

The dynamics of litterfall in eucalypt woodland surrounding pine plantations



Andrew C. Baker

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University
of Technology Sydney

June 2009



Declaration

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Andrew C. Baker

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the organisations who have supported my PhD financially. During my PhD I was supported by the Postgraduate Doctoral Helix Scholarship, provided by the Faculty of Science at UTS. Thankyou to the Department of Environmental Sciences at UTS, who provided funding, vehicles and equipment needed to undertake the large amount of fieldwork associated with this project. Thankyou to the Jenolan Caves Trust who supported my research both financially and logistically. Thanks especially to Dan Cove, Grant Commins, Stephen Meehan and Steve Reilly for their help and support at Jenolan.

Thankyou to the Linnean Society of New South Wales for their financial support of my project. Seed Energy (South Australia) kindly supported my research through the provision of radiata pine seeds needed to undertake the germination experiments.

A massive round of thanks goes to my primary supervisor Brad Murray, for all his help, ongoing support and guidance throughout the duration of my PhD. Thankyou for advising me on numerous questions, challenging my thinking, and for your encouragement during the tough times. Thankyou to my external supervisor, Grant Hose, for your advice and support, especially during conceptual and set up stages of my research.

Thankyou to Alan Wright, Stuart Young and Tessa Robson for your assistance with fieldwork. Thankyou to Alison and Anthony Passe-Desilva, Alan Wright, Nicole Hills, Stuart Young, and Tessa Robson for your assistance in the lab sorting litter, filling litterbags and/or measuring seedlings. Thankyou to the technical staff at UTS who helped me in particular: Gemma Armstrong, Jordan Illes, Rod Hungerford and Sue Fenech. Thankyou to Bob Covney (Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney) for assistance with plant identification.

Thankyou to Sue Wright, for proof reading my thesis. Thanks to Greg and Sue Wright, who kindly loaned me the use of their holiday home, so that I could spend numerous weeks in isolation writing.

Thankyou to my fellow postgraduate students for their help and support, especially members of the lab: Carla Harris, Damian Licari and Megan Phillips for many helpful discussions.

Finally thankyou to all my friends who have supported and encouraged me. Thankyou to my parents for providing a loving home and constant help and support,

whether that involved the tedious task of making litterbags and litter traps, use of their car for fieldwork, encouraging me or just chatting. Lastly, thank you to Tessa Robson, not only for the countless ways that you have supported my research, but more importantly for your invaluable friendship and support through these trying times.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xx
ABSTRACT	xxi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Biological invasions	1
1.2 Exotic plants and their impacts	2
1.3 The genus <i>Pinus</i>	3
1.4 Background to radiata pine	4
1.5 Radiata pine plantations in Australia	6
1.6 Effects of radiata pine plantations	7
1.7 The intrusive potential of pine plantations	11
1.8 Thesis aims and methods	12
1.9 Implications for management	14
1.10 Glossary	15
2 SEASONAL PATTERNS OF LITTERFALL IN NATIVE EUCALYPT WOODLAND VEGETATION SURROUNDING PINE PLANTATIONS	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.1.1 Aims	24
2.2 Methods	25
2.2.1 Study location	25
2.2.2 Experimental design	26
2.2.3 Sampling of litter	29
2.2.4 Statistical Analysis	31
2.3 Results	32
2.3.1 Comparisons between adjacent and reference sites	32
2.3.1.1 Litterfall at Jenolan	32
2.3.1.2 Litterfall at Gurnang	38
2.3.2 Comparison of litterfall at Jenolan and Gurnang	43
2.3.2.1 Comparison between reference sites	43
2.3.2.2 Comparison between adjacent sites	48
2.4 Discussion	53
2.4.1 Patterns of exotic litterfall in woodland communities	53
2.4.2 Patterns of native litterfall in woodland communities	56
2.4.3 Implications of litterfall at reference and adjacent sites	59
2.5 Conclusion	60

