

1 **Investigating dune-building feedback at the plant level: insights from a multispecies field**  
2 **experiment**

3 Elsemarie Mullins<sup>1</sup>, Laura J. Moore<sup>1</sup>, Evan B. Goldstein<sup>1</sup>, Theo Jass<sup>1</sup>, John Bruno<sup>2</sup> and Orencio  
4 Durán Vinent<sup>3</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Geological Sciences, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill,  
6 North Carolina, USA

7 <sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North  
8 Carolina, USA

9 <sup>3</sup>Department of Ocean Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843-3136,  
10 USA

11 **Keywords:** Coastal foredunes, Dune Grasses, *Ammophila breviligulata*, *Uniola paniculata*,  
12 *Spartina patens*

13

14 **Abstract**

15 Coastal foredunes provide the first line of defense against rising sea levels and storm surge and  
16 for this reason there is increasing interest in understanding and modeling foredune formation and  
17 post-storm recovery. However, there is limited observational data available to provide empirical  
18 guidance for the development of model parameterizations. To provide guidance for improved  
19 representation of dune grass growth in models, we conducted a two-year multi-species transplant  
20 experiment on Hog Island, VA, U.S.A. and measured the dependence of plant growth on  
21 elevation and distance from the shoreline, as well as the relationship between plant growth and  
22 sand accumulation. We tracked total leaf growth (length) and aboveground leaf length and found  
23 that *Ammophila breviligulata* (American beachgrass) and *Uniola paniculata* (sea oats) grew  
24 more than *Spartina patens* (saltmeadow cordgrass) by a factor of 15% (though not statistically

25 significant) and 45%, respectively. Our results also suggest a range of basal/frontal area ratios  
26 (an important model parameter) from 0.5-1 and a strong correlation between transplant growth  
27 and total sand deposition for all species at the scale of two years, but not over shorter temporal  
28 scales. Distance from the shoreline and elevation had no effect on transplant growth rate but did  
29 have an effect on survival. Based on transplant survival, the seaward limit of vegetation at the  
30 end of the experiment was approximately 30 m from the MHWL and at an elevation of 1.43 m,  
31 corresponding to inundation less than 7.5% of the time according to total water level  
32 calculations. Results from this experiment provide evidence for the dune-building capacity of all  
33 three species, suggesting *S. patens* is not a maintainer species, as previously thought, but rather a  
34 moderate dune builder even though its growth is less stimulated by sand deposition than *A.*  
35 *breviligulata* and *U. paniculata*.

36

## 37 Introduction

38 Barrier islands are low-lying, sandy landforms and comprise approximately 10% of the  
39 world's coastline (Stutz and Pilkey, 2011). Coastal foredunes (the first dunes landward of the  
40 beach) line the seaward side of many barrier islands and are the first line of defense against  
41 elevated water levels, protecting the landward side of an island, back-barrier marshes, and bays  
42 from inundation during storms. The height of foredunes relative to the maximum water level is a  
43 key factor in determining the impact of storms and along with storm surge controls whether or  
44 not overwash will occur (Sallenger, 2000; Ruggiero et al., 2001; Houser et al., 2008).

45 Coastal foredunes often form via a feedback between dune grasses and sand transport  
46 processes. Plants act as surface roughness elements that reduce the shear stress imparted to the

47 sand surface by wind (e.g., Bressolier and Thomas, 1977; Raupach et al., 1993; Arens, 1996;  
48 Durán and Herrmann, 2006), causing sand to be deposited on and around plants (e.g., Hesp,  
49 1981, 2002); dune-building vegetation increases deposition of sand on timescales as short as  
50 weeks (e.g. Arens, 1996). In turn, a moderate amount of sand deposition enhances the growth of  
51 aboveground biomass of dune-building grasses (e.g., Disraeli, 1984; Ehrenfeld, 1990; Maun,  
52 1998; Maun and Perumal, 1999; Gilbert and Ripley, 2010). The balance between the rate of  
53 burial and the rate of plant growth determines aboveground plant biomass (i.e., the aboveground  
54 volume of the plant) and therefore the degree to which a plant reduces wind flow. If a plant can  
55 grow vertically at a rate that is greater than the rate of sand deposition, then the stimulation of  
56 growth by burial will increase the area of the plant that interacts with the wind, further enhancing  
57 dune growth.

58         Although the distance from the shoreline that dune-building vegetation becomes  
59 established exerts a first-order control on dune height (Durán and Moore, 2013), species type and  
60 vegetation density affect dune width, height, growth rate, and alongshore continuity by  
61 influencing the rate of sand deposition (e.g., Godfrey, 1977; Hesp, 1984a; Seabloom and  
62 Wiedemann, 1994; Arens, 1996; Stallins and Parker, 2003; Hacker et al., 2012; Zarnetske et al.,  
63 2012; Wolner et al., 2013.). For example, on the U.S. West Coast, the invasive *Ammophila*  
64 *arenaria*, a relatively tall and dense grass that has an upright growth form which results in  
65 coastal dunes that are tall and narrow compared to dunes dominated by grasses that exhibit a  
66 more lateral growth pattern (Hacker et al., 2012; Zarnetske et al., 2012). Similarly, on the U.S.  
67 east coast, *Ammophila breviligulata* tends to be associated with tall, continuous dunes whereas  
68 *Uniola paniculata*, which grows more slowly in the lateral direction, tends to be associated with  
69 dunes that are discontinuous or hummocky (e.g., Godfrey, 1977; Godfrey et al., 1979; Stallins

70 and Parker, 2003; Stallins, 2005). Recent numerical work by Goldstein et al. (2017) builds on  
71 previous conceptual work from Godfrey (1977), suggesting that differences in the lateral growth  
72 rates between these two species, combined with physical processes that tend to reset dune-  
73 building in low areas, explain the observed relationships between alongshore dune morphology  
74 and grass species dominance on the U.S.A. East Coast.

75         Additionally, some researchers have suggested that although certain species build dunes,  
76 others, such as *Spartina patens* (i.e., “maintainer species”; Wolner et al., 2013), may suppress  
77 dune formation, leading to maintenance of low areas (Stallins, 2002, 2005; Wolner et al., 2013;  
78 Brantley et al., 2014). Stallins (2002, 2005) posits that *S. patens* binds sand acting as part of a  
79 weak positive feedback cycle that prevents dune growth, suggesting an additional way in which  
80 the type of vegetation present may be important in determining dune morphology. However,  
81 recent modeling work by Durán Vinent and Moore (2015) and Goldstein and Moore (2016),  
82 which demonstrated the evolution of low and high areas in the presence of only a single dune-  
83 building grass, suggests that the presence of maintainer species is not necessary for low dunes to  
84 form and persist for long periods.

85         Because vegetation influences patterns of dune growth and the ultimate shape of coastal  
86 foredunes, understanding how the growth rate of vegetation varies across the beach environment  
87 is important to improving predictions of dune growth rate and form. Many studies of dune-  
88 building grasses have demonstrated that sand deposition is an important factor controlling dune  
89 grass growth (e.g., van der Valk, 1974; Maun, 1998; Maun and Perumal, 1999; Dech and Maun,  
90 2005). Moderate amounts of deposition can have a positive effect by stimulating growth, but  
91 large amounts of burial can cause mortality (Selisker, 1994; Maun, 1998; Maun and Perumal,  
92 1999; Dech and Maun, 2005; Lonard et al., 2011). Other factors include salinity and water

93 availability, for which Young et al. (2011) use distance from shoreline and elevation as proxies.  
94 Young et al. (2011) found that forbs tend to occupy the beach area closest to the shoreline, dune  
95 grasses tend to occupy the foredune area at a higher elevation and close to shore, and shrubs  
96 occupy habitats farther from shore, behind the dune line. Previous work also demonstrates the  
97 effects of salt spray, soil salinity, soil moisture, and sand deposition on plant growth (Oosting  
98 and Billings, 1942; Disraeli, 1984; Ehrenfeld, 1990; Young et al., 1994; Wilson and Sykes,  
99 1999), but the relative importance of each factor can be difficult to isolate and varies from one  
100 geographic area to another (Greig-Smith, 1961; Wilson and Sykes, 1999). Other factors that can  
101 influence plant growth are management actions (beach raking, scraping, and driving) (Kelly,  
102 2014) as well as organic input from seagrass or wrack deposition on the shoreline (which can  
103 change soil texture) (Cardona and García, 2008; Del Vicchio et al., 2017). Though the effects of  
104 all of these different factors can be difficult to identify, we hypothesize that their integrated  
105 effect on plant growth may result in measurable differences in growth rate as a function of  
106 distance from the shoreline and elevation.

107         In addition, the cross-shore location and elevation at which plants grow appears to be  
108 partially determined by short-term fluctuations in sea level and wave run-up. For example,  
109 Kuriyama et al. (2005) and Hesp (2013) report that the seaward limit of vegetation corresponds  
110 with the elevation reached by wave run-up only a few times a year. This seaward limit of  
111 vegetation affects the width of the beach, the sand flux from the beach to dune, and the dune  
112 elevation (Arens, 1996; Hesp et al., 2005; Durán and Moore, 2013). A large supply of sand to  
113 the beach from the nearshore also widens the beach, enhancing sand flux from the beach to  
114 dunes (e.g. Psuty, 1988; Aargaard et al., 2004; Anthony et al., 2006; Houser and Mathew, 2011).  
115 In contrast, shell lag and soil moisture limit the beach area across which sand is available for

116 transport (e.g., Delgado-Fernandez et al., 2012; Wolner et al., 2013; Hoonhout and de Vries,  
117 2016). Wind intensity, as well as gustiness, are also important controls on how often and in what  
118 quantities sand is transported across the beach to the dune (Davidson-Arnott et al., 2005; Walker  
119 et al., 2009; Bauer et al., 2009; Davidson-Arnott and Bauer, 2009;).

