k}X_{k}\right) + \left(\mathfrak{K}_{i,j}X_{j}\right) + \left(\mathfrak{K}_{i,j,k}X_{j}X_{k}\right)\right]}$

$P_t = \overline{P_0 e^{rt}}$

