Response of Schoenoplectus acutus and Schoenoplectus californicus at Different Life-History Stages to Hydrologic Regime

## Taylor M. Sloey, Rebecca J. Howard & Mark W. Hester

#### Wetlands

Official Scholarly Journal of the Society of Wetland Scientists

ISSN 0277-5212 Volume 36 Number 1

Wetlands (2016) 36:37-46 DOI 10.1007/s13157-015-0713-8



Your article is protected by copyright and all rights are held exclusively by Society of Wetland Scientists. This e-offprint is for personal use only and shall not be selfarchived in electronic repositories. If you wish to self-archive your article, please use the accepted manuscript version for posting on your own website. You may further deposit the accepted manuscript version in any repository, provided it is only made publicly available 12 months after official publication or later and provided acknowledgement is given to the original source of publication and a link is inserted to the published article on Springer's website. The link must be accompanied by the following text: "The final publication is available at link.springer.com".



ORIGINAL RESEARCH

## SWS

CrossMark

# Response of *Schoenoplectus acutus* and *Schoenoplectus californicus* at Different Life-History Stages to Hydrologic Regime

Taylor M. Sloey<sup>1</sup> · Rebecca J. Howard<sup>2</sup> · Mark W. Hester<sup>3</sup>

Received: 22 April 2015 / Accepted: 9 October 2015 / Published online: 28 October 2015 © Society of Wetland Scientists 2015

Abstract For wetland restoration success to be maximized, restoration managers need better information regarding how the frequency, depth, and duration of flooding affect soil chemistry and the survival, growth, and morphology of targeted plant species. In a greenhouse study we investigated the impact of four different flooding durations (0 %, 40 %, 60 %, and 100 %) on soil physicochemistry and the responses of seedlings and adults of two species of emergent wetland macrophytes commonly used in restoration efforts (Schoenoplectus acutus and Schoenoplectus californicus). The longest flooding duration, which created more reducing soil conditions, resulted in significantly reduced survival of S. acutus adults  $(34 \pm 21 \%)$ survival) and complete mortality of seedlings of both species. Schoenoplectus californicus adults exhibited higher flooding tolerance, showing little impact of flooding on morphology and physiology. A companion field study indicated that S. californicus maintained stem strength regardless of flooding duration or depth, supporting the greenhouse study results. This information serves to improve our understanding of the ecological differences between these species as well as provide restoration managers with better guidelines for targeted eleva-

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s13157-015-0713-8) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

Taylor M. Sloey taylorsloey@gmail.com

- <sup>1</sup> Coastal Plant Ecology Laboratory, Department of Biology, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA, USA
- <sup>2</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, National Wetlands Research Center, 700 Cajundome Blvd, Lafayette, LA, USA
- <sup>3</sup> Institute for Coastal and Water Research, Department of Biology, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA, USA

tion and hydrologic regimes for these species in order to enhance the success of restoration plantings and better predict restoration site development.

Keywords Aerenchyma  $\cdot$  Flooding  $\cdot$  Hydrologic regime  $\cdot$  Soil reduction  $\cdot$  Stem strength

#### Introduction

In tidal wetland environments, flooding regimes influence plant species zonation, patterns of species dispersal, and survival based on the species' individual physiological tolerance to flooding (Jones and Etherington 1971; Weiher and Keddy 1995; Vervuren et al. 2003). Inundated soils and prolonged flooding result in soil oxygen depletion and lowered rates of photosynthesis (Van Bodegom et al. 2008). Wetland plants possess unique adaptations to help tolerate some flooding, including aerenchyma development (Voesnek et al. 2004), changes in root morphology (Sorrell et al. 2000), stem etiolation (Spink and Rogers 1996), and increased alcohol dehydrogenase activity (Messina and Conner 1998). Plant response to the duration of flooding and long-term survival vary considerably depending on species and age of the plant. Depth and duration of flooding can affect seedling mortality (Mandak and Pysek 2001; Elsey-Quirk et al. 2009) as soil oxygenation, soil chemistry, and hypoxic or anoxic conditions may reduce or completely inhibit seedling survival (Wijte and Gallagher 1996). Understanding the effects of specific aspects of hydrology (i.e., frequency, depth, and duration of flooding) on plant establishment, survival, and growth is essential to understanding limitations on vegetation re-colonization.

Flood tolerance characteristics of plants are particularly pertinent in the context of wetland restoration or creation. The dynamic nature of tidal marsh hydrology (i.e. variations in frequency, depth, and duration of flooding) may limit successful establishment and survival of desired wetland vegetation species during the course of restoration (Harper 1977; Galinato and van der Valk 1986). Generally, restoration theory advises that successful wetland restoration or creation can only be achieved after the establishment of the proper abiotic conditions (i.e., hydrologic regime and edaphic conditions) (Middleton 1999). Currently, limited conceptual models exist for marsh development in tidally influenced systems. Williams and Orr (2002) presented a conceptual model showing that colonization of mudflats in salt marsh occurs at approximately mean high water (MHW). Additionally, a review by McKee and Patrick (1988) explained that salt marsh intertidal zonation is dependent on tidal datum. However, because different plant species have different flooding tolerances, these thresholds need to be refined for specific plant species, as well as plant age, and the hydrogeomorphic setting of the wetland. Therefore, it is important to refine this conceptual model for key species of different marsh types and site specific applications.

Re-establishment of vegetation in tidal-marsh restoration sites promotes multiple ecological functions, including provision of animal habitat, protection of shorelines, sediment accretion, primary production, nutrient uptake, carbon sequestration, and enhancement of water quality (Simenstad and Thom 1996). Schoenoplectus acutus and S. californicus are widely distributed throughout the Americas and parts of the South Pacific (USDA/NRCS 2012). They are ideal species for use in restoration efforts in regions where they are native because they can reproduce both sexually and asexually, provide the aforementioned ecological functions, and are tolerant to general freshwater tidal marsh conditions (Watson and Byrne 2009; USDA/NRCS 2012). Although these species can tolerate some flooding, the species' tolerance thresholds for frequency or duration of inundation is not clearly defined at any life history stage. Little research has been conducted on these plant species to refine their ecology and physiological tolerances to stressors despite their large geographic distribution and expansive applicability for freshwater wetland restoration and creation.

We examined the response of *S. acutus* and *S. californicus* to different hydrologic regimes in both controlled greenhouse conditions and in the field. The objective of this study was to determine the optimum flooding regime for the two *Schoenoplectus* species and life stages to improve and inform restoration. Information from these studies can aid in minimizing restoration expenditures and maximizing efficiency of species placements in future wetland restoration and creation projects.

#### **Materials and Methods**

#### **Greenhouse Study**

Schoenoplectus acutus and S. californicus rhizomes were purchased from a native plant nursery in California, U.S. in February 2013 and transplanted to a greenhouse facility in Lafayette, Louisiana, U.S. (30.304206 N, -92.009775 E). An evaporative cooling system along one greenhouse wall maintained air temperatures below a maximum of 35 °C under ambient light conditions. Plant rhizomes were allowed to grow in Sta-Green <sup>™</sup> top soil for 12 weeks until the experiment initiation. Seedlings were germinated from seeds collected from a freshwater tidal marsh restoration site at Liberty Island, California, U.S. (38.308359 N, -121.686974 E). The experiment was initiated on 7 May 2013, when the seedlings were 8 weeks old. Adults were selected for similar sized rhizomes and consisted of a single ramet with two stems cut to 25 cm in height. Seedling transplants also had two stems that were 1.5-2.0 cm tall. Each plant (hereafter called units) was planted in individual 18.9 L buckets, perforated at the bottom and along the top to allow for uptake and drainage of water without scouring the soil surface. The bottom of the bucket was lined with 5 cm of course gravel, and the rest was filled with a mix of topsoil and clayey soil collected from an abandoned catfish pond located at Cade farm (University of Louisiana at Lafayette) as it more closely resembled the soil profile and particle size distribution of our reference field site at Liberty Island than commercial soil alone. Each unit was pre-treated with 30 g of Osmocote® (14-14-14) slow release fertilizer to avoid potential nutrient depletion.