120 Numerical models of coastal dune formation provide insights into the relative importance  
121 of the different mechanisms involved in dune-building, yet parameterizations of plant growth  
122 rates and growth form, especially species-specific rates, are currently limited by a lack of  
123 sufficient observational data. In addition, efforts are needed to determine whether, or not, certain  
124 species, such as *Spartina patens*, prevent dunes from growing (i.e. interrupt the positive feedback  
125 between deposition and growth), as previously hypothesized (e.g., Stallins, 2002; Stallins, 2005;  
126 Wolner et al., 2013; Brantley et al., 2014). In their review, Gilbert and Ripley (2010) also argue  
127 that field experiments to measure plant response to burial for adult dune grasses are necessary, as  
128 many of the studies thus far have focused on laboratory experiments and seedlings. Related to  
129 these needs, the most relevant timescale for modeling the response of dune grasses to sand  
130 deposition, and the influence of vegetation on sediment transport, also remain unclear.

131 To address these gaps in understanding and with the hope of identifying simple  
132 relationships between plant location and plant growth as we hypothesize above, we conducted a  
133 multi-species transplant experiment, which we monitored for two growing seasons, and in which  
134 we assess 1) plant growth rate as a function of elevation and distance from the shoreline for three  
135 different species of dune grass common on the U.S. East Coast; 2) sand accumulation and its  
136 influence on each of the three grass species; and 3) the evolution of the seaward limit of  
137 vegetation. Our findings, presented below, provide observational guidance for vegetation-related

138 parameters used in coastal dune models and general insights that can inform future dune  
139 modeling experiments.

## 140 **Approach**

### 141 *Study Site and Meteorological Conditions*

142 We performed our field work at the southern end of Hog Island, VA, which is located  
143 within the Virginia Barrier Islands in the mid-Atlantic Bight on the East Coast of the U.S.A.  
144 (Figure 1). Hog Island is an undeveloped, mixed-energy rotational drumstick island (Hayes,  
145 1979; Harris, 1992) with a tidal range of ~2 m. It is owned by The Nature Conservancy and is  
146 part of the Virginia Coast Reserve Long-term Ecological Research site. Since 1972, the south  
147 end of the island has been accreting (Fenster and Hayden, 2007; Fenster and Dolan, 1994);  
148 currently the beach along the southern end of the island is ~50 m wide and populated by embryo  
149 dunes, with the density of natural vegetation ranging from about 0 to 5 plants/m<sup>2</sup>. The soil is  
150 made up of fine to medium sand with very little organic matter. Shell lag covered an average of  
151 10% of the study area. The main foredune has a slope of 25-35 degrees, and the beach from the  
152 foredune to the shoreline varies in elevation from 1.5 to 2.5 meters in elevation (Figure 1). The  
153 erosion and deposition of sand within the experimental area varied between plant sites and within  
154 plant sites. Most sites showed erosion and deposition, depending on the season. During high  
155 water events, most of the low sites were scoured. During the winter, the beach narrowed and  
156 deposition increased in some areas. Because the study site is quite variable in topography, there  
157 is no clear pattern of deposition in relation to distance from shore.

158 Hog Island lies in the habitat range of several important dune grasses, making it an ideal  
159 place for a multi-species transplant experiment. *Ammophila breviligulata*, also known as  
160 American beach grass, dominates many of the dunes from Hog Island northward and grows (and

161 is planted) as far south as Cape Fear, NC (Woodhouse et al., 1977; Goldstein et al 2018). A C<sub>3</sub>  
162 (cool season) grass, *A. breviligulata* propagates using rhizomes and thrives in depositional  
163 environments (Disraeli, 1984; Ehrenfeld, 1990; Selisker, 1994). *Uniola paniculata* (sea oats)  
164 dominates dunes south of Cape Hatteras and has been found growing on the Virginia Barrier  
165 Islands (Tatnall, 1946; Harris et al. 2017; Mullins and Moore, 2017.) and as far north as  
166 Assateague Island, Maryland (Stalter and Lamont, 1990; Goldstein et al., 2018). *U.paniculata*  
167 also propagates via rhizomes but is a C<sub>4</sub> (warm season) grass (Wagner 1964, Lonard et al, 2011).  
168 *Spartina patens* (saltmeadow cordgrass), grows along the entire U.S. Atlantic coast, propagates  
169 via rhizomes, has a high salinity tolerance (it can survive up from 1 to 27 ppt; Lonard, Judd, and  
170 Stalter, 2010), and grows in marshes as well as on beaches and dunes. The leaves of *S. patens* are  
171 narrower and more upright than those of *A.breviligulata* and *U.paniculata* (Figure 2). In addition  
172 to these perennial dune grasses, Hog Island is also inhabited by numerous annual native beach  
173 and dune plants including *Panicum amarum* (bitter panicgrass), *Cakile endentula* (sea rocket),  
174 and *Salsola kali* (Russian thistle).

175         We retrieved meteorological data from the Hog Island weather station (Porter et al.,  
176 2016) and compared monthly averages for mean, maximum, and minimum temperature as well  
177 as mean, maximum, minimum precipitation and wind speed (Figure 3). We compare values from  
178 2000-2013 to 2014 and 2015 to determine if conditions during the experiment deviated from  
179 typical conditions. The highest wind speed recorded was from Hurricane Arthur in July 2014,  
180 and the extreme precipitation event in September of 2014 delivered a record rainfall relative to  
181 the remainder of the available record. The average temperature was typical, and the maximum  
182 and minimum were usually less extreme than the monthly maximum and minimum temperatures



183 recorded between 2000 and 2013. Average precipitation throughout the experiment was higher  
184 than the average for the comparative period, as was wind speed.

185

### 186 *Experimental design and data collection*

187 In May of 2014 we planted 2 individuals each (to improve likelihood of retaining one  
188 healthy individual) of *A. breviligulata* (Figure 2A), *S. patens* (Figure 2B), and *U. paniculata*  
189 (Figure 2C) at 60 sites in two cross-shore swaths (A and B; for a total of 360 plants at 180 sites)  
190 extending from a distance of 21.3 m from the mean high water line (MHWL) to the dune crest  
191 (103.5 m from the MHWL) and in elevation from 1.25 m to 3.78 m (Jass 2015; Figure 1). Plants  
192 were spread evenly, though randomly, throughout the swaths, with each species experiencing  
193 roughly the same range of conditions overall. The minimum distance between plant sites was  
194 1.06 meters, and most sites were between 1.4 and 3.4 meters away from the next nearest plant.  
195 We planted some of the transplants closer to the water than the natural perennial grasses were  
196 found. After 4 weeks, we also removed the plant at each site that had fewer or weaker leaves,  
197 leaving a single individual plant at each site. (Jass, 2015). The crest of mature foredunes on Hog  
198 Island is on average ~50 meters from the shoreline (Yousefi Lamini et al., 2017). The beach is  
199 wider in our study area than along the majority of the island because the southern end of the  
200 island has been accreting seaward in recent years, making this an ideal location to study plant  
201 growth across a range of elevations and distances from shore.

202 We sorted and selected intermediate-sized seedlings, grown from seed, by a nursery, and,  
203 prior to planting, trimmed the leaves of *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata* seedlings to 25 cm  
204 and leaves of *S. patens* to 20 cm (not all the *S. patens* plants had leaves longer than 20 cm,  
205 preventing us from trimming at 25 cm) to reduce variation in seedlings (Jass, 2015). We marked

206 each plant site with a fiberglass stake and attached a label recording species and swath A or B  
207 (Jass, 2015). Each pair of seedlings (root plugs of ~5 cm) was planted approximately 5 cm away  
208 from the stake, 10 cm away from each other, and 2 cm below the sand surface (Jass, 2015).  
209 During the first 4 weeks of the experiment we watered the plants 8 times (120 mL each) and  
210 replaced any plants that died with an individual from a reserve garden (which was cared for in  
211 the same way as the transplants) to reduce any effects of transplant shock on the experiment  
212 (Jass, 2015). To reduce competition, we clipped vegetation within 1 m of each plant site prior to  
213 planting and then clipped as necessary to maintain a 1 m-wide perimeter for the first growing  
214 season (May- October 2014; Jass, 2015). At the end of the 4 weeks, we removed the smaller  
215 plant at each site, leaving just one individual at each site. Although this resulted in just one plant  
216 per site, multiple replicate plants at a single site would impact growth (Franks, 2003) as these  
217 plants grow quickly. Additionally, the dune environment is highly variable and even nearby  
218 plants may experience different environmental conditions (Greig-Smith, 1961; Wilson and  
219 Sykes, 1999; Young et al., 2011).

220 To establish monuments from which to measure elevation over the course of the  
221 experiment, we installed 2 GPS benchmarks using PVC pipe filled with concrete on a secondary  
222 dune ridge (Jass, 2015). We measured the UTM coordinates and NAVD88 (North American  
223 Vertical Datum of 1988) elevation of each benchmark using a Trimble R-6 GPS antenna and  
224 post processed the points using the National Geodetic Survey's Online Positioning User Service  
225 (NGS-OPUS) (XY error = 0.008 cm, Z error = 0.022 cm). (Jass, 2015).

