

MR. PAUL BARTON REED (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-7143-7515)

DR. DANIEL F. DOAK (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-8980-3392)

Article type : Articles

Journal: Ecology

Manuscript type: Articles

Running Head: Drivers of native annuals' demography

Climate warming threatens the persistence of a community of disturbance-adapted native annual plants

Paul B. Reed^{1,6}, Scott D. Bridgham¹, Laurel E. Pfeifer-Meister¹, Megan L. Peterson², Bart R. Johnson³, Bitty A. Roy¹, Graham T. Bailes¹, Aaron A. Nelson¹, William F. Morris⁴, Daniel F. Doak⁵

¹Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

²Plant Biology Department, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30606

³Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

⁴Biology Department, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708

⁵Environmental Studies Program, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/ECY.3464](#)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

⁶Corresponding author. E-mail: preed@uoregon.edu

Manuscript received 1 November 2020; revised 29 March 2021; accepted 13 May 2021.

ABSTRACT

With ongoing climate change, populations are expected to exhibit shifts in demographic performance that will alter where a species can persist. This presents unique challenges for managing plant populations and may require ongoing interventions, including in-situ management or introduction into new locations. However, few studies have examined how climate change may affect plant demographic performance for a suite of species, or how effective management actions could be in mitigating climate change effects. Over the course of two experiments spanning six years and four sites across a latitudinal gradient in the Pacific Northwest, USA, we manipulated temperature, precipitation, and disturbance intensity, and quantified effects on the demography of eight native annual prairie species. Each year we planted seeds and monitored germination, survival, and reproduction. We found that disturbance strongly influenced demographic performance and that seven of the eight species had increasingly poor performance with warmer conditions. Across species and sites, we observed 11% recruitment (the proportion of seeds planted that survived to reproduction) following high disturbance, but just 3.9% and 2.3% under intermediate and low disturbance, respectively. Moreover, mean seed production following high disturbance was often more than tenfold greater than under intermediate and low disturbance. Importantly, most species exhibited precipitous declines in their population growth rates (λ) under warmer-than-ambient experimental conditions and may require more frequent disturbance intervention to sustain populations. *Aristida oligantha*, a C4 grass, was the only species to have λ increase with warmer conditions. These results suggest that rising temperatures may cause many native annual plant species to decline, highlighting the urgency for adaptive management practices that facilitate their restoration or introduction to newly suitable locations. Frequent and intense disturbances are critical to reduce competitors and promote native annuals' persistence, but even such efforts may prove futile under future climate regimes.

KEYWORDS

Adaptive management, climate manipulations, competition, cross-validation, demography, disturbance, latitude, Pacific Northwest prairies, population growth, range limits, recruitment, restoration

INTRODUCTION

Managing vulnerable species in a rapidly changing environment is a major conservation challenge. Because many species are believed to be at risk of decline with climate change (Pereira et al. 2010, Moritz and Agudo 2013, Román-Palacios and Wiens 2020), an increasingly important task is to predict how demographic performance will be affected by future climatic conditions, as well as what other factors could be managed to mitigate climate effects. This leads to two important questions for conservation: Under what climatic conditions can species exhibit stable or increasing populations? And, how do non-climatic effects such as disturbance alter population growth rates, potentially providing a way to mitigate climate change effects via local management?

Management of vulnerable plant populations, even before anthropogenic climate change became a complicating threat, has relied on understanding the factors most important in controlling local population growth rates. Disturbance is often a critical component to successfully establishing and maintaining a population (Connell and Slatyer 1977, Palmer et al. 1997, Macdougall and Turkington 2007). This is especially true for annual plants, which tend to be early-successional species and are therefore frequently limited by competition (Bazzaz 1979, Tilman 1990, Rees and Long 1992). Annuals are also subject to dramatic fluctuations in population size (Nunney 2002) and may be especially vulnerable to climate change (Morris et al. 2008). However, no studies to our knowledge have examined the controls of climate and disturbance together on the demographic success of a suite of co-occurring annual plants. It is critical to identify what factors have similar effects on co-occurring species to inform community-wide management in the face of climate change. While many conservation and restoration plans attempt to optimize benefits for a suite of native species (Wang et al. 2020), doing so successfully requires an understanding of the extent to which demographic responses are generalizable.

Furthermore, while climate change may prove detrimental for species within portions of their current geographic ranges, it may also open the possibility for range shifts that support

long-term persistence (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2013, Rehm et al. 2015, Reed et al. 2021). But because the ability to track favorable climatic conditions may be limited by dispersal (Loarie et al. 2009, Hargreaves et al. 2014, Bayly and Angert 2019, Cruzan and Hendrickson 2020, Pagel et al. 2020), vulnerable plants may require intentional translocations to newly suitable sites (Vitt et al. 2010). To justify such actions, it is important to understand how species will perform across climate gradients under projected climate change.

Experimentation provides a robust means to relate species' demographic performance to the effects of climate and disturbance. In particular, experimental manipulations that impose a range of current and future climatic conditions across multiple sites can disentangle the role of climate from local site factors (Dunne et al. 2004, Vilellas et al. 2019), and identify the degree to which population growth rates might change under future (relative to current) conditions. In addition, field manipulations focused on multiple species can give insights into the generality of climate responses, as well as other factors limiting population growth rates. While single species studies have provided many insights into limiting factors, a key question is whether they can be generalized to multiple species.

Here, using six years of data from two climate manipulation experiments spanning four sites across a latitudinal gradient, we examined the relationship between climate and demography for a suite of eight annual plant species native to prairie habitat in the western Pacific Northwest (PNW), USA. While our experiments were principally designed to focus on climate manipulations, we were also able to address how management-driven disturbance conditions shaped demographic performance.

Of the eight annual species we studied (Table 1; see Appendix S1: Section S1 for species' descriptions), five have current northern range limits that occur south of at least one of our experimental sites (Figure 1). These five species were therefore planted both within and beyond their current ranges. All eight species are important members of imperiled PNW prairie ecosystems (Noss et al. 1995), which have become the focus of many regional conservation and restoration efforts (Dunwiddie and Bakker 2011). PNW prairies were historically widespread, in part due to frequent burning by Native Americans (Boyd 1999). Following Euro-American settlement, fire suppression, land conversion, and the establishment of non-native species have contributed to the loss and modification of PNW prairie ecosystems (Dennehy et al. 2011).

Native annual species, in particular, have suffered tremendous declines, and many have become locally extirpated from most remaining prairie fragments (Dunwiddie et al. 2014). Deliberate reintroductions are often necessary to restore this functional group to the landscape.