3	SEASONAL INFLUXES OF NUTRIENTS THROUGH LITTERFALL IN NATIVE EUCALYPT WOODLAND SURROUNDING PINE PLANTATIONS	61
3.1	Introduction.....	61
3.1.1	Aims	63
3.2	Methods	64
3.2.1	Data collection	64
3.2.2	Data Analysis	65
3.3	Results.....	67
3.3.1	Carbon and nitrogen content of litter	67
3.3.1.1	<i>C and N content in litterfall at Jenolan</i>	<i>67</i>
3.3.1.2	<i>C and N content in litterfall at Gurnang.....</i>	<i>67</i>
3.3.1.3	<i>Comparison of C and N content in litterfall between Jenolan and Gurnang</i>	<i>71</i>
3.3.2	Carbon and nitrogen influx through litterfall	77
3.3.2.1	<i>Comparison between reference and adjacent sites.....</i>	<i>77</i>
3.3.2.2	<i>Comparison between Jenolan and Gurnang</i>	<i>81</i>
3.4	Discussion	84
3.4.1	Comparison of litter quality	84
3.4.2	Comparison of C and N input	85
3.5	Conclusion	86
4	LITTER DECOMPOSITION IN PINE PLANTATIONS AND SURROUNDING EUCALYPT WOODLAND	87
4.1	Introduction.....	87
4.1.1	Aims	91
4.2	Methods	92
4.2.1	Experimental design.....	92
4.2.2	Experimental procedure	92
4.2.3	Data Analysis	94
4.3	Results.....	96
4.3.1	Mass loss and carbon and nitrogen dynamics during decomposition.....	96
4.4	Discussion	103
4.4.1	Mass loss, carbon and nitrogen cycling.....	103
4.4.2	Litter decomposition and pine-litter intrusion.....	107
4.5	Conclusion	108
5	PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE OF EUCALYPT WOODLAND SURROUNDING PINE PLANTATIONS	109
5.1	Introduction.....	109
5.1.1	Aims	110
5.2	Methods	111
5.2.1	Methodology	111
5.2.2	Data Analysis	112
5.3	Results.....	114
5.3.1	Jenolan	114
5.3.2	Gurnang.....	125
5.4	Discussion	134

5.5	Conclusion	138
6	RELATING PINE-LITTER INTRUSION TO PLANT COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IN EUCALYPT WOODLAND SURROUNDING PINE PLANTATIONS	139
6.1	Introduction.....	139
6.1.1	Aims.....	140
6.2	Methods	141
6.2.1	Methodology	141
6.2.2	Data Analysis	142
6.3	Results.....	144
6.3.1	Plant community structure and pine litter at Jenolan	144
6.3.2	Plant community structure and pine litter at Gurnang.....	151
6.4	Discussion	156
6.5	Conclusion	160
7	AN EXPERIMENTAL EXAMINATION OF THE EFFECTS OF LITTER DEPTH AND LITTER TYPE ON THE GERMINATION AND EARLY GROWTH OF PINUS RADIATA SEEDLINGS	161
7.1	Introduction.....	161
7.1.1	Aims.....	164
7.2	Methods	164
7.2.1	Methodology	164
7.2.2	Data Analysis	167
7.3	Results.....	167
7.4	Discussion	176
7.4.1	Seedling establishment and growth.....	176
7.4.2	Implications for the field.....	178
7.5	Conclusion	179
8	DISCUSSION	180
8.1	Intrusive impacts of pine plantations on eucalypt woodland.....	180
8.2	Implications for invasion ecology	185
8.3	Implications for management	186
8.4	Future Research.....	192
8.5	Conclusion	193
	REFERENCES.....	194
	APPENDICES.....	215

List of Figures

Numbers in parentheses signify page numbers

Fig. 2.1. Exotic *P. radiata* plantations (right of fire trail) are often found in very close proximity to tracts of native eucalypt woodland (left of fire trail). In this case, a fire trail no less than 5 m wide separates a *P. radiata* plantation from the native vegetation of the Jenolan Caves Karst Conservation Reserve. (24)

Fig. 2.2. Fieldwork was conducted in woodland communities located within Jenolan Karst Conservation Reserve and Gurnang State Forest in the Central Tablelands of New South Wales. Map drawn by T. Robson using ArcMap. (27)

Fig. 2.3. Schematic diagram of sampling design and the layout of sampling plots within each site. This experimental design was replicated at both Jenolan and Gurnang. (28)

Fig. 2.4. Litter trap specifications and design. (30)