226

227 *Measurement methods*

228         At each month during the growing seasons of 2014 and 2015 (May – October), we  
229 measured the longest leaf of each transplant from the surface of the sand, hereafter referred to as  
230 “longest aboveground leaf length” or “LagLL.” We found the longest leaf by gathering the  
231 primary clump of leaves and straightening them. We then measured the distance from the sand  
232 surface to the tip of the longest leaf as it was straightened. We also recorded plant state as  
233 healthy (green and upright), stressed (yellow and/or horizontal), missing, or dead (completely  
234 brown), and photographed each plant to document our plant state observation. In June and  
235 October of 2014, and in June of 2015, we photographed the plan view (from the top) and frontal  
236 view of healthy plants and used the image-processing package, ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012),  
237 to measure frontal and basal area (Jass, 2015). In October of 2016, we also photographed 8  
238 natural plants of both *A. breviligulata* and *S. patens* and measured their basal and frontal areas.  
239 An extreme high water event between the September and October 2015 collection dates  
240 deposited large amounts of wrack on the plants within our experiment making observations  
241 difficult. For this reason, we have not used data from the October 2015 collection (our last) in  
242 our analyses. Additionally, in the months of March 2015 and April 2016, we measured elevation  
243 at each plant site and recorded plant absence, presence, or death (plant was completely brown  
244 and did not recover during the growing season), but did not measure leaf length because many  
245 leaves were still senesced. We exclude these data from the analyses of plant growth. Taking  
246 these omissions into account, we had a total of 11 sets of measurements of longest aboveground  
247 leaf and elevation — May (planting height, initial elevation), June, July, August, September,  
248 October 2014 and May, June, July, August, September 2015.

249         We used a Nikon DTM-322 total station (angle error = 5 arc seconds) to measure the  
250 elevation of the sand surface at each plant site (measured on the landward side of the plant stake)

251 monthly through the growing season (Jass, 2015). In some cases, the plant grew enough to  
252 surround the stake and our measurement was in the middle of the plant clump, while in other  
253 cases, the plant did not grow around the stake and the measurement site was bare and  
254 immediately adjacent to the edge of the plant. Elevations measured in the middle of the clump  
255 were usually higher than those measured adjacent to the clump, as sand deposition was greater in  
256 and around the plants than distant from the plants. The difference between elevation in the clump  
257 and beside the clump was always less than 10 cm, and there was no pattern among the plants in  
258 terms of which plants grew around the stake. Initial elevation of plant site is hereafter referred to  
259 as “ $z_i$ ”. Since the elevation of the ground surface changed at each plant site with each  
260 observation and we measured longest aboveground leaf length from the ground surface, we  
261 clarify notation here and in Figure 4: We determined total leaf growth ( $dl_{tot}$ ) by calculating the  
262 difference between the initial and final ground surface elevation ( $dz_{tot} = z_f - z_i$ ), adding this  
263 quantity to the final longest aboveground leaf length measurement ( $LagLL_f$ ) and then subtracting  
264 the initial final longest aboveground leaf length measurement ( $LagLL_i$ ) (Eq. 1).

$$265 \quad dl_{tot} = \left( (z_f - z_i) + LagLL_f \right) - LagLL_i \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

266 This results in  $dl_{tot}$  values less than zero for some individuals because their final  
267 aboveground leaf length ( $LagLL_f$ ) was very short (due to leaf senescence) and, in some cases, the  
268 ground surface was eroded during the experiment. In September of 2015, we measured the  
269 location of the planted, as well as the naturally occurring, seaward-most perennial and annual  
270 plants, associated with each of our experimental swaths. We use total leaf growth as a proxy for  
271 total plant growth, which we assume to be an integrated measure of how a plant responds to  
272 different environmental factors—both the etiolation response and biomass growth. We chose to  
273 focus on leaf length because it can be collected quickly and easily, and because it is less

274 disruptive to the field site than the collection of basal area measurements. As such, we collected  
275 leaf length measurements every month of the growing season (and at the end of the experiment,  
276 which is important for assessing total growth). We only collected basal area measurements 3  
277 times throughout the experiment (June 2015, October 2014, and June 2015) and these are  
278 therefore lower in temporal resolution and cover a shorter time period. We use aboveground leaf  
279 growth to determine how the combination of plant growth and sand deposition affect the  
280 aboveground size of the plant that is available to slow the wind causing sand deposition.

281 We calculated the NAVD88 elevation of the mean high water line (MHWL) at the  
282 location of the experiment (0.46 m) using VDATUM (NOAA), and then measured the shore  
283 perpendicular distance between each plant site and the MHWL to measure distance from shore  
284 (Jass, 2015).

285

## 286 **Results**

### 287 *Plant mortality*

288 We began our experiment (after retaining the healthiest individual at each plant site) with  
289 60 individuals of each species. Plants from each species died during the course of the experiment  
290 (May 2014 - September 2015). Specifically, we lost 16 (27%) of the *A. breviligulata* plants, 36  
291 (60%) of the *S. patens* plants, and 40 (66.7%) of the *U. paniculata* plants. We found that of the  
292 plants that died in June, July, and August (of 2014 and 2015), 65% were planted at initial  
293 elevations greater than 2.5 m (Figure 5B). In addition, all plants died that experienced more than  
294 20 cm of net erosion, defined as the difference between initial elevation and the elevation at the  
295 time mortality was recorded. We observed that low elevation plant sites were prone to scouring  
296 associated with high water events (Figure 5C). We also found that none of the *S. patens*

297 transplants survived at elevations above 3 m (Figure 5B). In addition to these trends related to  
298 the vertical dimension, we found a multidimensional trend worth mentioning as it relates to the  
299 seaward limit of vegetation. All plants within 30 m of the shoreline that were also below 1.47 m  
300 died during the experiment (Figure 5, A and B). Beyond these results, we found no other  
301 discernable species-specific patterns in plant death.

302

### 303 *Leaf growth differences and basal area differences*

304 For the analysis presented here we used data for transplants that were recorded as healthy  
305 during the entire course of the experiment from May 2014 to September 2015 (*A. breviligulata*: n  
306 = 44, *S. patens*: n = 24, *U. paniculata*: n = 20). We compared the total leaf lengths, longest  
307 aboveground leaf lengths, and basal/frontal areas for each species and used the ANOVA, aov,  
308 and TukeyHSD functions in the statistical package R (R Core Team, 2013) for each comparison.  
309 Results are reported as the mean ( $\bar{x}$ )  $\pm$  one standard deviation and significance is determined at  
310 the  $p < 0.05$  level—hereafter we use the term ‘significant’ to describe only those relationships for  
311 which  $p < 0.05$ .

312 Total leaf growth lengths ( $dl_{tot}$ ) for *A. breviligulata* and *S. patens* individuals were  
313 significantly shorter than for *U. paniculata* individuals, and *S. patens* exhibited almost half the  
314 range of measurement of the other species (Figure 6A, Tables 2 and 3). Considering just  
315 aboveground leaf length at the end of the experiment ( $L_{agLL_f}$ ), an ANOVA test indicates that *A.*  
316 *breviligulata* exhibited significantly longer mean  $L_{agLL_f}$  than the mean of *S. patens* individuals  
317 and significantly shorter  $L_{agLL_f}$  than the mean of the *U. paniculata* individuals (Fig 6B, Table 2  
318 and 3). As in total leaf growth lengths, the range of  $L_{agLL_f}$  for *S. patens* was half the range of the  
319 other species.

320 *S. patens* transplants had a significantly lower basal/frontal area than transplants of *A.*  
321 *breviligulata* and *U. paniculata* (Fig 6C) as evidenced by the ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc tests.  
322 The natural *A. breviligulata* and *S. patens* plants had a smaller range of values than their  
323 transplant counterparts (Tables 2 and 3).

#### 324 *Individual factors that influence plant growth—Linear regression*

325 We used the linear model (lm) function in R to analyze, for each of the three species, the  
326 relationship between plant growth and the factors of elevation, distance from shore, and sand  
327 deposition (at the monthly, seasonal, and two-growing seasons time scale). We acknowledge that  
328 elevation and distance from shore are proxies for environmental conditions (i.e., soil salinity,  
329 groundwater availability, etc.). We performed an F-test to determine significance for all of the  
330 linear regressions. When considering the relationship between only two variables none of the  
331 species showed a correlation between total leaf growth and distance from shore (Figure 7A) or  
332 between total leaf growth and initial elevation (Figure 7B).

333 To investigate the effects of burial on overall plant growth, we analyzed total leaf growth  
334 for experimental (2- growing seasons) and seasonal time periods. For all three species, the total  
335 change in elevation at each plant site measured over the course of the two-experiment which  
336 spanned two growing seasons (May 2014-Sept 2015) ( $z_f - z_i$ ) is positively correlated with total  
337 leaf growth ( $dl_{tot}$ ) (Figure 8) and statistically significant (AB slope = 1.48, SP and UP slopes =  
338 1.89). However, this positive correlation was not statistically significant at the annual time scale  
339 for any of the species (May 2014- Oct 2014 or May 2015-Sept 2015), even when considering the  
340 combined data from each year (May 2014- Oct 2014 and May 2015-Sept 2015).

341 To investigate the effects of burial on *aboveground* leaf length at different timescales  
342 (which was of interest because we hoped to determine at what time scale vegetation response to

343 sand deposition occurs), we analyzed longest aboveground leaf length (LagLL) change and  
344 elevation change at the experimental (2-growing season), seasonal, and monthly time scales. To  
345 do this, we performed a linear regression on the relationship between the final aboveground leaf  
346 length (LagLL<sub>f</sub>) and total elevation change (dz<sub>tot</sub>) over 2 seasons which results in a statistically  
347 significant positive correlation for *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata* and a positive correlation  
348 (though not statistically significant) for *S. patens* (Figure 9). However, analyzing data from 2014  
349 and 2015 separately, none of the species showed a significant correlation between longest  
350 aboveground leaf length and total elevation change at the scale of one year. When the data from  
351 both years are combined, *A. breviligulata* showed a significant positive correlation between  
352 above ground leaf length and elevation change (Figure 8B). The monthly change in above-  
353 ground leaf length (dagldt) and the monthly change in elevation (dzdt) are significantly  
354 (positively) correlated only for *S. patens* (Figure 8C).

