

Comparison of seed bank composition over a gradient of pyrophilic vegetation1

Authors: Huebner, Cynthia D., Gundy, Melissa Thomas-Van, and Underwood, Chris A.

Source: The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society, 150(3): 409-436

Published By: Torrey Botanical Society

URL: https://doi.org/10.3159/TORREY-D-22-00026.1

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at <u>www.bioone.org/terms-of-use</u>.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Comparison of seed bank composition over a gradient of pyrophilic vegetation¹

Cynthia D. Huebner,² Melissa Thomas-Van Gundy,³ and Chris A. Underwood⁴

² Northern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Morgantown, WV 26505
 ³ Northern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Parsons, WV 26287

⁴ Environmental Sciences and Society, University of Wisconsin, Platteville, WI 53818

Abstract. Seed bank compositions provide a record of past disturbances, the legacies of which may last thousands of years. Our goal was to determine if sites defined historically by fire-related (pyrophilic) tree species have seed bank compositions different from sites defined historically by pyrophobic tree species. We selected three 80+ year-old forested sites within the Monongahela National Forest, West Virginia, to represent three pyrophilic zones based on percent-pyrophilic-witness tree cover: Low (0-10%), Medium (40-50%), and High (80-90%). Soil plugs were collected to evaluate the seed bank and determine soil nutrients and charcoal abundance; cover of all understory plants was also estimated. The results, supported by the charcoal analyses, show significant differences between extant and seed bank vegetation, pyrophilic zones, and pyrophilic zones within each vegetation lifeform (extant *vs.* seed bank). The High zone seed bank had the greatest species richness, the most pyrophilic species, and differed the most from its extant vegetation, but was the least dense of all zones and a pyrophobic species ranked among its top five indicator species. These findings indicate mesophication and a depletion of pyrophilic species in the seed bank. The High site appears to be reaching a potential threshold where passive recovery to fire-adapted conditions may be unlikely.

Key words: charcoal, deciduous forest, fire, indicator species, multivariate, understory

Soil seed banks have been studied for decades as a source of relic, specialist species for restoration of native vegetation. Relic species' seed abundance and richness in seed banks vary with habitat as well as existing and historic management (van der Valk and Verhoeven 1988; Brown 1998; Valkó et al. 2011; Weerasinghe et al. 2019; Abella et al. 2020). Time since disturbance or cessation of disturbance regimes also affects seed bank composition and subsequent usefulness in restoration (van der Valk et al. 1992; Brown 1998; Laughlin 2003; Overdyck and Clarkson 2012). Seed banks of deciduous forest soils often differ in species composition from the existing understory and overstory vegetation, with compositions resembling the early-successional old fields that preceded the second-growth forest. The latter is due in part to changes in life-history types associated with successional stage, revealing greater seed predation, decreasing seed longevity,

doi: 10.3159/TORREY-D-22-00026.1

©Copyright 2023 by the Torrey Botanical Society

and lower seed abundance for seed banks as forests mature (Roberts and Vankat 1991; Bossuyt and Hermy 2000; Bossuyt *et al.* 2002; Plue *et al.* 2010a). Although old-growth and mature forests tend to have fewer seeds in their seed banks, some of the seeds may be of late-successional species (Leckie *et al.* 2000). Nonetheless, re-establishment of ancient forest (*i.e.*, intact forests that established *ca.* 1770 or earlier) species may take over a century despite being adjacent to ancient forests. This is due in part to the lack of abundant seed in the soil (Bossuyt and Hermy 2000).

Though mature forest seed bank compositions are often dominated by similar weedy earlysuccessional species, they may still provide a record of past disturbances, the legacies of which could last for as long as 1,600 years since human occupation (Plue et al. 2008; Plue et al. 2010b). For example, Gallo-Roman sites in northern France have a more homogenized seed bank composition than sites showing no history of Gallo-Roman occupation, likely due to evident alterations in the soil with increased phosphorus and pH levels (Plue et al. 2008). Indeed, the fact that many seed banks of young forests are dominated by early-successional species may reflect a history of arable land use instead of forest age. For instance, disturbed tropical forests in Panama with no agricultural history, distant from any agricultural land use, show no difference in seed bank species density or composition across

¹ We thank L. Ferrari, T. Fenstermaker, J. Juracko, B. Simpson, and R. Young for data collection and edits, and the USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station for funding.

 $^{^{2}}$ Author for correspondence: cynthia.d.huebner@usda.gov

Received for publication October 5, 2022, and in revised form February 23, 2023; first published May 9, 2023.

forest age (Dalling and Denslow 1998). Similarly, a lack of historic or current cultivation may explain a depauperate seed bank in a southern Appalachian oak forest (Schiffman and Johnson 1992). Nonetheless, agricultural systems with frequent tillage and cover crops reduce the germinable seed bank, so the importance of agricultural history on seed bank composition likely depends on the agricultural system (Mirsky et al. 2010) as well as the presence of any forest seed sources. Similarity between seed bank and extant species composition is lower in Mediterranean oak forests grazed by ruminants and Sus scrofa L. (wild boar) than in ungrazed forests, suggesting a similar impact as with crop cultivation, but in contrast, diversity is lower for both seed bank and extant species composition in grazed forests than ungrazed forests (Chaideftou et al. 2008). Similarly, seed banks of young deciduous forests in Maryland, USA, decrease in density and richness with increasing Odocoileus virginianus Zimm. (Eastern white-tailed deer) browse intensity (Beauchamp et al. 2013). Conversely, site seed bank species diversity increases in sites with greater fire frequency in heathy woodlands of southeast Australia but burning more than 5% of the area per year reduces combined above-ground and seed bank diversity (Chick et al. 2018; Chick et al. 2019). Seed banks found primarily in the duff and litter layer, rather than in mineral soil, are vulnerable to fires (Schiffman and Johnson 1992). Nonetheless, a lack of fire often correlates with a decrease in extant understory vegetation diversity (30-70% lower in southeast Australia; Chick et al. 2019) and may lead to the formation of alternative species assemblies, transitioning from pyrophilic (vegetation assemblages favored by fire) to pyrophobic (fire-sensitive vegetation assemblages) stable states (Wright et al. 2019). Pyrophilic forests often require frequent fire to maintain their species composition or system integrity (Stephens et al. 2018).

In eastern forests of the US, this shift from pyrophilic to pyrophobic vegetation is also called mesophication, a positive feedback cycle in which the removal of fire has resulted in a landscape that is increasingly fireproof and less amenable to either the restoration of fire regimes or the maintenance of historically pyrophilic, often *Pinus* or *Quercus*-dominated, forests (Nowacki and Abrams 2008; Caldwell *et al.* 2016; Varner *et al.* 2016; Palus *et al.* 2018; Alexander *et al.* 2021; Hanberry 2021). The impacts of mesophication on soil seed banks in US eastern forests are underinvestigated, with a few studies that focus on the return of fire to the landscape to restore dominant tree species (Brose et al. 2008; Iverson et al. 2008). In addition to the loss of tree species that dominate pyrophilic communities, fire suppression and the resulting mesophication are threats to several understory species in eastern forests, including a relatively common sedge, Carex digitalis Willd. (slender woodland sedge; Romand-Monnier 2014), Chamerion angustifolium (L.) Holub (fire weed; Foster 1985), Iliamna corei Sherff (Peter's mountain mallow; Hoss et al. 2008), and Xerophyllum asphodeloides (L.) Nutt. (turkeybeard; Bourg et al. 2015). Graminoid species, such as Dichanthelium commutatum (Schult.) Gould and Carex L. spp., have also been documented as fire-adapted (Hutchinson et al. 2005); however, lists of fire-adapted herbaceous species in eastern forests could not be located by these authors in the literature, though the Fire Effects Information System (FEIS) is a good source of fire-adapted plant species that is being updated continuously, albeit currently dominated by Western U.S. species. (FEIS 2022).

Plant species responding to fire can be classified as evaders, endurers, and/or resisters. Evaders are defined as species with long-lived propagules stored in the soil; endurers are defined as resprouters; resisters are defined as species that survive low-intensity fire due to certain adaptive characteristics. Plant species are also classified as increasers, maintainers, or decreasers. Increasers are likely to increase in abundance after a burn; maintainers are likely to maintain their current population size after a burn; decreasers are likely to decrease in abundance after a burn (Rowe 1983; Harrod and Reichard 2001). Here, we define fireadapted or pyrophilic species as most likely to maintain or increase their populations on sites that experience short to intermediate fire intervals and not those that may just increase temporarily (e.g., one growing season) after a single burn. More specifically, fire-adapted or pyrophilic species are maintainers or increasers that do so by either evading, enduring, and/or resisting multiple fires, some of which may be severe, over short or intermediate fire intervals.

Several studies have evaluated the effects of fire on seed banks and extant understory vegetation by comparing pre- and post-burn seed bank compositions. In a study that focused on the effects of two burns, spaced two to three years apart, on tree and shrub species composition, both the pre- and postprescribed burn seed banks were found to be dominated by the pyrophobic species Betula lenta L. (black birch), Liriodendron tulipifera L. (yellow-poplar), Rubus L. spp. (blackberry), and Vitis L. spp. (grapevine; Thomas-Van Gundy and Nowacki 2013). However, B. lenta, L. tulipifera, and Vitis spp. abundance decreased after the burns (Schuler et al. 2010). Density of Robinia pseudoacacia L. (black locust), a pyrophilic species (Thomas-Van Gundy and Nowacki 2013), a minor component of the seed bank, increased after the prescribed burns (Schuler et al. 2010). In a Virginia study, a sparse seed bank (less than 1 seedling m⁻²) may have resulted from frequent fire, but the seed bank's sparse herbaceous species composition consisted of more forest herb species similar to the extant vegetation than ruderal or early successional species (Shiffman and Johnson 1992). The latter suggest that these frequent fires may be helping to maintain the existing vegetation and not just acting as a disturbance to be colonized by ruderals. Knox and Clarke (2012) found that pyrophilic species were maintained in a long-lived seed bank responding to rare, severe fire events. Similarly, in a study that compared burned and unburned plots after a single West Virginia wildfire with areas of higher severity, burned plots were found to have higher species richness and diversity than unburned plots, but the analyses also included vegetative structures (rhizomes, corms, bulbs) in addition to seeds (Nowlin 1993). While over 80% of the seed bank species were found concomitantly in forest extant vegetation, some seed bank species typically associated with dry, fire-prone habitats and/or poor soils were found only in the burned sites, especially the more severely burned areas. These species included Cunila origanoides (L.) Britton (wild oregano), Danthonia spicata (L.) Beauv. (poverty grass), Polygala sanguinea L. (blood milkwort), and Potentilla simplex Michx. (old-field cinquefoil) (Nowlin 1993).

In contrast, Elliott and Vose (2005) showed that a single burn did not promote regeneration of pyrophilic species, including *Pinus echinata* Mill. (shortleaf pine), *Andropogon gyans* Ashe. (bluestem), or *Schizachyrium scoparium* (Michx.) Nash. (little bluestem). Another study in North Carolina forests showed little difference between pre-fire and post-fire seed bank compositions after a single burn, with both containing ruderal and forest species (Keyser *et al.* 2012). Similarly, overall species diversity, and the density of graminoid species, increased in the seed bank in an Arkansas study after a single prescribed fire, but with no evident increase in pyrophilic species (Schuler and Liechty 2008).

These varied responses to fire may be explained by legacy effects of previous disturbances including fire and cultivation. They may also be due in part to differences in climate and physiography that define the underlying vegetation. Pyrophilic species are often adapted to drier conditions or strongly associated with drier habitats that are prone to fires. Thus, pyrophilic species could be fire-adapted (fitness improves with fire) or just firerelated (found in fire-prone sites; Fulé 2008, Lamont and He 2017). However, drier sites in eastern US forests are still subject to mesophication (Caldwell et al. 2016; Palus et al. 2018; Alexander et al. 2021), though it may occur at a slower rate or be less likely to occur in some more xeric forests found in the western part of the central hardwood region (Olson et al. 2014).

Because short-term pre- and post-burn studies vary greatly and do not reliably predict how fire might impact seed banks and their potential as seed sources for restoration and the maintenance of fireresistant communities over the long term, a different approach is needed. Instead of comparing pre- and post-fire short-term impacts, our goal was to evaluate seed banks over a historic pyrophilic vegetation gradient defined by witness trees. Witness trees (also called bearing trees) were described historically to mark property boundaries. Though these land ownership records could suffer from surveyor bias, they are the best data available to determine European settlement-era forest vegetation. Though the witness trees, most of which are now dead, provide important information about historic vegetation, they may not differentiate between vegetation dependent on fire vs. vegetation defined by climate and physiography (*i.e.*, dry sites that are fire-prone), but seed bank composition may help make this distinction. We hypothesized that (1) seed bank compositions located in zones with a higher percentage of historic pyrophilic witness tree species would also have more pyrophilic seed bank species than sites with a lower percentage of pyrophilic witness tree species, and that (2) because of fire suppression and the presence of long-lived seeds, differences between extant understory vegetation and seed bank compositions would be greatest within sites with the highest percentage of pyrophilic witness trees. The latter comparison of seed bank and extant vegetation may help differentiate the effects of fire and mesophication vs climate and physiography. This research will help measure the degree of mesophication in eastern US forests and define the potential for restoration of fire-adapted and firerelated species and their communities. Eastern US forests once defined by fire but now showing signs of mesophication in their extant vegetation are unlikely to be restored after reintroducing fire if their current seed banks have also converted to pyrophobic species.

Materials and Methods. Pyrophilic Zones. The pyrophilic gradient sampled in this study is derived from an analysis of witness trees from the first deeds associated with the area that is now the Monongahela National Forest (Thomas-Van Gundy and Strager 2012). Witness trees are those trees cited in deeds to indicate corners and represent an inadvertent ecological data source describing mainly overstory trees at the time of the land survey. Approximately 22,000 witness trees from deeds between 1752 and 1899 were used to develop the geospatial layer with each corner representing a point; one to six trees could be found at each corner. The 49 species of witness trees were categorized into two classes, pyrophiles and pyrophobes. Species with traits (e.g., thick bark, serotinous cones, sprouting) that can persist under frequent and low- to moderate-severity fires were categorized as pyrophiles, and those with fire-sensitive and mesophytic traits (e.g., thin bark, leaves with high water content) were categorized as pyrophobes. A pyrophilic percentage was determined for each corner by dividing the number of pyrophilic individuals by the total number of individuals of both pyrophiles and pyrophobes and multiplying by 100. Ordinary kriging was used to develop a continuous pyrophilic value between all points (Thomas-Van Gundy and Nowacki 2013). The area described below is ideal for this study because the interpolated pyrophilic percentage transitions acutely over a relatively short distance from the Tygart Valley River (historically a pyrophilic overstory) to the shoulders of Cheat Mountain (historically a pyrophobic overstory; Fig. 1).

SITE DESCRIPTION. Our study site is located in the Monongahela National Forest, Greenbrier Ranger District, in Randolph County and the Allegheny Plateau Province, near the Tygart Valley River and Huttonsville, West Virginia (WV) (Fig. 1). Three sites were selected to represent three distinct pyrophilic zones: Low (0–10% pyrophilic witness trees; 38.6785500, -79.8939200, elevation 1,128 m), Medium (40-50% pyrophilic witness trees; 38.6730956, -79.9193730, elevation 975 m), and High (80-90% pyrophilic witness trees; 38.6555005, -79.9673850, elevation 792 m). Each site was approximately 0.2 ha in size. Soil types are Buchanan Ernst stony soil at the Low site, Meckesville stony silt loam at the Medium site, and Highsplint Berks Association moist, extremely stony soil at the High site (Web Soil Survey 2021). Annual precipitation is approximately 160 cm for the area. All three sites were located on southfacing slopes with 20-25% inclination and were forested with trees at least 80 years of age. The potential natural vegetation (as documented by the witness tree data) differs at the three sites spanning the inferred pyrophilic gradient from Picea rubens Sarg. (red spruce) on the Low site, Quercus montana Willd.-Acer saccharum Marsh.-Tilia americana L. (chestnut oak-sugar maple-basswood) on the Medium site, and Q. montana-Q. rubra L.-Q. alba L. (chestnut oak-northern red oak-white oak) on the High site. The sites are located along an approximately 7-km transect moving from east to west across the study area. The valleys along this transect may have been cultivated in the late 1700s, but there is no documented agricultural land use at the three sites for at least 80 years.

After the first railroads were built in West Virginia in 1853, timber removal denuded most of the slopes in what is now the Monongahela National Forest. These timber operations were often followed by large fires for about 25 years in the late 1800s. Consequently, it is likely our sites experienced one or more fires in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Forest reestablishment began with the designation of the Monongahela National Forest in 1915 (McKim 1970).

SAMPLING DESIGN. In early June 2016, two parallel 50-m transects on south-facing slopes, one from just below the ridgetop and the other about midway down the slope, each at least 10 m apart (Fig. 2), were selected within each of the three pyrophilic zones (Low, Medium, and High as



FIG. 1. Study area showing the pyrophilic zones and the three site locations.

defined above). Along each transect, five circular $1-m^2$ plots were placed at 10-m intervals. Within each $1-m^2$ plot, herbs, shrubs, and vines were identified and their abundance (ocular estimate of percent cover at 1 m above ground) recorded. All tree seedlings under 1 m tall were identified and their abundance and density recorded. Herbs and tree seedlings were only included if rooted in the plot, but the cover of shrubs and vines was

estimated if hanging in the plot as well as rooted in the plot with no height limit. Sites were also walked for the presence of any plant species not found in the $1-m^2$ plots.

Soil samples for the seed bank analyses were also collected in June 2016 and were located just outside the 1-m² circular plots in each cardinal direction (Fig. 2), resulting in a total of 20 samples per transect, 40 samples per pyrophilic zone, and



Fig. 2. Schematic drawing of the lay out of the two transects, vegetation plot, seed bank samples, soil chemistry samples, and soil charcoal samples at each of the three sites.

120 total samples. Each soil sample was 15×15 cm and 10 cm deep. The loose litter layer was removed prior to collection in the field, but the duff (humus) and all soil horizons within this 10-cm depth were included. Soil samples were placed in a walk-in refrigerator at 4 °C for 5 months of cold storage. With this design, approximately 9% of each 1-m² circular plot ($[4 \times 15 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}]/$ $10,000 = 0.09 \text{ m}^2$) was sampled, well over the suggested minimum of 3% for seed bank samples, and all soil samples were collected at least 50 cm apart (Plue and Hermy 2012). The soil sample depth of 10 cm is deeper than most seed bank samples of 5-6 cm depth and was used to potentially capture rarer or longer-lived species (Leckie et al. 2000).