Fig. 2.5. Litter traps were constructed using plastic weed matting attached to a polyethylene irrigation pipe loop and suspended by wooden stakes in the field, as seen here at one of the Jenolan field sites. (31)

Fig. 2.6. Comparison of pine litterfall between reference sites (R) and adjacent sites (A) at Jenolan: a) pine needles, b) pine pollen cones, c) pine wood and d) pine seeds. (36)

Fig. 2.7. Comparison of native litterfall between reference sites (R) and adjacent sites (A) at Jenolan: a) native leaves, b) native woody components, and c) native reproductive structures. (37)

Fig. 2.8. Comparison of pine litterfall between reference sites (R) and adjacent sites (A) at Gurnang: a) pine needles, b) pine pollen cones, c) pine wood and d) pine seeds. (41)

Fig 2.9. Comparison of native litterfall between reference sites (R) and adjacent sites (A) at Gurnang: a) native leaves, b) native woody litter and c) native reproductive structures. (42)

Fig. 2.10. Comparison of pine litterfall between reference sites at Jenolan (JC) and Gurnang (G). a) pine needles b) pine pollen cones c) pine seeds. No woody pine components were found at any of the reference sites during any sampling period. (46)

Fig. 2.11. Comparison of native litterfall between reference sites at Jenolan (JC) and Gurnang (G). a) native leaves, b) native woody components, and c) native reproductive structures. (47)

Fig. 2.12. Comparison of pine litterfall between adjacent sites at Jenolan (JC) and adjacent sites at Gurnang (G). a) pine needles b) pine pollen cones c) pine wood d) pine seeds. (51)

Fig. 2.13. Comparison of native litterfall between adjacent sites at Jenolan (JC) and adjacent sites at Gurnang (G). a) native leaves, b) native woody components, and c) native reproductive structures. (52)

Fig. 3.1. Comparisons among native leaffall at reference sites (Nat Ref), native leaffall at adjacent sites (Nat Adj) and pine needlefall from adjacent sites (Pine Adj) at Jenolan. a) carbon content, b) nitrogen content, c) C:N ratio. (69)

Fig. 3.2. Comparison of native leaffall at reference sites (Nat Ref), native leaffall at adjacent sites (Nat Adj) and pine needlefall from adjacent sites (Pine Adj) at Gurnang. a) carbon content, b) nitrogen content, c) C:N ratio. (70)

Fig. 3.3. Comparisons of native leaffall between reference sites at Jenolan and reference sites at Gurnang. a) carbon content, b) nitrogen content, c) C:N ratio. (74)

Fig. 3.4. Comparisons of native leaffall between adjacent sites at Jenolan and adjacent sites at Gurnang. a) carbon content, b) nitrogen content, c) C:N ratio. (75)

Fig. 3.5. Comparisons of pine needlefall between adjacent sites at Jenolan and adjacent sites at Gurnang. a) carbon content, b) nitrogen content, c) C:N ratio. (76)

Fig. 3.6. Comparisons of the seasonal input of carbon and nitrogen through foliar litterfall at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan. a) carbon, b) nitrogen and c) native leaf fall. (79)

Fig. 3.7. Comparisons of the seasonal input of carbon and nitrogen through foliar litterfall at reference and adjacent sites at Gurnang. a) carbon, b) nitrogen and c) native leaf fall. (80)

Fig. 3.8. Carbon and nitrogen input from foliar litterfall between (i) reference sites at Jenolan and reference sites at Gurnang a) carbon and b) nitrogen, (ii) adjacent sites at Jenolan and adjacent sites at Gurnang c) carbon and d) nitrogen. (83)

Fig. 4.1. Litterbags containing either native, pine or a 50:50 mix of pine and native litter were used to measure litter decomposition, as seen here at one of the reference sites. (95)

Fig. 4.2. Decomposition (weight loss) of native, mixed and pine litter at reference, adjacent and plantation sites. Graphs a-c compare the decomposition rates at a) reference, b) adjacent and c) plantation sites. Graphs d-f compare the decomposition rates between condition (site type) for d) native litter, e) mixed litter and f) pine litter. (99)