Ongoing climate change may further threaten these ecosystems (Bachelet et al. 2011), as regional precipitation is expected to become more variable and mean annual temperature is expected to rise by $\sim 3^{\circ}\text{C}$ by the end of the 21st century (Mote and Salathé 2010). Indeed, previous studies from our climate manipulation experiments suggest that warming will be detrimental for native perennial species within their current geographic range limits (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2013, Reed et al. 2021), cause a greater risk of introduced annual grass invasions (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2016), and shift native species' flowering and growth phenology (Reed et al. 2019). To understand how climate and disturbance will affect populations for this suite of native annual species, we asked:

1. How does demographic performance, and thus population growth rate, vary across a range of current and future climatic conditions?
2. Do species exhibit similar patterns in population growth rates across climatic space? Does being within versus beyond current northern limits affect performance?
3. How important is the role of disturbance in determining performance and modulating climate effects on these annual species?

METHODS

Study sites and experimental design:

This study combines six years of data from two experiments (Exp1: 2010-2012; Exp2: 2016-2018) that occurred across four sites spanning a 520 km latitudinal Mediterranean-climate gradient in the western PNW (Figure 1). The southern and central sites were used during both Exp1 and Exp2 while the northern 2 site replaced the northern 1 site between experiments since the northern 1 site was no longer available. Summer drought severity increases from north to south across this gradient. The 30-year normal (1981-2010) mean annual temperatures are 10.6°C , 10.5°C , 11.4°C , and 12.3°C at the northern 2, northern 1, central, and southern sites, respectively, while mean annual precipitation is 1240 mm, 1196 mm, 1134 mm, and 1434 mm, respectively (PRISM Climate Group). However, the southern site receives the greatest

proportion of its precipitation in the early growing season (November – March), and is generally much drier than the other sites in the spring and summer (Reynolds et al. 2015). All sites are located within PNW prairie habitat and were dominated by introduced perennial grasses prior to plot establishment. Treatments were discontinued at the southern and central sites during the gap years between Exp1 and Exp2.

Each site contained 20 plots of 7.1-m² that required heavy disturbance, prior to both experiments, to reduce existing vegetation and establish baseline starting communities. In late 2009 and 2015, plots were mowed, raked, and treated with herbicide (2% Glyphosate and grass-specific Poast). These events created ample open space for the 2010 and 2016 growing seasons, which are hereafter referred to as ‘high disturbance’ conditions (Figure 1). Following the 2009 disturbance, we sowed the southern, central, and northern 1 plots with an establishment mix of 19 native prairie species (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2013), and, following the 2015 disturbance, we sowed the southern, central, and northern 2 plots with an establishment mix of 29 native prairie species (Reed et al. 2021). Beginning in year two of each experiment (2011 and 2017), rapid regrowth of non-native vegetation resulted from minimal plot maintenance (hereafter: ‘low disturbance’ conditions). This regrowth was moderately controlled in half of each plot in 2012 and 2017 by implementing an ‘intermediate disturbance’ treatment (see below).

Each plot was assigned to a climate manipulation treatment. For Exp1, these were control (ambient temperature and precipitation), precip (+20% precipitation within the 2 week interval in which it occurred), warming (+2.5-3°C), and warming + precip (+2.5-3°C and +20% precipitation). Because we found the +20% precipitation treatment to have minimal effects and the warming treatment to be confounded by a reduction in soil moisture in other studies (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2013, 2016), we modified treatments prior to Exp2. In Exp2, the climate treatments were control, drought (-40% precipitation), warming (+2.5°C), and warming + precip (automatically irrigated to fully offset the warming-induced drying effect). See Appendix S1: Section S2 for a complete description of all climate treatments. Although there were differences in the warming + precip treatments of Exp1 and Exp2, we group them together in our figures for simplicity. Thus, we define five broad climate treatments overall (control, drought, precip, warming, and warming + precip). Due to logistical constraints with heating and irrigation, some treatments had delayed starting dates, resulting in uneven treatment replicates during some years

(Figure 1; Appendix S1: Section S2). Within each plot, we continuously logged canopy temperature and soil volumetric water content over the course of each experiment. However, also due to logistical constraints, this did not begin until several months into each experiment.

To monitor germination and survival of focal species, we planted 200 seeds per species per plot (25 seeds into eight 5.5-cm diameter subplot rings) in the fall prior to each experiment year, with a few exceptions. Neither *Plectritis congesta* nor *Plagiobothrys nothofulvus* were planted during Exp1, and neither *P. nothofulvus* nor *Thysanocarpus radians* were planted in fall 2015. Additionally, for *T. radians*, we only sowed 80 seeds in fall 2016 and 70 seeds in fall 2017 (10 seeds into eight and seven subplot rings, respectively) due to seed quantity limitations. To account for local adaptation, we used the nearest available seed sources for each site.

Because we observed very low recruitment one year into both experiments, we implemented an ‘intermediate disturbance’ treatment in half of each plot in the winter-spring of 2012 and 2017. This intermediate disturbance consisted of weeding and clipping any non-focal species to reduce their aboveground biomass. This resulted in only a moderate reduction in competitors compared to the high disturbance conditions of 2010 and 2016, based on our visual assessment of the amount of open space created. However, there was a noticeable reduction in non-focal species biomass compared to the plot halves not receiving the treatment, as well as the entire plots during the low disturbance-only years of 2011 and 2018. Thus, both experiments (and all four sites) imposed high, intermediate, and low disturbance conditions.

Demographic data:

We quantified three vital rates each experiment year: germination, survival (from germination to flowering), and per-capita seed production. Between winter and spring, we conducted 2-4 censuses of each plot to count the number of germinants from the previous fall’s planting. We thinned germinants in overcrowded subplots and corrected survival estimates for thinning. We aggregated germination and survival counts to the plot or the half-plot level (for 2012 and 2017). In 2018, we estimated germination from the seedbank by returning to subplot rings seeded in fall 2016 and fall 2015 to count second and third year germinants, respectively.

Per-capita seed production (collected during the final spring censuses) was estimated differently for Exp1 and Exp2. In Exp2, we counted plant-level fruit and/or seed production on

all or a subset of the individuals in a plot, harvesting a subset of fruits for the species which were too difficult to directly count seeds in the field. However, in Exp1, we harvested fruits from a known number of plants and combined these into a single sample (per plot), and then counted the total number of seeds (per plot) to estimate mean seeds per plant. Because we lacked plant-level seed production for Exp1, we calculated the mean number of seeds per plant for each year at the plot level for both experiments.

Analysis overview:

Since we combined results from different sites, years, and experimental treatments into a single analysis, we needed to create common data currencies. We did so by categorizing plot preparation and management actions into three disturbance groups (noted above and in Figure 1), and by replacing categorical climate treatments with continuous measures of temperature, precipitation, and composite variables (actual evapotranspiration and climatic water deficit). We then considered regression models that accounted for site, disturbance, and continuous climate covariates. In addition to allowing us to combine data from two experiments into a single, robust analysis, by regressing vital rates on actual climate variables (rather than taking an ANOVA approach with categorical treatments), we can (in future work) better project the effects of future changes in those climate variables.