Starting Nov 21, 2016, the seed bank samples collected at the N and S cardinal directions from each plot were mixed, as were the samples collected at the E and W cardinal directions. Roots, tubers, corms, bulbs, and rocks were removed from all mixed samples. The combinations resulted in 4,500 cm³ of soil for both the N +S and E + W mixtures per plot. The soil mixtures were placed in $103 \times 46 \times 6$ cm flats on top of 4cm potting soil mix and distributed uniformly across the flats to a depth of approximately 1 cm. This process produced 60 mixed soil samples. The 60 flats were placed in a greenhouse with temperature ranging between 25 °C and 30 °C (day) and 15 °C and 20 °C (night) with standardized day lengths (13 hours 6:30 am-7:30 pm) provided by high-pressure sodium lighting to mimic early spring conditions and promote

germination. After 3 months, controlled day length was extended to 14 hours (6:00 am-8:00 pm) to promote germination of later season species.

Flats were rotated weekly and watered daily as needed. Fertilizer was added after two weeks and then each week. Germinating species were marked with colored toothpicks, identified, and tallied every two weeks. Tallies were completed until there were no new germinating individuals. Individuals with confirmed identifications were removed from the flats at each tally period, with some pressed as voucher specimens. Some plants were transplanted to enable them to flower and fruit for more certain identification. The seed bank was monitored for a total of 5 months. For this study, we use the term "vegetation lifeforms" when comparing the vegetation grown from the seed bank *vs.* the extant understory vegetation.

Soil samples for soil chemistry analyses were taken at the same time as the vegetation surveys (June 2016). Soil chemistry (pH, % organic material, total N, total C, Ca, K, Mg, P, Al, Fe, Mn, Zn, Na, acidity, and cation exchange capacity) was evaluated using four mixed 1-cm diameter and 10-cm depth auger samples per 1-m² plot collected from just outside the plot boundary at the northeastern, southwestern, northwestern, and southeastern directions (Fig. 2). Soil samples were analyzed at the Maine Agriculture and Forest Experiment Station Analytical Laboratories and Maine Soil Testing Service, Orono, ME. Soil pH was measured in distilled water. Organic matter was measured by percent lost on ignition at 550 °C. Total nitrogen and carbon were measured as 2023]

percentages by combustion analysis at 1350 °C. Exchangeable acidity was extracted in potassium chloride and measured by titration. Exchangeable cations (Ca, K, Mg, P, Al, Fe, Mn, and Zn) were extracted in ammonium chloride and measured by ICP-OES with units of mg/kg. Effective cation exchange capacity (ECEC) was calculated by the summation of milliequivalent levels of Ca, K, Mg, Na, and acidity with units of milliequivalents per 100 g of soil. ECEC is a measure of available cations and an estimate of soil fertility. We used the Ca:Al ratio to estimate potential system stress per Cronan and Grigal (1995), who estimated there to be a 50% chance of a plant-stress growth response if the ratio is ≤ 1.0 , a 75% chance if the ratio is \leq 0.5, and a 100% if the ratio is \leq 0.2. We also included the C:N ratio in our analyses. The C:N ratio may be used as an approximate indicator of organic matter quality (Ostrowska and Porebska 2015), fertility, and primary productivity (Watt and Palmer 2012).

Soil samples for charcoal analysis were collected in October 2018 using a tubiform root auger to extract contiguous 10-cm intervals to the depth of refusal (typically parent material rock) or 1 m, following methods described by Horn and Underwood (2014). Six cores were collected at each site along the previously described 50-m transects at the midpoints between 0 and 10 m, 20 and 30 m, and 40 and 50 m on both transects at each site (Fig. 2). The average depth of the cores was 22 cm. Each 10-cm soil core increment was soaked overnight in 0.75 L of water to disaggregate the soil. Samples were then wet-sieved using a 20.5cm diameter sieve with a mesh size of 2 mm. Macroscopic charcoal was removed under magnification from the material remaining on the sieve, rinsed with distilled water, and transferred to a glass vial for drying at 100 °C for 36 hours. Once dry, the charcoal from each core section was weighed to determine an aggregate mass. Twenty individual charcoal fragments were randomly selected from across all sites for taxonomic identification and radiocarbon dating, yielding four samples from the Low and High sites and 12 samples from the Medium site. Randomly selected charcoal fragments were cut transversely with a razor blade to analyze wood morphology and identify the species of tree that burned to produce the charcoal. Charcoal fragments were pretreated using an acid-alkali-acid protocol to remove allochthonous sources of carbon and then dated

by the Radiocarbon Collaborative of the Northern Institute of Applied Climate Science (Supplemental Table S1). Radiocarbon years were converted to calibrated ages (Bronk Ramsey 2009) using the OxCal Version 4.4 radiocarbon calibration program (OxCal 2020) and the calibration curve datasets of Reimer *et al.* (2020) and Hua *et al.* (2021), for one modern (post-1950) date. We used the weighted mean of the calibration probability distribution to assign a single calendar year to each dated sample (Telford *et al.* 2004).

STATISTICAL ANALYSES. The goal of this study was to evaluate a single site within each pyrophilic zone intensively in terms of its seed bank and understory vegetation; to do so, we treated the sample plots within each as replicates. Separately, we averaged vegetation plots, seed-bank samples, and soil samples of the same distance point along both transects, resulting in five replicates per site. We averaged the corresponding plots for the two transects because of their similarity and to reduce the potential for overfitting our models. For the charcoal samples, depth values were averaged, and the resulting six samples were treated as replicates.

Species richness, diversity (Shannon index), evenness, and total density/cover per plot of both the seed bank and extant vegetation were determined and compared across the three pyrophilic classes using ANOVA; all means were compared using the Tukey's multiple-comparison test (Proc GLM; SAS v. 9.4). All variables except Ca, K, Na, and Ca:Al, which were log-transformed, met normality assumptions. Soil charcoal abundances were analyzed using a generalized linear model with a gamma distribution and log link function (Proc GenMod; SAS v. 9.4). Soil chemistry variables were compared across pyrophilic class using ANOVA (Proc GLM; SAS v. 9.4) noting any trends within pyrophilic class. Species compositions of both seed bank and extant vegetation were evaluated using a nonmetric multidimensional scaling (NMS) ordination using a Sørensen distance measure. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling diagrams were compared using groups for vegetation lifeform, pyrophilic zones, and the two categories combined. Significant differences in composition between the three pyrophilic classes were evaluated using a permutation-based MAN-OVA (perMANOVA, using 4999 permutations) and multi-response permutation (MRPP; PCORD v.7), also based on a Sørensen distance measure. MRPPs and perMANOVAs were run for the



FIG. 3. Comparison, using a one-way ANOVA, of soil pH (F = 53.64, P = 0.0001), Ca:Al (F = 4.06; P = 0.0451), Ca (mg/kg; F = 2.26, P = 0.15), Al (mg/kg; F = 26.10, P = 0.0001), ECEC (milliequivalents/100 g soil; F = 38.33, P = 0.00001), and acidity (milliequivalents/100 g soil; F = 22.12, P = 0.0001) across the three pyrophilic zones. Different letters within each graph are significantly different at P < 0.05.

vegetation lifeforms and pyrophilic zones separately and combined. After doing a log10 transformation on the distance measures, an ANOVA was used to compare extant vegetation and seed bank composition dissimilarities by pyrophilic zone using the Sørensen distance measures of the NMS.

Species indicator analyses were also conducted following Dufrěne and Legendre (1997), which defines a perfect indicator of group as both always being present within the group and not being present in other groups. Both proportional abundance and frequency of each species relative to all species in a particular group were included in the indicator species calculations. Indicator values were tested for statistical significance using Monte Carlo randomization (4999 permutations; PCORD, v. 7; McCune and Grace 2002).

Results. SOIL CHEMISTRY. All three sites exhibited acidic soils, but the Medium site was significantly less acidic than both the Low and High sites, and the Low site was the most acidic (Fig. 3). The Ca:Al ratio for the Medium site was < 0.5, indicating stressed growth conditions, whereas that of the Low site was just > 1 and

the High site was > 1.5. Variation was great, but the Medium and High sites differed significantly (Fig. 3). The effective cation exchange capacity was lower for the High site, despite the higher Ca:Al ratio, due to lower values of exchangeable acidity associated with very low Al values. The Low site, like the High site, had high levels of Ca but also had high levels of Al (Fig. 3). The Medium site had significantly more organic matter and higher C:N ratios than both the Low and High sites; the High site had significantly higher C:N ratios than the Low site, which does not appear to be due to organic matter (Fig. 4). Unlike, Ca and Al, the C and N amounts changed proportionally by site (*i.e.*, sites with relatively high C values also had high N values; Fig. 4). The Medium site had the highest levels of measured soil nutrients, with significantly higher levels of K, P, Zn, and Na than both the Low and High sites and significantly higher levels of Fe than the High site, all of which agree with the higher available cations at the Medium site (Table 1; Figs. 4 and 5).

SOIL CHARCOAL. Soil charcoal mass was most abundant in the Medium site and consistently highest in the upper 10 cm of soil for all three HUEBNER *ET AL.*: SEED BANK COMPOSITION VARIES OVER A PYROPHILIC GRADIENT



FIG. 4. Comparison, using a one-way ANOVA, of soil Na (mg/kg; F = 27.90; P = 0.0001), % Total C (F = 18.74, P = 0.0002), % Total N (F = 12.16, P = 0.0013), percent organic matter (F = 12.91, P = 0.001), and C:N (F = 68.79, P = 0.0001) across three pyrophilic zones. Sites with different letters within each graph are significantly at $P \le 0.05$.

pyrophilic zones (Fig. 6). Sites and depths differed significantly ($X^2 = 12.6$, P = 0.0018 and $X^2 = 12.2$ and P = 0.0067, respectively) but there were no significant interactions ($X^2 = 4.44$ and P = 0.35). The Low site had the oldest charcoal overall with three dates from the late Woodland Period (900–1650 AD). Low site charcoal was primarily *Acer rubrum* L. The Medium and High sites had charcoal more similar in age from the 17th and/ or 18th centuries, with the High site having somewhat older charcoal. Medium site charcoal

2023]

was dominated by *A. rubrum* and *Castanea dentata* (Marshall) Borkh. High site charcoal was all *C. dentata* (Supplemental Table S1).

EXTANT VEGETATION AND SEED BANK RICHNESS, DIVERSITY, AND EVENNESS. There was a total of 61 different extant vascular plant species in all sites, with 24 species in the Low site, 10 in the Medium site, and 37 in the High site. There were an additional 19 species not in the plots (offplot) in the Low site, 8 in the Medium site, and 34 in the

Table 1. Multiresponse permutation procedure (MRPP) results by vegetation lifeform and pyrophilic zone as groups using a Sørensen distance measure. The T-statistic describes the separation of the defined groups, the more negative the T, the greater the separation. A = the chance-corrected within group agreement (within group homogeneity). A = 1 when all members in a group are identical; A = 0 when heterogeneity within a group equals what is expected by chance; A < 0 means that there is less agreement within the groups than expected by chance; A > 0 but less than 1 indicate within-group agreement differs significantly from that expected by chance from the within-group agreement of the other groups. Pairwise comparisons within pyrophilic zone group are also presented.

Group	Group size	T-value	Chance corrected within group agreement-A	P-value
Vegetation lifeform	15	-16.81	0.22	0.00000003
Pyrophilic zone	10	-3.41	0.064	0.0084
Low vs. Medium	5	-2.67	0.070	0.026
Low vs. High	5	-2.87	0.050	0.020
Medium vs. High	5	-1.40	0.030	0.090

417



FIG. 5. Comparison, using a one-way ANOVA, of soil K (mg/kg; F = 91.80, P = 0.0001), Mg (mg/kg; F = 0.18, P = 0.87), P (mg/kg; F = 8.3, P = 0.0055), Fe (mg/kg; F = 9.99, P = 0.0028), Mn (mg/kg; F = 0.78, P = 0.48) and Zn (mg/kg; F = 9.56, P = 0.0033) across the three pyrophilic zones. Sites with different letters within each graph are significantly different at $P \le 0.05$.

High site. There were 56 different species in the seed bank, with 33 species in the Low site, 31 in the Medium site, and 44 in the High site. Though there was a trend for higher extant vegetation richness, diversity, and evenness for the High site, the differences among pyrophilic zone were not



FIG. 6. Soil charcoal abundance for each pyrophilic zone and by depth. Analysis used a generalized linear model with a gamma distribution and log link function. Charcoal amounts with different letters were significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$.

significant (Fig. 7). Similarly, seed bank richness was slightly higher for the High site (with no statistical significance), and seed bank diversity and evenness for the High site were significantly greater than for both the Low and Medium sites (Fig. 7). Total extant vegetation cover did not differ significantly across the pyrophilic zones, but total seed bank density of the High site was significantly lower than at both the Low and Medium sites (Fig. 8), signifying more species, but none was abundant in number in the seed bank High site.

SPECIES COMPOSITION COMPARISONS. We used NMS to compare the species compositions of the seed bank and extant vegetation within each pyrophilic zone. The vegetation lifeform (extant vegetation or seed bank) had the strongest separation (Fig. 9), but the pyrophilic vegetation category also showed clear separation (Fig. 10). The NMS ordination was run using a Sørensen distance measure, 250 random and real data runs, and a random number seed; it showed a 3dimensional configuration as the most reliable, with an 8.78 final stress value and 0.00 final instability value after 89 iterations. Stress values

HUEBNER ET AL.: SEED BANK COMPOSITION VARIES OVER A PYROPHILIC 419 2023] GRADIENT 8 2.5 1.0 Extant Diversity (Shannon Index) Number of Extant Species а а а 2.0 0.8 6 Extant Evenness 0.6 1.5 4 1.0 0.4 2 0.5 0.2 0 0.0 0.0 Low Medium High Medium High Medium High Low Low 14 2.5 0.8 Seed Bank Diversity (Shannon Index) Number of Seed Bank Species 12 а 2.0 Seed Bank Evenness 0.6 10 1.5 8 0.4 6 1.0 4 0.2 0.5 2 0 0.0 0.0 Low Medium High Low Medium High Low Medium High Pyrophilic Zone

FIG. 7. Comparison, using a one-way ANOVA, of extant and seed bank richness (F = 0.92, P = 0.42), diversity (Shannon index; F = 10.78, P = 0.0021) and evenness (F = 10.03, P = 0.0027) across the three pyrophilic zones. Sites with different letters within each graph are significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$.

below 10 are considered good with no real risk of drawing false inferences (McCune and Grace 2002; Peck 2016). The best separation of the vegetation lifeforms was axis 1, whereas axes 2 and 3 better separated the pyrophilic zones.

The multi-response permutation procedure (MRPP) comparing vegetation lifeform (with all pyrophilic zones combined) showed that the extant vegetation and seed bank compositions differed significantly from what would be expected at



FIG. 8. Comparison, using a one-way ANOVA, of extant vegetation total cover (F = 36, P = 0.7048) and seed bank total density (F = 17.82, P = 0.0003) across the three pyrophilic zones. Sites with different letters within each graph are significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$.



FIG. 9. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling ordination showing the vegetation lifeform (extant vegetation (EV) and seed bank (SB)) with convex hulls (the smallest convex polygon that encloses all points in the same set; a convex polygon is one that has no corners that bend inward).

random. Likewise, the compositions associated with the three pyrophilic zones (with both vegetation lifeforms combined) also differed significantly than what would be expected by chance, though the difference was weaker than that found comparing the vegetation lifeforms, and the Medium and High sites did not differ significantly (Table 1). The results of a two-way factorial perMANOVA agreed with the MRPP results but also manifested the impacts of the vegetation lifeform, showing that the Medium and High zones differed significantly from each other if the effects of the vegetation lifeform and any interactions were removed (partitioned out; Table 2). Vegetation lifeform explained most of the variance (49.6%), while the pyrophilic zone explained 13.2%.

To evaluate the degree of separation between extant vegetation and seed bank compositions



FIG. 10. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling ordination showing the pyrophilic zones (L = Low, M = Medium, and H = High) with convex hulls (the smallest convex polygon that encloses all points in the same set; a convex polygon is one that has no corners that bend inward); EV = extant vegetation and SB = seed bank.

within each pyrophilic zone, we analyzed a combined vegetation lifeform and pyrophilic zone variable using MRPP and perMANOVA (PCORD v. 7). Our NMS ordination using the combined vegetation lifeform and pyrophilic zone as the group reveals that the Medium site was the most homogeneous and the High site was the most heterogeneous for both extant vegetation and seed bank compositions (Fig. 11). The pairwise comparison of High site and extant vegetation *vs*. High site and seed bank had the lowest chance-corrected within-group agreement (A), showing the greatest within-group heterogeneity when comparing extant vegetation with seed bank compositions across each pyrophilic zone. However, the Medium site

Table 2. The results of a perManova using a two-way factorial design with vegetation lifeform as fixed factor; 4,999 randomizations; Sørensen distance measure. The subtable shows the results of the multiple comparisons with the pyrophilic zone group with the fixed factor (vegetation lifeform) and interaction effects partitioned out or included.

Group	d.f.	SS	MS	F	P-value
Vegetation lifeform	1	3.69	3.69	21.70	0.00020
Pyrophilic zone	2	1.61	0.80	4.73	0.00020
Interaction	2	0.86	0.43	2.52	0.011
Residual	24	4.08	0.17		
Pyrophilic zone—vegetation lifeform and interaction partitioned out	t	<i>P</i> -value	Pyrophilic zone—vegetation lifeform and interaction not partitioned out	t	<i>P</i> -value
Low vs. Medium Low vs. High Medium vs. High	2.82 2.07 1.74	0.00040 0.0018 0.018	Low vs. Medium Low vs. High Medium vs. High	1.83 1.62 1.28	0.023 0.020 0.13



FIG. 11. Nonmetric multidimensional scaling ordination showing the combined (Z + T or pyrophilic zone + vegetation lifeform) pyrophilic zones (L = Low, M = Medium, and H = High) and vegetation lifeforms (EV = extant and SB = seed bank) with convex hulls (the smallest convex polygon that encloses all points in the same set; a convex polygon is one that has no corners that bend inward); EV = extant vegetation and SB = seed bank (SB).

had the highest A or the greatest within-group homogeneity when comparing extant vegetation with seed bank compositions (Table 3). A one-way perMANOVA using a combined variable showed significant differences in the pair-wise comparisons (Table 4). A direct comparison of extant vegetation composition with seed bank composition within each pyrophilic zone showed that the High site had significantly greater dissimilarity between compositions of the extant vegetation and the seed bank than both the Medium and Low sites, with Low site dissimilarity trending to be higher than that of the Medium site (Fig. 12).