Fig. 4.3. Carbon content of native, mixed and pine litter at reference, adjacent and plantation sites during decomposition. Graphs a-c compare the decomposition rates at a) reference, b) adjacent and c) plantation sites. Graphs d-f compare the decomposition rates between condition (site type) for d) native litter, e) mixed litter and f) pine litter. (100)

Fig. 4.4. Nitrogen content of native, mixed and pine litter at reference, adjacent and plantation sites during decomposition. Graphs a-c compare the decomposition rates at a) reference, b) adjacent and c) plantation sites. Graphs d-f compare the decomposition

rates between condition (site type) for d) native litter, e) mixed litter and f) pine litter. (101)

Fig. 4.5. C:N ratio of native, mixed and pine litter at reference, adjacent and plantation sites during decomposition. Graphs a-c compare the rate of decomposition at a) reference, b) adjacent and c) plantation sites. Graphs d-f compare the decomposition rates between condition (site type) for d) native litter, e) mixed litter and f) pine litter. (102)

Fig. 5.1. Comparison of plant community attributes between reference (Ref) and adjacent (Adj) sites at Jenolan: a) total species richness, b) native species richness, c) exotic species richness, d) species evenness, e) Shannon's diversity index and f) Simpson's diversity index. T1= April 2006, T2 = October 2006, T3 = April 2007. (117)

Fig. 5.2. nMDS ordination of plant community attributes at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan in: a) April 2006, b) October 2006 and c) April 2007. Graphs on the left (i) show presence-absence data and graphs on the right (ii) show abundance data. ANOSIM revealed a significant difference between reference and adjacent sites during all three sampling periods for both presence, absence and abundance data. (118)

Fig. 5.3. nMDS ordination of plant community attributes at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan with increasing distance into native vegetation a) 0 m, b) 5 m, c) 15 m, d) 25 m e) 50 m. Graphs on the left (i) show presence-absence data and graphs on the right (ii) show abundance data. ANOSIM revealed significant differences between reference and adjacent sites at all distances for presence-absence data, with the largest degree of separation occurring at 0, 5 and 15 m sampling plots. For abundance data, ANOSIM revealed significant differences between reference and adjacent sites at 0, 5 and 15m sampling plots. (119)

Fig. 5.4. Comparison of plant community attributes between reference (Ref) and adjacent (Adj) sites at Gurnang: a) total species richness, b) native species richness, c) exotic species richness, d) species evenness, e) Shannon's diversity index and f) Simpson's diversity index. T1= April 2006, T2 = October 2006, T3 = April 2007. (129)

Fig. 5.5. nMDS ordination of plant community attributes at reference and adjacent sites at Gurnang in: a) April 2006, b) October 2006 and c) April 2007. Graphs on the left (i) show presence-absence data and graphs on the right (ii) show abundance data. ANOSIM revealed a weak separation between reference and adjacent sites for the abundance data. (130)

Fig. 5.6. nMDS ordination of plant community attributes at reference and adjacent sites at Gurnang with increasing distance into native vegetation a) 0 m, b) 5 m, c) 15 m, d) 25 m and e) 50 m. Graphs on the left (i) show presence-absence data and graphs on the right (ii) show abundance data. ANOSIM revealed a weak separation between reference and adjacent sites at 5 m sampling plots for both presence-absence and abundance data. (132)

Fig. 5.7. The pine plantation at Jenolan was observed intercepting snowfall. The snowfall can clearly be seen to stop at the edge of the pine plantation. Snowfall was virtually absent between 0 and 15 m into eucalypt woodland at adjacent sites, but was found beyond this distance. Photo taken on 3rd June 2006. (137)

Fig. 6.1. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing the total understorey plant community with environmental variables at Jenolan. (a) April 2006, (b) October 2006, and (c) April 2007. ‘Needles’ = pine needles, ‘Pollen’ = pine pollen cones, ‘Nat’ = native leaffall. (148)

Fig. 6.2. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing the native understorey plant community with environmental variables at Jenolan. (a) April 2006, (b) October 2006, and (c) April 2007. ‘Needles’ = pine needles, ‘Pollen’ = pine pollen cones, ‘Nat’ = native leaffall. (149)