We used a split-split plot on a randomized block design consisting of two transplant types (whole plot) representing different life history stages (seedlings and adults), two plant species (subplot) (*S. acutus* and *S. californicus*), four tidal flooding durations (sub-subplot) (0 % time flooded and not inundated, 40 % time flooded at a flooding depth of 20 cm, 60 % time flooded at 40 cm depth, and 100 % time flooded at 60 cm depth) with 5 replicates (blocks) of each. The split plot was separated by transplant type so that all species and flooding combinations of a single transplant type shared a tidal mesocosm. Units were blocked perpendicularly to the east/west light gradient.

Plant units were arranged in a large fiberglass cylindrical tank (91 cm height × 122 cm diameter). Different tidal flooding durations were achieved by elevating units on cinderblocks (Fig. 1). Each tank was elevated off the ground and connected by PVC tubing to its own reservoir of water (a cylindrical plastic tub measuring 61 cm height × 122 cm diameter with a covered top to reduce algal growth). Using a magnetic drive pump (MD 32, Zoro Tools Inc., Illinois) and gravity drainage, freshwater was continuously circulated between the experimental tank and the water reservoir to create a semi-diurnal tide with two high tide and two low tide events every 24 h. Tidal cycles for each of the five blocks were set five minutes apart to avoid overloading the electrical system, but the effect of this time difference is considered negligible. The selected percent time flooding and corresponding depths of maximum flooding were based on hydrologic data

Fig. 1 Diagram of tidal mesocosm showing a percentage of time flooded (shown on diagram) based on the percentage of time the soil surface of each unit was inundated, and b one experimental block in the splitsplit plot; transplant type (adult or seedling) represents the whole plot. Each tank contained four pots (experimental units) of each species (S. acutus and S. californicus). The greenhouse contained five blocks consisting of two tanks each, for a total of 10 tanks and 80 experimental units



extracted from tidal gauges at Liberty Island, California (Table 1). The overall tidal range at this field site was 1.35 m.

Units were monitored at one week, two weeks, and then monthly through 6 September 2013, for percent survival of standing biomass (as indicated by percent green living material of total biomass in each experimental unit), stem density and stem height. Soil redox potential was measured at 1 cm and 10 cm depths of each unit during each monitoring event using ORP electrodes (Thermo Orion 9179BN, Thermo Electron Corporation, Wisconsin). At the conclusion of the study, pore water was extracted from the top 15 cm of soil using a syringe with tubing attached. Pore water was analyzed for concentration of total sulfides using a Thermo Orion ion selective electrode (ThermoFisher Scientific, Massachusetts).

A subset of adult stems (2 stems for each test) was removed and immediately analyzed for stem strength and internal

**Table 1**Percent time of flooding and water level ranges at mean higher<br/>high water (MHHW), mean tide level (MTL), and mean lower low water<br/>(MLLW) at Liberty Island, CA

Tidal Datum	Max Depth of Flooding (relative to soil)	Percent Time of Day Flooded
MLLW	+0.01 m	9.47 %
MTL	+0.62 m	75.20 %
MHHW	+1.2 m	99.18 %

cross-sectional air space (aerenchyma formation). Stem strength was measured at the base, middle, and tip sections of the stem using a tool to obtain the modulus of elasticity, or E (Albert et al. 2013). As E increases, the stem is less likely to be pulled out of shape or bent with the stress of weight. Cross sections from the tip, middle, and base sections of collected stems were dyed with Tolluidine blue and photographed under a dissecting microscope. Photos of the cross sections were analyzed using Image J TM software to measure the total area of each cross section and total area of open space (aerenchyma). The area of cross-sectional aerenchyma was averaged across the stem sections to obtain a single mean for the entire stem, as stem section was not a significant factor. Plants were harvested and processed for root specific gravity using pycnometers. A subset of 10 live roots were collected from adult plants and analyzed for root morphology using WinRHIZO image analysis (Regent Instruments Inc., CAN). Roots were measured for the percent of total root length at varying size classes (0-0.05 mm, 0.05-0.10 mm, 0.10-0.20 mm, 0.20-0.50 mm, 0.50-1.0 mm and 1.0- > 2.0 mm). Finally, plant biomass was dried and weighed for total above- and belowground biomass and mass of inflorescences.

We implemented a mixed effects split-split-plot analysis of variance in SAS (SAS Institute, Inc 2010), with transplant type as our between plot factor, species as the within-plot factor, and flooding duration as a sub-plot factor, to test the effects of these factors on response variables (soil redox potential at 1 cm and 10 cm depths, pore water sulfide concentration, plant survival,

stem density, stem height, total aboveground biomass, total belowground biomass, mass of inflorescences, and area of cross-sectional aerenchyma) with a Tukey post-hoc test of pairwise comparisons to determine significant differences between means. Stem strength was tested in adults only. The effect of flooding duration, species, and stem section on stem strength was analyzed using a three-way ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc test. Root morphology was only tested in adults, the effect of flooding duration and species on the percentage of root length at given size classes was analyzed using a two-way ANOVA. For all statistical analyses, p < 0.05 was considered significant and all interactions between main factors, including all possible two-way and three-way interaction, were examined.

#### **Field Study**

We also sampled the stem strength of S. californicus growing in a freshwater tidal marsh restoration site located at Liberty Island, California. Stems were collected in May 2014 from each of eight zones that vary in elevation and wave/wind exposure (Fig. 2). Elevation of these zones was taken in September 2012 using a Trimble real time kinematic (RTK) survey using a rover (NAVD 88; Geoid 2009a). Percent time flooding ranges between 60 and 100 % of the time at this site, depending on elevation and season (Hester et al. 2015). Local hydrology and wave/wind exposure information was provided by hydrologic modelers at Environmental Science Associates (San Francisco, CA). In each zone, stems were collected from each of two proximities to the established marsh, one on the marsh edge/mudflat interface and the other from 5 m into the marsh interior. This was replicated two times at each site, for a total of at least 4 stems per zone, a total of 32 stems in total. Stems were cut at the base and placed in plastic tubes to protect the stems from damage. Stems were transported back to an indoor lab for testing of stem strength (methodology explained above, see Albert et al. 2013). The effect of marsh zone (defined by elevation and wind/wave exposure), proximity (interior and marsh edge), and stem section (tip, mid, base) on stem strength was analyzed for statistical significance  $(\alpha = 0.05)$  using a split-split plot design with marsh zone as the between-plot factor, proximity as the between-plot factor and stem section as the sub-plot factor.

This field site selected was part of a comprehensive study to assess *S. californicus* marsh expansion (Hester et al. 2015) and transplant success in restoration scenarios (Sloey et al. 2015). Unfortunately, *S. acutus* was not present within our sampling area footprint, but was present within the greater restoration project area. Limited information exists regarding *S. acutus* stem strength, but a study by Sloey and Hester (unpublished data) found that when subject to wind stress, *S. acutus* and *S. californicus* stems break (lodge) at similar percentages.

#### Results

#### **Greenhouse Study**

Flooding duration affected soil redox potential and sulfide concentration. Soils were significantly more reduced with increased flooding at 1 cm ( $F_{3,48} = 34.59$ , p < 0.0001) and 10 cm depths ( $F_{3,48} = 27.05$ , p < 0.0001) (Table 2; Table S1). Soil redox potential values among units exposed to constant inundation fell into the range that sulfate reduction may occur (less than -100 mV). Consequently, concentration of sulfides was significantly higher in the interstitial pore water of units flooded for longer durations ( $F_{3,48} = 22.80$ , p < 0.0001), though these sulfide concentrations were relatively low (< 3 ppm) (Table 2; Table S1).

Plant responses to flooding duration indicated interesting species and transplant type differences. Seedling survival was lower than adults at all flooding durations and decreased with increased durations of flooding resulting in a significant interaction between transplant type and flooding duration ( $F_3$ ,  $_{48} = 13.84, p < 0.0001$ ). Adult survival, however, was decreased only at 100 % flooding (Table 2; Table S1). Stem production was greater among S. acutus in regard to species, and adult plants in regard to plant age, and units subjected to shorter durations of flooding, as shown by a 3-way interaction between transplant type, species, and flooding duration ( $F_{3}$ ,  $_{48}$  = 12.01, p < 0.0001) (Table 2; Table S1). Flooding duration did not affect stem production in S. californicus adults. Schoenoplectus californicus adults grew taller ( $F_{3,48} = 6.19$ , p = 0.0012; Table S1) and produced more biomass (F<sub>3.</sub>  $_{48} = 26.19, p < 0.0001$ ) under all flooding levels compared to S. acutus. For seedlings of both species and S. acutus adults, stem height and biomass production decreased with increasing duration of flooding; however, S. californicus adults showed the opposite trend of increased height with increased flooding duration (Table 2; Table S1). Production of inflorescence biomass was higher in S. acutus than S. californicus, but S. acutus adult inflorescence biomass production was impeded by longer durations of flooding, whereas S. californicus showed no impact of flooding on inflorescence biomass production (F<sub>3</sub>,  $_{48}$  = 39.81, p < 0.0001; Table 2). Seedlings did not produce reproductive structures throughout the duration of our study. Increased flooding generally led to reduced belowground biomass production, except for S. californicus adults, which showed no discernible impact of flooding ( $F_{3,48} = 8.75$ , *p* < 0.0001; Table 2).