355

#### 356 *Combination of factors that influence plant growth—Multiple linear regression*

357 To determine the best-fit equation to describe the growth of each species over the course  
358 of our experiment, we performed a multiple linear regression for the following variables: initial  
359 elevation, change in elevation, and distance from shoreline. Because our site was quite variable  
360 in topography, elevation and distance from shoreline are not tightly correlated—there are some  
361 low areas close to the foredune, and some high areas close to the shore on embryo dunes.  
362 Erosion and deposition patterns were also variable across the site. Because none of these  
363 variables were tightly correlated with each other we included all of them in the analysis. We  
364 normalized the variables by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation, and  
365 created linear models using all possible combinations of the variables. We chose the best linear



366 model using a method similar to the stepwise method (Draper and Smith, 1966; Table 4) — we  
367 eliminated the models for which the F statistic was not statistically significant, and then we  
368 further narrowed down the number of linear models by choosing only those with an  $R^2$  adjusted  
369 value was more than 0.1 higher than other models (similar to a step-wise analysis of models).  
370 Finally, we chose the models that had the lowest AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) score  
371 (Akaike, 1973), which can be considered as the optimal model (Table 4).

372 The results of the multiple linear regression analysis are as follows (coefficients are  
373 dimensionless and represent the relative importance of each variable):

374 
$$A. \textit{breviligulata}: dl_{tot} = -23.17x + 255.4dz_{tot} - 127.5z_i + 530.6$$

375 
$$S. \textit{patens}: dl_{tot} = 106.9dz_{tot} + 451.5$$

376 
$$U. \textit{paniculata}: dl_{tot} = 206.2dz_{tot} - 41.64z_i + 872.7$$

377 Where  $dl_{tot}$  is the total change in leaf length across the entire experiment,  $x$  is the distance from  
378 the shoreline,  $dz_{tot}$  is the total change in elevation across the time period of the experiment, and  
379  $z_i$  is the initial elevation. For all of the species,  $dz_{tot}$  had the largest coefficient. For *S. patens*,  
380 leaf growth is best explained by elevation change. The same is true for *U. paniculata*, with the  
381 addition of initial elevation. All parameters are significant for *A. breviligulata* – elevation  
382 change, initial elevation, and distance from the shoreline. Growth of *A. breviligulata* is  
383 significantly positively correlated with change in elevation, but negatively correlated with initial  
384 elevation and distance from shoreline (Table 4).

### 385 *Seaward limit of vegetation and total water level calculation*

386 All of the transplants emplaced below 1.43 m in elevation that are within 30 m of the  
387 MHWL died (Figure 5), yielding a seaward limit to transplant vitality. As a follow-up to the  
388 experiment, we recorded mortality in April of 2016 and display it in figure 10, which shows no

389 clear pattern in plant mortality within each swath (Figure 10). The transplants at elevations  
390 below 1.43 m but very close to the dune (where we observed ponding of fresh water following  
391 heavy rainstorms) grew well and survived throughout the entire experiment. We also measured  
392 the elevation of the seaward limit of perennial (*A. breviligulata*, *S.patens*) (dark green triangles;  
393 mean of 1.37 m) and annual (*C. edentula* (sea rocket), *S.Kali* (Russian thistle))(light green  
394 triangles; mean of 1.54 m) vegetation in September 2015 (Figure 10).

395 We computed a total water level (TWL) time series for the site for May 2014-April 2016  
396 using hourly tide gauge data from the Hog Island (VCR\_LTER data set, Porter et al., 2016), and  
397 hourly wave buoy data (Buoy 44014, <http://www.ndbc.noaa.gov/>). The TWL series is an  
398 estimate of the height reached by water on the beach through time (e.g., Ruggiero et al., 2001).  
399 We calculated wave runup using the predictor of Stockdon et al. (2006) and a beach slope of  
400 0.05 as measured for our cross-shore transects measured using the total station. From this record,  
401 74 days of data were missing, mostly from the end of 2014, resulting in a total of 626 days and  
402 89% coverage of this time period. Because the missing data encompassed approximately 6 days  
403 of elevated water levels (as indicated by the tide gauge at the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel,  
404 which has a continuous record during this period), it is likely that our analysis slightly  
405 underestimates the actual TWL during the study period. Using the TWL time series, we summed  
406 the cumulative hours at each elevation using 0.1 cm bins, shown in Figure 11.

407 The average elevation of the seaward-most extent of vegetation was highest for the  
408 perennial vegetation (dark green, average elevation = 1.54 m), lowest for the annual vegetation  
409 (light green, average elevation = 1.37 m), and the elevation of the seaward-most limit for our  
410 transplants (black, lowest elevation = 1.43 m) was in between (Figure 11). We calculated the  
411 number of inundation hours (NIH) for each elevation using the TWL for 1) the total time of the

412 experiment, 2) the growing season months (May-Sept) and 3) all winter season months (Oct-  
413 April), and found that the seaward-most elevation at which plants survived corresponded to the  
414 elevation above which the water rose for 425 hours (i.e., underwater 5.5 % of the time) and 500  
415 hours (i.e., underwater 8.7% of the time) for perennials (non-growing season levels) and annuals  
416 (growing season levels), respectively.

## 417 **Discussion**

### 418 *Potential Effects of Experimental Design*

419 There were several aspects of our experimental design that could have affected transplant  
420 growth and sand deposition in the dune environment. By trimming the transplants to reduce  
421 variation in initial size we may have stimulated growth early on in the experiment. However, we  
422 trimmed all of the transplants, and the trimming only reduced transplant height by a maximum of  
423 20%, so we expect any effects of trimming to be consistent across the experiment and minimal.  
424 We also planted our transplants as plugs, which were composed of more organic matter than the  
425 existing sandy substrate. While this may have contributed to plant growth at the beginning of the  
426 experiment by providing nutrients and organic matter to the transplant roots, the transplants  
427 looked similar to the surrounding natural plants by the end of the first growing season, and we  
428 expect that any effects of potential additional nutrients would be limited to the first couple of  
429 months and consistent across the transplants. The removal (by clipping) of surrounding  
430 vegetation may also have influenced sediment transport by increasing the amount of exposed  
431 nearby sand available for transport. The initial density of surrounding vegetation ranged from ~0  
432 to 5 plant clumps/m<sup>2</sup>, so the effect of clearing vegetation on pre-existing nearby sand availability  
433 may have been greater in areas with initially higher densities than those with lower densities.  
434 However, our transplants were spread evenly throughout the swaths and all were centered within

435 a 1-m radius circle from which vegetation had been removed by clipping, so the effect of  
436 different surrounding plant densities would not have affected some plants (or species) more than  
437 others. Despite the potential effect of these aspects of our experimental design, our consistency  
438 in applying treatments equally to all transplants and the similarity between our transplants and  
439 natural plants by the end of the first growing season suggests that these effects, if present, were  
440 consistent across transplants and short-lived.

#### 441 *Plant Mortality*

442 We recorded widespread plant mortality during the experiment. Loss of all three species  
443 at elevations above 2.5 m in June, July and August may have been the result of the short root  
444 systems of our transplants (~10 cm) and the extremely low soil moisture at shallow depths at  
445 these elevations during summer months. We hypothesize that the plants that died in association  
446 with greater than 20 cm of net erosion either washed away or likely suffered from more extreme  
447 root exposure during scouring events than other plants. Specific measurement of root exposure  
448 following high water events would be required to more fully determine plant survival thresholds  
449 during extreme conditions. Future studies could also investigate the role of freshwater  
450 availability and transplant root plug length as controls on plant mortality.

451 Because of widespread transplant mortality, our data density is different for each species.  
452 However, we did find that *A. breviligulata* survived the best of the three species (only 16%  
453 mortality vs >60%). This may be because it is naturally the most dominant dune species at the  
454 site. The reduction in sample size arising from mortality may explain the lack of a relationship  
455 between total leaf growth and distance from shore or elevation. Alternatively, such simple  
456 relationships may be undetectable regardless of sample size, or they may simply not exist.  
457 Additionally, because our analysis of plant growth did not include unhealthy or dead plants, we

458 may overestimate transplant growth in the dune environment (because unhealthy or dying plants  
459 will likely grow more slowly).

#### 460 *Species-specific Insights*

461 Each of the three dune grass species responded differently to environmental conditions  
462 throughout our experiment, as reflected in differences in leaf growth rates and basal/frontal area  
463 ratios, suggesting that each species may influence dune growth in a different way. Although this  
464 is not surprising because we expect variation in plant shape for different species, this difference  
465 in overall plant shape is consistent with the greater potential for *A. breviligulata* and *U.*  
466 *paniculata* to trap sediment (and build dunes more quickly) in three dimensions relative to *S.*  
467 *patens*. Previous authors have attributed differences in dune width and height to differences in  
468 the morphology of dominant dune grass species (e.g., Godfrey, 1977; Woodhouse et al., 1977;  
469 Godfrey et al., 1979; Hesp, 1984a; Hacker et al., 2012; Zarnetske et al, 2012, 2015). Our results  
470 add to this growing body of evidence and suggest that the same phenomenon may be true for the  
471 three U.S. East coast dune-grass species, especially when considering the effects of *S. patens*  
472 relative to the other two species.