However, this approach also meant that we could not account for interactions among sites and years, or random effects within years that were not related to interannual differences in climate. We attempted to address this with a random year effect, but year was partially confounded with site and disturbance and there were unequal sample sizes among sites. This often resulted in poor model fit with unrealistic estimates for some site and year combinations.

Since we could not account for interactions among sites and years, the effects of disturbance and climate covariates may be overestimated due to excessively narrow standard errors on coefficient estimates. However, despite this caveat, we feel that our strategy made the best-possible use of our unique datasets. It allowed us to combine multiple years of data from manipulative climate treatments across four sites into a climate response surface based on temperature and moisture, which are the climate forcing variables of interest to the larger scientific community. We also did this for suite of eight plant species rather than focusing on a single species.

Analyses:

We conducted all analyses using R version 4.0.2 (R Core Team 2020). Because we noticed a strong decline in focal species' performance when disturbance was low, we first ran an ANOVA-based analysis looking at the effects of disturbance and site. Using mixed models, we ran logistic regressions on germination, survival, and recruitment into the reproductive class (total survival from planting to reproduction, or the product of germination and survival). Since we lacked plant-level seed data for Exp1 and thus could not use a Poisson-family generalized linear model, we ran linear models of the log-transformed mean number of seeds per plant (plus a small constant 0.1 since some means were zero) weighted by the number of plants per plot used to calculate the means. We treated site, disturbance, and their interaction as fixed effects and plot as a random effect (to account for repeated sampling across years) and tested for statistical differences among sites and disturbance levels using Tukey's post-hoc comparisons.

To test for relationships between vital rates and climate, we focused on environmental variables related to temperature, precipitation, and drought stress due to their documented relevance for PNW prairie plant performance (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2016, Reed et al. 2019, 2021, Peterson et al. 2021). To accommodate missing plot-level data on canopy temperature and soil moisture, and to estimate how large-scale climate conditions will alter plant performance, we ran a series of analyses that translated treatment-specific, plot-level climatic data into predicted measures of mean temperature, total precipitation, and drought stress that correspond to PRISM (PRISM Climate Group) climate variables (Appendix S1: Section S3). Briefly, using directly measured data from control plots, we first established the relationship between monthly site-level PRISM estimates of temperature and precipitation with plot-level canopy temperature and soil volumetric water content. Using this relationship, we then estimated PRISM values of temperature and precipitation for each climate treatment plot using their unique temperatures and water contents. Finally, we used these estimates of temperature and precipitation to derive potential evapotranspiration (PET), actual evapotranspiration (AET – the amount of water removed by evaporation and transpiration) and climatic water deficit (CWD – PET minus AET), which were calculated using the Redmond 2019 R function using a modified Thornthwaite water balance model. For analyses of demographic rates, we aggregated monthly climate variables (mean temperature, total precipitation, AET, and CWD) into winter and spring seasonal values

(November - February and March - June, respectively), since in the Mediterranean-type climate of the PNW these species generally germinate in the fall and winter, grow and reproduce in the spring, and senesce by the summer.

Using these seasonal values, we tested for climate effects on vital rates by fitting a series of mixed models that also accounted for site x disturbance effects and a random plot effect. We fit models that combined one temperature variable (winter or spring) with one moisture variable (winter or spring precipitation, AET, or CWD, excluding winter CWD since it was always zero), resulting in seven total climate variables (two seasons x four variables, minus winter CWD). We excluded models containing combinations of winter temperature with winter AET and spring temperature with spring CWD due to high collinearity. We included quadratic effects of climate to allow unimodal (hump-shaped) relationships between vital rates and climate, as it is reasonable to expect vital rates to peak at intermediate conditions. We incorporated temperature x precipitation interactions but not temperature x AET or temperature x CWD since temperature is directly incorporated into the calculations of AET and CWD.

We were unable to include climate x site or climate x disturbance interactions due to low within-site climate variation during the high-disturbance years (when not all climate treatments were operational yet), and limited data in later years when species' abundances were low. Including such interactions forced poor model fit with unrealistic predictions. Although this prohibited us from testing whether climate responses differed within versus beyond current ranges, we could still establish relationships between vital rates and the climate across the entire latitudinal gradient.

We identified the model with the best predictive performance for each vital rate using a K -fold cross-validation procedure (James et al. 2013, Tredennick et al. 2021), where $K = 5$. Stratifying by site, disturbance, and year, we randomly split the dataset into five groups (*folds*) and iteratively withheld one fold (20%) at a time to serve as an out-of-sample test set while the remaining four folds (80%) served as a training set. Within each loop, we fit all possible subsets of the series of models we wanted to examine, including two no-climate null models (one that accounted for site and disturbance effects and the other accounting for site only). For each model fitted to the training dataset, we made predictions on the out-of-sample test data and compared these predictions to observed values to calculate a mean-squared-error for each model within

each fold. We then calculated the average mean-squared-error for each model across the five folds and considered the model with the lowest average mean-squared-error to have the best predictive performance. We then fit this “best” model formula to the entire dataset.

To estimate population growth rates (λ), we sampled 1000 random sets of our seven climate variables from a multivariate normal distribution based on their means and covariances across all sites and years of the study. We then predicted germination, survival, and seed production for each site and disturbance level on that set of climate values using our models with the best predictive performance, and calculated λ as the product of the three predicted vital rates. To estimate uncertainty in each vital rate, we used the ‘predictInterval’ function from the merTools package (Knowles and Frederick 2020), using 2000 simulations to obtain 95% prediction intervals. We multiplied the three upper limits of the vital rates to get the upper prediction limit for λ , and the three lower limits of the vital rates to get the lower prediction limit for λ . We did not include a seedbank when calculating λ as our limited seedbank germination data suggested these rates were minimal (see Results).

To visualize λ as a function of climate, we performed a principal component analysis (PCA) on our measured climate data. Using a PCA was necessary since different vital rates could be explained by different combinations of the seven climate variables (e.g., a germination model may include winter temperature and winter precipitation, but the survival model includes spring temperature and spring CWD). Using the simulated set of multivariate climate values, we plotted smoothed contours of λ against PC1 and PC2 scores using a loess fit. We acknowledge that this loess-fit procedure adds a second dimension of uncertainty to our analyses. However, our goal with these analyses was to simply to visualize the best-estimated relationships between λ and climate, and not to estimate full uncertainty in these effects. Thus, we felt this was the simplest procedure to use and interpret.