Stem strength in adult plants showed a significant 3-way interaction between species, flooding duration, and stem section ( $F_{6,685} = 3.47$ , p = 0.0022) (Table S2; Table S1). Although *S. acutus* exhibited larger overall *E* values than *S. californicus*, it is important to recognize that the value of E is partially driven by stem radius; because *S. californicus* stems were thicker than those of *S. acutus*, the value of E was lower. Stems of *S. acutus* 

### Author's personal copy



0 255 510 1,020 1,530 2,040

Fig. 2 Liberty Island surface elevations as determined by RTK survey (left) marked with the eight *S. californicus* collection zones and Liberty Island wave energy (right)

(at all sections) appeared less rigid when subjected to longer durations of flooding (Fig. 3). Schoenoplectus californicus stems, in contrast, were strongest with intermediate flooding. Calculations of the percent aerenchyma (cross sectional air space) in stems showed that longer durations of flooding resulted in a significantly greater percent of cross-sectional stem space consisting of aerenchyma ( $F_{3,25} = 9.05$ , p = 0.0003) (Table 2, Table S1, Fig. 4). Analysis of root morphology showed a significant effect of species at the 0.1–0.2 mm ( $F_{1,29} = 26.38$ , p < 0.0001) and 0.50–1.0 mm (F<sub>1.29</sub> = 139.29, p < 0.0001) (Table S3). There was a significant effect of flooding duration at the 0.20–0.50 mm (F<sub>3,29</sub> = 5.97, p = 0.0027) class and a significant interaction between the two effects at the 1.00-2.00 mm ( $F_{3,29} = 3.52$ , p < 0.0274) class. Trends indicate that longer durations of flooding correlated with a higher percentage of total root length at smaller diameters in S. californicus (p < 0.0001) but showed no impact on S. acutus (Fig. 5).

#### **Field Study**

Schoenoplectus californicus stems collected from the Liberty Island, California field site revealed that stem strength differed among stem section ( $F_{2,52} = 14.89$ , p < 0.0001), with the tips exhibiting the strongest stems relative to diameter, followed by mid-section and base (Table S4, Fig. 6). Note that the base sections were able to support more weight overall than the tip

and mid sections, but the calculation of E is dependent on diameter. There was no significant effect of proximity (p = 0.8694) or zone (p = 0.8562) on stem strength.

#### Discussion

Hydrology, referred to as the master variable controlling wetland plant species zonation, plays an influential role in determining which species and ages of plants can successfully establish and survive (Tiner 1999; Mitsch and Gosselink 2007), and Casanova and Brock (2000) reported that the duration and frequency of flooding has more influence on plant species establishment compared to depth of flooding. Schoenoplectus acutus and S. californicus co-occur throughout much of the western and southern United States (USDA/NRCS 2014), but our understanding of the differences between these species in regard to tolerance thresholds to flooding duration was limited. Our research has defined the flooding tolerance thresholds for these species, which has implications for improving our understanding of competitive interactions in plant associations. This information can be used to maximize restoration efforts in terms of planting the proper species at the proper ages depending on the site hydrology and elevation. Our finding that S. californicus exhibits superior stem strength regardless of environmental conditions suggests