Fig. 6.3. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing the exotic understorey plant community with environmental variables at Jenolan (a) April 2006, (b) October 2006, and (c) April 2007. ‘Nat’ = native leaffall, ‘pH’ = soil pH. (150)

Fig. 6.4. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing the total understorey plant community with environmental variables at Gurnang. (a) April 2006, (b) October 2006, and (c) April 2007. ‘Pollen’ = pine pollen cones, ‘N’ = soil nitrogen. (154)

Fig. 6.5. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing the native plant community with environmental variables at Gurnang. (a) April 2006, (b) October 2006, and (c) April 2007. ‘Pollen’ = pine pollen cones, ‘N’ = soil nitrogen. (155)

Fig. 7.1. Seventy-five pots were arranged in a random block design, in the glasshouse facilities at UTS. Each block consisted of three rows of five pots. This photo was taken 34 days after the seeds were sown and young pine seedlings are clearly visible in each of the pots. (166)

Fig. 7.2. Seedling height significantly decreased with increasing litter depth (a). Conversely, there were no significant differences between litter type (pine, native and a 50:50 mix of pine and native) at different litter depths: b) 1 cm, c) 2 cm d) 3 cm and e) 4 cm. For comparison, the control (no litter) is shown on all graphs. (170)

Fig. 7.3. Seedling emergence (a) survival (b) and establishment (c). The effect of litter type and litter depth is shown in the graphs on the left (i), while the effect of litter depth alone is shown in the graphs on the right (ii). Litter depth had a significant effect on the seedling emergence (a) and establishment (c) but not seedling survival (b). (172)

Fig 7.4. Final mass of seedling components (a) needles, (b) roots and (c) stems. In all three attributes, the final mass did not significantly differ between litter types (i) but were significantly different between litter depths (ii). Data shown are the total dry weights harvested for each pot. (174)

Fig. 7.5. Total seedling dry weight (a), root:shoot ratio (b) and SLA did not significantly differ between litter types (i) but were significantly different between litter depths (ii). Data presented are the total for seedlings in each pot. (175)

Fig. 8.1. A summary diagram highlighting the differences between reference (i) and adjacent (ii) sites at Jenolan situated on the edge of eucalypt woodland (i.e. 0 m sampling plots). At adjacent sites, pine-litter intrusion increased the total quantity of (a) leaffall and (b) carbon and nitrogen entering the litter layer, resulting in (c) a larger quantity of litter remaining and (d) a larger quantity of nitrogen accumulated in leaffall. (184)

Fig. 8.2. The cleared zone between radiata pine plantations and native woodland vegetation acts as a firebreak, as seen here in a radiata pine plantation located in the Southern Highlands of NSW (Australia). Such zones will undoubtedly limit the intrusion of pine litter into native vegetation, although such zones may also create a different set of ‘edge effects’. (189)

Fig. 8.3. This photo was taken in Gurnang State Forest and shows a narrow strip of native vegetation between the pine plantation and the adjacent native vegetation. The tops of several pines within the plantation are highlighted by the red arrows and can be seen behind a row of eucalypts. In this instance, the strip is likely to act as a buffer between the plantation and remnant vegetation on the left of the photo. Unfortunately, the strip of native vegetation comprised only a small portion of the plantation edge. (190)

List of Tables

Numbers in parentheses signify page numbers

Table 1.1. The 1996 global distribution of *P. radiata* (adapted from Lavery & Mead 1998). (5)

Table 1.2 Australian studies documenting the spread of pine wildings into native eucalypt forests and woodlands. Unless otherwise indicated, wildings are *P. radiata*. (9)

Table 1.3. Glossary of key terms used in this thesis. (15)

Table 2.1. Summary of plant litterfall studies in Australia. (i) Studies performed in eucalypt forests and woodlands; (ii) studies which compare litterfall in eucalypt woodland with exotic pine plantations; and (iii) studies which examine litterfall in native plant communities that have been invaded by exotic plants. Where possible, the rate of litterfall for the different components of litterfall are presented ('leaf' = leaf-fall, 'twig' = twig-fall, 'bark' = bark-fall, 'bark and twigs' = combined fall of bark and twigs). (19)

Table 2.2. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA comparing the various components of litterfall at Jenolan between (i) reference and adjacent sites (condition), (ii) distance into native vegetation and (iii) time. (34)