Indicator species analyses comparing vegetation lifeform showed that the extant vegetation composition had very few indicator species compared



FIG. 12. Comparison of extant vegetation (EV) and seed bank (SB) composition dissimilarity values within each pyrophilic zone (L = Low, M = Medium, and H = High). Dissimilarity was determined from Sørensen distance measures and compared using a one-way ANOVA. Comparisons with different letters are significantly different at P < 0.05.

to the seed bank composition, and only one of these (Vaccinium pallidum Aiton) was a fireadapted/fire-related species (Arthur et al. 1998; FEIS 2022). The seed bank composition also had only one species, R. pseudoacacia, that was fireadapted (Table 5). A comparison of indicator species among the three pyrophilic zones but within each vegetation lifeform revealed more differences in fire-adapted indicator species. Within the extant vegetation, Gaultheria procumbens L. (fire-related; Ducey et al. 1996, FEIS 2022) and O. montana (fire-adapted/fire-related; Hoss et al. 2008, FEIS 2022) were the only species significant at *P*-value < 0.05, and they both were indicators of the Medium zone. Melampyrum lineare var. latifolium W. P. C. Barton and Q. rubra, both fire-adapted/fire-related species (Reed 1984; Crow

Table 3. Multiresponse permutation procedure results comparing combined vegetation lifeform and seed bank groups using a Sørensen distance measure. The T-statistic describes the separation of the defined groups, the more negative the T, the greater the separation. A = the chance-corrected within group agreement (within group homogeneity). A = 1 when all members in a group are identical; A = 0 when heterogeneity within a group equals what is expected by chance; A < 0 means that there is less agreement within the groups than expected by chance; A > 0 but less than 1 indicate within-group agreement differs significantly from that expected by chance from the within-group agreement of the other groups. Pairwise comparisons within the combined group are also presented. L, M, and H = Low, Medium, and High pyrophilic zones, respectively; EV = extant vegetation, and SB = seed bank.

Group	Group size	T-value	Chance corrected within-group agreement—A	P-value
Combined vegetation lifeform and pyrophilic zone	30	-11.38	0.36	0.00000
L-EV vs. L-SB	5	-5.34	0.34	0.0016
M-EV vs. M-SB	5	-5.76	0.47	0.0017
H-EV vs. H-SB	5	-5.20	0.18	0.0016

Table 4. The results of a one-way perManova using 4,999 randomizations and a Sørensen distance measure. The subtable shows the results of the pairwise comparisons across vegetation lifeform within each pyrophilic zone. L, M, and H = Low, Medium, and High pyrophilic zones, respectively; EV = extant vegetation, and SB = seed bank.

Group	d.f.	SS	MS	F	P-value
Combined vegetation lifeform and pyrophilic zone Residual	5 24	6.15 4.08	1.23 0.17	7.24	0.00020
Pairwise comparisons	t	P-value			
L-EV vs. L-SB M-EV vs. M-SB H-EV vs. H-SB	3.14 4.40 2.21	0.0064 0.0080 0.0078			

1988; Gibson 1993; Varner et al. 2016), were indicator species of the High zone but only marginally significant (Q. rubra less significant than M. lineare var. latifolium; Table 6). In the seed bank, two fire-adapted/fire-related species were significant indicators of the High zone, including Hieracium paniculatum L. (Silberhorn 1966; Keyser et al. 2012), Dichanthelium latifolium (L.) Harvill (Catling and Brownell 1999; Slaughter and Paskus 2015), and three fire-adapted species were marginally significant indicators of the High zone, including Dichanthelium dichotomum (L.) Gould (Taft and Solecki 2002; Glitzenstein et al. 2012), Poa sylvestris A. Gray (Taft 2003; McClain and Ebinger 2007), and Sphenopholus obtusata (Michx.) Scribn. (Hadley 1970; Jenkins and Parker 2000; Klips 2003; Taft 2003). However, Liriodendron tulipifera L., a pyrophobic species (Thomas-Van Gundy and Nowacki 2013; FEIS 2022), was also a significant indicator in the High zone (Table 7). The Medium zone showed Kalmia latifolia L. (Elliott et al. 2013; FEIS 2022) and Fragaria virginiana Duchesne (Klips 2003; Wilk et al. 2009), both fire-adapted/fire-related (Table 7). No fire-adapted/fire-related species were

indicators of the Low zone in either the extant vegetation or the seed bank (Tables 6 and 7).

The complete species list for the sites (Supplemental Table S2) shows that there were six exotic species found, five of which were only in the seed banks and five of which only occurred in the High site. Also, 10 fire-adapted/fire-related species that were present only in the High site but too uncommon in the extant vegetation (eight) and the seed bank (three) to be an indicator species (i.e., occurring only offplot in the extant vegetation), included Antennaria plataginifolia (L.) Richardson (extant vegetation; Tester 1989; Copeland et al. 2002; Ebinger et al. 2013), Carex wildenovii Schkuhr ex Willd. (seed bank; Allard and Leonard 1962; Hutchinson et al. 2005), Carva glabra (Mill.) Sweet (extant vegetation; FEIS 2022), Covallaria majalis var. montana (Raf.) H. E. Ahles (extant vegetation; Ruch et al. 2010; Gierczyk et al. 2017), Dichanthelium boscii (Poir.) Gould & C.A. Clark (both; Taft and Solecki 2002; Dichanthelium linearifolium (Scribn.) Gould/depauperatum (Muhl.) Gould (seed bank; Taft and Solecki 2002; McClain and Ebinger 2007; Burton et al. 2011), Hieracium venosum L. (extant vegetation; Homoya 1994; Cipollini et al. 2012;

Table 5. Indicator species for each vegetation lifeform (extant and seed bank). Only species with relative importance values > 40 are shown.

Species	Vegetation lifeform	Relative importance value (> 40)	P-value	Fire-adapted/ fire-related
Amelanchier arborea (F. Michx.) Fernald	Extant	53.3	0.0020	
Smilax rotundifolia L.	Extant	46.7	0.0066	
Vaccinium pallidum Aiton	Extant	46.7	0.0066	Х
Dennstaedtia punctilobula (Michx.) T. Moore	Seed Bank	100.0	0.0002	
Carex laxiflora Lam.	Seed Bank	66.7	0.0002	
Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.	Seed Bank	66.7	0.0002	
Liriodendron tulipifera L.	Seed Bank	60.0	0.0010	
Robinia pseudoacacia L.	Seed Bank	60.0	0.0010	Х
Carex swanii (Fernald) Mack.	Seed Bank	46.7	0.0076	

Species	Pyrophilic zone	Relative importance value (> 60)	P-value	Fire-adapted/ fire-related
Melampyrum lineare var. latifolium W.P.C. Barton	High	60.0	0.0612	Х
Quercus rubra L.	High	53.2	0.1096	Х
Dryopteris intermedia (Muhl. ex Willd.) A. Gray	Low	100.0	0.0010	
Betula sp. L.	Low	80.0	0.0098	
Prunus serotina L. f.	Low	80.0	0.0138	
Arisaema triphyllum (L.) Schott	Low	60.0	0.0612	
Viola rotundifolia Michx.	Low	60.0	0.0612	
Gaultheria procumbens L.	Medium	100.0	0.0010	Х
Quercus montana Willd.	Medium	76.3	0.0108	Х
Acer rubrum L.	Medium	64.6	0.0120	

Table 6. Indicator species for each pyrophilic type (Low, Medium, and High) in the extant vegetation. Only species with importance values 60 or greater are included.

Townsend and Ludwig 2020), Houstonia longifolia Gaertn. (extant vegetation; Schiffman and Johnson 1992; Davis et al. 2002; Li and Waller 2015), Quercus velutina Lam. (extant vegetation; McClain and Ebinger 2007; Burton et al. 2011), and Rosa carolina L. (extant vegetation; Taft and Solecki 2002; McClain and Ebinger 2007). There were a few fire-adapted/fire-related species found as uncommon species in both the Medium and High sites, namely Andropogon virginicus L (seed bank; Hughes et al. 1991; D'Antonio et al. 2000; Cipollini et al. 2012) and Vaccinium stamineum L (both; Ford 1995; Arthur et al. 1998; Kreher et al. 2000) and one uncommon species, Gaylussacia baccata (Wangenh.) K. Koch (extant vegetation; Matlack et al. 1993; Arthur et al. 1998; Elliott et al. 1999) found only in the Medium site (Supplemental Table S2).

Discussion. Hypothesis 1: Seed Bank Composi-TIONS LOCATED IN ZONES WITH A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF HISTORIC PYROPHILIC WITNESS TREE SPECIES WILL ALSO HAVE MORE PYROPHILIC SEED-BANK SPECIES THAN SITES WITH A LOWER PERCENTAGE OF PYROPHILIC WITNESS TREE SPECIES. Our results show that the High pyrophilic site seed bank composition differed significantly from the Low site and also the Medium site, but only from the latter if the effects of vegetation lifeform (seed bank vs. extant vegetation) were also removed. The High site had more fire-adapted/fire-related seed bank species than both the Low and Medium pyrophilic sites. However, the Medium site, in addition to the pyrophilic witness tree gradient, may exhibit more xeric site characteristics (understory with abundant Kalmia latifolia, a mor humus (partially decomposed plant material, often small roots) or duff

Table 7. Indicator species for each pyrophilic zone in the seed bank. Only species with importance values \geq 60 are included.

Species	Pyrophilic zone	Relative importance value (≥ 60)	P-value	Fire-adapted/ fire-related
Hieracium paniculatum L.	High	100.0	0.0012	Х
Dichanthelium latifolium (L.) Harvill	High	80.0	0.0120	Х
Liriodendron tulipifera L.	High	71.5	0.0372	
Dichanthelium dichotomum (L.) Gould	High	60.0	0.0644	Х
Poa sylvestris A. Gray	High	60.0	0.0666	Х
Sphenopholus obtusata (Michx.) Scribn.	High	60.0	0.0644	Х
Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.) R. Bolli	Low	100.0	0.0016	
Viola rotundifolia Michx.	Low	99.0	0.0024	
Viola blanda Willd.	Low	97.0	0.0036	
Carex swanii (Fernald) Mack.	Low	96.3	0.0062	
Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.	Low	86.2	0.0060	
Carex laxiflora Lam.	Low	66.5	0.0678	
Betula sp. L.	Low	64.3	0.0016	
Kalmia latifolia L.	Medium	79.5	0.0020	Х
Lysimachia quadrifolia L.	Medium	77.2	0.0114	
Juncus tenuis Willd.	Medium	60.4	0.0628	
Fragaria virginiana Duchesne	Medium	60.0	0.0634	Х

2023]

layer, and relatively abundant *Q. montana* in the overstory) than the High site (Braun 1940; Niering 1953). Despite this, the High site manifested more fire-adapted/fire-related indicator species than the Medium site; though the High site had the lowest significant densities, it had the highest significant richness values of all three zones.

Compared to other 80-year or older deciduous forest seed banks in eastern North American forests, our sites were relatively depauperate in terms of both richness and density, with an average richness of 6.88 and density of 82.46 m⁻². For instance, one Tucker County, West Virginia, study (Huebner, unpublished) had 52 species and density of 1,569 m⁻². A Canadian seed bank study of an old-growth forest had 49 species and density of 1,218 m⁻² (Leckie et al. 2000). Landenberger and McGraw (2004) found 44 species and density of 2,579 m⁻² in West Virginia mixed-mesophytic forests, and Ashton et al. (1998) documented an average of 17 species and a density of 1,257 m⁻² across three land types. The driest of the land types in the Ashton et al. (1998) study had 16 species and a density of 659 m⁻². Huebner (unpublished) found 28 species and a density of 1,445 m⁻² in a northern hardwood forest in Pennsylvania, and Royo and Ristau (2013) found 15 species and an approximate density of 1,000 m⁻² in another Pennsylvania northern hardwood forest. While these seed bank analyses clearly had high richness and density values compared to our sites, Schiffman and Johnson (1992) showed an average density of only 0.43 m⁻² for an Appalachian oak forest in Virginia, with forest herbs having greater densities than even the ruderals. Schiffman and Johnson (1992) reasoned that the sparse seed banks were due to no historic cultivation and past low-intensity burns with no outside source of ruderal species propagules. Our High site having the lowest density values (7.22 m⁻²) of the three pyrophilic zones may support the hypothesis of past low-intensity burns being the cause of low seed bank densities proposed by Schiffman and Johnson (1992). This is further supported by our High site having the highest and significantly different diversity and evenness values, showing a lack of dominant species, the cover of which relatively frequent burns may have helped reduce.

However, deer pressure may also play a role in the sparse seed banks. Increased deer browse was strongly associated with decreased seed bank abundance in a temperate deciduous forest in Maryland (Beauchamp et al. 2013) and recently fallowed agricultural fields in New York (DiTommaso et al. 2014). Deer may affect not only seed abundance but also seed bank composition, with higher proportions of plants that survive deer browse and still produce seeds than plants that do not survive the browse and/or produce seeds (Tamura 2019). Grazing in general has been noted to act antagonistically with fire in terms of species richness. Davies et al. (2013) found that ungrazed (by livestock) seed bank samples treated with simulated smoke and heat treatments had significantly higher species richness, including several fire-adapted species, than grazed samples. Though there is at least one species (Ageratina altissima var. altissima (L.) King & H. Rob.; white snakeroot) which deer avoid, most of the species found in our sites' seed banks and extant vegetation are browsed by deer, suggesting deer pressure has not played a prominent, recent role in defining the seed banks at these sites. Nonetheless, the lack of oak saplings (personal observation), as is common to many forested areas in West Virginia, supports an underlying, ubiquitous deer problem that may be exacerbated in more xeric sites (Regula et al. 2015).

The greater number of fire-adapted/fire-related species found in the seed bank of the High site supports our hypothesis, but the low densities of these species are cause for concern in terms of their longevity and ability to prevent future mesophication of the High zone site. None of the fire-adapted species in our sites are rare or threatened species, also suggesting that at one time these species may have been abundant and any threatened species that may have been present have since been extirpated from the site. Several plant communities with frequent fires are noted for their rare species in part because these communities (e.g., barrens, glades, balds, prairie pockets) are rare as well (Campbell et al. 1991; Latham 2003). In a Kentucky study in Appalachian pine-oak barrens, rare plants were associated with disturbed habitats, such as roadsides, but notably also were linked to recent fires. Indeed, similar disturbed habitats without any burning did not share the same rare species (Campbell et al. 1991). Though our study did not contain any of the same rare species as this Kentucky study, Melampyrum lineare var. latifolium (cow-wheat) is a shared relatively common indicator species in the extant vegetation and Lespedeza Michx. was a shared genus between the Kentucky study and our sites (*L. capitata* Michx., bushclover, in Kentucky [Campbell *et al.* 1991] and *L. hirta* (L.) Hornem, hairy bushclover, found only in the High site). However, *L. hirta* was too rare to be defined as an indicator species in our study area. While all the fire-adapted species found in our sites share traits that would enable them to survive xeric conditions, *L. hirta* may be an example of a species where its physical dormancy due to the hard seed coat (typical of many Fabaceae) provides evidence of historical fire at the High site.

Though we added horticultural-grade charcoal to our seed bank samples, we did not simulate fire by adding smoke or heat. Several studies show that treating seed bank soil samples with smoke and/or heat may stimulate germination of some fireadapted species, with liquid smoke being most effective. The effect is mostly to increase the density of species that may be found without the added liquid smoke or heat (Enright and Kintrup 2001; Chou et al. 2012; Nelson et al. 2012; Davies et al. 2013). Liquid smoke may also inhibit germination of other species (Chou et al. 2012; Nelson et al. 2012). Latham (2003) also noted that in many northeastern US rare communities, many of the rare species benefit only indirectly from fire that is critical for maintaining other more dominant shrub species. Nonetheless, the number of uncommon fire-adapted/fire-related species found in the extant vegetation of the High site support the need for future research to include applying liquid smoke derived from litter collected from each of our sites.

Hypothesis 2: Because of fire suppression and THE PRESENCE OF LONG-LIVED SEEDS, DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXTANT UNDERSTORY VEGETATION AND SEED BANK COMPOSITIONS WOULD BE GREATEST WITHIN SITES WITH THE HIGHEST PERCENTAGE OF PYROPHILIC WITNESS TREES. The site with the highest percentage of pyrophilic witness trees (High site) did show the greatest difference between the extant understory vegetation and the seed bank composition. However, the Low and Medium sites' extant vegetation and seed bank compositions did not differ significantly, indicating this pattern may not follow the pyrophilic gradient completely. Instead, the greater similarity between the Low and Medium sites may be driven by comparatively higher fire suppression and/or stress levels than found in the High site. Fire suppression at the Medium site is supported by its relatively deep duff layer due to abundant K. latifolia, which propagates best in duff (Lorente et al. 2012). Although very dry duff conditions can lead to highly destructive hot burns that remove all the duff (Waldrop et al. 2010), fire ignition can be more difficult with deep duff layers (Varner et al. 2007; Pipkin 2012). Further, low ratios of Ca to K and Mg at the Medium site are indicative of xeric sites (Klinka and Lowe 1976), soil weatherization, and lack of fire (McKee 1991). The very low Ca values with corresponding high levels of Al or a low Ca:Al value, in contrast, support a stressed environment compared to the Low and High sites (Klinka and Lowe 1976). Such stressed conditions may further reduce the likelihood of early successional species in the seed bank of the Medium site compared to the Low site, resulting in greater similarity between the Medium site's extant vegetation and seed bank compositions. Given that the indicator species associated with the Medium site were also examples of xeric/stressed species and no fires have been documented at the site for at least 80 years, the presence of these species in the seed bank may not be due to fire. The Low site's high Ca values explain a lack of difference in the stress level, as defined by the Ca:Al, between the Low and High sites (Klinka and Lowe 1976; Farr et al. 2009; Elliott et al. 2013).