(70)         (70)         (70)           Adult         S. carlformicus         100 $-1401$ $\pm$ $272$ $-1953$ $\pm$ $717$ $261$ $\pm$ $118$ Adult         S. carlformicus         100 $-1301$ $\pm$ $273$ $\pm$ $473$ $\pm$ $473$ $\pm$ $473$ $\pm$ $0018$ S. carlformicus         100 $-2383$ $\pm$ $373$ $\pm$ $473$ $250$ $\pm$ $0018$ S. carlformicus         100 $-2183$ $\pm$ $3758$ $-1302$ $\pm$ $353$ $\pm$ $0018$ S. carlformicus         100 $-1333$ $\pm$ $3758$ $-1302$ $\pm$ $3536$ $\pm$ $0018$ Common         0 $1231$ $\pm$ <	Transplant Type	Species	Flooding Duration	Soil Red at 1 cm 6	ox Poten depth (m	tial V)	Soil Rec at 10 cm	lox Poter 1 depth (1	ntial nV)	Sulfide n pore	concentr water	ation	Plan Surv	ıt 'ival (%	(0)	Stem I (# of st	Density Tems per	: unit)
Adult $x \ arcmax$ 100 $-140.1$ $x \ 2.23$ $x \ 3.75$ $x \ 4.78$ $2.61$ $x \ 1.18$ Adult $x \ culture$ 100 $-136.1$ $x \ 2.75$ $x \ 4.78$ $0.23$ $x \ 0.03$ $x \ culture$ 100 $-136.1$ $x \ 2.56$ $x \ 4.29$ $0.23$ $x \ 0.048$ $x \ culture$ 00 $-36.1$ $x \ 2.55.8$ $-755$ $x \ 1.96$ $x \ 0.018$ $x \ culture$ 00 $-76.1$ $x \ 2.55.8$ $-755$ $x \ 1.966$ $x \ 0.018$ $x \ culture$ 00 $-76.1$ $x \ 3.55.8$ $-107.5$ $x \ 0.018$ $x \ 0.018$ $x \ culture$ 00 $-73.4$ $x \ 4.12$ $-190.2$ $x \ 8.4.7$ $0.075$ $x \ 0.075$ $x \ culture$ $00$ $-144.3$ $x \ 3.5.6$ $190.7$ $x \ 0.075$ $x \ 0.075$ $x \ culture$ $00$ $-174.3$ $x \ 3.5.6$ $10.7$ $x \ 0.075$ $x \ culture$ $00$ $175.3$ $x \ 41.2$ <			(0/)							(mqq)								
60 $-259$ $\pm$ $2.78$ $-755$ $\pm$ $472$ B $0.22$ $\pm$ $0.01$ B           60 $915$ $\pm$ $206$ C $905$ $\pm$ $216$ B $0.25$ $\pm$ $0.01$ B           60 $915$ $\pm$ $206$ C $905$ $\pm$ $206$ B $\pm$ $312$ B $146$ C $0.01$ B $\pm$ $0.01$ B           60 $-281$ S $\pm$ $315$ B $-417$ B $-413$ B $-413$ B $-413$ B $-001$ B $\pm$ $001$ B           8 $-244$ $\pm$ $437$ B $-107$ S $\pm$ $310$ B $536$ $\pm$ $001$ B $0$ $-234$ B $-107$ S $\pm$ $335$ S $201$ B $302$ S $\pm$ $001$ B $0$ $90$ $-235$ S $\pm$ $356$ S $\pm$ $002$ B $\pm$ $002$ B $0$ $000$ S $\pm$ $475$ B $-300$ S $\pm$ $002$ B $\pm$ $002$ B $0$ <	Adult	S. acutus	100	-140.1	H	72.2A	-195.3	+	73.7 A	2.61	+	1.18 A	34	H	21A	2.4	H	1.6 A
40         #33 $\pm$ 0.44 B         -756 $\pm$ 429 B         0.25 ± $\pm$ 0.44 B           60         -38.1 $\pm$ 73.8 ±         73.3 ± $\pm$ 13.8 ± $\pm$ 0.04 B           60         -38.1 $\pm$ 73.9 ±         -75.1 ± $\pm$ 13.9 ±         0.05 ± $\pm$ 0.04 B           60         -38.1 ± $\pm$ 73.6 ±         0.03 ± $\pm$ 0.01 B           60         17.5 ± $\pm$ 37.5 B         -13.0 ± $\pm$ 37.3 ± $\pm$ 0.07 B           60         17.5 ± $\pm$ 37.5 B         -13.0 ± $\pm$ 37.8 ±         0.03 B $\pm$ 0.07 B           60         17.5 ± $\pm$ 37.5 B         23.0 ± $\pm$ 37.8 ±         0.03 B $\pm$ 0.03 B           60         17.3 ± $\pm$ 37.5 B         27.9 ±         0.03 B         0.03 B           60         91.3 ± $\pm$ 37.8 ±         13.0 ±         27.9 E         0.04 ±         0.03 B           70.1 B         0.03 ±			60	-25.9	H	52.7B	-73.5	H	47.8 B	0.52	H	0.27 B	95	H	2B	44.8	H	10.4 B
0 $915$ $\pm$ $206$ $900$ $\pm$ $166$ $2013$ $\pm$ $003$ 60 $-581$ $\pm$ $215$ $-753$ $\pm$ $1929$ $\pm$ $003$ 60 $-561$ $\pm$ $215$ $-753$ $\pm$ $1929$ $\pm$ $003$ $200$ $2373$ $\pm$ $313$ $\pm$ $003$ $\pm$ $003$ $200$ $233$ $\pm$ $381$ $-1078$ $\pm$ $335$ $\pm$ $003$ $25$ californics $100$ $733$ $\pm$ $381$ $-107$ $\pm$ $003$ $\pm$ $003$ $2.0013$ $5$ $233$ $\pm$ $335$ $-113$ $3523$ $003$ $114$ $0013$ $\pm$ $335$ $-133$ $\pm$ $213$ $\pm$ $013$ $00113$ $5$ $413$ $533$ $233$ $233$ $233$ $233$ $234$ $236$ $1148$			40	48.3	H	41.4B	-75.6	H	42.9 B	0.25	H	0.14  B	88	H	7 AB	43.2	H	7.1 B
Seedling $x$ californics         100 $-213$ $\pm$ $173$ $\pm$ $173$ $\pm$ $173$ $\pm$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $113$ $1133$ $1133$ $113$ <			0	191.5	++	20.6 C	90.0	++	14.6 C	0.04	++	0.03 B	86	H	9  AB	57.4	H	9.3 B
60 $-361$ $\pm$ $21.3$ B $-75.3$ $\pm$ $193$ B $0.65$ $\pm$ $0.04$ B           Seelling         5. acuns         100 $17.3$ $\pm$ $17.3$ $\pm$ $10.6$ $\pm$ $0.01$ B           Seelling         5. acuns         100 $17.3$ $\pm$ $36.5$ $\pm$ $10.73$ $\pm$ $36.6$ $\pm$ $0.01$ B           Sectification         100 $17.3$ $\pm$ $36.6$ $197$ $\pm$ $0.073$ B           S. californicus         100 $17.3$ $\pm$ $35.6$ $197$ $\pm$ $0.073$ B           S. californicus         100 $17.3$ $\pm$ $35.6$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.073$ B           Adut $175$ $\pm$ $35.6$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.014$ B           Itemsplat $175$ B $\pm$ $35.6$ $1.713$ B $0.33$ B $1.74$ B           Tanaplat $179$ B $\pm$ $35.5$ $1.718$ A $2.55$ AB $8.7$ Adut $1.18$		S. californicus	100	-218.7	H	17.9 A	-271.9	H	15.2 A	2.92	H	$1.18 \mathrm{A}$	100	H	0 B	11.6	H	1.4 A
Addity $-4.8$ $\pm$ $53.9$ $-41.3$ $\pm$ $75.9$ $-41.3$ $\pm$ $75.3$ $\pm$ $00.0$ $\pm$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ $0.013$ <			60	-36.1	H	21.5 B	-75.5	H	19.9 B	0.55	++	0.04 B	66	H	1 B	12.4	H	1.1 A
Seedling $0$ $-397.2$ $\pm$ $71.6$ C $201.3$ $\pm$ $0.016$ $\pm$ $0.017$ $\pm$ $0.017$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.075$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.076$ $\pm$ $0.075$ $=$ $0.075$ $\pm$ $0.075$ $=$ $0.075$ $=$ $0.075$ $=$ $0.075$ $=$ $0.075$ $0.014$ $0.075$ $0.014$ $0.075$ $0.014$ $0.075$ $0.014$			40	-4.8	H	53.9 B	-41.3	H	17.3 B	0.06	+I	0.03 B	06	H	8 AB	10.8	H	1.7 A
Seedling         S. actures         100 $-108.8$ $\pm$ $86.1$ A $-107.8$ $\pm$ $100.7$ $3.05$ $\pm$ $0.77$ A           40 $-24.4$ $\pm$ $4.75$ B $-4.19.2$ $\pm$ $3.56.$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.078$ 40 $-24.4$ $\pm$ $4.75$ B $-4.19.2$ $\pm$ $3.56.$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.028$ 40 $107.3$ $\pm$ $3.54.6$ $1.90.7$ $\pm$ $3.54.6$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.038$ 7. californicus $100$ $1.41.3$ $\pm$ $3.54.6$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.048$ $\pm$ $0.038$ 7. californicus         Sulfide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Belowground         Irit           Adult $1.18A$ $3.2$ $\pm$ $2.4.3$ B $0.51$ $\pm$ $0.351$ $\pm$ $0.38$ Adult $1.18A$ $3.7$ $\pm$ $4.1A$ $6.8$ $\pm$ $4.3$ A $0.03$ B $1.18$ B <th></th> <th></th> <th>0</th> <th>297.2</th> <th>++</th> <th>70.6 C</th> <th>201.2</th> <th>H</th> <th>88.4 C</th> <th>0.02</th> <th>++</th> <th>0.01 B</th> <th>93</th> <th>H</th> <th>4  AB</th> <th>10.6</th> <th>H</th> <th>0.7 A</th>			0	297.2	++	70.6 C	201.2	H	88.4 C	0.02	++	0.01 B	93	H	4  AB	10.6	H	0.7 A