Table 2.3. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA comparing the various components of litterfall at Gurnang between (i) reference and adjacent sites (condition), (ii) distance into native vegetation and (iii) time. (39)

Table 2.4. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA comparing the various components of litterfall between: (i) reference sites at Jenolan and reference sites at Gurnang (location), (ii) distance into native vegetation and (iii) time. Note, 'pine wood' was not a component of litterfall at any of the reference sites at Jenolan or Gurnang and therefore was omitted from this analysis. (44)

Table 2.5. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA comparing the various components of litterfall between: (i) adjacent sites at Jenolan and adjacent sites at Gurnang (location), (ii) distance into native vegetation and (iii) time. (49)

Table 2.6. Annual native litterfall (g/m^2) at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan and Gurnang. Mean values are presented in bold. (58)

Table 3.1. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal litter quality among native leaffall at reference sites, native leaffall at adjacent sites and pine needlefall at adjacent sites, at Jenolan. (68)

Table 3.2. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal litter quality among native leaffall at reference sites, native leaffall at adjacent sites and pine needlefall at adjacent sites, at Gurnang. (68)

Table 3.3. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal litter quality of native leaffall between reference sites located at Jenolan and Gurnang. (72)

Table 3.4. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal litter quality of native leaffall between adjacent sites located at Jenolan and Gurnang. (72)

Table 3.5. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal litter quality of pine needlefall between adjacent sites located at Jenolan and Gurnang. (73)

Table 3.6. Results of the three-factor ANOVA comparing the seasonal C and N inputs from foliar litterfall at different distances at reference and adjacent sites located at (i) Jenolan and (ii) Gurnang. (78)

Table 3.7. Results of the three-factor ANOVA comparing seasonal C and N inputs from foliar litterfall at different distances into native woodland and between (i) reference sites at Jenolan and reference sites at Gurnang and (ii) adjacent sites at Jenolan and adjacent sites at Gurnang. (82)

Table 4.1. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA comparing variables measured during litter decomposition between (i) reference, adjacent and plantation sites (condition), (ii) pine needles, eucalypt leaves and a 50:50 mix of the two (litter) and (iii) the length of time the litterbag were in the field (time). (98)

Table 5.1. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA for univariate measures of plant species richness and diversity at Jenolan. Each measure of plant community composition was compared between reference and adjacent sites (condition) and distance into eucalypt woodland (distance) during three different sampling periods (time). (115)

Table 5.2. Analysis of similarity (ANOSIM) was used to determine if there were significant differences in plant community composition at Jenolan between condition (reference and adjacent sites) and different sampling times. Presence-absence transformed data were analysed to compare species identity between treatments. Square root transformed ('abundance') data were tested to compare both the relative abundance of species between treatments. (121)

Table 5.3. Results of similarity percent analysis (SIMPER) comparing the presence/absence of understorey plant species at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan. SIMPER was performed only where ANOSIM found significant differences between reference and adjacent sites. The results show the main (top 10) species that contributed to the dissimilarity between reference and adjacent sites. The total contribution that these species had to dissimilarity is given in parentheses. (122)

Table 5.4. Results of similarity percent analysis (SIMPER) comparing the abundance of understorey plant species at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan. SIMPER was performed only where ANOSIM found significant differences between reference and adjacent sites. The results show the main (top 10) species that contributed to the dissimilarity between reference and adjacent sites. The total contribution that these species had to dissimilarity is given in parentheses. (124)

Table 5.5. Results of the 3-factor ANOVA for univariate measures of plant species richness and diversity at Gurnang. Each measure of plant community composition was compared between reference and adjacent sites (condition) and distance into eucalypt woodland (distance) during three different sampling periods (time). (127)

Table 5.6. Analysis of similarity (ANOSIM) was used to determine if there were significant differences in plant community composition at Gurnang between condition (reference and adjacent sites) and different sampling times. Presence-absence transformed data were analysed to compare species identity between treatments. Square root transformed ('abundance') data were tested to compare both the relative abundance of species between treatments. (131)