The dissimilarity between vegetation lifeform (extant vegetation and seed bank) was much higher than between pyrophilic zone, but the species compositional differences between extant vegetation and seed bank composition differed for each zone. The Low and Medium sites had seed bank compositions defined more by mesic and xeric forest species, respectively, with a few open-area species (e.g., Lysimachia quadrifolia L., fourflowered loosestrife), especially in the Medium site. Sharing at least some extant species and being relatively depauperate makes the Low and Medium seed banks similar to the seed banks described by Leckie et al. (2000) and Schiffman and Johnson (1992) with possible seed bank depletion caused by deer (Beauchamp et al. 2013). In contrast, the High site's seed bank was defined primarily by pyrophilic seed bank species and shared few species with the extant vegetation. Moreover, the densities of the High site pyrophilic seed bank species were lower than the densities of the seed bank species found in the Low and Medium sites. Many of the uncommon fire adapted/fire-related species remaining in the High site's extant understory may be being maintained vegetatively but with decreasing abundances. The High site contained more pyrophobic species in the extant vegetation (nine +) or and seed bank (eight +) than pyrophilic species (Supplemental Table S2), in addition to the indicator seed bank species *L. tulipifera*. Thus, the High site is exhibiting mesophication with decreasing potential to recover even if fire were to be reintroduced. It is also concerning that the High site had the highest number of exotic species in both the extant and seed bank vegetation, albeit they were still at low density. The High site was geographically closest to private land, though the Medium and Low sites were closer to roads, both of which are known sources of exotic plant propagules (Mortensen *et al.* 2009; Gavier-Pizarro *et al.* 2010; Huebner 2021).

We expected there to be greater charcoal abundance in the High pyrophilic zone. However, the Low zone had the most charcoal, with some dates from the Woodland Period, which may indicate this location was burned by indigenous people at a time when plant husbandry and domestication were increasing in parts of the Appalachian Plateau with probable use of fire to clear areas for cultivation (Delcourt et al. 1998; Lafon et al. 2017). Our results, which are limited by a small number of samples, do not necessarily indicate that the High and Medium zones do not also share a similar Woodland Period history. Instead, comparatively recent fires may have been much more frequent in these zones than in the Low zone, increasing charcoal amounts from those dates such that a small random sample made selection of older dates less probable. In the late 1600s, the first Europeans began exploring West Virginia, and in the mid- to late 1700s the first European settlements were established in Randolph County, West Virginia. The earlier fires at the High zone may be linked to Native American land use and weather (lightning). The fires at the Medium and High zones site may additionally have been associated with European settlements, though none are documented specifically in this location at that time (Bosworth 1916). Tree species represented by the randomly selected charcoal fragments align with our hypotheses regarding species distributions across the pyrophilic gradient. Low site charcoal was dominated by the mesophyte A. rubrum, the Medium site had a mix of A. rubrum and C. dentata, a fire-adapted species, and High site samples were all C. dentata. Although C. dentata is no longer a dominant species in these forests, its presence in this charcoal record is a

reminder of its once broad distribution throughout eastern North American forests.

Conclusions. The High site had the greatest number of pyrophilic species in both the extant vegetation and the seed bank composition as well as the greatest diversity of the three zones. This greater diversity was, in part, due to having a mixture of pyrophilic and pyrophobic species. The High site also had exceptionally low seed bank densities, especially of the pyrophilic species. In addition, the extant vegetation and seed bank composition differed the most from each other at the High site compared to the Low and Medium sites, reflecting a transition from fire-adapted species to mesophytic species. Our results are based on one site per pyrophilic zone but reveal a vulnerability of fireprone vegetation in West Virginia to mesophication and a decreasing propensity to restoration of fireadapted plant communities even with the reintroduction of fire. The degree of mesophication is also influenced by site conditions, with stressed xeric sites being more likely to show an increase in dominance of stress-tolerant species that may also be fire-adapted. Implications for management include increasing efforts of reintroducing fire to once fire-prone sites, monitoring natural species reestablishments from the seed bank in response to increased fire frequencies, and, if such responses are weak, seeding or planting pyrophilic species known historically to be present at the fire-prone sites. Soil charcoal results provide direct evidence of past fire on these forests, dating to at least the Woodland Period for the Low site. Further soil charcoal investigations with more radiocarbon dates could provide a more comprehensive and robust fire and forest composition history for these forests. Other sites will need to be sampled with similar intensity to confirm that vulnerability of fire-prone vegetation to mesophication is a common phenomenon in eastern temperate deciduous forests.

Literature Cited

- ABELLA, S. R., J. L. HODEL, AND T. A. SCHETTER. 2020. Unusually high-quality soil seed banks in a Midwestern US oak savanna region: Variation with land use history, habitat restoration, and soil properties. Restoration Ecology 28: 1100–1112. doi.org/10.1111/rec. 13164.
- ALEXANDER, H. D., C. SIEGERT, J. S. BREWER, J. KREYE, M. A. LASHLEY, J. K. MCDANIEL, A. K. PAULSON, H. J. RENNINGER, AND J. M. VARNER. 2021. Mesophication of oak landscapes: Evidence, knowledge gaps, and future

research. BioScience 71: 531-542. doi.org/10.1093/ biosci/biaa169.

- ALLARD, H. A. AND E. C. LEONARD. 1962. List of vascular plants of the northern Triassic area of Virginia. Castanea 27: 1–56.
- ARTHUR, M. A., R. D. PARATLEY, AND B. A. BLANKENSHIP. 1998. Single and repeated fires affect survival and regeneration of woody and herbaceous species in an oak-pine forest. Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 125: 225–236. doi.org/10.2307/2997220.
- ASHTON, P. M. S., P. G. HARRIS, AND R. THADANI. 1998. Soil seed bank dynamics in relation to topographic position of a mixed-deciduous forest in southern New England, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 111: 15–22. doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(98)00305-3.
- BEAUCHAMP, V. B., N. GHUZNAVI, S. M. KOONTZ, AND R. P. ROBERTS. 2013. Edges, exotics and deer: The seed bank of a suburban secondary successional temperate deciduous forest. Applied Vegetation Science 16: 571–584. doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12036.
- BOSSUYT, B. AND M. HERMY. 2000. Restoration of the understorey layer of recent forest bordering ancient forest. Applied Vegetation Science 3: 43–50. doi.org/ 10.2307/1478917.
- Bossuyt, B., M. HEYN, AND M. HERMY. 2002. Seed bank and vegetation composition of forest stands of varying age in central Belgium: Consequences for regeneration of ancient forest vegetation. Plant Ecology 162: 33–48. doi.org/10.1023/A:1020391430072.
- BOSWORTH, A. S. 1916. A History of Randolph County, West Virginia, from its Earliest Exploration and Settlement to the Present Time. Elkins, WV. 448 pp.
- BOURG, N. A., D. E. GILL, AND W. J. MCSHEA. 2015. Fire and canopy removal effects on demography and reproduction in turkeybeard (*Xerophyllum asphodeloides*), a fire-dependent temperate forest herb. Journal of Sustainable Forestry 34: 71–104. doi.org/10.1080/ 10549811.2014.973609.
- BRAUN, E. L. 1940. An ecological transect of Black Mountain, Kentucky. Ecological Monographs 10: 193– 241. doi.org/10.2307/1948606.
- BRONK RAMSEY, C. 2009. Bayesian analysis of radiocarbon dates. Radiocarbon 51: 337–360. doi.org/10.1017/ S0033822200033865.
- BROSE, P. H., K. W. GOTTSCHALK, S. B. HORSLEY, P. D. KNOPP, J. N. KOCHENDERFER, B. J. MCGUINNESS, G. W. MILLER, T. E. RISTAU, S. H. STOLESON, AND S. L. STOUT. 2008. Prescribing regeneration treatments for mixedoak forests in the Mid-Atlantic Region. General Technical Report NRS-33. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA, USA. 100 pp.
- BROWN, S. C. 1998. Remnant seed banks and vegetation as predictors of restored marsh vegetation. Canadian Journal of Botany 76: 620–629. doi.org/10.1139/b98-038.
- BURTON, J. A., S. W. HALLGREN, S. D. FUHLENDORF, AND D. M. LESLIE. 2011. Understory response to varying fire frequencies after 20 years of prescribed burning in an upland oak forest. Plant Ecology 212: 1513–1525. doi. org/10.1007/s11258-011-9926-y.
- CALDWELL, P. V., C. F. MINIAT, K. J. ELLIOTT, W. T. SWANK, S. T. BRANTLEY, AND S. H. LASETER. 2016. Declining water yield from forested mountain watersheds in

response to climate change and forest mesophication. Global Change Biology 22: 2997–3012. doi.org/10. 1111/gcb.13309.

- CAMPBELL, J. J. N., D. D. TAYLOR, M. E. MEDLEY, AND A. C. RISK. 1991. Floristic and historical evidence of firemaintained, grassy pine-oak barrens before settlement in southeastern Kentucky, pp. 359–375. *In* S. C. Nodvin and T. A. Waldrop, eds. Fire and the environment: Ecological and cultural perspectives. General Technical Report SE-GTR-69. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, NC.
- CATLING, P. M. AND V. R. BROWNELL. 1999. The flora and ecology of Southern Ontario Granite Barrens, pp. 392– 405. In R. Anderson, J. S. Fralish, and J. M. Baskin, eds. Savannas, Barrens, and Rock Outcrop Plant Communities of North America. Cambridge University Press, New York. doi.org/10.1017/ CBO9780511574627.025.
- CHAIDEFTOU, E., C. A. THANOS, E. BERGMEIER, A. KALLIMANIS, AND P. DIMOPOULOS. 2008. Seed bank composition and above-ground vegetation in response to grazing in sub-Mediterranean oak forests (NW Greece), pp. 255–265. *In* A. G. Van der Valk, ed. Forest Ecology. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands. doi.org/10.1007/s11258-008-9548-1.
- CHICK, M. P., C. R. NITSCHKE, J. S. COHN, T. D. PENMAN, AND A. YORK. 2018. Factors influencing above-ground and soil seed bank vegetation diversity at different scales in a quasi-Mediterranean ecosystem. Journal of Vegetation Science 29: 684–694. doi.org/10.1111/jvs. 12649.
- CHICK, M. P., A. YORK, H. SITTERS, J. DI STEFANO, AND C. R. NITSCHKE. 2019. Combining optimization and simulation modelling to measure the cumulative impacts of prescribed fire and wildfire on vegetation species diversity. Journal of Applied Ecology 56: 722– 732. doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13314.
- CHOU, Y. F., R. D. COX, AND D. B. WESTER. 2012. Smoke water and heat shock influence germination of shortgrass prairie species. Rangeland Ecology and Management 65: 260–267. doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-11-00093.1.
- CIPOLLINI, M. L., J. CULBERSON, C. STRIPPELHOFF, T. BALDVINS, AND K. MILLER. 2012. Herbaceous plants and grasses in a mountain longleaf pine forest undergoing restoration: A survey and comparative study. Southeastern Naturalist 11: 637–668. doi.org/10. 1656/058.011.0406.
- COPELAND, T. E., W. SLUIS, AND H. F. HOWE. 2002. Fire season and dominance in an Illinois tallgrass prairie restoration. Restoration Ecology 10: 315–323. doi.org/ 10.1046/j.1526-100X.2002.02023.x.
- CRONAN, C. S. AND D. F. GRIGAL. 1995. Use of calcium/ aluminum ratios as indicators of stress in forest ecosystems. Journal of Environmental Quality 24: 209–226. doi.org/10.2134/jeq1995.004724250024000 20002x.
- CROW, T. R. 1988. Reproductive mode and mechanisms for self-replacement of northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*): A review. Forest Science 34: 19–40.
- DALLING, J. W. AND J. S. DENSLOW. 1998. Soil seed bank composition along a forest chronosequence in seasonally moist tropical forest, Panama. Journal of Vegeta-

tion Science 9: 669–678. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/ 3237285.

- D'ANTONIO, C. M., J. T. TUNISON, AND R. K. LOH. 2000. Variation in the impact of exotic grasses on native plant composition in relation to fire across an elevation gradient in Hawaii. Austral Ecology 25: 507–522. doi. org/10.1046/j.1442-9993.2000.01079.x.
- DAVIES, R. J. P., M. A. WHALEN, D. A. MACKAY, D. TAYLOR, AND P. PISANU. 2013. Does soil seed bank diversity limit post-fire regeneration in small, fragmented, longunburnt remnants of fire adapted vegetation? Biological Conservation 158: 287–295. doi.org/10.1016/j. biocon.2012.08.013.
- DAVIS, J. E. JR., C. MCRAE, B. L. ESTEP, L. S. BARDEN, AND J. F. MATTHEWS. 2002. Vascular flora of Piedmont prairies: Evidence from several prairie remnants. Castanea 67: 1–12.
- DELCOURT, P. A., H. R. DELCOURT, C. R. ISON, W. E. SHARP, AND K. J. GREMILLION. 1998. Prehistoric human use of fire, the eastern agricultural complex, and Appalachian oak-chestnut forests: Paleoecology of Cliff Palace Pond, Kentucky. American Antiquity 63: 263–278. doi.org/10.2307/2694697.
- DITOMMASO, A., S. H. MORRIS, J. D. PARKER, C. L. CONE, AND A. A. AGRAWAL. 2014. Deer browsing delays succession by altering aboveground vegetation and belowground seed banks. PLoS ONE 9: e91155. doi. org/10.1371/journal.pone.0091155.
- DUCEY, M. J., W. K. MOSER, AND P. M. S. ASHTON. 1996. Effect of fire intensity on understory composition and diversity in a *Kalmia*-dominated oak forest, New England, USA. Vegetatio 123: 81–90. doi.org/10.1007/ BF00044890.
- DUFRÊNE, M. AND P. LEGENDRE. 1997. Species assemblages and indicator species: The need for a flexible asymmetrical approach. Ecological Monographs 67: 345–366.
- EBINGER, J. E., L. R. PHILLIPPE, W. C. HANDEL, C. J. CUNNINGHAM, W. E. MCCLAIN, R. NYBOER, AND T. BITTNER. 2013. Vascular plant communities of the Green River Lowlands in Northwestern Illinois. Illinois Natural History Survey Bulletin 39: 39–78. doi.org/10.21900/j.inhs.v39.96.
- ELLIOTT, K. J. AND J. M. VOSE. 2005. Effects of understory prescribed burning on shortleaf pine (*Pinus echinata* Mill.)/mixed-hardwood forests. The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 132: 236–251. doi.org/10. 3159/1095-5674(2005)132%5B236:EOUPBO%5D2. 0.CO;2.
- ELLIOTT, K. J., J. D. KNOEPP, J. M. VOSE, AND W. A. JACKSON. 2013. Interacting effects of wildfire severity and liming on nutrient cycling in a southern Appalachian wilderness area. Plant and Soil 366: 165–183. doi.org/10.1007/s11104-012-1416-z.
- ELLIOTT, K. J., R. L. HENDRICK, A. E. MAJOR, J. M. VOSE, AND W. T. SWANK. 1999. Vegetation dynamics after a prescribed fire in the southern Appalachians. Forest Ecology and Management 114:199–213. doi.org/10. 1007/s11104-012-1416-z.
- ENRIGHT, N. J. AND A. KINTRUP. 2001. Effects of smoke, heat and charred wood on the germination of dormant soil-stored seeds from a *Eucalyptus baxteri* heathywoodland in Victoria, SE Australia. Austral Ecology

26: 132–141. doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-9993.2001. 01096.x.

- FARR, C., J. SKOUSEN, P. EDWARDS, S. CONNOLLY, AND J. SENCINDIVER. 2009. Acid soil indicators in forest soils of the Cherry River Watershed, West Virginia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 158: 343–353. doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0588-8.
- FEIS. 2022. Fire Effects Information System. https://www. feis-crs.org/feis/. Accessed March 1, 2022.
- FORD, B. A. 1995. Status of the deerberry, *Vaccinium stamineum* L. (Ericaceae), in Canada. Rhodora 97: 255–263.
- FOSTER, D. R. 1985. Vegetation development following fire in *Picea mariana* (black spruce)-Pleurozium forests of south-eastern Labrador, Canada. The Journal of Ecology 73: 517–534. doi.org/10.2307/2260491.
- FULÉ, P. Z. 2008. Does it make sense to restore wildland fire in changing climate? Restoration Ecology 16: 526– 531. doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2008.00489.x.
- GAVIER-PIZARRO, G. I., V. C. RADELOFF, S. I. STEWART, C. D. HUEBNER, AND N. S. KEULER. 2010. Rural housing is related to plant invasions in forests of southern Wisconsin, USA. Landscape Ecology 25: 1505– 1518. doi.org/10.1007/s10980-010-9516-8.
- GIBSON, W. 1993. Selective advantages to hemi-parasitic annuals, genus *Melampyrum*, of a seed-dispersal mutualism involving ants: I. Favorable nest sites. Oikos 67: 334–344. doi.org/10.2307/3545480.
- GIERCZYK, B., A. SZCZEPKOWSKI, A. KUJAWA, T. ŚLUSARCZYK, AND P. ZANIEWSKI. 2017. Contribution to the knowledge of fungi of the Kampinos National Park (Poland) with particular emphasis on the species occurring in burnt places. Acta Mycologica 52: 1–18. doi.org/10.5586/am.1093.
- GLITZENSTEIN, J. S., D. R. STRENG, R. E. MASTERS, K. M. ROBERTSON, AND S. M. HERMANN. 2012. Fire-frequency effects on vegetation in north Florida pinelands: Another look at the long-term Stoddard Fire Research Plots at Tall Timbers Research Station. Forest Ecology and Management 264: 197–209. doi.org/10.1016/j. foreco.2011.10.014.
- HADLEY, E. B. 1970. Net productivity and burning responses of native eastern North Dakota prairie communities. American Midland Naturalist 84: 121– 135. doi.org/10.2307/2423731.
- HANBERRY, B. B. 2021. Transition from fire-dependent open forests: Alternative ecosystem states in the Southeastern United States. Diversity 13: 411. doi. org/10.3390/d13090411.
- HARROD, R. J. AND S. REICHARD. 2001. Fire and invasive species within the temperate and boreal coniferous forests of western North America, pp. 95–101. *In* K. E. M. Galley and T. P. Wilson, eds. Proceedings: Invasive species workshop: The role of fire in the control and spread of invasive species. Fire Conference 2000: The first national congress on fire ecology, prevention, and management. Miscellaneous Publication No. 11, Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, FL.
- HOMOYA, M. A. 1994. Indiana barrens: Classification and description. Castanea 59: 204–213.
- HORN, S. P. AND C. A. UNDERWOOD. 2014. Methods for the study of soil charcoal as an indicator of fire and forest history in the Appalachian Region, U.S.A., pp. 104– 110. In T. A. Waldrop, ed. Proceedings: Wildland fire

in the Appalachians: Discussions among managers and scientists. General Technical Report SRS-199, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC, USA.