473 Consistent with previous studies of *A. breviligulata* (e.g. Disraeli, 1984; Ehrenfeld, 1990;  
474 Maun, 1998), *U. paniculata* (Wagner, 1964; Miller et al., 2010; Ehrenfeld, 1990; Harris et al.,  
475 2017) and *S. patens* (Godfrey and Godfrey, 1976; Godfrey et al., 1979; Ehrenfeld, 1990; Stallins,  
476 2002), our results suggest that all three species are significantly stimulated by sand deposition  
477 (Figure 6). Though part of the strength of this positive correlation admittedly arises from the  
478 need to include the change in elevation in the determination of total change in leaf length,  
479 investigating the relationship between these two quantities is the only way to assess how well  
480 plants keep up with burial. However, keeping up with burial is not the entire story as our results

481 also reveal a significant positive correlation between aboveground leaf length (which was not  
482 calculated using change in elevation) with the change in elevation for *A. breviligulata* and *U.*  
483 *paniculata*. Importantly, in our transplant experiment neither the effect of deposition on total  
484 leaf length nor the effect of deposition on aboveground leaf length was apparent except when  
485 analyzing data at the temporal scale of two years. The lack of consistent correlation between  
486 sand deposition and plant growth at the shorter, monthly (and annual) timescale suggests there is  
487 a lag of at least more than a year between sand deposition and measurable effects of subsequent  
488 stimulation of plant growth. It is not clear whether this is because of a lag in effect or because the  
489 annual signal is so small that it is swamped by noise in the signal. Interestingly, Keijsers et al.  
490 (2016) found no correlation between percent cover of vegetation and sand accumulation on the  
491 order of a decade, suggesting that the feedback between plant growth and sand deposition  
492 operates most successfully on the order of a few years.

493         Although we found that plant growth is positively correlated with sand deposition for  
494 each species after a period of two years, that our analysis does not reveal a clear correlation  
495 between plant growth and distance from shore is consistent with the findings of studies of  
496 lacustrine dunes that indicate distance from shore was not an important influence on plant growth  
497 (Maun and Perumal, 1999; Dech and Maun, 2005; Forey et al. 2008). It is also consistent with  
498 previous studies that suggest a single environmental factor cannot determine where plants grow  
499 (Maun and Perumal 1999, Young et al. 2011). Thus, it appears that biotic and abiotic factors are  
500 not operating in a sufficiently comprehensive or consistent fashion to alter plant growth. This  
501 lack of correlation could be due to the nature of our study (we used transplants and did not  
502 measure natural grasses), the small sample size of plants that survived for the entire course of the  
503 experiment, or the variability in water table level and soil moisture, but it could also indicate that

504 plant growth it not strongly influenced by the variables that change with distance from shore and  
505 elevation alone.

506         The multiple linear regression analysis provides more insight into the combination of  
507 factors that influence plant growth for each species. The weak negative correlation between *A.*  
508 *breviligulata* growth and the combination of distance from shore and elevation (when both  
509 factors are considered along with total change in elevation) is surprising because other authors  
510 have found *A. breviligulata* growth to be densest at some distance from the shoreline where sand  
511 burial is greatest, which tends to be around the peak of the foredune (Cheplick, 2005; Young et  
512 al., 2011; Yousefi Lalimi et al., 2017). Our use of transplants, which necessarily had shallow root  
513 systems and therefore did not have access to groundwater when planted on the foredune, may at  
514 least partially explain why the transplants grew more slowly farther from shore.

515         The multilinear regression analysis for *U. paniculata* and *S. patens* suggests that fewer  
516 factors are correlated with growth than in the case of *A. breviligulata*, though all results included  
517 the change in elevation variable. The negative correlation between *U. paniculata* growth and  
518 elevation, agrees well with results of previous studies that note the influence of elevation on *U.*  
519 *paniculata* growth; Oosting and Billings (1942) found this species grew best at a maximum  
520 distance from the water table, and Hester and Mendelsohn (1989) found that *U. paniculata*  
521 plants were water logged at a distance of 0.3 m above the water table but did well above 0.9 m  
522 above the water table. Neither elevation nor distance from shore were included in the best  
523 equation for *S. patens*, which emphasizes the ability of *S. patens* to survive in a wide range of  
524 environmental conditions—this species grows well in marshes as well as on beaches and dunes  
525 (Ehrenfeld, 1990; Lonard, Judd, and Stalter, 2010). It is not as adapted to the environment of  
526 shifting sand (Woodhouse et al., 1977), which may explain why it exhibited, on average, the

527 least amount of the total leaf growth, aboveground leaf growth, and basal/frontal area ratio at the  
528 end of the experiment out of the three species in our experiment.

529 *Support for reclassification of S. patens as a dune builder*

530       Whereas previous work has documented the ability of *S. patens* to recover from burial  
531 (Godfrey and Godfrey, 1976; Ehrenfeld, 1990), some researchers have emphasized the ability of  
532 this species to grow in overwash areas more readily than other species found in the beach  
533 environment (Ritchie and Penland, 1988), suggesting that its presence in these areas may prevent  
534 dunes from growing (Godfrey et al., 1979; Stallins, 2005; Wolner et al., 2013). We favor an  
535 alternative (though not new, see Woodhouse, 1982) interpretation: *S. patens* is frequently found  
536 in overwash flats because it has a relatively high salinity tolerance (Oosting and Billings, 1942;  
537 Ehrenfeld, 1990; Lonard et al., 2010). Because it grows more slowly, is less stimulated by  
538 burial, and has a smaller basal area than *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata*, it will tend to be less  
539 effective at causing sand deposition and therefore will accumulate sand less quickly than the  
540 other two recognized dune-building grasses. This interpretation is supported by our finding that  
541 the positive correlation between aboveground leaf length and sand deposition for *S. patens* was  
542 not statistically significant (as it was for the other species) and our finding that the longest leaves  
543 of *S. patens* transplants exhibited the least amount of growth and the smallest basal/frontal area  
544 of the three dune grasses. Even with slower rates of aboveground leaf growth, *S. patens*  
545 effectively builds elevation, creating higher topography, which then provides potential sites for  
546 other dune grass species to become established, as recognized by Woodhouse (1982). Thus, not  
547 only are the results of our experiment inconsistent with the hypothesis that *S. patens* prevents  
548 dune growth (as posited by the maintainer hypothesis), they also suggest that *S. patens* is  
549 effective at causing sand deposition, just less so than *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata*. Given



550 our findings and these arguments, combined with model results from Durán and Moore (2015)  
551 and Goldstein and Moore (2016), which indicate that a vegetative maintainer feedback is not  
552 necessary for low-lying areas to persist, we propose that in the overwash, beach, and dune  
553 environments, *S. patens* is a moderate ‘dune-builder’ rather than a ‘maintainer’ species.

#### 554 *Empirical guidance for modeling dune formation*

555 Taken together, our findings also yield insights into the vegetative dynamics of dune-  
556 building grasses for both ecology and coastal dune modeling. Results from our linear and  
557 multilinear regression analyses confirm the importance of including burial effects in plant growth  
558 equations. They also suggest that a combination of other factors (i.e., distance from shore,  
559 elevation) are important as well, but in different ways for different species. For example, when  
560 representing the growth of *S. patens*, the relative influence of sand deposition on growth rate  
561 should be 10-20% less than for representations of *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata* (Table 2).  
562 Incorporating the details of these results into dune growth models in a quantitative way will  
563 require relating changes in longest leaf length (the measure of plant growth studied here) to  
564 changes in percent cover (the quantity used to represent plant growth in dune models), for a large  
565 number of natural plants and is the subject of ongoing work.

566 Additionally, our results indicate that basal/frontal area ratios are species-specific. Our  
567 observational data provides some guidance on the appropriate ratio to use for the three East  
568 Coast dune species; 0.7-1 for *A. breviligulata*, ~1 for *U. paniculata*, and a value of 0.5-0.6 for *S.*  
569 *patens*, though our sample size was small and more observations are needed, especially of  
570 natural plants.

571 The seaward limit of vegetation is also an important parameter for inclusion in numerical  
572 models of dune growth. Though perennial and annual plants are different in their persistence in

573 the beach environment, it seems reasonable to expect that if TWL is important in determining the  
574 seaward extent of perennials, it would also be important in determining the extent of annuals. If  
575 TWL determines extent, the seaward limit of perennials would be determined by the highest total  
576 water levels throughout the year (which usually occurs in the winter). Similarly, the seaward  
577 limit of annuals would be affected by water levels during the growing season (which are usually  
578 lower than the winter levels, unless there is a hurricane). Our results, which indicate that the NIH  
579 for annuals and perennials (5.5 % vs. 8.7%, resp.) and the elevation of the seaward extent (1.54  
580 m vs. 1.37 m, resp.) are similar, suggests that the same process—TWL—determines the seaward  
581 extent of both types of vegetation. The time of inundation we report is slightly greater than  
582 findings from Kuriyama et al. (2005), which may be because our TWL record was computed  
583 from observational data at nearby locations rather than observed on the beach locally through  
584 time. Regardless, both Hesp (2013) and Kuriyama et al. (2005) indicate that the seaward limit of  
585 vegetation occurs at an elevation where wave run-up only occurs a few times a year. If this  
586 analysis, is generalizable, then it should be possible to approximate the seaward limit of annual  
587 and perennial vegetation (and potential changes in this limit with changes in sea level and  
588 storms) by computing a TWL, instead of making direct observations of the seaward extent of  
589 vegetation. Additional comparisons between TWL, NIH and the seaward extent of vegetation  
590 will be helpful in determining the extent to which this finding applies to other locations.

### 591 ***Conclusions***

592 Results from our multi-species transplant experiment highlight the differences in growth  
593 among different dune grass species, the importance of sand burial in determining plant growth,  
594 and the complexity of factors that influence plant growth. We found that of the three dune  
595 grasses we planted, *S. patens*, on average, grew less than the *A. breviligulata* and *U. paniculata*.

596 However, leaf growth was positively correlated with sand deposition for all species. Although *S.*  
597 *patens* may not build dunes as quickly as *A. breviligulata* or *U. paniculata*, and has a small  
598 basal/frontal area which results in less total sand accumulation, it does grow in response to burial  
599 and thus is more appropriately classified as a dune-building species rather than as a maintainer.