Table 6.1. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing total plant community structure and environmental variables at Jenolan. Marginal effects show the contribution of each variable singularly, while conditional effects show the contribution of the variable relative to variables already included in the model. The approximate contribution of each of the significant variables was calculated. (145)

Table 6.2. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing native plant community structure and environmental variables at Jenolan. Marginal effects show the contribution of each variable singularly, while conditional effects show the contribution of the variable relative to variables already included in the model. The approximate contribution of each of the significant variables was calculated. (146)

Table 6.3. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing exotic plant community structure and environmental variables at Jenolan. Marginal effects show the contribution of each variable singularly, while conditional effects show the contribution of the variable relative to variables already included in the model. The approximate contribution of each of the significant variables was calculated. (147)

Table 6.4. Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing total plant community structure and environmental variables at Gurnang. Marginal effects show the contribution of each variable singularly, while conditional effects show the contribution of the variable relative to variables already included in the model. The approximate contribution of each of the significant variables was calculated. (152)

Table 6.5 Results of the canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) comparing native plant community structure and environmental variables at Gurnang. Marginal effects show the contribution of each variable singularly, while conditional effects show the contribution of the variable relative to variables already included in the model. The approximate contribution of each of the significant variables was calculated. (153)

Table 7.1. Results of the repeated measures ANOVA. The data did not meet the assumption of homogeneity of covariance (sphericity assumed) and accordingly, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used with reduced degrees of freedom. (169)

Table 7.2. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing litter depth ('depth') and litter type ('type') for seedling emergence, survival and establishment. (171)

Table 7.3. Results of the two-factor ANOVA comparing litter depth ('depth') and litter type ('type') for each of the growth measurements taken during the harvesting of seedlings within each pot. (173)

List of Appendices

Numbers in parentheses signify page numbers

Appendix 1 - List of understorey flora found at Jenolan field sites. Plant names as per PlantNET (NSW Flora online: <http://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au/>) and the Australian Plant Name Index (<http://www.anbg.gov.au/cpbr/databases/apni-search-full.html>). Databases were accessed in September 2007. * Denotes exotic species. (215)

Appendix 2 - List of understorey flora found at Gurnang field sites. Plant names as per PlantNET (NSW Flora online: <http://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au/>) and the Australian Plant Name Index (<http://www.anbg.gov.au/cpbr/databases/apni-search-full.html>). Databases were accessed in September 2007. * Denotes exotic species. (221)

Abstract

Biological invasions pose one of the greatest threats to global biodiversity and frequently result in the widespread loss of flora and fauna. Biological invasions have become a major focus of ecology in recent decades, and in particular, the invasive species radiata pine (*Pinus radiata* D. Don) is of considerable concern. Radiata pine has a very limited distribution in the northern hemisphere in its natural range. Its utility in the timber and manufacturing industries, however, has led to widespread planting, especially in the southern hemisphere, where over 4 million hectares of plantations have been established. In fact, radiata pine is now the most commonly cultivated conifer in the world. A growing body of evidence from studies in the southern hemisphere has shown that pines are spreading invasively beyond the confines of plantations, displacing native species and becoming the dominant species in a number of vegetation types. The negative ecological impacts associated with pine plantations now extend well beyond plantation boundaries.

While a number of studies have examined the invasion of individual pines (wildings) from plantations into surrounding vegetation, very few studies have considered the impacts of pine plantations and pine litter on surrounding native plant communities. Pine litter is defined here as structures shed from pines; primarily needles and pollen cones, but also seeds and twigs. In New South Wales (Australia), pine plantations are frequently bordered by native vegetation, providing ideal conditions for pine-litter intrusion to occur. Nevertheless, rates of pine-litter intrusion have never been quantified. Furthermore, the responses of an ecosystem to an influx of pine litter are largely unknown. The aims of this thesis are first to quantify the intrusion of pine litter into native vegetation adjacent to pine plantations and second to determine the impacts of pine litter intrusion on the structure and function of native woodland communities. Fieldwork was conducted at two geographically disparate locations in the Central Tablelands of New South Wales (Australia): Jenolan Caves Karst Conservation Reserve and Gurnang State Forest. At both sites, pine plantations and native woodland are separated by a narrow fire trail that is only a few metres wide. A comparative framework is used, whereby sites in eucalypt woodland that were adjacent to pine plantations (adjacent sites) were compared with sites in eucalypt woodland that were not adjacent to plantations but rather adjacent to eucalypt woodland (reference sites). As the effect of plantations is expected to decrease with increasing distance into native

vegetation, sampling plots located at distances of 0, 5, 15, 25 and 50 m from the edge of the native vegetation were established at reference and adjacent sites. This enabled testing of both the impact of plantations on native vegetation, and also the spatial extent of this impact on native vegetation.