60 $73.5$ $\pm$ $37.5$ $-130.2$ $\pm$ $55.2$ $0.31$ $\pm$ $0.075$ 60 $73.4$ $\pm$ $47.1$ $190$ $\pm$ $53.5$ $-190.2$ $\pm$ $0.028$ 60 $19.7$ $\pm$ $38.5$ $-210.2$ $\pm$ $53.6$ $0.09$ $\pm$ $0.075$ 40 $103.9$ $\pm$ $44.5$ $76.1$ $\pm$ $23.85$ $0.018$ $\pm$ $0.028$ 7 $0.03.9$ $\pm$ $24.58$ $52.0$ $\pm$ $24.98$ $0.018$ $\pm$ $0.038$ 7 $0.03.9$ $\pm$ $24.58$ $52.0$ $\pm$ $24.98$ $0.038$ Adut $1.18$ $32$ $\pm$ $21.4$ $\pm$ $43.5$ $53.66$ $8$ $14.3$ $0.038$ Adut $1.18$ $32$ $\pm$ $32.7$ $1004$ $13.6$ $12.33$ $4$ $43.7$ $10.34$ $12.34$ $17.4$	Seedling	S. acutus	100	-108.8	H	$86.1  \mathrm{A}$	-107.8	H	107.6 A	3.05	++	0.77 A	0	H	0 A	NA	H	NA
40 $-2.44$ ± $44.7B$ $-4.13$ ± $44.7B$ $-4.13$ ± $47.1B$ $0.49$ $\pm$ $0.35B$ 60 $1.97$ ± $5.34.4$ $1.90$ $1.97$ ± $0.14B$ $0.03$ ± $0.14B$ $0.13B$ $0.14B$ $0.13B$ $0.14B$ $0.13B$			60	17.5	H	37.5 B	-130.2	H	55.2 B	0.31	H	0.07 B	40	H	24 A	2.4	H	$1.6 \mathrm{A}$
0         129.1 $\pm$ 54.4         119.0 $\pm$ 28.5 $-210.2$ $\pm$ 28.8 $0.75$ $\pm$ $0.75$ $0.03$ $\pm$ $0.04$ $\pm$ $0.75$ $0.03$ $\pm$ $0.04$ $\pm$ $0.04$ $\pm$ $0.03$ $\pm$ $0.14$ $B$ $0.12$ $\pm$ $0.14$ $B$ $0.12$ $\pm$ $0.04$ $0.03$ $B$ $0.03$ $B$ $0.03$ $B$ $0.03$ $B$ $0.03$ $B$ $0.03$			40	-24.4	H	44.7 B	-41.9	H	47.1 B	0.49	H	0.35 B	80	H	20 B	8.0	H	2.8 A
S. californicas         100 $-144.3$ $\pm$ $38.5A$ $-210.2$ $\pm$ $33.6A$ $1.97$ $\pm$ $0.14B$ 0 $10.7$ $\pm$ $41.2B$ $2.9.3$ $\pm$ $70.1B$ $0.14B$ 10 $10.7$ $\pm$ $41.2B$ $2.9.3$ $\pm$ $70.1B$ $0.14B$ Transplant Type         Sulfide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Belowground         Ir           Tausplant Type         Sulfide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Belowground         Ir           (ppm)         (cm) $a2.3$ $\pm$ $2.1A$ $\pm$ $4.1A$ $6.8$ $\pm$ $4.3A$ $0.3B$ $0.33$ $B_{1215}$ $\pm$ $2.5AB$ $B_{121}$ Adut $1.18A$ $217$ $\pm$ $2.4B$ $2.13BC$ $131.6$ $\pm$ $2.55AB$ $B_{1215}$ $\pm$ $2.55AB$ $B_{1215}$ $Adut$ $1.18A$ $2.17$ $\pm$ $2.4B$ $2.33$ $\pm$ $2.55A$			0	129.1	++	54.4 C	119.0	++	28.8 C	0.09	H	0.02 B	100	H	0 B	8.6	H	$0.6 \mathrm{A}$
60 $19.7$ $\pm$ $41.2$ B $29.3$ $\pm$ $70.1$ B $0.51$ $\pm$ $0.14$ B           The fight $103.9$ $\pm$ $24.5$ G $52.0$ $\pm$ $24.9$ B $0.12$ $\pm$ $0.03$ B           Transplant Type         Suffide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Ir           Tansplant Type         Suffide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Belowground         Ir           npore water         (cm) $(m)$ $m$ $10.3$ B $52.5$ AB $8$ $4.3$ A $\pm$ $10.3$ B $6.3$ $\pm$ $4.3$ A $0.03$ B $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $57.6$ $\pm$ $3.4$ A $4.3$ B $121.5$ $\pm$ $25.5$ AB $8$ $121.5$ $\pm$ $25.6$ AB $11.1$ B $0.14$ B $0.3$ B $1217$ $\pm$ $23.4$ B $121.5$ $\pm$ $25.5$ AB $8$ $11.1$ A $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $11.1$ B $1$		S. californicus	100	-144.3	H	38.5 A	-210.2	H	53.6 A	1.97	H	0.75 A	0	H	$0 \mathrm{A}$	NA	H	NA
40         103.9 $\pm$ 24.5 B         52.0 $\pm$ 24.9 B         0.12 $\pm$ 0.03 B           Tansplant Type         Sulfde concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Transplant Type           Tansplant Type         Sulfde concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Total Aboveground         Transplant Type           Adult         1.18 A         32 $\pm$ 21 A $\pm$ 4.1 A         6.8 $\pm$ 4.3 A           0.12 B         87 $\pm$ 3.4 $\pm$ 10.3 B         96.3 $\pm$ 25.5 AB         8           1.18 A         76 $\pm$ 3.4 $\pm$ 4.1 A         6.8 $\pm$ 4.3 A         0.03 B           0.14 B         87 $\pm$ 2.1 A $\pm$ 4.1 A         6.8 $\pm$ 25.6 B         0.1           1.18 A         2.17 $\pm$ 0.3 B         2.13 BC         18.5 E $\pm$ 25.6 B         0.1           1.18 A         0.118         1.18 A			60	19.7	H	41.2 B	29.3	H	70.1 B	0.51	H	0.14  B	20	H	$20 \mathrm{A}$	1.0	H	$1.0 \mathrm{A}$
0         165.7 $\pm$ 40.5 C         76.1 $\pm$ 27.9 C         0.06 $\pm$ 0.03 B           Tansplant Type         Sulfide concentration         Stem Height         Total Aboveground         Total Belowground         In           n pore water         (cm) $\pm$ $27.9$ L $0.06$ $\pm$ $0.03$ B           Adult         1.18 A $32$ $\pm$ $21A$ $\pm$ $41$ A $6.8$ $\pm$ $43.3$ A $0.03$ B $0.03$ B $0.03$ B $0.03$ B $0.03$ B $0.03$ B $0.14$ B $87$ $\pm$ $2A$ $\pm$ $43.8$ $0.25.8$ $\pm$ $43.3$ A $0.38$ $0.118$ A $0.38$ $0.118$ A $0.38$ $0.118$ A $0.38$ $0.118$ $0.03$ $0.01$ B $0.01$ B $0.01$ $0.01$ B $0.01$ B $0.01$ $0.01$ B $0.01$ $0.01$ B $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$ $0.01$			40	103.9	H	24.5 B	52.0	H	24.9 B	0.12	H	0.03 B	100	H	0 B	4.4	H	0.5 A
Transplant Type       Sulfide concentration       Stem Height       Total Aboveground       Total Belowground       In         Tansplant Type       Sulfide concentration       Stem Height       Total Aboveground       Total Belowground       In         n pore water       (ppn)       (cm)       (cm)       Biomass (g)       Biomass (g)       Biomass (g)       Biomass (g)         Adult       1.18 A       32 $\pm$ 21A $\pm$ 4.1 A       6.8 $\pm$ 4.3 A $0.3$ 0.14 B       8       76 $\pm$ 3.A $\pm$ 10.3 B       96.3 $\pm$ 255.6 B       11         0.14 B       8       7 $\pm$ 2.A $\pm$ 4.3 B       121.5 $\pm$ 255.6 B       11         0.03 B       76 $\pm$ 3.A $\pm$ 13.8 C       131.6 $\pm$ 255.6 B       11         0.04 B       181 $\pm$ 3.8 C $\pm$ 13.8 C       131.6 $\pm$ 255.6 B       0         0.03 B       162 $\pm$ 3.8 C $\pm$ 13.8 C       131.6 $\pm$ 255.4 B       0         0.04 B       0.03 B			0	165.7	H	40.5 C	76.1	H	27.9 C	0.06	+I	0.03 B	100	H	0 B	9.0	H	3.6 A
Transplant Type       Suffide concentration       Stem Height       Total Aboveground       Total Belowground       In         n pore water       n pore water       (pm))       (cm)       Biomass (g)       Bio       Bio       Bio <th></th>																		
n pore water         n pore water         Biomass (g)	Transplant Type	Sulfide concen	tration Si	em Height		Toté	ıl Abovegr	ound	Total I	3elowgro	pun	In	florescer	JCe		Area c	)f	