- Hoss, J. A., C. W. LAFON, H. D. GRISSINO-MAYER, S. R. ALDRICH, AND G. G. DEWEESE. 2008. Fire history of a temperate forest with an endemic fire-dependent herb. Physical Geography 29: 424–441. doi.org/10.2747/ 0272-3646.29.5.424.
- HUA, Q., J. C. TURNBULL, G. M. SANTOS, A. Z. RAKOWSKI, S. ANCAPICHÚN, R. DE POL-HOLZ, S. HAMMER, S. J. LEHMAN, I. LEVIN, J. B. MILLER, J. G. PALMER, AND C. S. M. TURNEY. 2021. Atmospheric radiocarbon for the period 1950–2019. Radiocarbon 64: 723–745. doi.org/ 10.1017/rdc.2021.95.
- HUEBNER, C. D. 2021. Patterns of invasive plant abundance in disturbed versus undisturbed forests within three land types over 16 years. Diversity and Distributions 27: 130–143. doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13175.
- HUGHES, F., P. M. VITOUSEK, AND T. TUNISON. 1991. Alien grass invasion and fire in the seasonal submontane zone of Hawai'i. Ecology 72: 743–747. doi.org/10. 2307/2937215.
- HUTCHINSON, T. F., R. E. J. BOERNER, S. SUTHERLAND, E. K. SUTHERLAND, M. ORTT, AND L. R. IVERSON. 2005. Prescribed fire effects on the herbaceous layer of mixed-oak forests. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 35: 877–890. doi.org/10.1139/x04-189.
- IVERSON, L. R., T. F. HUTCHINSON, A. M. PRASAD, AND M. P. PETERS. 2008. Thinning, fire, and oak regeneration across a heterogeneous landscape in the eastern US: 7year results. Forest Ecology and Management 255: 3035–3050. doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2007.09.088.
- JENKINS, M. A. AND G. R. PARKER. 2000. The response of herbaceous-layer vegetation to anthropogenic disturbance in intermittent stream bottomland forests of southern Indiana, USA. Plant Ecology 151: 223–237. doi.org/10.1023/A:1026575219518.
- KEYSER, T. L., T. ROOF, J. L. ADAMS, D. SIMON, AND G. WARBURTON. 2012. Effects of prescribed fire on the buried seed bank in mixed-hardwood forests of the southern Appalachian Mountains. Southeastern Naturalist 11: 669–688. doi.org/10.1656/058.011.0407.
- KLINKA, K. AND L. E. LOWE. 1976. Organic constituents of forest humus layers in the coastal western hemlock biogeoclimatic zone of British Columbia in relation to forest ecosystems. 1. Proximate analyses. Research Note 74: 1–16. British Columbia Forest Service, Research Division, Victoria, BC, Canada.
- KLIPS, R. A. 2003. Vegetation of Claridon Railroad Prairie, a remnant of the Sandusky Plains of central Ohio. Castanea 68: 135–142.
- KNOX, K. J. E. AND P. J. CLARKE. 2012. Fire severity, feedback effects and resilience to alternative community states in forest assemblages. Forest Ecology and Management 265:47–54. doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco. 2011.10.025.
- KREHER, S. A., S. A. FORE, AND B. S. COLLINS. 2000. Genetic variation within and among patches of the clonal species, *Vaccinium stamineum* L. Molecular Ecology 9: 1247–1252. doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294x. 2000.01002.x.
- LAFON, C. W., A. T. NAITO, H. D. GRISSINO-MAYER, S. P. HORN, AND T. A. WALDROP. 2017. Fire history of the

Appalachian region: A review and synthesis. General Technical Report SRS-219. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC, USA. 97 pp. doi.org/10.1016/ j.tplants.2016.11.004.

- LAMONT, B. B. AND T. HE. 2017. Fire-proneness as a prerequisite for the evolution of fire-adapted traits. Trends in Plant Science 22: 278–288.
- LANDENBERGER, R. E. AND J. B. McGRAW. 2004. Seed-bank characteristics in mixed-mesophytic forest clearcuts and edges: Does "edge effect" extend to the seed bank? Canadian Journal of Botany 82: 992–1000. doi. org/10.1139/b04-080.
- LATHAM, R. E. 2003. Shrubland longevity and rare plant species in the northeastern United States. Forest Ecology and Management 185: 21–39. doi.org/10. 1016/S0378-1127(03)00244-5.
- LAUGHLIN, D. C. 2003. Lack of native propagules in a Pennsylvania, USA, limestone prairie seed bank: Futile hopes for a role in ecological restoration. Natural Areas Journal 23: 158–164.
- LECKIE, S., M. VELLEND, G. BELL, M. J. WATERWAY, AND M. J. LECHOWICZ. 2000. The seed bank in an old-growth, temperate deciduous forest. Canadian Journal of Botany 78: 181–192. doi.org/10.1139/b99-176.
- LI, D. AND D. WALLER. 2015. Drivers of observed biotic homogenization in pine barrens of central Wisconsin. Ecology 96: 1030–1041. doi.org/10.1890/14-0893.1.
- LORENTE, M., W. F. PARSONS, R. L. BRADLEY, AND A. D. MUNSON. 2012. Soil and plant legacies associated with harvest trails in boreal black spruce forests. Forest Ecology and Management 269: 168–176. doi.org/10. 1016/j.foreco.2011.12.029.
- MATLACK, G. R., D. J. GIBSON, AND R. E. GOOD. 1993. Regeneration of the shrub *Gaylussacia baccata* and associated species after low-intensity fire in an Atlantic coastal plain forest. American Journal of Botany 80: 119–126. doi.org/10.1002/j.1537-2197.1993.tb13778. x.
- McCLAIN, W. E. AND J. E. EBINGER. 2007. Fire maintained, closed canopy barren communities in western Illinois. Transactions of the Illinois Academy of Science 100: 209–222.
- McCUNE, B. AND J. B. GRACE. 2002. Analysis of Ecological Communities. MjM Software Design, Gleneden Beach, OR. 300 pp.
- MCKEE, W. H., JR. 1991. Long-term impacts of fire on Coastal Plain pine soils, pp. 405–413. In S. C. Nodvin and T. A. Waldrop, eds. Fire and the environment: Ecological and cultural perspectives. General Technical Report SE-GTR-69. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, NC, USA.
- McKIM, C. R. 1970. 50-Year History of the Monongahela National Forest. Unpublished manuscript. Monongahela National Forest Office, Elkins, WV. 66 pp. https:// play.google.com/books/reader?id=Yres7zHE2ugC &pg=GBS.PP2&hl=en.
- MIRSKY, S. B., E. R. GALLANDT, D. A. MORTENSEN, W. S. CURRAN, AND D. L. SHUMWAY. 2010. Reducing the germinable weed seedbank with soil disturbance and cover crops. Weed Research 50: 341–352. doi.org/10. 1111/j.1365-3180.2010.00792.x.

- MORTENSEN, D. A., E. S. RAUSCHERT, A. N. NORD, AND B. P. JONES. 2009. Forest roads facilitate the spread of invasive plants. Invasive Plant Science and Management 2: 191–199. doi.org/10.1614/IPSM-08-125.1.
- NELSON, D. C., G. R. FLEMATTI, E. L. GHISALBERTI, K. W. DIXON, AND S. M. SMITH. 2012. Regulation of seed germination and seedling growth by chemical signals from burning vegetation. Annual Review of Plant Biology 63: 107–130. doi.org/10.1146/annurevarplant-042811-105545.
- NIERING, W. A. 1953. The past and present vegetation of high point state park, New Jersey. Ecological Monographs 23: 127–148. doi.org/10.2307/1948517.
- NIACS (NORTHERN INSTITUTE OF APPLIED CLIMATE SCIENCE). 2022. Radiocarbon Collaborative between the USFS Northern Research Station and Michigan Tech University, Northern Research Station, Madison, WI, USA.
- NOWACKI, G. J. AND M. D. ABRAMS. 2008. The demise of fire and "mesophication" of forests in the eastern United States. BioScience 58: 123–138. doi.org/10. 1641/B580207.
- NOWLIN, M. K. 1993. The effects of wildfire on the herbaceous layer of a southwestern West Virginia mixed hardwood forest. M.S. Thesis. Marshall University, Huntington, WV. Paper 386. 71 pp.
- OLSON, M. G., A. P. STEVENSON, B. O. KNAPP, J. M. KABRICK, AND R. G. JENSEN. 2014. Is there evidence of mesophication of oak forests in the Missouri Ozarks? pp. 139–153. *In* J. W. Groninger, E. J. Holzmueller, C. K. Nielsen, amd D. C. Dey, eds. Proceedings, 19th Central Hardwood Forest Conference; March 10–12, 2014, Carbondale, IL. General Technical Report NRS-P-142. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Newtown Square, PA, USA.
- OSTROWSKA, A. AND G. PORĘBSKA. 2015. Assessment of the C/N ratio as an indicator of the decomposability of organic matter in forest soils. Ecological Indicators 49: 104–109. doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.09.044.
- OVERDYCK, E. AND B. D. CLARKSON. 2012. Seed rain and soil seed banks limit native regeneration within urban forest restoration plantings in Hamilton City, New Zealand. New Zealand Journal of Ecology 36: 177– 190.
- OxCaL. 2020. OxCal software. https://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk/ oxcal.html. Accessed July 25, 2022.
- PALUS, J. D., P. C. GOEBEL, D. M. HIX, AND S. N. MATTHEWS. 2018. Structural and compositional shifts in forests undergoing mesophication in the Wayne National Forest, southeastern Ohio. Forest Ecology and Management 430: 413–420. doi.org/10.1016/j. foreco.2018.08.030.
- PECK, J. E. 2016. Multivariate Analysis for Ecologists Step-by-Step, 2nd ed. Using PC-ORD v7. MjM Software Design, Gleneden Beach, OR. 192 pp.
- PIPKIN, A. R. 2012. The Influence of Fire and Other Disturbance on Ericaceous Shrubs in Xeric Pine-oak Forests of the Appalachian Mountains. Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A & M University. College Station, TX. 108 p.
- PLUE, J. AND M. HERMY. 2012. Consistent seed bank spatial structure across semi-natural habitats determines plot

sampling. Journal of Vegetation Science 23: 505–516. doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2011.01361.x.

- PLUE, J., M. HERMY, K. VERHEYEN, P. THUILLIER, R. SAGUEZ, AND G. DECOCQ. 2008. Persistent changes in forest vegetation and seed bank 1,600 years after human occupation. Landscape Ecology 23: 673–688. doi.org/ 10.1007/s10980-008-9229-4.
- PLUE, J., B. VAN GILS, C. PEPPLER-LISBACH, A. DE SCHRIJVER, K. VERHEYEN, AND M. HERMY. 2010a. Seed-bank convergence under different tree species during forest development. Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics 12: 211–218. doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2010.03.001.
- PLUE, J., K. VERHEYEN, H. VAN CALSTER, D. MARAGE, K. THOMPSON, R. KALAMEES, M. JANKOWSKA-BLASZCZUK, B. BOSSUYT, AND M. HERMY. 2010b. Seed banks of temperate deciduous forests during secondary succession. Journal of Vegetation Science 21: 965–978. doi. org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2010.01203.x.
- REED, P. W. 1984. Population studies of threatened and endangered plants of Barker Woods Nature Preserve, LaPorte County, Indiana. Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science 94: 121–130.
- REGULA, A. E., D. W. MCGILL, AND C. D. HUEBNER. 2015. Effects of different management regimes on survival of northern red oak underplantings in the Ridge and Valley Province, pp. 39–44. *In* A. G. Holley, K. F. Connor, and J. D. Haywood, eds. Proceedings, 17th Biennial Southern Silvicultural Research Conference. e-General Technical Report SRS-203. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. Asheville, NC, USA.
- REIMER, P., W. AUSTIN, E. BARD, A. BAYLISS, P. BLACKWELL, BRONK RAMSEY, C. M. BUTZIN, H. CHENG, R. EDWARDS, M. FRIEDRICH, P. GROOTES, T. GUILDERSON, I. HAJDAS, T. HEATON, A. HOGG, K. HUGHEN, B. KROMER, S. MANNING, R. MUSCHELER, J. PALMER, C. PEARSON, J. VAN DER PLICHT, R. REIMER, D. RICHARDS, E. SCOTT, J. SOUTHON, C. TURNEY, L. WACKER, F. ADOLPHI, U. BÜNTGEN, M. CAPANO, S. FAHRNI, A. FOGTMANN-SCHULZ, R. FRIEDRICH, P. KÖHLER, S. KUDSK, F. MIYAKE, J. OLSEN, F. REINIG, M. SAKAMOTO, A. SOOKDEO, AND S. TALAMO. 2020. The IntCal20 Northern Hemisphere radiocarbon age calibration curve (0–55 cal kBP). Radiocarbon 62: 725–757. doi.org/10.101/RDC.2020. 41.
- ROBERTS, T. L. AND J. L. VANKAT. 1991. Floristics of a chronosequence corresponding to old field-deciduous forest succession in southwestern Ohio. II. Seed banks. Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club 118: 377–384. doi.org/10.2307/2997089.
- ROMAND-MONNIER, F. 2014. Carex digitalis. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2014: e.T44392899A44464089. http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/ IUCN.UK.2014-1.RLTS.T44392899A44464089.en. Retrieved May 20, 2016.
- Rowe, J. S. 1983. Concepts of fire effects on plant individuals and species, pp. 135–180. *In* R. W. Weing and D. A. MacLean, eds. The Role of Fire in Northern Circumpolar Ecosystems. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- ROYO, A. A. AND T. E. RISTAU. 2013. Stochastic and deterministic processes regulate spatio-temporal vari-

ation in seed bank diversity. Journal of Vegetation Science 24: 724–734. doi.org/10.1111/jvs.12011.

- RUCH, D. G., B. G. TORKE, K. S. BADGER, AND P. E. ROTHROCK. 2010. The vascular flora in three prairie cemeteries in Henry County, Indiana. Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science 119: 35–51.
- SCHIFFMAN, P. M. AND W. C. JOHNSON. 1992. Sparse buried seed bank in a southern Appalachian oak forest: Implications for succession. American Midland Naturalist 127: 258–267. doi.org/10.2307/2426532.
- SCHULER, J. L. AND H. O. LIECHTY. 2008. Seed bank emergence following prescribed burning in the Ozark Highlands, pp. 516–524. In D. F. Jacobs and C. H. Michler, eds. Proceedings, 16th Central Hardwood Forest Conference; April 8–9, 2008, West Lafayette, IN. General Technical Report NRS-P-24. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Newtown Square, PA, USA.
- SCHULER, T. M., M. THOMAS-VAN GUNDY, M. B. ADAMS, AND W. M. FORD. 2010. Seed bank response to prescribed fire in the central Appalachians. Research Paper NRS-9. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA, USA. 9 pp.
- SILBERHORN, G. M. 1966. The vascular plants of the Hillman Boy Scout Reservation. Castanea 31: 277–296.
- SLAUGHTER, B. S. AND J. J. PASKUS. 2015. Ecological assessment of Sharonville State Game Area, Pierce Road Unit, Jackson County, Michigan. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report No. 2015-18, Lansing, MI. 54 pp.
- STEPHENS, S. L., B. M. COLLINS, C. J. FETTIG, M. A. FINNEY C. M. HOFFMAN, E. E. KNAPP, M. P. NORTH H. SAFFORD, AND R. B. WAYMAN. 2018. Drought, tree mortality, and wildfire in forests adapted to frequent fire. BioScience 68: 77–88. doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix146.
- TAFT, J. B. 2003. Fire effects on community structure, composition, and diversity in a dry sandstone barrens. Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 130: 170–192. doi.org/10.2307/3557552.
- TAFT, J. B. AND M. K. SOLECKI. 2002. Vegetation composition, structure, and diversity patterns of two dry sandstone barrens in southern Illinois. Castanea 67: 343–368.
- TAMURA, A. 2019. Potential of soil seed banks for vegetation recovery following deer exclusions under different periods of chronic herbivory in a beech forest in eastern Japan. Ecological Research 34: 160–170. doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.1060.
- TELFORD, R. J., E. HEEGAARD, AND H. J. B. BIRKS. 2004. The intercept is a poor estimate of a calibrated radiocarbon age. The Holocene 14: 296–298. doi.org/ 10.1191/0959683604hl707fa.
- TESTER, J. R. 1989. Effects of fire frequency on oak savanna in east-central Minnesota. Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club 116: 134–144. doi.org/10.2307/ 2997196.
- THOMAS-VAN GUNDY, M. A. AND G. J. NOWACKI. 2013. The use of witness trees as pyro-indicators for mapping

past fire conditions. Forest Ecology and Management 304: 333–344. doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.05.025.