600 We found that the influence of burial on plant growth is to reduce aboveground area  
601 initially as a plant is buried, but that moderate amounts of sand burial increase overall plant  
602 growth at the two year timescale. The balance between burial and growth should be considered  
603 when modeling vegetation response to burial — it is a non-linear and species-specific response,  
604 as noted in previous studies (e.g. Maun, 1998; Gilbert and Ripley, 2010). Also relevant to  
605 modeling efforts, we found plant basal/frontal area (important in parameterizing surface  
606 roughness) to be between 0.5 and 1, and that the seaward limit of vegetation corresponded to an  
607 elevation which was inundated for a total of only 50 days (7.5% of the time) over the course of  
608 our experiment.

609 This work provides insight into factors affecting the growth of *A. breviligulata*, *S. patens*,  
610 and *U. paniculata* transplants in the beach and dune environment and highlights species-specific  
611 differences that are important to include in modeling efforts if dune growth is to be accurately  
612 portrayed. Improved model parameterizations will aid in increasing our understanding of the  
613 vegetation-sediment transport feedback that causes dunes to grow and will enhance our ability to  
614 explore the effects of changing future conditions on the dune-building process.

## 615 **Acknowledgements**

616 The buoy data set used in this paper is freely available through NOAA's National Data Buoy  
617 Center (NDBC) website. This work was funded by the National Science Foundation  
618 Geomorphology and Land Use Dynamics Program (EAR-1324973) and the Virginia Coastal

619 Reserve LTER Program (National Science Foundation DEB-123773). Transplant data is  
620 available (Mullins et al., 2018), Support for E. deVries was also provided by the National  
621 Science Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-1650116. Any opinions, findings,  
622 and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do  
623 not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. We thank the University of  
624 North Carolina at Chapel Hill Department of Geological Sciences Martin Fund for additional  
625 research funding. We thank the Nature Conservancy for permission to perform the research on  
626 Hog Island, VA, and the staff at the Anheuser-Busch Coastal Research Center for logistical  
627 support. We also thank Larry Benninger, Julie Zinnert, Brad Murray, and Tamlin Pavelsky  
628 whose helpful comments improved the manuscript and the many others who helped in the field,  
629 including Sarah Margolis, Sara Hahne, Margaret Jones, and Laura Rogers. We thank Stuart Lane  
630 and the associate editor as well as four anonymous reviewers whose comments improved the  
631 manuscript. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

632

633 References:

- 634 Aagaard T, Davidson-Arnott R, Greenwood B, Nielsen J. 2004. Sediment supply from shoreface  
635 to dunes: Linking sediment transport measurements and long-term morphological evolution.  
636 *Geomorphology* 60 : 205-224. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2003.08.002  
637
- 638 Akaike H. 1973. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In  
639 *2<sup>nd</sup> International Symposium on Information Theory*, Petrov BN, Csaki F (eds). Akademia  
640 Kiado: Budapest; 267-281.  
641
- 642 Anthony EJ, Vanhee S, Ruz MH. 2006. Short-term beach-dune sand budgets on the north sea  
643 coast of France: Sand supply from shoreface to dunes, and the role of wind and fetch.  
644 *Geomorphology* 81 : 316-329. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2006.04.022  
645
- 646 Arens SM. 1996. Patterns of sand transport on vegetated foredunes. *Geomorphology* 17 : 339-  
647 350. DOI: 10.1016/0169-555X(96)00016-5  
648
- 649 Bauer BO, Davidson-Arnott RGD, Hesp PA, Namikas SL, Ollerhead J, Walker IJ. 2009. Aeolian  
650 sediment transport on a beach: Surface moisture, wind fetch, and mean transport.  
651 *Geomorphology* 105 : 106-116. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.02.016  
652
- 653 Brantley ST, Bissett SN, Young DR, Wolner CW V, Moore LJ. 2014. Barrier island morphology  
654 and sediment characteristics affect the recovery of dune building grasses following storm-  
655 induced overwash. *PLoS One* 9 : e104747. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0104747  
656
- 657 Bressolier C, Thomas Y. 1977. Studies on wind and plant interactions on French Atlantic coastal  
658 Dunes. *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology* 47 : 331-338.  
659
- 660 Cardona L, García M. 2008. Beach-cast seagrass material fertilizes the foredune vegetation of  
661 Mediterranean coastal dunes. *Acta Oecologica* 34:97-103. DOI: 10.1016/j.actao.2008.04.003  
662
- 663 Cheplick GP. 2005. Patterns in the distribution of American beachgrass (*Ammophila*  
664 *breviligulata*) and the density and reproduction of annual plants on a coastal beach. *Plant*  
665 *Ecology* 180 : 57-67. DOI: 10.1007/s11258-005-2467-5  
666
- 667 Davidson-Arnott RGD, Bauer BO. 2009. Aeolian sediment transport on a beach: Thresholds,  
668 intermittency, and high frequency variability. *Geomorphology* 105 : 117-126. DOI:  
669 10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.02.018  
670
- 671 Davidson-Arnott RGD, Law MN. 1996. Measurement and Prediction of Long-Term Sediment  
672 Supply to Coastal Foredunes. *Journal of Coastal Research* 12 : 654-663.  
673
- 674 Davidson-Arnott RGD, MacQuarrie K, Aagaard T. 2005. The effect of wind gusts, moisture  
675 content and fetch length on sand transport on a beach. *Geomorphology* 68 : 115-129. DOI:  
676 10.1016/j.geomorph.2004.04.008  
677

678 Dech JP, Maun MA. 2005. Zonation of vegetation along a burial gradient on the leeward slopes  
679 of Lake Huron sand dunes. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 83 : 227-236. DOI: 10.1139/b04-163  
680

681 Delgado-Fernandez I, Davidson-Arnott R, Bauer BO, Walker IJ, Ollerhead J, Rhew H. 2012.  
682 Assessing aeolian beach-surface dynamics using a remote sensing approach. *Earth Surface  
683 Processes and Landforms* 37 : 1651-1660. DOI: 10.1002/esp.3301  
684

685 Del Vicchio SD, Jucker T, Carboni M, Acosta ATR. 2017. Linking plant communities on land  
686 and at sea: The effects of *Posidonia oceanica* wrack on the structure of dune vegetation.  
687 *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 184 : 30-36.  
688

689 Disraeli DJ. 1984. The effect of sand deposits on the growth and morphology of *Ammophila  
690 Breviligulata*. *Journal of Ecology* 72:145-154.  
691

692 Draper N, Smith H. 1966. *Applied Regression Analysis*, J. Wiley & Sons, London, 407 pp.  
693

694 Durán O, Silva MVN, Bezerra LJC, Herrmann HJ, Maia LP. 2008. Measurements and numerical  
695 simulations of the degree of activity and vegetation cover on parabolic dunes in north-eastern  
696 Brazil. *Geomorphology* 102 : 460-471. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.05.011  
697

698 Durán O, Herrmann H. 2006. Vegetation Against Dune Mobility. *Physical Review Letters* 97 :  
699 188001. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.188001  
700

701 Durán O, Moore LJ. 2013. Vegetation controls on the maximum size of coastal dunes.  
702 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110 : 17217-22. DOI:  
703 10.1073/pnas.1307580110  
704

705 Durán Vinent O, Moore LJ. 2015. Barrier island bistability induced by biophysical interactions.  
706 *Nature Climate Change* 5: 158-162. DOI: 10.1038/nclimate2474  
707

708 Ehrenfeld JG. 1990. Dynamics and Processes of Barrier Island Vegetation. *Reviews in Aquatic  
709 Sciences* 2 : 437-480.  
710

711 Fenster MS, Hayden BP. 2007. Ecotone displacement trends on a highly dynamic barrier Island:  
712 Hog Island, Virginia. *Estuaries and Coasts* 30 : 978-988. DOI: 10.1007/BF02841389  
713

714 Fenster M, Dolan R. 1994. Large-scale reversals in shoreline trends along the U.S. mid-Atlantic  
715 coast. *Geology* 22 : 543-546. DOI: 10.1130/0091-7613(1994)022<0543:LSRIST>2.3.CO;2  
716

717 Forey E, Chapelet B, Vitasse Y, Tilquin M, Touzard B, Michalet R. 2008. The relative  
718 importance of disturbance and environmental stress at local and regional scales in French coastal  
719 sand dunes. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 19 : 493-502. DOI: 10.3170/2008-8-18392  
720

721 Gilbert ME, Ripley BS. 2010. Resolving the differences in plant burial responses. *Austral  
722 Ecology* 35 : 53-59. DOI: 10.1111/j.1442-9993.2009.02011.x  
723

724 Godfrey PJ. 1977. Climate, plant response and development of dunes on barrier beaches along  
725 the U.S. east coast. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 21 : 203-216. DOI:  
726 10.1007/BF01552874.

727

728 Godfrey PJ, Godfrey MM. 1976. *Barrier Island Ecology of Cape Lookout National Seashore and*  
729 *Vicinity, North Carolina. National Park Service Scientific Monograph Series 9.*

730

731 Godfrey PJ, Leatherman SP, Zaremba R. 1979. A geobotanical approach to classification of  
732 barrier beach systems. In *Barrier islands: From the Gulf of St.Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico*,  
733 Leatherman SP (ed). Academic Press: New York; 99-126.

734

735 Goldstein EB, Moore LJ. 2016. Stability and bistability in a one-dimensional model of coastal  
736 foredune height. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 121: 964-977. DOI:  
737 10.1002/2014JF003432

738

739 Goldstein EB, Moore LJ, Vinent OD. 2017. Vegetation controls on maximum coastal foredune “  
740 hummockiness” and annealing time. *Earth Surface Dynamics Discussions* 2 : 1-15. DOI:  
741 10.5194/esurf-2017-2

742

743 Goldstein E. B., E. Mullins, L.J. Moore, R.G. Biel, J.K. Brown, S.D. Hacker, K.R. Jay, R.S.  
744 Mostow, P. Ruggiero, J.K. Zinnert, (2018) Literature-based latitudinal distribution and possible  
745 range shifts of two US east coast dune grass species (*Uniola paniculata* and *Ammophila*  
746 *breviligulata*) PeerJ 6:e4932 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4932>

747

748 Greig-Smith P. 1961. Data on Pattern within Plant Communities : I . The Analysis of Pattern.  
749 *Journal of Ecology* 49 : 695-702.