(ppm)         (cm)           Adult         1.18 A         32 $\pm$ $21 \mathrm{A}$ $\pm$ $4.1 \mathrm{A}$ $6.8$ $\pm$ $4.3 \mathrm{A}$ $0$ $0.27 \mathrm{B}$ $87$ $\pm$ $3.4$ $\pm$ $1.18 \mathrm{A}$ $5.25 \mathrm{AB}$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $8$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $8$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $8$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $1.18 \mathrm{A}$ $0.14 \mathrm{B}$ $87$ $\pm$ $2.3 \mathrm{A}$ $\pm$ $4.3 \mathrm{B}$ $121.5$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $11.18 \mathrm{A}$ $0.03 \mathrm{B}$ $11.18 \mathrm{A}$ $217 \pm$ $208 \pm$ $13.38 \mathrm{C}$ $131.6 \pm$ $\pm$ $25.5 \mathrm{AB}$ $0.01 \mathrm{B}$ $0.04 \mathrm{B}$ $10.129 \pm$ $\pm$ $20.9 \mathrm{B}$ $127.7 \pm$ $10.6 \mathrm{B}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.01 \mathrm{B}$ $1129 \pm$ $\pm$ $9.2 \pm$ $\pm$ $25.4 \mathrm{A}$ $0$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.04 \mathrm{C}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.03 \mathrm{B}$ $0.03 \mathrm{B}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$ $0.0 \mathrm{A}$		n pore water				Bio	mass (g)		Bioma	ss (g)		B	iomass (§	g)		Cross-	section	al
Adult         1.18 A         32 $\pm$ $21$ A $\pm$ $4.1$ A $6.8$ $\pm$ $4.3$ A $0.27$ B $87$ $\pm$ $3.1$ $\pm$ $4.1$ A $6.8$ $\pm$ $4.3$ A $0.27$ B $87$ $\pm$ $3.1$ $\pm$ $3.1$ $5.4$ B $5.5.5$ AB $8$ $1.1.5$ $\pm$ $255.6$ B $11$ 0.14 B $87$ $\pm$ $2.3$ A $\pm$ $4.3$ B $121.5$ $\pm$ $255.6$ B $11$ 0.14 B $87$ $\pm$ $2.3$ A $\pm$ $5.4$ B $255.6$ B $11$ 0.03 B $162$ $\pm$ $3.8$ B $13.3$ BC $13.3$ BC $13.56$ $\pm$ $27.08$ B $0.0$ 0.04 B $162$ $\pm$ $10.8$ $2.34$ B $12.77$ $\pm$ $17.4$ B $0.0$ 0.01 B $0.77$ A $0$ $0$ A $0$ A $0$ A $0$ $\pm$ $2.55$ A $0$ 0.01 B $0.77$ A $0$		(mdd)	) (c	m)												Aeren	chyma (	(%)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Adult	1.18 A	32	+	21 A	+	4.1	A	6.8	H	4.3 A	0		++	0.00 A	23.8	H	4.6 A
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0.27 B	×.	++	3 A	++	10.	3 B	96.3	++	25.5 /	AB 8	46	+1	1.79 B	8.8	++	1.9 AC
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0.14 B	8,	++	2 A	++	4.3	В	121.5	++	25.61	3 15	3.30	+1	0.67 B	5.7	H	1.2 BC
1.18 A $217$ $\pm$ $20B$ $\pm$ $13.8C$ $131.6$ $\pm$ $28.5B$ $0.04$ 0.04 B       181 $\pm$ $3BC$ $\pm$ $13.3BC$ $131.6$ $\pm$ $28.5B$ $0.01$ 0.03 B $162$ $\pm$ $10BC$ $\pm$ $3.4B$ $127.7$ $\pm$ $10.6B$ $0.0$ 0.01 B $129$ $\pm$ $9C$ $\pm$ $2.9B$ $127.7$ $\pm$ $10.6B$ $0.0$ 0.01 B $129$ $\pm$ $0.4$ $0$ $\pm$ $27.7$ $\pm$ $10.6B$ $0.0$ 0.07 B $0.77 A$ $0$ $\pm$ $0.A$ $0$ $\pm$ $0.4$ $0$ $0.6$ $\pm$ $17.4B$ $0.0$ 0.07 B $222$ $\pm$ $15AB$ $\pm$ $217A$ $92$ $\pm$ $25A$ $0$ $0.07 B$ $50$ $\pm$ $15AB$ $\pm$ $217A$ $92$ $\pm$ $25A$ $0$ $0.02 B$ $0$ $\pm$ $0A$ $0$ $\pm$ $226A$		0.03 B	76	++	3 A	H	5.4	В	258.3	++	69.4 (	15	<u>)</u> ,44	÷	1.78 B	5.9	H	1.3 BC
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1.18 A	2	۲ ±	20 B	++	13.	8 C	131.6	H	28.5 1	3 0.	20	++	0.07 A	25.6	+1	3.1 A
0.03 B       162 $\pm$ 10 BC $\pm$ 3.4 B       127.7 $\pm$ 10.6 B       0.         0.01 B       129 $\pm$ 9 C $\pm$ 2.9 B       127.3 $\pm$ 10.6 B       0.         Seedling       0.77 A       0 $\pm$ 0 A $\pm$ 0 A       0 $\pm$ 17.4 B       0.         0.07 B       2.2 $\pm$ 15 AB $\pm$ 0.0 A       0 $\pm$ 0 A       0 $\pm$ 0.0 A       0         0.07 B       2.2 $\pm$ 15 AB $\pm$ 0.0 A       0 $\pm$ 0.0 A       0 $\pm$ 0.0 A       0         0.07 B       6.0 $\pm$ 19 AB $\pm$ 2.17 A       9.2 $\pm$ 3.5 A       0         0.02 B       5.0 $\pm$ 19 AB $\pm$ 2.17 A       9.2 $\pm$ 3.5 A       0         0.02 B $5.0$ $\pm$ $10.6$ B $\pm$ $2.17$ A       9.2 $\pm$ $3.5$ A       0         0.02 B $\pm$ $4$ $\pm$ $2.6$ A $1.1$ A $0.8$		0.04 B	18	1 ±	3 BC	++	13.	3 BC	185.6	H	27.01	3 0.	26	H	0.26 A	23.3	H	2.9 A
0.01 B       129 $\pm$ 9 C $\pm$ 2.9 B       127.3 $\pm$ 17.4 B       0.         Seedling $0.77$ A       0 $\pm$ 0 A       0       0 $\pm$ 0 A $\pm$ 0 A $\pm$ 0 A $\pm$ 0 A       0       0 $\pm$ 0 A       0       0 $\pm$ 0 $\pm$ 0       0 <td< th=""><th></th><th>0.03 B</th><th>16</th><th>5 ±</th><th>10 B</th><th>⊤ C</th><th>3.4</th><th>В</th><th>127.7</th><th>H</th><th>10.61</th><th>3 0.</th><th>10</th><th>÷</th><th>0.06 A</th><th>7.3</th><th>H</th><th>1.5 C</th></td<>		0.03 B	16	5 ±	10 B	⊤ C	3.4	В	127.7	H	10.61	3 0.	10	÷	0.06 A	7.3	H	1.5 C
Seedling $0.77$ A $0$ $\pm$ $0$ A $\pm$ $0$ A $0$ $\pm$ $0$ A $0$ $0.07$ B $22$ $\pm$ $15$ AB $\pm$ $16.6$ A $3.4$ $\pm$ $2.5$ A $0$ $0.07$ B $22$ $\pm$ $15$ AB $\pm$ $16.6$ A $3.4$ $\pm$ $2.5$ A $0$ $0.35$ B $39$ $\pm$ $19$ AB $\pm$ $21.7$ A $9.2$ $\pm$ $3.5$ A $0$ $0.02$ B $60$ $\pm$ $4$ B $\pm$ $2.6$ A $12.9$ $\pm$ $1.1$ A $0$ $0.75$ A $0$ $\pm$ $0$ A $0$ $\pm$ $0$ A $0$ $\pm$ $0.7$ $0.14$ B $10$ $\pm$ $0$ A $0$ $2.5$ A $7.1$ $\pm$ $0.8$ A $0$ $0.03$ B $32$ $\pm$ $8$ AB $\pm$ $2.5$ A $7.1$ $\pm$ $1.7$ A $0$ $0.03$ B $57$ $\pm$ $18$ AB $\pm$ $1.76$ A $88$ $\pm$ $2.3$ A $0$		0.01 B	12	∓ 6i	9 C	++	2.9	В	127.3	+	17.4 1	3 0.	02	+H	0.02 A	6.4	H	1.3 B
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Seedling	0.77 A	0	H	0 A	Ŧ	0 /	_	0	H	0 A	0		+1	0 A	NA	H	NA
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0.07 B	2	++	15 A	₽	16.	6 A	3.4	H	2.5 A	0		++	0 A	22.7	++	21.6 A
0.02 B     60     ±     4 B     ±     2.6 A     12.9     ±     1.1 A     0       0.75 A     0     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     ±     0 A       0.75 A     0     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     ±     0 A       0.75 A     0     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     0     ±     0 A       0.14 B     10     ±     10 AB     ±     2.4 A     0.8     ±     0 A       0.03 B     32     ±     8 AB     ±     2.5 A     7.1     ±     1.7 A     0       0.03 B     57     ±     18 AB     ±     17.6 A     8.8     ±     23 A     0		0.35 B	36	#	19 A	B ±	21.	7 A	9.2	H	3.5 A	0		H	0 A	16.2	H	3.5 A
0.75 A     0     ±     0 A     ±     0 A     0     ±     0 A     0       0.14 B     10     ±     10 AB     ±     2.4 A     0.8     ±     0.8 A     0       0.03 B     32     ±     8 AB     ±     2.5 A     7.1     ±     1.7 A     0       0.03 B     57     ±     18 AB     ±     17.6 A     8.8     ±     23 A     0		0.02 B	90	#	4 B	++	2.6	Y	12.9	+	1.1 A	0		+H	0 A	18.8	H	3.3 A
0.14B 10 ± 10AB ± 2.4A 0.8 ± 0.8A 0 0.03B 32 ± 8AB ± 2.5A 7.1 ± 1.7A 0 0.03R 57 ± 18AB ± 12.6A 88 ± 23.4 0		0.75 A	0	++	0 A	++	7 0	/	0	+	0 A	0		+H	0 A	NA	H	NAA
0.03 B 32 ± 8AB ± 2.5 A 7.1 ± 1.7 A 0 0.03 B 57 + 18 AB + 126 A 88 + 23 A 0		0.14  B	1(	++	$10 \mathrm{A}$	B ⊭	2.4	A.	0.8	H	$0.8\mathrm{A}$	0		++	0 A	15.0	++	8.6 A
003R 57 + 18 AB + 12 6 A 88 + 23 A 0		0.03 B	3,	++	8 AE	+	2.5	¥.	7.1	+1	1.7 A	0		÷	0 A	9.7	H	3.9 A
		0.03 B	5,	++	$18 \mathrm{A}$	₽	12.	6 A	8.8	H	2.3 A	0		+1	0 A	0.5	H	0.2 B