- THOMAS-VAN GUNDY, M. A. AND M. P. STRAGER. 2012. European settlement-era vegetation of the Monongahela National Forest, West Virginia. General Technical Report NRS-GTR-101. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA, USA. 39 pp.
- Townsend, J.F. and J. C. Ludwig. 2020. Floristics of Difficult Creek Natural Area Preserve. Journal of the Botanical Research Institute of Texas 14: 481–519.
- VALKÓ, O., P. TÖRÖK, B. TÓTHMÉRÉSZ, AND G. MATUS. 2011. Restoration potential in seed banks of acidic fen and dry-mesophilous meadows: Can restoration be based on local seed banks? Restoration Ecology 19: 9–15. doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2010.00679.x.
- VAN DER VALK, A. G. AND J. T. A. VERHOEVEN. 1988. Potential role of seed banks and understory species in restoring quaking fens from floating forests. Vegetatio 76: 3–13. doi.org/10.1007/BF00047383.
- VAN DER VALK, A. G., R. L. PEDERSON, AND C. B. DAVIS. 1992. Restoration and creation of freshwater wetlands using seed banks. Wetlands Ecology and Management 1: 191–197. doi.org/10.1007/BF00244924.
- VARNER, J. M., J. K. HIERS, R. D. OTTMAR, D. R. GORDON, F. E. PUTZ, AND D. D. WADE. 2007. Overstory tree mortality resulting from reintroducing fire to longunburned longleaf pine forests: The importance of duff moisture. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 37: 1349–1358. doi.org/10.1139/X06-315.
- VARNER, J. M., J. M. KANE, J. K. HIERS, J. K. KREYE, AND J. W. VELDMAN. 2016. Suites of fire-adapted traits of oaks in the southeastern USA: Multiple strategies for persistence. Fire Ecology 12: 48–64. doi.org/10.4996/ fireecology.1202048.
- WALDROP, T., R. A. PHILLIPS, AND D. A. SIMON. 2010. Fuels and predicted fire behavior in the southern Appalachian Mountains after fire and fire surrogate treatments. Forest Science 56: 32–45.
- WATT, M. S. AND D. J. PALMER. 2012. Use of regression kriging to develop a Carbon:Nitrogen ratio surface for New Zealand. Geoderma 183: 49–57. doi.org/10.1016/ j.geoderma.2012.03.013.
- WEB SOIL SURVEY. 2021. https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda. gov/app/. Accessed Dec. 30, 2021.
- WEERASINGHE, M., M. S. ASHTON, E. R. HOOPER, AND B. M. SINGHAKUMARA. 2019. Floristics of soil seed banks on agricultural and disturbed land cleared of tropical forests. Restoration Ecology 27: 138–147. doi.org/10. 1111/rec.12711.
- WILK, J. A., A. T. KRAMER, AND M. V. ASHLEY. 2009. High variation in clonal vs. sexual reproduction in populations of the wild strawberry, *Fragaria virginiana* (Rosaceae). Annals of Botany 104: 1413–1419. doi. org/10.1093/aob/mcp239.
- WRIGHT, B. R., D. E. ALBRECHT, J. L. SILCOCK, J. HUNTER, AND R. J. FENSHAM. 2019. Mechanisms behind persistence of a fire-sensitive alternative stable state system in the Gibson Desert, Western Australia. Oecologia 191: 165–175. doi.org/10.1007/s00442-019-04474-1.

2023]

Supplemental Table S1. Charcoal age results for samples with identifiable species/genera using ¹⁴C dating. Analyses were conducted by the National Institute of Applied Climate Science. (NIACS). CADN = *Castanea dentata* and ACRU = *Acer rubrum*.

$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Lab} \\ \mbox{Number} \\ \mbox{Site, Transect, Core, and Depth} \\ \mbox{Site, Transect, Sore, and Depth} \\ $						Calibrated		
					Uncalibrated	age range	Rel. area	Weighted mean
Number Site, Transect, Core, and Deph D (%) (°C yr BP) $\pm 2\sigma$ prob. curve (cal yr BP) 256130 Pyro 1, Lower Transect, 50 m, 20-28 cm deep ACRU -142.0 1160 ± 20 $1178 - 1161$ 0.124 1071 256137 Pyro 1, Lower Transect, 25 m, 20-28 cm deep ACRU -143.8 1180 ± 20 $1178 - 1056$ 0.954 2814 256126 Pyro 1, Upper Transect, 50 m, $-0 - 10$ cm deep Acers p. -293.6 2725 ± 20 $2861 - 2766$ 0.954 671 26127 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 0 m, $20 - 24$ cm deep Acers p. -33.2 200 ± 20 $295 - 265$ 0.254 211 20-24 cm deep $217 - 145$ 0.954 0.71 $116-32$ 0.954 0.71 20-24 cm deep $217 - 145$ 0.254 211 106 ± 20 $2861 - 2766$ 0.254 211 20-24 cm deep $217 - 148$ 0.954 0.71 $112-72$ 0.072 256128 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN -14.8 50 ± 20	Lab		Sample	$\Delta^{14}C$	¹⁴ C age	(cal yr BP)	under	calibration age
$ 256130 \mbox{Pyro 1, Lower Transect, 50 m, } CADN = -142.0 1160 \pm 20 1178-1161 = 0.124 \\ 0-10 \ \mbox{Order} 0 = 0.104 \\ 1127-11049 = 0.509 \\ 11024-1006 = 0.321 \\ 1024-1006 = 0.321 \\ 1024-1006 = 0.321 \\ 1024-1006 = 0.332 \\ 20-28 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-24 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-266 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-266 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-266 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-20 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-20 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-20 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-10 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-10 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-10 \ \mbox{cndep} = 0 \\ 20-21 \ cnde$	Number	Site, Transect, Core, and Depth	ID	(‰)	(¹⁴ C yr BP)	$\pm 2\sigma$	prob. curve	(cal yr BP)
	256130	Pyro 1, Lower Transect, 50 m,	CADN	-142.0	1160 ± 20	1178-1161	0.124	1071
		0–10 cm deep				1127-1049	0.509	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		· · · · · · · · · · · · ·				1034-976	0.321	
$ \begin{array}{c} 20-28 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 20-21 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm cm} \\ 20-24 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 20-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \ 20-258 \ {\rm cm} \$	256113	Pyro 1, Lower Transect, 50 m.	ACRU	-143.8	1180 + 20	1178-1056	0.917	1113
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	200110	20–28 cm deen	mente	1.0.0	1100 = 20	1021-1006	0.038	1110
$ \begin{array}{c} 20-28 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 20-24 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 256125 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 0 m}, \\ 20-24 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 20-24 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 217-145 \ 0.592 \\ 218-24 \ 0.171 \ 196 \\ 226-24 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 215-146 \ 0.611 \\ 256128 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 25 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 215-146 \ 0.611 \\ 256128 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 25 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 215-146 \ 0.611 \\ 256112 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 25 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 215-146 \ 0.611 \\ 256112 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 25 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 256118 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 50 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 256118 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 50 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 256118 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 50 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 216-140 \ {\rm ordeep} \\ 216-140 \ {\rm ordeep} \\ 216-19 \ {\rm Pyro} 2, {\rm Lower Transect, 50 m}, \\ O-10 \ {\rm cm} \ {\rm deep} \\ 214-195 \ 0.077 \ 20-266 \ 0.372 \ 219 \ 0.686 \ 2077 \ 219 \ 0.686 \ 2077 \ 219 \ 0.677 \ 190-147 \ 0.468 \ 213-410 \ 219 \ 0.777 \ 190-147 \ 0.468 \ 213-410 \ 210 \ 214-195 \ 0.677 \ 129 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-224 \ 0.288 \ 0.314 \ 238 \ 20-27 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 100 \ 20 \ 258-223 \ 0.257 \ 127 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 110-20 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 \ 0.100 $	256126	Pyro 1 Upper Transect 25 m	Acer sn	-293.6	2725 + 20	2861-2766	0.954	2814
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	200120	20–28 cm deen	i ieer opi	2,010	2,20 = 20	2001 2,00	01901	2011
$ \begin{array}{c} 256122 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 0 m, ACRU \\ 266128 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 0 m, ACRU \\ 20-24 \text{ cm deep} \\ 256123 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ 20-24 \text{ cm deep} \\ 215-146 0.171 \\ 226-166 0.401 \\ 126-137 0.099 \\ 112-72 0.072 \\ 256127 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 215-146 0.611 \\ 20-20 \text{ cm deep} \\ 213-115 0.264 \\ -11 \text{ to } -3 0.015 \\ -4 \text{ to } -5 0.07 \\ -14 \text{ to } -5 0.07 \\ 256112 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 20-20 \text{ cm deep} \\ 20-20 \text{ cm deep} \\ 214-30 0.704 \\ 256118 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -21.0 100 \pm 20 258-223 0.257 127 \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 214-195 0.077 \\ 100-147 0.468 \\ 256118 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -21.0 100 \pm 20 258-223 0.257 127 \\ 10-20 \text{ cm deep} \\ 214-195 0.077 \\ 100-147 0.468 \\ 256114 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -17.5 75 \pm 20 255-225 0.287 131 \\ 10-20 \text{ cm deep} \\ 214-195 0.077 \\ 100-147 0.468 \\ 256121 \text{Pyro } 2, \text{Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -10.6 65 \pm 15 253-226 0.298 134 \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 67-40 0.369 $	256125	Pyro 1 Unper Transact 50 m	ACRU	_95.3	735 + 20	689_653	0.954	671
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	250125	0-10 cm deen	neno	15.5	755 = 20	007-055	0.754	071
$ \begin{array}{c} 2012 1910 \\ 20-24 \ cm \ deep \\ 20-25 \ cm \ deep \ $	256122	Pyro 2 Lower Transect 0 m	ACRU	_33.2	200 + 20	295_265	0.254	211
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	230122	20. 24 cm deen	nereo	55.2	200 = 20	217 145	0.502	211
$ \begin{array}{c} 226123 \text{Pyr0 2, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN} \\ 20-24 \text{ cm deep} \\ 226-166 \\ 156-137 \\ 0.099 \\ 112-72 \\ 0.072 \\ 112-72 \\ 0.072 \\ 20-26 \\ 0.10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0.055 \pm 12 0.258 - 223 0.257 127 \\ 140-31 0.697 \\ 138-115 0.288 \\ 67-40 0.369 \\ 0-28 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0.055 \pm 20 0.289 0.314 \\ 0-152 \\ 0.025 \\ 0-10 \text{ cm deep} \\ 0.036 \\ $	256122	Pure 2 Lower Transact 0 m	CADN	286	165 + 20	217-145	0.392	106
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	230123	20 24 cm doop	CADN	-28.0	103 ± 20	204-204	0.171	190
$ \begin{array}{c} 100 - 172 \\ 112 - 72 \\ 0.072 \\ 256127 \\ Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m, ACRU \\ 0-10 cm deep \\ 256128 \\ Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN \\ 0-10 cm deep \\ 138 - 115 \\ 0.264 \\ 71 - 39 \\ -1 \ to -3 \\ 0.015 \\ -4 \ to -5 \\ 0.07 \\ 138 - 115 \\ 0.264 \\ 71 - 39 \\ -1 \ to -3 \\ 0.015 \\ -4 \ to -5 \\ 0.07 \\ 138 - 115 \\ 0.264 \\ 71 - 39 \\ -1 \ to -3 \\ 0.015 \\ -4 \ to -5 \\ 0.07 \\ 256112 \\ Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -21.3 \\ 105 \pm 20 \\ 256 - 222 \\ 0.251 \\ 126 \\ 141 - 30 \\ 0.704 \\ 256118 \\ Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -21.0 \\ 100 \pm 20 \\ 258 - 223 \\ 0.257 \\ 127 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 214 - 195 \\ 0.76 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 214 - 195 \\ 0.77 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 214 - 195 \\ 0.77 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 214 - 195 \\ 0.77 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 214 - 195 \\ 0.77 \\ 190 - 147 \\ 0.468 \\ 256114 \\ Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -17.5 \\ 75 \pm 20 \\ 255 - 225 \\ 0.287 \\ 131 \\ 10 - 20 \ cm deep \\ 139 - 88 \\ 0.314 \\ 33 - 33 \\ 0.354 \\ 256121 \\ Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -10.5 \\ 75 \pm 20 \\ 258 - 223 \\ 0.257 \\ 127 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 139 - 88 \\ 0.314 \\ 33 - 33 \\ 0.354 \\ 256121 \\ Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -10.5 \\ 525 - 225 \\ 0.287 \\ 131 \\ 10 - 20 \ cm deep \\ 139 - 88 \\ 0.314 \\ 33 - 33 \\ 0.354 \\ 256121 \\ Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU \\ -10.6 \\ 65 \pm 15 \\ 253 - 226 \\ 0.298 \\ 134 \\ 0 - 10 \ cm deep \\ 67 - 40 \\ 0.369 \\ 758 \\ 20 - 27 \ cm deep \\ 256129 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN \\ -109.5 \\ 865 \pm 20 \\ 793 - 724 \\ 0.954 \\ 758 \\ 20 - 27 \ cm deep \\ 256129 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ -77.0 \\ 575 \pm 20 \\ 230 - 20 \\ 0.152 \\ 232 - 170 \\ 0.355 \\ 0.318 \\ 256116 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ -77.0 \\ 575 \pm 20 \\ 230 - 170 \\ 0.355 \\ 0.318 \\ 256116 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ -77.0 \\ 575 \pm 20 \\ 235 - 220 \\ 0.152 \\ 10 - 20 \ cm deep \\ 208 - 190 \\ 0.16 \\ 119 - 50 \\ 0.354 \\ 232 - 170 \\ 0.355 \\ 0.318 \\ 256116 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ -77.0 \\ 575 \pm 20 \\ 235 - 220 \\ 0.318 \\ 256120 \\ Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN \\ -77.0 \\ 575 \pm 20 \\ 235 - 220 \\ 0.318 \\ 503 \\ 503 \\ 503 \\ 503 \\ 5$		20–24 cm deep				156 127	0.401	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						112 72	0.033	
	256127	Drugs 2. Lauren Transsat 25 m	ACDI	22.1	105 ± 15	200.266	0.072	200
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	230127	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m,	ACRU	-32.1	195 ± 15	290-266	0.236	208
256128Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN -14.8 50 ± 20 $253-227$ 0.265 121 $0-10$ cm deep $138-115$ 0.264 $71-39$ 0.34 -1 to -3 0.015 -4 to -5 0.07 256112Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -19.5 90 ± 20 $256-224$ 0.268 129 $0-10$ cm deep $141-30$ 0.704 256118Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -19.5 90 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep $139-33$ 0.686 256114Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN -34.8 215 ± 20 $305-266$ 0.372 219 $0-10$ cm deep 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.077 $0-10$ cm deep 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.077 0.077 256114 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -17.5 75 ± 20 $228-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 $83-33$ 0.354 $83-33$ 0.354 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m, ACRU -20.6 100 ± 20 $228-224$ 0.267 127 $0-10$ cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 $83-33$ 0.354 $20-27$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 127 126 $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 127 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, CADN -10.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 </td <td>25(120</td> <td>0-10 cm deep</td> <td>CADM</td> <td>14.0</td> <td>50 ± 20</td> <td>215-146</td> <td>0.611</td> <td>101</td>	25(120	0-10 cm deep	CADM	14.0	50 ± 20	215-146	0.611	101
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	230128	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m,	CADN	-14.8	50 ± 20	253-227	0.265	121
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0–10 cm deep				138-115	0.264	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						/1-39	0.34	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						-1 to -3	0.015	
256112 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.3 105 ± 20 $2259-222$ 0.251 126 10-20 cm deep $141-30$ 0.704 256117 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -19.5 90 ± 20 $256-224$ 0.268 129 $0-10$ cm deep $139-33$ 0.686 129 $140-31$ 0.697 256118 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN -34.8 215 ± 20 $305-266$ 0.372 219 $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 $190-147$ 0.468 256114 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -17.5 75 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 $83-33$ 0.354 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m, ACRU -20.6 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 126 $138-115$ 0.288 134 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, CADN -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ <			G . D .		105 . 00	-4 to -5	0.07	10.6
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256112	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 25 m,	CADN	-21.3	105 ± 20	259-222	0.251	126
256117 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -19.5 90 \pm 20 256–224 0.268 129 0–10 cm deep 139–33 0.686 256118 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -21.0 100 \pm 20 258–223 0.257 127 0–10 cm deep 214–055 0.077 0–10 cm deep 214–195 0.077 190–147 0.468 256114 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -17.5 75 \pm 20 255–225 0.287 131 10–20 cm deep 214–195 0.077 100–147 0.468 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU -20.6 100 \pm 20 258–223 0.257 127 0–10 cm deep 214–195 0.077 100–147 0.468 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU -20.6 100 \pm 20 258–223 0.257 127 0–10 cm deep 140–31 0.697 256124 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU -16.8 65 \pm 15 253–226 0.298 134 0–10 cm deep 67–40 0.369 256131 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, CADN -109.5 865 \pm 20 793–724 0.954 758 256129 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -26.3 145 \pm 20 280–240 0.152 165 0–10 cm deep 153–129 0.101 119–56 0.269 256115 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -77.0 575 \pm 20 634–589 0.636 591 10–20 cm deep 20.101 119–56 0.269 256116 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -36.7 230 \pm 20 310–274 0.534 238 10–20 cm deep 20.251 126 256129 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -21.4 105 \pm 20 259–222 0.251 126 0–10 cm deep 20.251 126		10–20 cm deep				141–30	0.704	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256117	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m,	ACRU	-19.5	90 ± 20	256-224	0.268	129
256118 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN -21.0 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 219 256119 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN -34.8 215 ± 20 $305-266$ 0.372 219 $214-195$ 0.077 $190-147$ 0.468 $214-195$ 0.077 $190-147$ 0.468 256114 Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -17.5 75 ± 20 $255-225$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 $83-33$ 0.354 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, ACRU -20.6 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, CADN -16.8 65 ± 15 $253-226$ 0.298 134 256129 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 256115 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m,		0–10 cm deep				139–33	0.686	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256118	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m,	ACRU	-21.0	100 ± 20	258-223	0.257	127
256119Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, CADN -34.8 215 ± 20 $305-266$ 0.372 219 $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep $190-147$ 0.468 256114Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, ACRU -17.5 75 ± 20 $255-225$ 0.287 131 $10-20$ cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 $83-33$ 0.354 256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m, ACRU -20.6 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 $138-115$ 0.288 $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep $0-10$ cm deep 0.369 758 758 256124 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, CADN -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 $20-27$ cm deep 256126 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 256115 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -77.0 575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 $10-20$ cm deep $563-535$ 0.318 238 $10-20$ cm deep $280-190$ 0.016 $10-20$ cm deep $208-199$ 0.016 $185-150$ 0.404 $228-199$ 0.016 $10-20$ cm deep 256120 Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126 $10-20$ cm deep $141-30$ 0.704 126 $141-30$ 0.704 126		0-10 cm deep	~			140–31	0.697	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256119	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m,	CADN	-34.8	215 ± 20	305-266	0.372	219
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0-10 cm deep				214-195	0.077	
256114Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m, 10-20 cm deepACRU -17.5 75 ± 20 $255-225$ 0.287 131 10-20 cm deep $139-88$ 0.314 256121Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m, 0-10 cm deepACRU -20.6 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 256124Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, 0-10 cm deepACRU -16.8 65 ± 15 $253-226$ 0.298 134 256131Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, 20-27 cm deepCADN -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 256129Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 0-10 cm deepCADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 256115Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10-20 cm deepCADN -77.0 575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 256116Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10-20 cm deepCADN -36.7 230 ± 20 $310-274$ 0.534 238 256116Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, $10-20$ cm deepCADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126 256120Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, $0-10$ cm deepCADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126						190–147	0.468	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256114	Pyro 2, Lower Transect, 50 m,	ACRU	-17.5	75 ± 20	255-225	0.287	131
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10–20 cm deep				139–88	0.314	
256121 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m, $ACRU$ -20.6 100 ± 20 $258-223$ 0.257 127 $0-10 \text{ cm deep}$ $140-31$ 0.697 $140-31$ 0.697 256124 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, $ACRU$ -16.8 65 ± 15 $253-226$ 0.298 134 $0-10 \text{ cm deep}$ $138-115$ 0.288 $67-40$ 0.369 256131 Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, $CADN$ -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 256129 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, $CADN$ -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 $0-10 \text{ cm deep}$ $0-10 \text{ cm deep}$ 0.101 $119-56$ 0.269 $153-129$ 0.101 $119-56$ 0.269 0.575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 $10-20 \text{ cm deep}$ $563-535$ 0.318 238 $10-20 \text{ cm deep}$ $208-199$ 0.016 $10-20 \text{ cm deep}$ $208-199$ 0.016 $185-150$ 0.404 2256120 Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251						83-33	0.354	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256121	Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 0 m,	ACRU	-20.6	100 ± 20	258-223	0.257	127
256124Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, 0-10 cm deepACRU -16.8 65 ± 15 $253-226$ 0.298 134 $0-10$ cm deep $138-115$ 0.288 $67-40$ 0.369 256131Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, 20-27 cm deepCADN -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 256129Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 0-10 cm deepCADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 256115Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10-20 cm deepCADN -77.0 575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 256116Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10-20 cm deepCADN -36.7 230 ± 20 $310-274$ 0.534 238 256116Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 25 m, 0-10 cm deepCADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126		0-10 cm deep				140–31	0.697	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256124	Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m,	ACRU	-16.8	65 ± 15	253-226	0.298	134
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0–10 cm deep				138–115	0.288	
256131Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m, 20–27 cm deepCADN -109.5 865 ± 20 $793-724$ 0.954 758 256129Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 0–10 cm deepCADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 256115Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10–20 cm deepCADN -77.0 575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 256116Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10–20 cm deepCADN -77.0 575 ± 20 $634-589$ 0.636 591 256116Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, 10–20 cm deepCADN -36.7 230 ± 20 $310-274$ 0.534 238 256120Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, 0–10 cm deepCADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126						67–40	0.369	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256131	Pyro 2, Upper Transect, 50 m,	CADN	-109.5	865 ± 20	793–724	0.954	758
256129 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -26.3 145 ± 20 $280-240$ 0.152 165 0-10 cm deep $232-170$ $0.235153-129$ $0.101119-56$ $0.269256115 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -77.0 575 \pm 20 634-589 0.636 59110-20 cm deep$ $563-535$ $0.318256116 Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m, CADN -36.7 230 \pm 20 310-274 0.534 23810-20 cm deep$ $208-199$ $0.016185-150$ $0.404256120 Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.4 105 \pm 20 259-222 0.251 126$		20–27 cm deep						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256129	Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m,	CADN	-26.3	145 ± 20	280-240	0.152	165
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0–10 cm deep				232 - 170	0.235	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						153-129	0.101	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						119–56	0.269	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256115	Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m,	CADN	-77.0	575 ± 20	634–589	0.636	591
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10-20 cm deep				563-535	0.318	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	256116	Pyro 3, Lower Transect, 0 m,	CADN	-36.7	$230~\pm~20$	310-274	0.534	238
256120 Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126 $0-10$ cm deep $141-30$ 0.704		10-20 cm deep				208-199	0.016	
256120 Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m, CADN -21.4 105 ± 20 $259-222$ 0.251 126 $0-10$ cm deep $141-30$ 0.704						185-150	0.404	
0-10 cm deep 141–30 0.704	256120	Pyro 3, Upper Transect, 25 m,	CADN	-21.4	105 ± 20	259-222	0.251	126
		0–10 cm deep				141-30	0.704	