750

751 Hacker SD, Zarnetske P, Seabloom E, Ruggiero P, Mull J, Gerrity S, Jones C. 2012. Subtle  
752 differences in two non-native congeneric beach grasses significantly affect their colonization,  
753 spread, and impact. *Oikos* 121 : 138-148. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.18887.x

754

755 Harris AL, Zinnert JC, Young DR. 2017. Differential response of barrier island dune grasses to  
756 species interactions and burial. *Plant Ecology* 218 : 609-619. DOI: 10.1007/s11258-017-0715-0

757

758 Harris MS. 1992. *The geomorphology of Hog Island, Virginia: A mid-Atlantic coast barrier.*  
759 Thesis, University of Virginia. Charlottesville, VA.

760

761 Hayes MO. 1979. Barrier Island Morphology as a Function of Wave and Tide Regime. In  
762 *Barrier islands: From the Gulf of St.Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico*, Leatherman SP (ed).  
763 Academic Press: New York; 1-29.

764

765 Hesp PA. 2002. Foredunes and blowouts: initiation, geomorphology and dynamics.  
766 *Geomorphology* 48 : 245-268. DOI: 10.1016/S0169-555X(02)00184-8

767

768 Hesp PA. 1981. The Formation of Shadow Dunes. *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology* 51 : 101-  
769 111. DOI: 10.1306/212F7C1B-2B24-11D7-8648000102C1865D.

770  
771 Hesp PA. 2013. A 34 year record of foredune evolution, Dark Point, NSW, Australia. *Journal of*  
772 *Coastal Research S.I.* 65: 1295-1300. DOI: 10.2112/SI65-219.1  
773  
774 Hesp PA. 1984. Fore dune formation in southeast Australia. In *Coastal Geomorphology in*  
775 *Australia*. Thom BG (ed). Academic Press: London; 69-97.  
776  
777 Hesp PA, Davidson-Arnott R, Walker IJ, Ollerhead J. 2005. Flow dynamics over a foredune at  
778 Prince Edward Island, Canada. *Geomorphology* 65 : 71-84. DOI:  
779 10.1016/j.geomorph.2004.08.001  
780  
781 Hester MW, Mendelssohn IA. 1989. Water relations and growth responses of *Uniola paniculata*  
782 (sea oats) to soil moisture and water-table depth. *Oecologia* 78:289-296. DOI:  
783 doi.org/10.1007/BF00379100  
784  
785  
786 Hoonhout BM, de Vries S. 2016. A process-based model for aeolian sediment transport and  
787 spatiotemporal varying sediment availability. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*  
788 121 : 1555-1575. DOI:10.1002/2015JF003692  
789  
790 Houser C, Hapke C, Hamiton C. 2008. Controls on coastal dune morphology, shoreline erosion  
791 and barrier island response to extreme storms. *Geomorphology* 100: 223-240. DOI:  
792 10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.12.007  
793  
794 Houser C, Mathew S. 2011. Alongshore variation in foredune height in response to transport  
795 potential and sediment supply: South Padre Island, Texas. *Geomorphology* 125: 62-72. DOI:  
796 10.1016/j.geomorph.2010.07.028.  
797  
798 Jass T. 2015. Environmental controls on the growth of dune-building grasses and the effect of  
799 plant morphology on coastal foredune formation. Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel  
800 Hill. Chapel Hill, NC.  
801  
802 Keijsers JGS, De Groot AV, Riksen MJPM. 2016. Modeling the biogeomorphic evolution of  
803 coastal dunes. *Journal of Geophysical Research : Earth Surface* 121: 1161-1181. DOI:  
804 10.1002/2015JF003815  
805  
806 Kelly JF. 2014. Effects of human activities (raking, scraping, off-road vehicles) and natural  
807 resource protections on the spatial distribution of beach vegetation and related shoreline features  
808 in New Jersey. *Journal of Coastal Conservation* 18: 383-398. DOI: doi.org/10.1007/s11852-  
809 014-0324-1  
810  
811 Kuriyama Y, Mochizuki N, Nakashima T. 2005. Influence of vegetation on aeolian sand  
812 transport rate from a backshore to a foredune at Hasaki, Japan. *Sedimentology* 52: 1123-1132.  
813 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3091.2005.00734.x  
814



815 Lonard RI, Judd FW, Stalter R. 2010. The Biological Flora of Coastal Dunes and Wetlands:  
816 *Spartina patens* (W. Aiton) G.H. Muhlenberg. *Journal of Coastal Research* 26: 935-946. DOI:  
817 10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-09-00154.1  
818  
819 Lonard RI, Judd FW, Stalter R. 2011. Biological Flora of Coastal Dunes and Wetlands: *Uniola*  
820 *paniculata* L. *Journal of Coastal Research* 27: 984-993. DOI: 10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-  
821 00167.1  
822  
823 Maun MA. 1998. Adaptations of plants to burial in coastal sand dunes. *Canadian Journal of*  
824 *Botany* 738: 713-738.  
825  
826 Maun MA, Perumal J. 1999. Zonation of vegetation on lacustrine coastal dunes : effects of burial  
827 by sand. *Ecology Letters* 2: 14-18.  
828  
829 Miller TE, Gornish ES, Buckley HL. 2010. Climate and coastal dune vegetation : disturbance,  
830 recovery, and succession. *Plant Ecology* 206: 97-104. DOI: 10.1007/s11258-009-9626-z  
  
831 Mullins EV, Moore LJ. 2017. Locations of *Uniola paniculata* on selected Virginia Barrier  
832 Islands, 2017. Environmental Data Initiative.  
833 doi:[10.6073/pasta/08d29335a6993474ff19c847e0817f37](https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/08d29335a6993474ff19c847e0817f37). Dataset accessed 1/20/2018.  
  
834  
835 Mullins, E., Jass, T., Goldstein E., and Moore, L.J. 2016. Transplanted grasses on Hog Island,  
836 VA2014-2015. Virginia Coast Reserve Long-Term Ecological Research Project Data Publication  
837 knb-lter-vcr.273.2.  
838  
839 Oosting HJ, Billings WD. 1942. Factors Effecting Vegetational Zonation on Coastal Dunes.  
840 *Ecology* 23 : 131-142. DOI: 10.2307/1931081.  
841  
842 Porter J, Krovetz D, Spiliter J, Williams T, Overman K. 2016. Tide Data for Hog Island (1991-).  
843 Dataset. DOI: 10.6073/pasta/838034c56e68505df36ee86ea3134531  
844  
845 Psuty NP. 1988. Sediment budget and dune/beach interaction. *Journal of Coastal Research* S.I. 3  
846 : 1-4.  
847  
848 R Core Team. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
849 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>.  
850  
851 Ritchie W, Penland S. 1988. Rapid dune changes associated with overwash processes on the  
852 deltaic coast of South Louisiana. *Marine Geology* 81:97-122. DOI: 10.1016/0025-  
853 3227(88)90020-5  
854  
855 Raupach MR, Gillette DA, Leys JF. 1993. The effect of roughness elements on wind erosion  
856 threshold. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 98 : 3023-3029. DOI: 10.1029/92JD01922  
857

858 Ruggiero P, Komar PD, McDougal WG, Marra JJ, Beach RA. 2001. Wave runup, extreme water  
859 levels, and the erosion of properties backing beaches. *Journal of Coastal Research* 17: 407-419.  
860

861 Sallenger AH. 2000. Storm Impact Scale for Barrier Islands. *Journal of Coastal Research* 16 :  
862 890-895.  
863

864 Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ : 25 years of image  
865 analysis. *Nature Methods* 9 : 671-675. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.2089  
866

867 Seabloom EW, Wiedemann AM. 1994. Distribution and Effects of *Ammophila breviligulata*  
868 Fern. (American beachgrass) on the Foredunes of the Washington Coast. *Journal of Coastal*  
869 *Research* 10 : 178-188.  
870

871 Selisker DM. 1994. The Effect of Accelerated Sand Accretion on Growth, Carbohydrate  
872 Reserves, and Ethylene Production in *Ammophila breviligulata* ( Poaceae ). *American Journal of*  
873 *Botany* 81 : 536-541.  
874

875 Stallins JA. 2002. Dune plant species diversity and function in two barrier island biogeomorphic  
876 systems. *Plant Ecology* 165 : 183-196.  
877

878 Stallins JA. 2005. Stability domains in barrier island dune systems. *Ecological Complexity* 2 :  
879 410-430. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecocom.2005.04.011  
880

881 Stallins JA, Parker AJ. 2003. The influence of complex systems interactions on barrier Island  
882 dune vegetation pattern and process. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93 :  
883 13-29. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8306.93102  
884

885 Stalter R, Lamont EE. 1990. The vascular flora of Assateague Island, Virginia. *Bulletin of the*  
886 *Torrey Botanical Club* 117 : 48-56.  
887

888 Stockdon HF, Holman RA, Howd PA, Sallenger AH. 2006. Empirical parameterization of setup,  
889 swash, and runup. *Coastal Engineering* 53 : 573-588. DOI: 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2005.12.005  
890

891 Stutz ML, Pilkey OH. 2011. Open-ocean barrier islands: Global influence of climatic,  
892 oceanographic, and depositional settings. *Journal of Coastal Research* 27 : 207-222. DOI:  
893 10.2112/09-1190.1  
894