Lastly, we also explored how climate and disturbance event frequency jointly determined each species’ long-run (geometric mean) annual population growth rate. For an annual plant with no seed bank living in an environment with stochastic disturbances, the long-run growth rate is given by:

$$\lambda_g = \lambda_h^{p_h(d)} \lambda_i^{p_i(d)} \lambda_l^{p_l(d)}$$

where λ_h , λ_i , and λ_l are the population growth rates in years of high, intermediate, and low disturbance conditions, respectively, and $p_h(d)$, $p_i(d)$, and $p_l(d)$ are the proportions of years with high, intermediate, and low disturbance conditions, which depend on the frequency of disturbance events, d . We assumed that high disturbance conditions prevail in a year with a disturbance event, intermediate conditions prevail in the first year post-disturbance event, and low disturbance conditions two or more years post-disturbance. We used a Markov model in which we calculated λ_g across disturbance event probabilities (d) ranging from 0 to 1 in increments of 0.02. The proportions of years with high, intermediate, and low disturbance conditions are then given by the dominant right eigenvector (normalized to one) of the Markov matrix that governs transitions between disturbance states (where columns represent the high, intermediate, and low disturbance conditions this year and rows represent the conditions next year, in the same order):

$$\begin{bmatrix} d & d & d \\ 1-d & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-d & 1-d \end{bmatrix}$$

Because *P. nothofulvus* was not planted under high disturbance conditions, we assumed intermediate conditions in a disturbance event year and low disturbance conditions one or more years post-disturbance event.

RESULTS

Recruitment was greatest under high disturbance for most species and sites (Figure 2A; site x disturbance: $p < 0.05$ for all species). *P. congesta* was the major exception, having highest recruitment under intermediate disturbance regardless of site. Predicted recruitment was $11.0 \pm 2.1\%$ (mean $\pm$ 1 s.e.) across all species and sites under high disturbance but fell to just $3.9 \pm 1.3\%$ and $2.3 \pm 0.8\%$ under intermediate and low disturbance, respectively. Germination and survival, the two components of recruitment, exhibited similar responses to disturbance but significant differences were more common for germination (Appendix S2: Figure S1). Most species also had greatest per capita seed production under high disturbance regardless of site, with seed counts often more than tenfold greater compared to intermediate and low disturbance (Figure 2B). Again, *P. congesta* (at the northern 2 site) was the major exception to this finding. Germination from the seedbank was mostly negligible, with high-end estimates of just 0.6% and

0.3% of the seeds germinating after two and three years in the seed bank, respectively, in 2018 across all species and sites (Appendix S3: Table S1).

We established strong relationships between monthly PRISM estimates of temperature ($R^2 = 0.985$) and precipitation ($R^2 = 0.828$) from control plot canopy temperatures and soil volumetric water contents. When performing a PCA on our set of seven climate variables, the first two principal components accounted for 50.02% and 23.77% of the variance in the climate data, respectively (Figure 3). PC1 was mostly driven by variation in temperature (cooler to warmer from left to right), while PC2 generally reflected additional variation explained by moisture (drier to moister from bottom to top). Most of the climate-space variation was between the warmed and not-warmed treatments regardless of site, rather than among sites (Appendix S2: Figure S2).

With the exception of *P. nothofulvus* seed production, the vital rate models with the best predictive performance included at least one climate term (Appendix S3: Table S2). In general, most of these models substantially reduced average mean-squared-error relative to the two no-climate null models (Appendix S3: Table S3). Most vital rates predicted by temperature and/or climatic water deficit (CWD) had negative or unimodal relationships with these variables, whereas relationships to precipitation and actual evapotranspiration (AET) were more variable (Appendix S2: Figures S3-S10). Although disturbance and site influenced the intercepts of vital rate-climate relationships, there was no consistent tendency for certain sites to support higher performance.

When integrating vital rate models into predicted population growth rates (λ), we observed a wide range in the magnitude of λ by species and disturbance (Figure 4: note each species' response is averaged across sites). However, with few exceptions, λ was $\ll 1$ under low disturbance but $\gg 1$ under high disturbance. These patterns hold true at the 95% prediction limits (Appendix S2: Figures S11, S12). The only exceptions were *P. congesta*, for which λ peaked at intermediate disturbance, and *Collinsia grandiflora*, which showed relatively weak effects of disturbance. λ also differed strongly by site, but this effect did not appear to be a simple function of latitude (Appendix S2: Figures S13-S15).

For most species, λ increased toward cooler climatic conditions (Figure 4: negative scores for PC1; note the colored polygons depicting the range of climatic conditions that

occurred in each treatment). *Navarretia pubescens*, *T. radians*, and *P. nothofulvus* peaked at cooler, drier conditions while *Achyrochaena mollis*, *Clarkia purpurea*, *C. grandiflora*, and *P. congesta* peaked at cooler, moister conditions. *Aristida oligantha* was the major exception, as it increased toward warmer, drier conditions (Figure 4). Again, responses remain consistent at the 95% prediction limits (Appendix S2: Figures S11, S12). These patterns become especially apparent when plotting $\log(\lambda)$ against PC1 (Figure 5; note each species is plotted under its optimal disturbance condition). Five of the eight species exhibit a steep decline in $\log(\lambda)$ once outside of ambient PC1 conditions, while *P. nothofulvus* and *P. congesta* exhibit more subtle, but consistent, decline. *A. oligantha* is the lone species to have $\log(\lambda)$ increase with PC1.

Lastly, the long-run annual population growth rate, calculated as a function of climate and disturbance frequency, revealed that more frequent disturbances would increase population growth rates for every species except *P. congesta* (Figure 6). With greater warming (increasing PC1), *N. pubescens*, *T. radians*, *A. mollis*, *P. nothofulvus*, *C. purpurea*, and *C. grandiflora* would all require more frequent disturbance to sustain population growth rates. In contrast, while *A. oligantha* would also benefit from more frequent disturbance, this would not be necessary for it to sustain its populations under future conditions.

DISCUSSION

We have shown how both disturbance and warming strongly drive the demographic performance of a suite of native annual species reintroduced to PNW prairies. We found evidence suggesting that most species' population growth rates decline precipitously following the initial boom of a major disturbance event, and that seven of the eight species have increasingly poor performance under future climatic conditions. While stressing the importance of implementing common prairie restoration disturbances such as fire, grazing, and mowing (Davison and Kindscher 1999) when managing annual plant populations, these results also warn that future warming may lead to local extirpations despite best management practices. This is consistent with studies of very different systems (Bickford et al. 2010, Linares and Doak 2010, Montero-Serra et al. 2019), suggesting that although managing local demographic drivers may partially mitigate climate change effects, the impacts of climate change may overwhelm such efforts for many species.