433

Supplemental Table S2. Species found in the extant understory vegetation (EV) and/or the seed bank (SB) by pyrophilic zone (L = Low, M = Medium, H = High. P = present only in the offplot walk through. Numbers represent the frequency of occurrence on both transects (1 = occurring in every plot). * = exotic. Determination of fire-adapted/fire-related (marked with an X) is based on having at least one published source indicating an increase in abundance or stable abundance that is not just transitory post-burn (only a temporary increase via germination immediately after the burn).

Species Common Name EV Size EV Size First-Related Tree/shrub/woody vine Acer panyshvanicum L. Striped maple 0 0 0 0.2 0 Acer succhronm Marsh. Sugar maple 1 0.6 1 0 0.8 0.2 Acer succhronm Marsh. Sugar maple 0 0 0 0.8 0.2 Acer succhronm Marsh. Devil's walking stick 0 0 0 0.8 0.2 Aristolochia macrophylla Lam. Datchmars pipe 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.4 0.8 Buddliga davidii Franch.* Butterfly bush 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.2 0 X Carya tomentous (Lam. ex Poir.) Mockernut hickory 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Gaviasscia baccata (Wangenh), K. Black huckelberry 0 0 0			Lo	ow	Medium		High		Fire-Adapted/
Tree/shrub/woody vine Striped maple 0	Species	Common Name	EV	SB	EV	SB	EV	SB	Fire-Related
Area manufacture Striped maple 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Acer probum L. Red maple 1 0.6 1 0 <	Tree/shruh/woody vine								
Acer rubrum L. Red maple 1 0.6 1 0.6 1 0.8 0.2 Acer saccharum Marsh. Sugar maple 0.2 0 <td>Acer pennsylvanicum L</td> <td>Striped maple</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	Acer pennsylvanicum L	Striped maple	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Acer saccharim Marsh. Sugar maple 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 Amelanchier arbora (F. Michx.) Common serviceberry 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 Aratia spinosa L. Devil's walking stick 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 Aratia spinosa L. Devil's walking stick 0 0 0 0 0.2 0.2 Aratia spinosa L. Bitch 0.8 1 0 0.6 0.6 0.2 0.2 Buddlej advidi Franch.* Butterfly bush 0.6 0 0.0 0.2 0.2 X Carya glava (Mill.) Sweet Pignut hickory 0 0 0.0 0.2 0 Frasinus americana L. White sh P 0 0.2 0 0.2 0 Gaylussacia baccata (Wangenh) K. Black huckelberry 0 0 0.2 0 0.2 0 0 Gray sacia fustifiat L. Mountain laurel 0 0 0 0 0 0	Acer ruhrum L	Red maple	1	0.6	1	0	0.8	0.2	
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Transform} \mbox{Transform}$	Acer saccharum Marsh	Sugar maple	0.2	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.2	
Fermald Devil's walking stick 0 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 Aralia sprinosa L. Dutchman's pipe 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 Betula L. sp. Birch 0.8 1 0 0.8 0 0.4 Carya gardiniana Walter Muscle wood 0 0 0 0 0.4 Carya gabra (Mill.) Sweet Pignut hickory 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Carya gabra (Mill.) Sweet Pignut hickory 0	Amelanchier arborea (F. Michx)	Common serviceberry	0.2	0	0.8	0	0.8	0	
Aralia spinosa L. Devil's walking stick 0 0 0 0 0 2 Aristolochia macrophylla Lam. Dutchman's pipe 0	Fernald	Common serviceberry	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	
Aristolochia macrophylla Lam. Dutchman's pipe 0	Aralia spinosa L	Devil's walking stick	0	0	0	0.8	0	0.2	
Betula L. sp. Birch 0.8 1 0 0.8 Buddleja davidii Franch. * Butterfly bush 0 0 0 0 0.4 Carpinus caroliniana Walter Muscle wood 0 0 0 0 0 0.2 0 X Carya tomenosa (Lam. ex Poir.) Mockernut hickory 0	Aristolochia macrophylla Lam	Dutchman's nine	Ő	Ő	õ	0	р	0	
	Retula I sn	Birch	0.8	1	Õ	1	0	0.8	
Carping caroliniana Water Musele wood 0	Buddleia davidii Franch *	Butterfly bush	0.0	0	0	0	0	0.0	
Carya glabra (Mill.) SweetPignut hickory00	Carpinus caroliniana Walter	Muscle wood	Ő	Ő	õ	0	р	0	
Carya tomentosa (Lam. ex Poir.) Nutt.Mockernut hickory Mockernut hickory00000P0Nutt.Cornus florida L. Flowering dogwood00000P0Fagus grandifolia Ehrh. Americana L.Hite ash TeaberryP000000XGaultheria procumbers L. Gaultheria procumbers L. TeaberryTeaberry000000XGaultheria procumbers L. GrayTeaberry000000XKochBlack huckelberry0000000XMamanelis virginiana L. GrayWitchhazel000000XKochMountain holly Uriodendron tulipifera L. Parthenocissus quinquefolia (L.) Virginia Creeper0000000Prathenocissus quinquefolia (L.) Prunus seroina Ehrh. Dems stroba L. Muerus montana Wild, Chestnut cak0000000Prunus seroina Ehrh. Muerus montana Wild, Chestnut cak0000000000Prunus seroina Ehrh. Muerus montana Wild, Chestnut cak0000000000000000000000000000000<	Carva glabra (Mill.) Sweet	Pignut hickory	Ő	Ő	õ	0	0.2	õ	х
Nutl.Intervention functionIntervention functionInterventionIn	Carva tomentosa (Lam ex Poir)	Mockernut hickory	Ő	0	Õ	0	P	0	11
Low Cornus Fagus grandifolia Ehrh.Flowering dogwood0000P0Fagus grandifolia Ehrh.American beech0.2000020Gaultheria gravinus americana L.Teaberry000000XGaultheria gravinus americana KochBlack huckelberry000000XHamamelis viginiana GrayWhite ash000000XHamamelis viginiana GrayMountain laurel00000000Ilex montana Torr. & A. Gray ex A.Mountain laurel000000000Gray GrayCuriodendron tulipifera L.Mountain laurel00	Nutt	Wieckernut mekory	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Formula for the problemNorther for the problem 0.2 0 0 1.2 Fraxinus americana L.White ashP 0 0 0.2 0 0 X Gaultheria procumbers L.Teaberry 0 0 0 0.2 0 0 X Gaylussacia baccata (Wangenh.) K.Black huckelberry 0 0 0 0 0 X KochHamamellis virginiana L.Witchhazel 0 0 0 0 0 X GrayKochHamamellis virginiana L.Mountain holly 0 0 0 0 0 0 GrayCaraTuip poplar 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Magnolia fraseri WalterUmbrella treeP 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Picca rubens Sarg.Red spruce 0.4 0 0 0 0 0 0 Prunus serotina Ehrh.Black cherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 0 Puruus serotina Ehrh.Black cherry 0.8 0 0 0.2 0 X Quercus notana Willd.Chestnut toak 0 0 0.2 0 X Quercus rubra L.Northern red oak 0 0 0 0 Z X Quercus rubra L.Pasture rose 0 0 0 0 Z X Roboladono cale allulaceumFlame azalea 0 <	Cornus florida L	Flowering dogwood	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Process Practines americana L.White ash the sh the sh practines baccata (Wangenh), K. Black huckelberryP0000.20NGaultssecia (Gaylussacia) baccata (Wangenh), K. KochBlack huckelberry00000.200XKochWitchhazel0000000000XKochMountain holly000000000000Itex montana Torr. & A. Gray ex A. GrayMountain holly000	Fagus grandifolia Ehrh	American beech	0.2	Õ	Õ	Ő	P	Õ	
Additheria procumbers L. Teaberry 0 0 1 0 0 0 X Gaylissacia paccata (Wangenh.) K. Black huckelberry 0 0 0 0 0 X Koch Black huckelberry 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Koch Black huckelberry 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Gray Gray Kak Mountain holly 0 0 0 0 0 X Kalmia latifolia L. Mountain laurel 0	Fraxinus americana L	White ash	р	Õ	Õ	Ő	0.2	Õ	
Gardiussacia baccata (Wangenh.) K. Black huckelberry 0 0 0.0 0 0.0 0 0.0 0 0.0 0<	Gaultheria procumbens L	Teaberry	0	Ő	1	0	0.2	õ	х
Solvation blocked (Marginin) I.Just inderivative black inderivative (Nagenin) I.Just inderivative (Nagenin)	Gavlussacia baccata (Wangenh) K	Black huckelberry	Ő	Ő	0.2	0	Ő	õ	X
Hamamelis virginiana L.Witchhazel00000.20Ilex montana Torr. & A. Gray ex A. GrayMountain holly00P000Kalmia latifolia L.Mountain laurel000.810.40.6XLiriodendron tulipifera L.Tulip poplar00000000Magnolia fraseri WalterUmbrella treeP00000000Planch.Plicea rubens Sarg.Red spruce0.400000000Planch.Prunus sensylvanica L. f.Pin cherry00.800 </td <td>Koch</td> <td>Drack macketoenty</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>11</td>	Koch	Drack macketoenty	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	11
Ilex montana Torr. & A. Gray ex A. Mountain holly 0 0 0 0 0 0 Gray Kalmia latifolia L. Mountain laurel 0 0 0.8 1 0.4 0.6 X Magnolia fraseri Walter Umbrella tree P 0<	Hamamelis virginiana L	Witchhazel	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Anomana Tone of the first o	Ilex montana Torr & A Grav ex A	Mountain holly	Ő	Õ	р	Ő	0	Õ	
Kalmia latifolia L.Mountain laurel000.810.40.6XLiriodendron tulipifera L.Tulip poplar000100.81Magnolia fraseri WalterUmbrella treeP0000000Nysas sylvatica MarshallBlack gum000.2000 <td< td=""><td>Grav</td><td>hiounum nong</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td></td<>	Grav	hiounum nong	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Liriodendron tulipifera L. Tulip poplar 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Magnolia fraseri Walter Umbrella tree P 0 0 0 0 0 0 Magnolia fraseri Walter Umbrella tree P 0 0 0 0 0 0 Parthenocissus quinquefolia (L.) Virginia Creeper 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Planch. Picea rubens Sarg. Red spruce 0.4 0 </td <td>Kalmia latifolia L</td> <td>Mountain laurel</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>х</td>	Kalmia latifolia L	Mountain laurel	0	0	0.8	1	0.4	0.6	х
DiscretionFor productFor productFor productFor productMagnolia fraseriWalterUmbrella treeP00000Parthenocissus quinquefolia (L.)Virginia Creeper0000000Planch.Pinus strobus L.White pine00000000Prunus pensylvanica L. f.Pin cherry00.60000000Quercus alba L.White oak00	Liriodendron tulinifera L	Tulin poplar	Ő	Õ	0	1	0	0.8	
Myson sylvatica MarshallBlack gum000.200Parthenocissus quinquefolia (L.)Virginia Creeper0000.20Planch.Picea rubens Sarg.Red spruce0.400000Prunus strobus L.White pine00.600000Prunus pensylvanica L. f.Pin cherry0.8000000Quercus amontana Brhh.Black cherry0.800000XQuercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak000.400.60XQuercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak00000XQuercus velutina Lam.Black oak00000XRobinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust00.20XRubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.600Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sasafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSasafrasP000000Sasafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSasafrasP0000000	Magnolia fraseri Walter	Umbrella tree	P	Ő	Õ	0	0	0	
DistributionDiright Diright Parthenocissus quinquefolia (L.)Virginia Creeper00 <t< td=""><td>Nyssa sylvatica Marshall</td><td>Black gum</td><td>0</td><td>Õ</td><td>0.2</td><td>Ő</td><td>Õ</td><td>Õ</td><td></td></t<>	Nyssa sylvatica Marshall	Black gum	0	Õ	0.2	Ő	Õ	Õ	
Planch.Planch.Planch.Planch.Picea rubens Sarg.Red spruce 0.4 0 0 0 Pinus strobus L.White pine 0 0.6 0 0 Prunus pensylvanica L. f.Pin cherry 0 0.6 0 0 Purunus serotina Ehrh.Black cherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 Quercus alba L.White oak 0 0 0.2 0 X Quercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak 0 0 0.2 0 X Quercus velutina Lam.Black oak 0 0 0 0.2 0 X Rhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Rubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry 0 1 0	Parthenocissus auinauefolia (L.)	Virginia Creeper	Ő	Ő	0	Ő	0.2	Õ	
Picea rubensSarg.Red spruce 0.4 0 0 0 0 PinusstrobusL.White pine 0 0 0 0 0 0 PrunussensylvanicaL. f.Pin cherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 0 PurunusserotinaElackCherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 0 QuercusalbaL.White oak 0 0 0 0.2 0 X QuercusmontanaWild.Chestnut oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X QuercusmontanaWild.Chestnut oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X Quercus veluinaLam.Black oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X Quercus veluina Lam.Black oak 0 0 0 0.6 0 X Robinia pseudoacaciaL.Black locust 0 0.2 0 0.8 X Robinia pseudoacaciaL.Pasture rose 0 0 0 0 0.2 2 RubusallegheniensisPorterCommon blackberry 0 1 0 0.8 0 0.2 RubusL.sp.Black berryP 1 0 0.6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 RubusL.sp.BlackberryP 0 0 <	Planch.		-	-	-	-		-	
Pinus strobus L. White pine 0 0 0 0 P 0 Prunus pensylvanica L. f. Pin cherry 0 0.6 0 0 0 0 Prunus serotina Ehrh. Black cherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 0 0 Quercus alba L. White oak 0 0 0.8 0 0.6 0 0 0 X Quercus montana Willd. Chestnut oak 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 0 X Quercus rubra L. Northern red oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X Quercus velutina Lam. Black oak 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Quercus velutina Lam. Black locust 0 0.2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Robinia pseudoacaia L. Black locust 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Picea rubens Sarg.	Red spruce	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	
Prunus pensylvanica L. f.Pin cherry00.6000Prunus serotina Ehrh.Black cherry0.800000Quercus alba L.White oak0000.20XQuercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak000.400.60XQuercus rubra L.Northern red oak000.400.60XQuercus velutina Lam.Black oak0000002XRhododendron calendulaceum (Michx.) Torr.Flame azalea0000002XRobinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust0000002XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000002XRubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberryP100.8002XSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P00000Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier000000000Singa canadensis (L.)Common greenbrier00000000Singa canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock00000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0	Pinus strobus L.	White pine	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Prunus serotina Ehrh.Black cherry 0.8 0 0 0 0 0 Quercus alba L.White oak 0 0 0 0.2 0 X Quercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak 0 0 0.8 0 0.2 0 X Quercus montana Willd.Northern red oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X Quercus velutina Lam.Black oak 0 0 0.4 0 0.6 0 X Rhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust 0 0.2 0 8 P 0.8 X Rosa carolina L.Pasture rose 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Rubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry 0 1 0 0.6 0 0 Sasafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP 0 P 0.6 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 X Vaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry 0 0 <t< td=""><td>Prunus pensylvanica L. f.</td><td>Pin cherry</td><td>0</td><td>0.6</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td></t<>	Prunus pensylvanica L. f.	Pin cherry	0	0.6	0	0	0	0	
Quercus alba L.White oak00000.20XQuercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak000.800.20XQuercus rubra L.Northern red oak0000.400.60XQuercus velutina Lam.Black oak000000.20XRhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea0000000ZXRobinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust00.200.8P0.8XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose0000002XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000.6002XRubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600	Prunus serotina Ehrh.	Black cherry	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	
\widetilde{Q} uercus montana Willd.Chestnut oak000.800.20X $Quercus rubra L.$ Northern red oak000.400.60X $Quercus velutina Lam.$ Black oak00000.20X $Rhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea00000020XRhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea00000P0X(Michx.) Torr.RBlack locust0000P0XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose000000.2RXRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry000000RXRubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry01000000R BolliSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P000$	Ouercus alba L.	White oak	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	Х
Quercus rubra L.Northern red oak000.400.60XQuercus velutina Lam.Black oak00000.20XRhododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea0000P0(Michx.) Torr.000P0Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust0000P0XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose0000P0XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000.600.2XRubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.80002XRubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100002XSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0000XSmilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000000000Tiuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry00000XXVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry000000XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum00000 <td><i>Quercus montana</i> Willd.</td> <td>Chestnut oak</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0</td> <td>Х</td>	<i>Quercus montana</i> Willd.	Chestnut oak	0	0	0.8	0	0.2	0	Х
Quercus velutina Lam.Black oak00000.20XRhododendron calendulaceum (Michx.) Torr.Flame azalea0000P0Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust00.200.8P0.8XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose0000P0XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000.600.2Rubus L. sp.Black locust0000.600.2Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry0100001Sassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.20.20.20.2Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier00000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000000Ilia americana L.American basswoodP000.600000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock000000XXVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry00000XXViburnum acerifolium L.Deerberry0000 </td <td><i>Quercus rubra</i> L.</td> <td>Northern red oak</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0</td> <td>Х</td>	<i>Quercus rubra</i> L.	Northern red oak	0	0	0.4	0	0.6	0	Х
\widetilde{R} hododendron calendulaceumFlame azalea0000P0(Michx.) Torr. $Robinia pseudoacacia L.$ Black locust00.200.8P0.8X $Rosa carolina L.$ Pasture rose0000P0X $Rubus allegheniensis$ PorterCommon blackberry0000.600.2 $Rubus L.$ sp.BlackberryP100.800.2 $Rubus pensylvanicus$ Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600 $Rablis pensylvanicus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry010000R. BolliRSassafrasP0P0.60.20.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier00000000Singa canadensis (L.) CarrièreCommon greenbrier0000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock000000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000000XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000000XVitirs L. sp.Grape00.400.40$	<i>Quercus velutina</i> Lam.	Black oak	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	Х
(Michx.) Torr.Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust00.200.8P0.8XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose0000P0XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000.600.2Rubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.800.2Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry010000R. BolliSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier0000000Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier0000000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock00000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.8XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry00000.40XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum000.400.40	\tilde{R} hododendron calendulaceum	Flame azalea	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Robinia pseudoacacia L.Black locust00.200.8P0.8XRosa carolina L.Pasture rose00000P0XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry00000.600.20.2Rubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.800.20.2Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.6000Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry0100.6000R. BolliSassafrasP0P0.60.20.20.2Sassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier0000000Singa canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000000Suga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock000000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000000XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000000XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000000Vitis L. sp.Grape000000<	(Michx.) Torr.								
Rosa carolina L.Pasture rose0000P0XRubus allegheniensis PorterCommon blackberry0000.600.2Rubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.800.2Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry010000R. BolliSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSassafrasSaw brier000000Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier0000000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP000000Isuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock00000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry0000.60XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry00000XViburnum acerifolium L.Grape0000.400	Robinia pseudoacacia L.	Black locust	0	0.2	0	0.8	Р	0.8	Х
Rubus allegheniensis Rubus L. sp.Common blackberry Blackberry0000.600.2Rubus pensylvanicus Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Pennsylvania blackberry Common elderberryP100.800.2R. BolliSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0100000Samilax glauca WalterWalterSassafrasP0P0.60.20.20.2Smilax glauca ValterWalterSassafrasP0P0.60.20.20.2Silax rotundifolia L. Tilia americana L.Common greenbrier Eastern hemlock00000000Vaccinium pallidum Aiton Vaccinium stamineum L.Late low blueberry Deerberry000000000XViburnum acerifolium L. Vitis L. sp.Grape00000.400.400.40	Rosa carolina L.	Pasture rose	0	0	0	0	Р	0	Х
Rubus L. sp.BlackberryP100.800.2Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry0100.6000R. BolliSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.60.20.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier000000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier0000000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP000000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock000000XVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry00000.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Deerberry000000.400.4Vitis L. sp.Grape00.400.400.400.4	Rubus allegheniensis Porter	Common blackberry	0	0	0	0.6	0	0.2	
Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.Pennsylvania blackberry0100.600Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry010000R. BolliSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier00000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP00000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000PVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.8XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry00000ZXViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000.400.4	Rubus L. sp.	Blackberry	Р	1	0	0.8	0	0.2	
Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)Common elderberry010000R. BolliSassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier00000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP00000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000PVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.8XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000.40Vitis L. sp.Grape00.400.40	Rubus pensylvanicus Poir.	Pennsylvania blackberry	0	1	0	0.6	0	0	
R. BolliSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Sassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasSassafrasP0000.40Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier00000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000.80000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP0000000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000P000<	Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis (L.)	Common elderberry	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Sassafras albidum (Nutt.) NeesSassafrasP0P0.60.20.2Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier000000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000.80000Tilia americana L.American basswoodP000000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000P0Vaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.80XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000.4000Viburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum000.400.4	R. Bolli	-							
Smilax glauca WalterSaw brier00000.40Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000.800.60Tilia americana L.American basswoodP00000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000P0Vaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.80XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000.20.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000.400.4Vitis L. sp.Grape00.400.400.4	Sassafras albidum (Nutt.) Nees	Sassafras	Р	0	Р	0.6	0.2	0.2	
Smilax rotundifolia L.Common greenbrier000.800.60Tilia americana L.American basswoodP000000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000P000NVaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.80XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000.20.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000.400.4Vitis L. sp.Grape00.400.400.4	Smilax glauca Walter	Saw brier	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	
Tilia americana L.American basswoodP00000Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock00000P0Vaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry0000.600.80XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry00000.20.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum00000.400.4	Smilax rotundifolia L.	Common greenbrier	0	0	0.8	0	0.6	0	
Tsuga canadensis (L.) CarrièreEastern hemlock0000P0Vaccinium pallidum AitonLate low blueberry000.600.80XVaccinium stamineum L.Deerberry0000.20.20.2XViburnum acerifolium L.Maple-leaf viburnum0000.400.4Vitis L. sp.Grape00.400.400.4	Tilia americana L.	American basswood	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Vaccinium pallidum Aiton Late low blueberry 0 0 0.6 0 0.8 0 X Vaccinium stamineum L. Deerberry 0 0 0 0.2 0.2 0.2 X Viburnum acerifolium L. Maple-leaf viburnum 0 0 0 0.4 0 Vitis L. sp. Grape 0 0.4 0 0.4 0 0.4	Tsuga canadensis (L.) Carrière	Eastern hemlock	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Vaccinium stamineum L. Deerberry 0 0 0 0.2 0.2 0.2 X Viburnum acerifolium L. Maple-leaf viburnum 0 0 0 0 0.4 0 Vitis L. sp. Grape 0 0.4 0 0.4 0 0.4	Vaccinium pallidum Aiton	Late low blueberry	0	0	0.6	0	0.8	0	Х
Viburnum acerifolium L. Maple-leaf viburnum 0 0 0 0.4 0 Vitis L. sp. Grape 0 0.4 0 0.4 0 0.4	Vaccinium stamineum L.	Deerberry	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	Х
Vitis L. sp. Grape 0 0.4 0 0.4 0 0.4	Viburnum acerifolium L.	Maple-leaf viburnum	0	0	0	0	0.4	0	
	Vitis L. sp.	Grape	0	0.4	0	0.4	0	0.4	