895 Tatnall RR. 1946. *Flora of Delaware and the Eastern Shore: An annotated list of the fern and*  
896 *flowering plants on the peninsula of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.* Lancaster, Pennsylvania:  
897 *Society of Natural History of Delaware.*  
898

899 van der Valk AG. 1974. Environmental factors controlling the distribution of forbs on coastal  
900 foredunes in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 52: 1057-1073.  
901

902 Walker IJ, Hesp PA, Davidson-Arnott RGD, Bauer BO, Namikas SL, Ollerhead J. 2009.  
903 Responses of three-dimensional flow to variations in the angle of incident wind and profile form

904 of dunes: Greenwich Dunes, Prince Edward Island, Canada. *Geomorphology* 105: 127-138. DOI:  
905 10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.12.019  
906

907 Wagner RH. 1964. The Ecology of *Uniola paniculata* L. in the Dune-Strand Habitat of North  
908 Carolina. *Ecological Monographs* 34:79-96.  
909

910 Wilson JB, Sykes MT. 1999. Is zonation on coastal sand dunes determined primarily by sand  
911 burial or by salt spray? A test in New Zealand dunes. *Ecology Letters* 2 : 233-236. DOI:  
912 10.1046/j.1461-0248.1999.00084.x  
913

914 Wolner CW V, Moore LJ, Young DR, Brantley ST, Bissett SN, McBride RA. 2013.  
915 Ecomorphodynamic feedbacks and barrier island response to disturbance: Insights from the  
916 Virginia Barrier Islands, Mid-Atlantic Bight, USA. *Geomorphology* 199 : 115-128. DOI:  
917 10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.03.035  
918

919 Woodhouse WW. 1982. Coastal sand dunes of the U.S. In *Creation and Restoration of Coastal*  
920 *Plant Communities*, Lewis RR (ed). CRC Press: Boca Raton;1-44.  
921

922 Woodhouse WW, Seneca ED, Broome SW. 1977. Effect of species on dune grass growth.  
923 *International Journal of Biometeorology* 21 : 256-266. DOI: 10.1007/BF01552879  
924

925 Young DR, Brantley ST, Zinnert JC, Vick JK. 2011. Landscape position and habitat polygons in  
926 a dynamic coastal environment. *Ecosphere* 2 :art71. DOI: 10.1890/ES10-00186.1  
927

928 Young DR, Erickson DL, Semones SW. 1994. Salinity and the small-scale distribution of three  
929 barrier island shrubs. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 72 : 1365-1372. DOI: 10.1139/b94-167  
930

931 Yousefi Lalimi F, Silvestri S, Moore LJ, Marani M. 2017. Coupled topographic and vegetation  
932 patterns in coastal dunes: Remote sensing observations and ecomorphodynamic implications.  
933 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 122 : 119-130. DOI: 10.1002/2016JG003540  
934

935 Zarnetske PL, Hacker SD, Seabloom EW, Ruggiero P, Killian JR, Maddux TB, Cox D. 2012.  
936 Biophysical feedback mediates effects of invasive grasses on coastal dune shape. *Ecology* 93 :  
937 1439-50. DOI: 10.1890/11-1112.1  
938

939 Zarnetske PL, Ruggiero P, Seabloom EW, Hacker SD. 2015. Coastal foredune evolution : the  
940 relative influence of vegetation and sand supply in the US Pacific Northwest. *Journal of the*  
941 *Royal Society Interface* 12: 20150017. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2015.0017>.

Tables

Table 1. Abbreviation and variables.

Abbreviation or Variable	Meaning
AB	<i>Ammophila breviligulata</i>
B/F	Basal/frontal
dagl years	Difference in aboveground leaf length for each season, analyzed together
dagldt	Monthly change in aboveground leaf length
dl <sub>tot</sub>	Total leaf growth
dz years	Change in elevation for each season, analyzed together
dz14	Change in elevation from beginning to end of 2014 season
dz15	Change in elevation from beginning to end of 2015 season
dzdt	Monthly change in elevation
dz <sub>tot</sub> , dz	Total change in elevation
LagLL	Longest aboveground leaf length
LagLL <sub>f</sub>	Final longest aboveground leaf length
LagLL <sub>i</sub>	Initial longest aboveground leaf length
NatAB	Natural <i>Ammophila breviligulata</i>
NatSP	Natural <i>Spartina Patens</i>
NIH	Number of inundation hours
SP	<i>Spartina patens</i>
TWL	Total water level
UP	<i>Uniola paniculata</i>
x, dist	Distance from shoreline
z <sub>f</sub>	Final elevation
z <sub>i</sub> , el, z <sub>i</sub>	Initial elevation

Table 2. Averages, standard deviations, and ranges of total leaf growth( $dl_{tot}$ ), longest aboveground leaf length ( $L_{agLLf}$ ), and basal/frontal (B/F) area ratios for each species.

	$dl_{tot}$ (mm)			$L_{agLLf}$ (mm)			B/F area		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	range	$\bar{x}$	SD	range	$\bar{x}$	SD	range
<i>Ammophila breviligulata</i>	531	295	1286	760	219	922	1.08	0.50	2.53
<i>Spartina patens</i>	452	162	664	595	132	536	0.5	0.43	1.58
<i>Uniola paniculata</i>	873	261	1178	1035	186	899	1.07	0.22	0.83
Natural <i>A. breviligulata</i>							0.68	0.23	0.75
Natural <i>S. patens</i>							0.59	0.16	0.46

Table 3. Analysis of variance and TukeyHSD values for differences in means and variances of total leaf growth ( $dl_{tot}$ ), longest aboveground leaf length (LagLL), and basal/frontal (B/F) area ratio ( $p < 0.05$  in bold).

ANOVA	F value	Pr(>F)
$dl_{tot}$ plant (Figure 3,A)	17.4	5.1e-7
TukeyHSD comparison	Difference (mm)	p adj
SP-AB	-79	0.47
<b>UP-AB</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>1.5e-4</b>
<b>UP-SP</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>2.4e-6</b>
ANOVA	Fvalue	Pr(>F)
LagLL plant (Figure 3,B)	28.6	3.7e-10
TukeyHSD comparison	Difference (mm)	p adj
<b>Sp-AB</b>	<b>-164</b>	<b>0.0038</b>
<b>UP-AB</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>3.1e-6</b>
<b>UP-SP</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>0.00e-6</b>
ANOVA	F value	Pr(>F)
B/Farea (Figure 3, C)	5.0	4e-4
TukeyHSD comparison	Difference	p adj
<b>SP-AB</b>	<b>-0.37</b>	<b>0.01</b>
UP-AB	-0.01	0.10
NatAB-AB	-0.40	0.12
<b>NatSP-AB</b>	<b>-0.50</b>	<b>0.03</b>
DM-AB	0.42	0.91
UN-SP	0.36	0.06
NatAB-SP	-0.40	0.10
NatSP-SP	-0.13	0.98
DM-SP	0.79	0.42
NatAB-UP	-0.40	0.21
NatSP-UP	-0.49	0.07
DM-UP	0.42	0.91
NatSP-NatAB	-0.09	0.10
DM-NatAB	0.82	0.41
DM-NatSP	0.92	0.29

Table 4: The results of the multilinear regression pseudo-stepwise selection of best variables to use for each species. The variables are “dist” for distance from shoreline, “dz” for change in elevation, and “zi” for initial elevation. For each combination of variables, we calculated the F statistic, R<sup>2</sup> value, R<sup>2</sup> adjusted value, and AIC statistic for each model. We eliminated the models whose F statistic was not statistically significant, and then further narrowed down the number of models by choosing only those whose R<sup>2</sup> adjusted value was more than 0.1 higher than other models (those which are bolded). Finally, we chose the models that had the lowest AIC score, which can be considered optimal. Bolded values are significant, shaded values are the final selection.

Ammophila	<u>dist</u>	<b><u>dz</u></b>	<u>zi</u>	<u>dist, dz</u>	<u>dist, zi</u>	<b><u>dz, zi</u></b>	<b><u>dist, dz, zi</u></b>
F stat	0.16	<b>40.69</b>	2.23	<b>31.21</b>	1.41	<b>48.9</b>	<b>32.26</b>
R <sup>2</sup>	0.004	0.50	0.052	0.62	0.07	0.71	0.72
R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	-0.02	0.49	0.029	0.56	0.019	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.69</b>
AIC	3387.86	3130.41	3369.34	3038.72	3365.62	2928.4	<b>2926.16</b>
Spartina	<u>dist</u>	<b><u>dz</u></b>	<u>zi</u>	<u>dist, dz</u>	<u>dist, zi</u>	<b><u>dz, zi</u></b>	<u>dist, dz, zi</u>
F stat	2.95	<b>16.08</b>	1.074	<b>11.23</b>	1.42	<b>8.83</b>	<b>7.13</b>
R <sup>2</sup>	0.12	0.43	0.049	0.53	0.12	0.47	0.53
R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	0.08	<b>0.41</b>	0.003	<b>0.48</b>	0.04	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.46</b>
AIC	15.14	<b>14.70</b>	15.22	16.52	17.14	16.64	18.52
Uniola	<u>dist</u>	<u>dz</u>	<u>zi</u>	<u>dist, dz</u>	<u>dist, zi</u>	<b><u>dz, zi</u></b>	<u>dist, dz, zi</u>
F stat	0.13	<b>30.97</b>	0.7	<b>15.4</b>	0.81	<b>16.33</b>	<b>10.28</b>
R <sup>2</sup>	0.007	0.63	0.038	0.64	0.09	0.66	0.66
R <sup>2</sup> <sub>adj</sub>	-0.05	<b>0.61</b>	-0.016	<b>0.60</b>	-0.02	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.59</b>
AIC	1740.9	1544.23	1734.81	1539.75	1726.4	<b>1532.12</b>	1533.79