Extremely few studies of the demographic drivers of plants have compared multiple species to ask whether responses can be generalized (but see Peterson et al. 2021, Reed et al. 2021). The observation that climate warming caused declining population growth rates was remarkably consistent across these eight species, with *A. oligantha*, a C4 grass (Adams and Wallace 1985) and our only C4 focal species, being the lone exception that exhibited the opposite response. This is perhaps unsurprising, given that C4 species generally reach highest dominance in warmer environments (Edwards and Still 2008). Given the projected increase in regional temperatures of ~3°C by the 2080s (Mote and Salathé 2010, Dalton and Fleishman 2021), *A. oligantha* may be poised to persist and even thrive in the future. Contrarily, the consistently negative responses to warming among the remaining species does not bode well for the future of native plant biodiversity in PNW prairies. It is estimated that the richness of native annuals in western Washington prairies has already declined from ~50% of the native flora in the early 1800s to ~18% today (Dunwiddie et al. 2014). As the climate shifts toward warmer conditions, these species may further drop out of communities and cause native diversity to decline (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2016). Indeed, data at the community level show that native cover and diversity decline with increasing temperature and drought severity, while introduced annual cover increases (Reed et al., in review).

The observation that warming caused declining demographic performance agrees with previous work on other PNW prairie species in these experiments (Pfeifer-Meister et al. 2013, Reed et al. 2021), as well as on a widespread mountain plant in Colorado (Panetta et al. 2018) and two North American tundra plants (Doak and Morris 2010). However, while some studies only report declining population growth rates at species' trailing edges (Lesica and Crone 2017, Sheth and Angert 2018), we found declining rates across a large latitudinal gradient, including near our species' leading (northern) edges. This echoes the warning of Peterson et al. (2018) that species may be at risk of decline throughout their geographic ranges. If declines in vital rates such as survival and fecundity are left unchecked, populations could be eliminated (Panetta et al. 2018). Although multi-year seedbanks may allow for some buffering, this decline may be more rapid for annual species, which, unlike perennials, are not also buffered by persistent adult stages (Morris et al. 2008).

Furthermore, several of these focal species have relatively restricted ranges along the west coast of the United States, only occurring from parts of California to southern Oregon (*N. pubescens*, *T. radians*, and *A. mollis*) or the Columbia River Gorge (*P. nothofulvus*). Range-restricted species may be more susceptible to warming (Parmesan 2006, Sheth and Angert 2014), and if a species becomes increasingly restricted, it may eventually become found only within microclimate refugia. In PNW prairies, key refugia habitats are known to be critical in supporting vulnerable species' persistence (Bachelet et al. 2011). However, such locations will likely not remain refugia in future climates (Ulrey et al. 2016).

Whether a species was planted within or beyond its current northern range limit did not appear to influence the magnitude of the site effect on demographic performance. Instead, the idiosyncratic site effects we document may be attributed to other local factors such as nutrients, soil characteristics, and the surrounding biotic communities. Unfortunately, we were unable to test whether the demographic responses to climate differed by site, as we did in Pfeifer-Meister et al. (2013) and Reed et al. (2021), since we lacked enough within-site climate variation during the important establishment years when competition was low. With such data, we may have observed opposing demographic responses such as warming being detrimental within but not beyond northern range limits (Reed et al. 2021). Although this could have hinted at the potential benefits of geographic range shifts, our results at least provide broad conclusions that these species are vulnerable.

Given the increasing urgency to intervene when species become vulnerable to climate change, the responses to disturbance observed here have important management implications. Without the presence of a substantial long-lived seed bank, most of these species appear to require the low-competition environments that followed major disturbance events. Intermediate levels of disturbance (i.e., weeding and clipping of non-focal species) often provided a boost relative to low disturbance conditions (i.e., minimal maintenance), but these were generally small effects. While disturbance can facilitate the spread of invasive species (Bradford and Lauenroth 2006, Lembrechts et al. 2016), it can also play an important role in managing vulnerable species by helping them to establish in new locations (Coates et al. 2006, Holl and Hayes 2006) or to maintain viable populations where currently found.

In these experiments, we introduced or reintroduced our focal species to degraded prairie sites where they are not otherwise currently found. While the strong disturbance events that preceded both experiments caused most of these species to initially exhibit a “boom” year, these were often followed up with “bust” years that were exacerbated by warming. The major exception was *P. congesta*, which did not appear to depend on intense disturbance events. For the other species, our evidence suggests that maintaining high disturbance frequencies (short return intervals) will be critical for successfully establishing and maintaining populations in the face of climate warming (Figure 6). Indeed, ecological and ethnographic evidence indicates that PNW prairies historically burned with a typical fire return interval of 1-2 years, driven by both natural ignitions and those set by Native Americans to manage prairie resources (Boyd 1999, Storm and Shebitz 2006). Frequent fire would thus have been a key to their more widespread distribution and greater abundance prior to Euro-American settlement (Dunwiddie et al. 2014). A return to such short disturbance intervals may be even more critical under projected climate warming. Although the nature of disturbances (e.g., burrowing mammals, floods, fire, etc.) may differ in other systems, we suspect that an interplay between climate change and altered disturbance in their effects on disturbance-adapted plants is likely to be common.

Despite compelling evidence for climate and disturbance as important demographic controls, there are a few remaining caveats. First, it is important to note that our contour plots of λ are meant to represent directional trends and the actual values should not be taken literally. Figure 4 is averaged across sites, which had very different and idiosyncratic effects on the magnitude of λ . True population growth rates of these species would inevitably be site- and context-dependent, although we expect that the negative effects of warming would hold true in many cases. Second, our λ calculations do not account for intraspecific competition. Given that we only planted 200 seeds per species per plot in each year (and never had close to 100% germination), we believe that this force was negligible, especially relative to interspecific competition (given far greater cover from non-focal species). Lastly, it is possible that species were “hedging their bets” by delaying germination through the unfavorable years post-establishment (Gremer and Venable 2014). If this is the case, the species may have built adequate seed banks (through our continued seed addition) to have more “booms” in subsequent years. While second and third-year germination in 2018 suggest minimal seedbank activity (Appendix S3: Table S1), this data was limited to a single low disturbance year and we cannot

discount the possibility of continued seed dormancy. *C. purpurea* seed can remain viable after three years of dry lab storage, but its germination rate may be reduced by 50-60% at that point (Thomson et al. 2016). *P. congesta* is thought to lack dormancy (Young-Mathews 2012). Little else is known about dormancy potential in these native annual forbs or their longevity in the seedbank, other than the belief that their seedbanks are already depleted in most remaining prairie sites (Dunwiddie et al. 2014). In general, our finding that declining disturbance frequency could be a threat is unlikely to be changed by the inclusion of a seed bank.