42

🙆 Springer

### Author's personal copy

Wetlands (2016) 36:37-46



Fig. 3 Stem strength, as expressed as the modulus of elasticity (E), (mean  $\pm$  SE) of *S. californicus* and *S. acutus* stems. Stems strength was determined for tip, middle, and base sections of the stem as a function of the percentage of time the soil surface of the experimental unit was flooded

that it is an excellent species for establishment in high energy tidal environments under a variety of flooding regimes. Additionally, this research has implications for informing management decisions and improving the science and practice of mitigating wave erosion of earthen levees with vegetation, which also provides marsh habitat. We want to emphasize that for successful wetland restoration/creation, managers and designers should focus not strictly on a target elevation, but rather, on what elevation is needed to achieve a target hydrology (specifically the frequency of flooding and the percentage of time flooded). Additionally, it is important for restoration managers to understand that despite the best conceptual models, each species and age of transplant has a unique range of tolerances to environmental stressors.

Wetland restoration and mitigation efforts are often unsuccessful when they fail to recreate the proper hydrogeomorphology or recognize that the wetlands are part of larger landscapes (especially tidal and coastal wetlands) (Zedler 1997; Whigham 1999). Our study provides specific information for restoration managers to create the proper hydrogeomorphic conditions to facilitate successful restoration of tidal Schoenoplectus spp. marshes. Regarding soil physicochemistry, constant inundation resulted in more severely reduced soils, reaching the -100 mV range where sulfate reduction can occur (DeLaune and Reddy 2005). However, for the duration of this experiment, reduction resulted in the production of sulfides at low concentrations (around 0.09 mM), probably due to the lack of sulfates in the fresh water used in the experiments. Sulfide concentrations were therefore unlikely to have a detrimental effect on the plants (DeLaune et al. 1983; Sloey et al. 2015). Regardless, this study shows that the duration of flooding has a strong impact on the severity of soil reduction and therefore, wetland restoration managers should focus on creating elevations for species where the hydrologic regimes and tidal sequences result in sulfide production within the limitations of the target species.

Beyond altering soil chemistry, flooding can impede plant growth by reducing plant exposure to light, oxygen, and photosynthesis, as well as altering the plant's physiology and growth (Crawford 1982). Constant inundation may be too stressful for young seedlings with little carbon storage (i.e., relatively low root/rhizome mass) and small stems that cannot emerge from water to survive, as evidenced by 100 % mortality in seedlings of both species. Sloey et al. (2015) found that S. californicus and S. acutus transplants that possessed emergent stems at the time of planting performed better under flooded field conditions than rhizome transplants that had no aboveground biomass. Schoenoplectus spp. have also been observed to be able to colonize deeper waters (flooded 100 % of the time) at the Liberty Island restoration site via vegetative propagation (Hester et al. 2015 in review). Clonal plants are physiologically integrated and able to share resources, thus allowing the individuals that make up a larger genet to survive in conditions that a lone ramet could not (Eckert 1999). Overall, adult survival and growth was superior to seedlings. Yet, observations of the adults revealed important differences between species. Although S. acutus and S. californicus are closely related taxonomically and similar in morphology, their tolerance to flooding, and therefore fundamental niches, separate these species. Percent time flooded greater than 60 % resulted in a significant decrease in survival for S. acutus adults, yet did not decrease survival in S. californicus. This information has important implications for planting and distribution strategies for

Fig. 4 Images of representative cross sections as a function of percentage of time the soil surface of the experimental unit was flooded. Area of aerenchyma formation was measured as the white, open air space within the stem cross section



restoration efforts. If *S. acutus* is a desired species for implementation, the soil surface at a restoration site must be exposed to air for some portion of the day. To maximize successful establishment of individual ramets at the sensitive seedling stage of both species, our results suggest a minimum exposure



Fig. 5 Percent of total root length per size class of adult *S. acutus and S. californicus* (mean + SE) as a function of percentage of time the soil surface of the experimental unit was flooded. Means marked with different letters indicate statistically significant differences (p < 0.05)

of 40 % of the day, although *S. californicus* adults can tolerate longer flooding durations.

Physiological responses to flooding differed among species. We witnessed evidence of both compensatory responses and harmful effects of flooding stress. To cope with the stress of waterlogging, flood-adapted plants produce ethylene which promotes stem elongation (etiolation), aerenchyma formation, and growth of adventitious roots (Dat et al. 2004). Etiolation is a common stress response among submerged plants (Blom and Voesenek 1996) and has been shown to decrease stem strength and contribute to lodging, or bending, of plants (Beatty 1964). We observed a non-significant (p = 0.0516)trend that stem height decreased with increased flooding among seedlings of both species and the S. acutus adults, however the opposite (and significant) trend was exhibited in S. californicus adults (Table 2), suggesting an etiolation response by S. californicus. Often plants that etiolate do so at the expense of biomass thus resulting in taller but more fragile stems (Beatty 1964), but S. californicus did not exhibit reduced biomass. Both species showed that the area of aerenchyma in stem cross-sections increased with prolonged flooding. The formation of aerenchyma is a common adaptation among wetland plants that facilitates transport of oxygen between shoots and roots in oxygen depleted environments (Jackson and Armstrong 1999). Analysis of root size classes showed that increased flooding resulted in a proportional shift toward smaller roots (<0.2 mm) in S. californicus due to the promotion of adventitious roots. Studies on other species have documented that the formation of adventitious roots improves the overall survival of the plant after flooding (Sartoris and Belcher 1949; Kramer 1951). Schoenoplectus acutus did not show these positive compensatory growth patterns, indicating it is more susceptible to the negative effects of flooding than S. californicus.

Author's personal copy



Fig. 6 Stem strength, expressed as the modulus of elasticity (log E), (mean  $\pm$  SE) of *S. californicus* collected from natural marsh edge and transplant sites at Liberty Island, CA (see Fig. 2). Stems strength was determined for tip, middle, and base sections of the stem

Survival, growth, and biomass production were reduced in S. acutus units subjected to longer durations of flooding. Inflorescence biomass production was generally low in all S. californicus units. For S. acutus, increased flooding duration resulted in lower inflorescence biomass production, which suggests that not only does prolonged flooding limit the vegetation expansion of S. acutus, but could potentially limit long distance dispersal by reducing the seed rain. Stem strength of S. acutus adults was reduced under flooded conditions, especially when flooded 100 % of the time. In contrast, S. californicus stem strength did not appear to be impacted by flooding, as shown in both the controlled greenhouse experiment and field collections. Tidal wetlands are typically exposed to high wind and wave energy, and tall stemmed plants such as Schoenoplectus spp. are subject to lodging (Tanner 2001). Our field study supports the notion that S. californicus stems maintain rigidity regardless of abiotic conditions. Whereas we might have predicted that plants growing on the east side of Liberty Island would have weaker stems due to longer durations of flooding, we observed a non-significant trend showing that stronger stems were present on the east, where duration of flooding and wind and wave energy were most severe. Studies have reported that the stems of riparian plants have higher tensile strength when they possess larger cross sectional areas and are conditioned to moving water as opposed to stagnant water (Boeger and Poulson 2003; Bociag et al. 2009). The larger diameter and unique triangular shape of S. californicus stems may contribute to its strength, but more empirical research is needed to address these questions. Schoenoplectus californicus exhibited many qualities that suggest it may be a more suitable species for implementation in freshwater tidal wetlands, exhibiting stronger evidence of stress compensation and flooding tolerance compared to S. acutus.