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/The-Journal-of-the-Torrey-Botanical-Society on 18 Oct 2024 Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

Supplemental Table S2. Continued.

			Low		Medium		gh	Fire-Adapted/
Species	Common Name	EV	SB	EV	SB	EV	SB	Fire-Related
Forb								
Actaea racemosa L.	Black cohosh	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Ageratina altissima var. altissima (L.)	White snakeroot	0.2	0.4	0	0	Р	0.6	
King & H. Rob.								
Antennaria plantaginifolia (L.)	Plantainleaf pussytoes	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	Х
Richardson								
Arisaema triphyllum (L.) Schott	Jack in the pulpit	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	
Conopholis americana (L.) Wallr.	Cancer root	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Convallaria majalis var. montana (Raf.) H.E. Ahles	American lily-of-the valley	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	Х
Cypripedium acaule Aiton	Pink lady's slipper	0	0	Р	0	0	0	
Desmodium nudiflorum (L.) DC.	Naked-flowered tick trefoil	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Dioscorea villosa L.	Wild yam	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Dryopteris intermedia (Muhl. ex Willd.) A. Gray	Intermediate wood fern	1	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Erechtites hieraciifolius</i> (L.) Raf. ex DC.	Fire weed	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.4	
Erigeron annuus (L.) Pers.	Daisy fleabane	0	0.6	0	0.2	0	0.4	
Eurybia divaricata (L.) G.L. Nesom	White woodland aster	0.2	0	0	0	Р	0	
<i>Eutrochium purpureum</i> (L.) E.E. Lamont	Joe pye weed	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	
Fragaria virginiana Duchesne	Virginia strawberry	0	0	0	0.6	0	0	Х
Galium aparine L.	Cleavers	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Galium circaezans Michx.	Wild licorice	0	0.2	0	0	0.4	0	
Galium lanceolatum Torr.	Lanceleaf wild licorice	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Galium triflorum Michx.	Sweetscented bedstraw	0.2	0.2	0	0	Р	0	
Goodyera pubescens (Willd.) R. Br.	Downy rattlesnake plantain	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Helianthus L. sp.	Sunflower	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Hieracium L. sp. *	Hawkweed	0	0	0	0	0	1	Х
Hieracium paniculatum L.	Panicled hawkweed	0	0	0	0	Р	1	X
Hieracium venosum L.	Rattlesnake weed	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	X
Houstonia longifolia Gaerth.	Long-leaved summer bluets	0	0	0	0	P	0	Х
Hypericum L. sp.	St. John's wort	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.2	
Hypericum punciaium Lam.	Dotted St. John's wort	P D	02	0	0	0	0	
Impatiens L. sp. Laportag canadansis (L.) Wedd	Wood nettle	r D	0.2	0	0	0	0	
Laspadaza hirta (L.) Hornem	Hairy bushelover	0	0	0	0	0	02	v
Leucanthemum vulgare I am *	Ox-eve daisy	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	\mathbf{A}
Lobelia inflata L	Indian tobacco	Ő	0	0	0.2	0	0	
Lysimachia auadrifolia L	Four-flowered loosestrife	Ő	0.2	P	0.8	Ő	0	
Maianthemum canadense Desf.	Canada lilv	Р	0	0	0	Õ	Ő	
Maianthemum racemosum ssp. racemosum (L.) Link	False Solomon's seal	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Medeola virginiana L.	Cucumber root	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Melampyrum lineare var. latifolium W.P.C. Barton	Cow-wheat	0	0	0	0	0.6	0	Х
Mitchella repens L.	Partridge berry	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	
Monotropa uniflora L.	Indian pipe	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Phytolacca americana L.	Pokeweed	0	0.2	0	0.6	0	0.4	
Plantathera orbiculata (Pursh) Lindl.	Round-leaved orchid	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Polygonatum biflorum (Walter) Elliott	Solomon seal	Р	0	0	0	Р	0	
Polygonatum pubescens (Willd.) Pursh	Downy Solomon seal	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	
Potentilla simplex Michx. /canadensis L.	Old field/running cinquefoil	0	0	0	0.6	0.2	0.6	
Prenanthes L. sp.	White lettuce	0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Prosartes laguninosa (Michx.) D. Don	Yellow mandarin	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Ranunculus hispidus Michx.	Hispid buttercup	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	

Supplemental Table S2. Continued.

		Lo	ow	Mee	lium	Hi	igh	Fire-Adapted/
Species	Common Name	EV	SB	EV	SB	EV	SB	Fire-Related
Rumex acetosella L. *	Sheep sorrel	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	
Rumex crispus L. *	Curly dock	Р	0	0	0	0	0.2	
Solidago arguta Aiton	Cutleaf goldenrod	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Solidago caesia L.	Blue-stem goldenrod	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Solidago canadensis L.	Canada goldenrod	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	
Solidago curtisii Torr. & A. Gray	Curtis' goldenrod	0.2	0.2	0	0	0	0	
Solidago rugosa Mill.	Wrinkled-leaf goldenrod	0	0.4	0	0	0	0.4	
Symphyotrichum lateriflorum var. lateriflorum (L.) A. Love & D. Love	Calico aster	0	0.4	0	0	0	0.4	
Symphyotrichum undulatum (L.) G.L. Nesom	Wavy-leaf aster	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Veronica officinalis L.*	Common speedwell	0	0.2	0	0.2	0	0.4	
Viola blanda Willd.	Sweet white violet	0.4	1	0	0	0	0.2	
Viola hastata Michx.	Halberd-leaf yellow violet	0	0	0	0.2	0	0	
Viola palmata L.	Palmate-leaf violet	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Viola rotundifolia Michx.	Roundleaf violet	0.6	1	0	0.2	0	0	
Viola sororia Willd./palmata L.	Downy wood violet/palmate- leaf violet	0.4	0.6	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Grass/rush/sedge								
Agrostis perennans (Walter) Tuck.	Autumn bent grass	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.6	
Andropogon virginicus L.	Broomsedge	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.2	Х
Carex communis L.H. Bailey	Colonial sedge	0	0.4	0	0.4	0	0	
Carex debilis Michx.	Weak sedge	Р	0.4	0	0.2	0	0.2	
Carex digitalis Willd.	Finger sedge	0	0.4	0	0	0.2	0	Х
Carex L. sp.	Sedge	0	0.4	0	0	0	0.4	
Carex laxiflora Lam.	Loose-flowered sedge	0	1	0	0.6	Р	0.4	
Carex normalis Mack.	Right-angle sedge	0	0.2	0	0.2	0	0.2	
Carex pensylvanica Lam.	Pennsylvania sedge	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.2	
Carex straminea Willd. ex Schkuhr	Straw-colored sedge	0	0.8	0	0.2	0	0.2	
Carex swanii (Fernald) Mack.	Swan's sedge	0	1	0	0.4	0	0	
Carex willdenovii Schkuhr ex Willd.	Wildenow's sedge	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	
Danthonia compressa Austin Dichanthelium boscii (Poir.) Gould &	Poverty grass Bosc's panic grass	0 0	0.2 0	0 0	0 0	0 0.2	0.4 0.2	Х
C.A. Clark Dichanthelium commutatum (Schult.)	Variable panic grass	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.4	Х
Gould								
Dichanthelium dichotomum (L.) Gould	Bushy panic grass	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	Х
Dichanthelium latifolium (L.) Harvill	Broad-leaved panic grass	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	Х
Dichanthelium linearifolium (Scribn.) Gould/depauperatum (Muhl.) Gould	Linear-leaved panic grass/ starved panic grass	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	Х
<i>Festuca subverticillata</i> (Pers.) E.B. Alexeev	Nodding fescue	Р	0	0	0	Р	0	
Glyceria R. Br. sp.	Mannagrass	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	
Glyceria striata (Lam.) Hitchc.	Fowl mannagrass	Р	0	0	0	0	0	
Juncus effusus L.	Common rush	0	0.2	0	0.6	0	0.4	
Juncus tenuis Willd.	Path rush	0	0	0	0.8	0	0.4	
Melampyrum lineare var. latifolium W.P.C. Barton	Cow-wheat	0	0	0	0	0.6	0	Х
Panicum L. sp.	Panic grass	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	Х
Poa alsodes A. Gray	Woodland bluegrass	0.2	0.4	Р	0	0	0.2	
Poa sylvestris A. Gray	Sylvan bluegrass	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	Х
Scirpus L. sp.	Bulrush	0	0.6	0	0.4	0	0	
Sphenopholis obtusata (Michx.) Scribn.	Prairie wedgegrass	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	Х

2023]

Species	Common Name	Low		Medium		High		Fire-Adapted/
		EV	SB	EV	SB	EV	SB	Fire-Related
Fern								
Asplenium platyneuron (L.) Britton, Sterns & Poggenb.	Ebony spleenwort	0	0	0	0	Р	0	
Dennstaedtia punctilobula (Michx.) T. Moore	Hayscented fern	0	1	0	1	Р	1	
Dryopteris marginalis (L.) A. Gray	Marginal wood fern	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Polystichum acrostichoides (Michx.) Schott	Christmas fern	Р	0	0	0	0.2	0	
Thelypteris noveboracensis (L.) Nieuwl.	New York fern	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	