In conclusion, we identified the important roles of warming and disturbance on the demographic performance of a suite of annual species native to Pacific Northwest prairies, seeded at multiple sites over multiple years. This type of comprehensive study using climate manipulations is exceedingly rare and provides a robust analysis of how species may fare in future climatic conditions. While active management and intervention, including frequent disturbance, will be essential to lessen the risk of climate change for vulnerable annual plant populations, their long-term persistence may still be in jeopardy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to all who helped collect seeds and data, including Friends of Buford Park, Siskiyou BioSurvey LLC, and the Center for Natural Lands Management, Kendra Chambers, Matthew Krna, Kathryn Nock, Annelise Rue-Johns, Megan Sherritt, Leah Thompson, Xing Wu, and others. We also thank the Siskiyou Field Institute, The Nature Conservancy, and Capitol Land Trust for site use, and editor Peter Adler and two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions that greatly improved this manuscript. This study was funded by the National Science Foundation's Macrosystems Biology Program, award # 1340847, and the Office of Science (Biological and Environmental Research), U.S. Department of Energy, grant # DE-FG02-09ER604719. Statement of authorship: All authors designed the study; PR, SB, BJ, LPM, BR, GB, and AN collected the data; PR and DD analyzed the data; PR wrote the first draft of the manuscript and all authors contributed to revisions; WF and DD are co-senior authors.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online at: [link to be added in production]

529

530 **OPEN RESEARCH**

531 Data (Reed et al. 2021) are archived in the Dryad digital data repository:

532 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.q573n5tj0>

533

534 **REFERENCES**535 Adams, D. E., and L. L. Wallace. 1985. Nutrient and biomass allocation in five grass species in
536 an Oklahoma tallgrass prairie. *The American Midland Naturalist* 113:170–181.537 Bachelet, D., B. R. Johnson, S. D. Bridgham, P. V Dunn, H. E. Anderson, and B. M. Rogers.
538 2011. Climate change impacts on western Pacific Northwest prairies and savannas.
539 *Northwest Science* 85:411–429.540 Bayly, M. J., and A. L. Angert. 2019. Niche models do not predict experimental demography but
541 both suggest dispersal limitation across the northern range limit of the scarlet monkeyflower
542 (*Erythranthe cardinalis*). *Journal of Biogeography* 46:1316–1328.543 Bazzaz, F. A. 1979. The physiological ecology of plant succession. *Annual Review of Ecology*
544 *and Systematics* 10:351–371.545 Bickford, D., S. D. Howard, D. J. J. Ng, and J. A. Sheridan. 2010. Impacts of climate change on
546 the amphibians and reptiles of Southeast Asia. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 19:1043–
547 1062.548 Boyd, R. 1999. *Indians, fire, and the land*. Page Oregon State University Press. Corvallis,
549 Oregon.550 Bradford, J. B., and W. K. Lauenroth. 2006. Controls over invasion of *Bromus tectorum*: The
551 importance of climate, soil, disturbance and seed availability. *Journal of Vegetation Science*
552 17:693.553 Burnham, K. P., and D. R. Anderson. 2002. *Model selection and multimodel inference: a*
554 *practical information-theoretic approach* (second edition). Ecological Modelling. Springer.

- Coates, F., I. D. Lunt, and R. L. Tremblay. 2006. Effects of disturbance on population dynamics of the threatened orchid *Prasophyllum correctum* D.L. Jones and implications for grassland management in south-eastern Australia. *Biological Conservation* 129:59–69.
- Connell, J. H., and R. O. Slatyer. 1977. Mechanisms of succession in natural communities and their role in community stability and organization. *The American Naturalist* 111:1119–1144.
- Cruzan, M. B., and E. C. Hendrickson. 2020. Landscape genetics of plants: Challenges and opportunities. *Plant Communications* 1:1–15.
- Dalton, M., and E. Fleishman. 2021. Fifth Oregon climate assessment. Oregon Climate Change Research Institute, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.
<https://blogs.oregonstate.edu/occri/oregon-climate-assessments/>
- Davison, C., and K. Kindscher. 1999. Tools for diversity: Fire, grazing and mowing on tallgrass prairies. *Ecological Restoration* 17:136–143.
- Dennehy, C., E. R. Alverson, H. E. Anderson, D. R. Clements, R. Gilbert, and T. N. Kaye. 2011. Management strategies for invasive plants in Pacific Northwest prairies, savannas, and oak woodlands. *Northwest Science* 85:329–351.
- Doak, D. F., and W. F. Morris. 2010. Demographic compensation and tipping points in climate-induced range shifts. *Nature* 467:959–962.
- Dunne, J. A., S. R. Saleska, M. L. Fischer, and J. Harte. 2004. Integrating experimental and gradient methods in ecological climate change research. *Ecology* 85:904–916.
- Dunwiddie, P. W., E. R. Alverson, R. A. Martin, and R. Gilbert. 2014. Annual species in native prairies of South Puget Sound, Washington. *Northwest Science* 88:94–105.
- Dunwiddie, P. W., and J. D. Bakker. 2011. The future of restoration and management of prairie-oak ecosystems in the Pacific Northwest. *Northwest Science* 85:83–92.
- Edwards, E. J., and C. J. Still. 2008. Climate, phylogeny and the ecological distribution of C4 grasses. *Ecology Letters* 11:266–276.
- Gremer, J. R., and D. L. Venable. 2014. Bet hedging in desert winter annual plants: Optimal

- 582 germination strategies in a variable environment. *Ecology Letters* 17:380–387.
- 583 Hargreaves, A. L., K. E. Samis, and C. G. Eckert. 2014. Are species' range limits simply niche
584 limits writ large? A review of transplant experiments beyond the range. *The American*
585 *Naturalist* 183:157–173.
- 586 Holl, K. D., and G. F. Hayes. 2006. Challenges to introducing and managing disturbance regimes
587 for *Holocarpha macradenia*, an endangered annual grassland forb. *Conservation Biology*
588 20:1121–1131.
- 589 Knowles, J. E., and C. Frederick. 2020. merTools: Tools for Analyzing Mixed Effect Regression
590 Models. R package version 0.5.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=merTools>
- 591 James, G., D. Witten, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. 2013. An Introduction to Statistical Learning
592 with Applications in R. Page (G. Casella, S. Fienberg, and I. Olkin, Eds.). 1st edition.
593 Springer, New York, NY.
- 594 Lembrechts, J. J., A. Pauchard, J. Lenoir, M. A. Nuñez, C. Geron, A. Ven, P. Bravo-Monasterio,
595 E. Teneb, I. Nijs, and A. Milbau. 2016. Disturbance is the key to plant invasions in cold
596 environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
597 *America* 113:14061–14066.
- 598 Lesica, P., and E. E. Crone. 2017. Arctic and boreal plant species decline at their southern range
599 limits in the Rocky Mountains. *Ecology Letters* 20:166–174.
- 600 Linares, C., and D. F. Doak. 2010. Forecasting the combined effects of disparate disturbances on
601 the persistence of long-lived gorgonians: A case study of *Paramuricea clavata*. *Marine*
602 *Ecology Progress Series* 402:59–68.
- 603 Loarie, S. R., P. B. Duffy, H. Hamilton, G. P. Asner, C. B. Field, and D. D. Ackerly. 2009. The
604 velocity of climate change. *Nature* 462:1052–1055.
- 605 Macdougall, A. S., and R. Turkington. 2007. Does the type of disturbance matter when restoring
606 disturbance-dependent grasslands? *Restoration Ecology* 15:263–272.
- 607 Montero-Serra, I., J. Garrabou, D. F. Doak, J. B. Ledoux, and C. Linares. 2019. Marine protected
608 areas enhance structural complexity but do not buffer the consequences of ocean warming