The results of our study provide informative guidance for future restoration of tidal marshes using *Schoneoplectus* spp. by using a controlled, manipulative mesocosm experiment that imposed a series of hydrologic regimes on adults and seedlings of two *Schoenoplectus* species. Restoration sites can differ in a variety of environmental characteristics, including the site-specific differences in the relationship between elevation and the resultant hydrologic regime. Managers should be encouraged to include a scientific component within the restoration framework, such as small scale test plantings prior to project-wide planting efforts to refine their knowledge of how the target species may respond to site-specific environmental conditions, particularly depth and percentage of time flooded. This type of information can enhance the efficacy of the restoration and improve predicted rates of plant establishment and expansion across elevation gradients of the site.

Acknowledgments Funding for this study was partially provided by the Society of Wetland Scientists' student research grant program. Our sincere thanks is extended to members of the Coastal Plant Ecology Laboratory at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, the National Wetlands Research Center in Lafayette, LA, and Drs. Dennis Albert and Dan Cox of Oregon State University.

Additionally, we thank Drs. Scott France, Paul Leberg, and Beth Middleton for comments and manuscript review. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

#### References

- Albert DA, Cox DT, Lemein T, Hyun-Doug Y (2013) Characterization of Schoenoplectus pungens in a great lakes coastal wetland and a Pacific northwestern estuary. Wetlands 33:445–458
- Beatty RH (1964) Method for reducing lodging in small grains. United States Patent Office (3,314,777) Patented April 18, 1967
- Blom CWPM, Voesenek LACJ (1996) Flooding: the survival strategies of plants. Tree 11:290–295
- Bociąg K, Gałka A, Łazarewicz T, Szmeja J (2009) Mechanical strength of stems in aquatic macrophytes. Acta Soc Bot Pol 78:181–187
- Boeger MR, Poulson ME (2003) Morphological adaptations and photosynthetic rates of amphibious *Veronica anagalis-aquatica*. L. under different flow regimes. Aquat Bot 75:123–135

TransplantA

- Casanova MT, Brock MA (2000) How do depth, duration, and frequency of flooding influence the establishment of wetland plant communities? Plant Ecol 147:237–250
- Crawford RMM (1982) Physiological responses to flooding. Physiological Plant Ecology II Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology 12:453–477
- Dat JF, Capelli N, Folzer H, Bourgeade P, Badot P (2004) Sensing and signaling during plant flooding. Plant Physiol Biochem 42:273–282 DeLaune RD, Reddy KR (2005) Redox potential. Elsevier Ltd.

DeLaute RD, Smith CJ, Patrick WH (1983) Relationship of marsh elevation, redox potential, and sulfide to Spartina alterniflora productivity. Soil Sci Soc Am J 47:930–935

- Eckert CG (1999) Clonal plant research: proliferation, integration, but not much evolution. Am J Bot 86:1649–1654
- Elsey-Quirk T, Middleton BA, Proffitt CE (2009) Seed flotation and germination of salt marsh plants: the effects of stratification, salinity, and/or inundation regime. Aquat Bot 91:40–46
- Galinato MI, van der Valk AG (1986) Seed germination traits of annuals and emergents recruited during drawdowns in the delta marsh, Manitoba, Canada. Aquat Bot 28:89–102
- Harper JL (1977) Population biology of plants. Academic Press, London
- Hester MW, Willis JM, Sloey TM (2015) Field assessment of environmental factors constraining the development and expansion of *Schoenoplectus californicus* marsh at a California tidal freshwater restoration site. Wetlands Ecology and Management (in review)
- Jackson MB, Armstrong W (1999) Formation of aerenchyma and the processes of plant ventilation in relation to soil flooding and submergence. Plant Biol 1:274–287
- Jones R, Etherington JR (1971) Comparative studies of plant growth and distribution in relation to waterlogging. J Ecol 59:793–801
- Kramer PJ (1951) Causes of injury to plants resulting from flooding of the soil. Plant Physiol 26:722–736
- Mandak B, Pysek P (2001) The effects of light quality, nitrate concentration and presence of bracteoles on germination of different fruit types in the heterocarpous *Atriplex sagittata*. J Ecol 89:149–158
- McKee KL, Patrick WH (1988) The relationship of smooth cordgrass (Spartina alterniflora) to tidaldatums: a review. Estuaries 11:143– 151
- Messina MG, Conner WH (1998) Southern forested wetlands. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, Florida
- Middleton BA (1999) Wetland restoration, flood pulsing, and disturbance dynamics. Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey
- Mitsch WJ, Gosselink JG (2007) Wetlands, Fourth edn. John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, USA
- Sartoris GB, Belcher BA (1949) The effect of flooding on flowering and survival of sugar cane. Sugar 44:36–39
- SAS Institute, Inc (2010) Enterprise Guide 4.2 On Demand. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, North Carolina

- Simenstad CA, Thom RM (1996) Functional equivalency trajectories of the restored Gog-Le-Hi-Te estuarine wetland. Ecol Appl 6:38-56
- Sloey TS, Willis JM, Hester MW (2015) Hydrologic and edaphic constraints on *S. acutus, S. californicus*, and *T. latifolia* in tidal marsh restoration. Restoration Ecology (accepted March 2015)
- Sorrell BK, Mendelssohn IA, McKee KL, Woods RA (2000) Ecophysiology of wetland plant roots: a modeling comparison of aeration in relation to species distribution. Ann Bot 86:675–685
- Spink A, Rogers S (1996) The effects of a record flood on the aquatic vegetation of the upper Mississippi river system: some preliminary findings. Hydrobiologia 340:51–57
- Tanner CC (2001) Growth and nutrient dynamics of soft-stem bulrush in constructed wetlands treating nutrient-rich wastewaters. Wetl Ecol Manag 9:49–73
- Tiner RW (1999) Wetland indicators: a guide to wetland identification, delineation, classification, and mapping. CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, Florida
- United States Department of Agriculture/ Natural Resources Conservation Service (2014) Plant guide. Interagency Riparian/ Wetland Project, Plant Materials Center, Aberdeen, Idaho
- USDA/NRCS (United States Dept. of Agriculture/ Natural Resources Conservation Services (2012) Plants Database. www.plants.usda.gov
- Van Bodegom PM, Sorrell BK, Oosthoek A, Bakker C, Aerts R (2008) Separating the effects of partial submergence and soil oxygen demand on plant physiology. Ecology 89:193–204
- Vervuren PJA, Blom CWPM, de Kroon H (2003) Extreme flooding events on the Rhine and the survival and distribution of riparian plant species. J Ecol 91:135–146
- Voesnek LACJ, Rijnders JGM, Peeters AJM, van de Steeg HM, de Kroon H (2004) Plant hormones regulate fast shoot elongation under water: from genes to communities. Ecology 85:16–27
- Watson EB, Byrne R (2009) Abundance and diversity of tidal marsh plants along the salinity gradient of the San Francisco estuary: implications for global change ecology. Plant Ecol 205:113–128
- Weiher E, Keddy PA (1995) The assembly of experimental wetland plant communities. Oikos 73:323–335
- Whigham DF (1999) Ecological issues related to wetland preservation, restoration, creation and assessment. The Science of the Total Environment 240:31–40
- Wijte AHB, Gallagher J (1996) Effects of oxygen availability and salinity on early life history stages of salt marsh plants. I. Difference germination strategies of *Spartina alterniflora* and *Phragmites australis* (Poaceae). Am J Bot 83:1337–1342
- Williams PB, Orr MK (2002) Physical evolution of restored breached levee salt marshes in the San Francisco bay estuary. Restor Ecol 10:527–542
- Zedler JB (1997) Restoring tidal wetlands: a scientific view. National Wetlands News 19:8–11