- 609 for an overexploited precious coral. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 56:1063–1074.
- 610 Moritz, C., and R. Agudo. 2013. The future of species under climate change: resilience or
611 decline? *Science* 341.
- 612 Morris, W. F., C. A. Pfister, S. Tuljapurkar, C. V Haridas, C. L. Boggs, M. S. Boyce, E. M.
613 Bruna, D. R. Church, T. Coulson, D. F. Doak, S. Forsyth, J.-M. Gaillard, C. C. Horvitz, S.
614 Kalicz, B. E. Kendall, T. M. Knight, C. T. Lee, and E. S. Menges. 2008. Longevity can
615 buffer plant and animal populations against changing climatic variability. *Ecology* 89:19–
616 25.
- 617 Mote, P. W., and E. P. Salathé. 2010. Future climate in the Pacific Northwest. *Climatic Change*
618 102:29–50.
- 619 Noss, R. F., E. T. LaRoe, and J. M. Scott. 1995. Endangered ecosystems of the United States: A
620 preliminary assessment of loss and degradation.
- 621 Nunney, L. 2002. The effective size of annual plant populations: The interaction of a seed bank
622 with fluctuating population size in maintaining genetic variation. *American Naturalist*
623 160:195–204.
- 624 Pagel, J., M. Treurnicht, W. J. Bond, T. Kraaij, H. Nottebrock, A. L. Schutte-Vlok, J. Tonnabel,
625 K. J. Esler, and F. M. Schurr. 2020. Mismatches between demographic niches and
626 geographic distributions are strongest in poorly dispersed and highly persistent plant
627 species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
628 117:3663–3669.
- 629 Palmer, M. A., R. F. Ambrose, and N. L. Poff. 1997. Ecological theory and community
630 restoration ecology. *Restoration Ecology* 5:291–300.
- 631 Panetta, A. M., M. L. Stanton, and J. Harte. 2018. Climate warming drives local extinction:
632 evidence from observation and experimentation. *Science Advances* 4:1–9.
- 633 Parmesan, C. 2006. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annual*
634 *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 37:637–669.
- 635 Pereira, H. M., P. W. Leadley, V. Proença, R. Alkemade, J. P. W. Scharlemann, J. F. Fernandez-

- Manjarrés, M. B. Araújo, P. Balvanera, R. Biggs, W. W. L. Cheung, L. Chini, H. D. Cooper, E. L. Gilman, S. Guénette, G. C. Hurtt, H. P. Huntington, G. M. Mace, T. Oberdorff, C. Revenga, P. Rodrigues, R. J. Scholes, U. R. Sumaila, and M. Walpole. 2010. Scenarios for global biodiversity in the 21st century. *Science* 330:1496–1501.
- Peterson, M. L., G. Bailes, L. B. Hendricks, L. Pfeifer-Meister, P. B. Reed, S. D. Bridgham, B. R. Johnson, R. Shriver, E. Waddle, H. Wroton, D. F. Doak, B. A. Roy, and W. F. Morris. 2021. Latitudinal gradients in population growth do not reflect demographic responses to climate. *Ecological Applications* 31:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2242>.
- Peterson, M. L., D. F. Doak, and W. F. Morris. 2018. Both life-history plasticity and local adaptation will shape range-wide responses to climate warming in the tundra plant *Silene acaulis*. *Global Change Biology* 24:1614–1625.
- Pfeifer-Meister, L., S. D. Bridgham, C. J. Little, L. L. Reynolds, M. E. Goklany, and B. R. Johnson. 2013. Pushing the limit: experimental evidence of climate effects on plant range distributions. *Ecology* 94:2131–2137.
- Pfeifer-Meister, L., S. D. Bridgham, L. L. Reynolds, M. E. Goklany, H. E. Wilson, C. J. Little, A. Ferguson, and B. R. Johnson. 2016. Climate change alters plant biogeography in Mediterranean prairies along the West Coast, USA. *Global Change Biology* 22:845–855.
- PRISM Climate Group. 2020. <https://prism.oregonstate.edu/>
- R Core Team. 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reed, P., S. Bridgham, L. Pfeifer-Meister, M. Peterson, B. Johnson, B. Roy, G. Bailes, A. Nelson, W. Morris, and D. Doak. 2021. Climate warming threatens the persistence of a community of disturbance-adapted native annual plants. Dryad, data set. <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.q573n5tj0>
- Reed, P. B., M. L. Peterson, L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, W. F. Morris, D. F. Doak, B. A. Roy, B. R. Johnson, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, and S. D. Bridgham. 2021. Climate manipulations differentially affect plant population dynamics within versus beyond northern range limits. *Journal of Ecology* 109:664–675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13494>.

- Reed, P. B., L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, B. A. Roy, B. R. Johnson, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, M. C. Boulay, S. T. Hamman, and S. D. Bridgham. 2019. Prairie plant phenology driven more by temperature than moisture in climate manipulations across a latitudinal gradient in the Pacific Northwest, USA. *Ecology and Evolution* 9:3637–3650.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4995>.
- Rees, M., and M. J. Long. 1992. Germination biology and the ecology of annual plants. *The American Naturalist* 139:484–508.
- Rehm, E. M., P. Olivas, J. Stroud, and K. J. Feeley. 2015. Losing your edge: Climate change and the conservation value of range-edge populations. *Ecology and Evolution* 5:4315–4326.
- Reynolds, L. L., B. R. Johnson, L. Pfeifer-Meister, and S. D. Bridgham. 2015. Soil respiration response to climate change in Pacific Northwest prairies is mediated by a regional Mediterranean climate gradient. *Global Change Biology* 21:487–500.
- Román-Palacios, C., and J. J. Wiens. 2020. Recent responses to climate change reveal the drivers of species extinction and survival. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 117:4211–4217.
- Sheth, S. N., and A. L. Angert. 2014. The evolution of environmental tolerance and range size: A comparison of geographically restricted and widespread *Mimulus*. *Evolution* 68:2917–2931.
- Sheth, S. N., and A. L. Angert. 2018. Demographic compensation does not rescue populations at a trailing range edge. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115:201715899.
- Storm, L., and D. Shebitz. 2006. Evaluating the purpose, extent, and ecological restoration applications of indigenous burning practices in southwestern Washington. *Ecological Restoration* 24:256–268.
- Thomson, D. M., R. Cruz-de Hoyos, K. Cummings, and E. L. Schultz. 2016. Why are native annual abundances low in invaded grasslands? Testing the effects of competition and seed limitation. *Plant Ecology* 217:431–442.
- Tilman, D. 1990. Constraints and tradeoffs: toward a predictive theory of competition and succession. *Oikos* 58:3–15.

Tredennick, A. T., G. Hooker, S. P. Ellner, and P. B. Adler. 2021. A practical guide to selecting models for exploration, understanding, and prediction in ecology. *Ecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3336>

Ulrey, C., P. F. Quintana-Ascencio, G. Kauffman, A. B. Smith, and E. S. Menges. 2016. Life at the top: long-term demography, microclimatic refugia, and responses to climate change for a high-elevation southern Appalachian endemic plant. *Biological Conservation* 200:80–92.

Villellas, J., M. B. García, and W. F. Morris. 2019. Geographic location, local environment, and individual size mediate the effects of climate warming and neighbors on a benefactor plant. *Oecologia* 189:243–253.

Vitt, P., K. Havens, A. T. Kramer, D. Sollenberger, and E. Yates. 2010. Assisted migration of plants: Changes in latitudes, changes in attitudes. *Biological Conservation* 143:18–27.

Wang, Y., Q. Fang, S. T. M. Dissanayake, and H. Önal. 2020. Optimizing conservation planning for multiple cohabiting species. *PLoS ONE* 15:1–14.

Young-Mathews, A. 2012. Plant fact sheet for shortspur seablush (*Plectritis congesta*). Corvallis, Oregon.

Table 1. The eight focal species in descending order of northern range limit (see Figure 1). All species have southern range limits in California. “Exp” column: *P. congesta* and *P. nothofulvus* were only planted in the second experiment (Exp2), while all other species were planted in both experiments. **P. nothofulvus* and *T. radians* were also not planted in fall 2015 (see Methods).

Species	Family	Exp
<i>Plectritis congesta</i> (Lindl.) DC	Caprifoliaceae	Exp2
<i>Collinsia grandiflora</i> Lindl.	Plantaginaceae	Both
<i>Clarkia purpurea</i> (W. Curtis) A. Nelson & J.F. Macbr.	Onagraceae	Both
<i>Plagiobothrys nothofulvus</i> A. Gray	Boraginaceae	Exp2*

712	<i>Aristida oligantha</i> Michx.	Poaceae	Both	Figure 1. On the left: map
713	<i>Achyrachaena mollis</i> Schauer	Asteraceae	Both	
714	<i>Thysanocarpus radians</i> Benth.	Brassicaceae	Both*	
715	<i>Navarretia pubescens</i> (Benth.) Hook. & Arn.	Polemoniaceae	Both	

716 of the four experimental sites in the western Pacific Northwest, USA, with inset table describing
717 the disturbance conditions, sites, and climate treatment plot replicates for each year of the
718 experiments (Exp1: 2010-2012, Exp2: 2016-2018; see Methods). There were 62 unique year x
719 site x climate treatment combinations and 360 replicates in total. On the right: the eight focal
720 species grouped by their current northern-range-limit regions (full species names given in Table
721 1). The Klamath Mountain species are within their current ranges only at the southern site; the
722 Willamette Valley species are within their current ranges at the southern and central sites; the
723 Puget Lowland species are within their current ranges at all four sites. Photo of *A. oligantha* by
724 Ed Alverson; all other photos by Paul Reed and Bitty Roy.


725 **Figure 2.** The role of disturbance (high, intermediate, low) on species' (A) recruitment
726 (surviving plants per seed planted) and (B) seeds per surviving plant (note the log-scale axis).
727 Bars show estimated marginal means $\pm$ 95% confidence limits. "High" disturbance includes all
728 data from 2010 and 2016; "intermediate" disturbance includes all data from the plot halves
729 receiving the intermediate disturbance treatments of 2012 and 2017; "Low" disturbance includes
730 all data from 2011 and 2018, as well as all data from the plot halves that did not receive the
731 intermediate disturbance treatments in 2012 and 2017 (see methods). Letters indicate significant
732 differences ($p < 0.05$) between disturbance levels for a given site and species. Species are
733 arranged from left to right in ascending order of northern range limit.

734 **Figure 3.** Principal components analysis of the seven climate variables used in the study, using
735 all 360 unique replicates from Exp1 and Exp2. Polygons encapsulate the five broad climate
736 treatments. 'temp' = mean temperature, 'precip' = total precipitation, 'aet' = total actual
737 evapotranspiration, 'cwd' = total climatic water deficit; 'W' = winter, 'S' = spring. PC1 is
738 primarily driven by temperature (cooler to warmer from left to right) while PC2 reflects
739 additional variation explained by moisture (drier to moister from bottom to top). There is
740 considerable separation in climatic space as a result of the warming treatments, regardless of site.

Figure 4. Contour plots of estimated population growth rates (λ) as a function of climate (PC1 and PC2) and disturbance (high, intermediate, and low) averaged across sites for each of the eight focal species. Climate is depicted as the first two principal components of all seven climate variables used in the study, with PC1 reflecting temperature (cooler to warmer left to right) and PC2 reflecting moisture (drier to moister bottom to top). Colored polygons depict the range of climatic conditions that occurred in each climate treatment over the course of the experiments. $\otimes$ indicates the location of highest λ .

Figure 5. Log-transformed population growth rates (λ) of each species against PC1 (at PC2 = 0). Shaded bands indicate 95% prediction intervals. Dashed horizontal line at $\text{Log}(\lambda) = 0$ indicates a “stable” population. Black vertical lines identify the range of PC1 values in the control treatment plots across all sites and years.

Figure 6. Contour plots of the long-run (geometric mean) annual population growth rate (λ) for each species as a function of climate (PC1) and disturbance frequency. Long-run population growth rates were calculated using Markov models (see Methods), assuming that high disturbance conditions prevail in a disturbance event year, intermediate conditions in the first year post-disturbance event, and low disturbance conditions two or more years post-disturbance event. For *P. nothofulvus*, which was not planted during a high disturbance year, we used intermediate conditions in a disturbance event year and low disturbance conditions one or more years post-disturbance event. $\otimes$ indicates the location of highest λ .



Northern limit: Puget Lowlands

P. congesta *C. grandiflora* *C. purpurea*




Northern limit: Willamette Valley

P. nothofulvus *A. oligantha*



Northern limit: Klamath Mountains

A. mollis *T. radians* *N. pubescens*



Disturbance Lo Inter Hi Within current range Beyond current range

ecy_3464_f2.pdf