The first and crucial step in examining the intrusive effects of pine plantations was to quantify the amount of native and exotic litterfall at reference and adjacent sites. At each sampling plot, I measured the amount of native and exotic litterfall (i.e. pine litter intrusion) every 4 weeks for 1 year at Gurnang State Forest and for 2 years at Jenolan Caves Karst Conservation Reserve. Pine needles and pollen cones were found to be a significant component of litterfall in woodlands adjacent to pine plantations. Exotic and native litterfall varied both seasonally and annually. Interestingly, peak needlefall from pines occurred in autumn and winter, which coincided with the minimum native leaf fall. Conversely, pine needlefall was at a minimum during summer, during which native leaf fall was high. The comparison of two separate woodlands adjacent to plantations revealed similar patterns of pine-litter intrusion although the absolute quantity of pine-litter intrusion was greater at Jenolan compared to Gurnang. Comparison of the carbon (C) and nitrogen (N) content of litterfall revealed subtle yet significant differences between pine and native litterfall. Pine litter generally had a lower N content than native leaf fall at Jenolan, but a higher N content than native litter at Gurnang. At both locations, the pine litterfall is additional to native litterfall and as such, pine-litter intrusion is adding additional resources to woodlands adjacent to the plantation.

Having determined the rates of pine-litter intrusion, the next step was to determine the fate of pine litter once it had intruded into woodland vegetation. In the absence of fire, plant litter is ultimately broken down through the decomposition process. A three-by-three experimental design was employed, where 3 litter types (pine, native and a 50:50 mix of pine and native litter) were placed under 3 different conditions ('reference sites', 'adjacent sites', and sites within pine plantations). Litterbags were constructed and filled with a known mass of litter before being placed in the field. Every 8 weeks, for 18 months, litterbags were collected and destructively sampled. Decomposition was measured as a function of weight loss through time, while the corresponding nitrogen and carbon contents were determined. While decomposition was quite slow overall, rates of decomposition were generally faster for native litter than

for pine litter. Throughout the experiment, the N concentration of litter increased in all litter types although it was higher in native litter than in pine litter.

An important consequence of the slower rate of decomposition of pine litter is likely to be the accumulation of pine litter in woodlands adjacent to plantations. This may have severe implications for the structure and composition of plant communities adjacent to plantations. To test this, I examined the seasonal and spatial patterns of plant community structure of eucalypt woodlands surrounding pine plantations at Jenolan and Gurnang. Eucalypt woodland at Gurnang showed only a minor change in the structure and composition of understorey vegetation at sites nearest the plantation. In contrast, eucalypt woodland at Jenolan showed a much stronger response to plantations, with significantly lower total species richness at adjacent sites compared with reference sites. This resulted in a pronounced ‘edge effect’ up to 15 m into eucalypt woodland adjacent to pine plantations.

Canonical correspondence analysis was used to examine the relationship between environmental variables and plant community structure. Pine litterfall explained a significant portion of the variation in plant community structure at reference and adjacent sites at Jenolan, where large quantities of pine litter intrude into native vegetation. At Gurnang, where smaller quantities of pine litter intrude into eucalypt woodland, pine litter intrusion explained a lower portion of the variance between reference and adjacent sites. The plantation at Jenolan consists of large, mature pines that have formed a dense closed canopy, while at Gurnang, the plantation has been established more recently and the pines are not as large, and have not formed a closed canopy. The plantations at Jenolan are therefore a greater source of litter and are also likely to have more pronounced influence on the microclimate compared with the plantations at Gurnang. Lower diversity of flora at Gurnang also may limit the ability to detect differences in plant communities between reference and adjacent sites.

Finally, I investigated the impact of pine litter on plant community structure by testing the hypothesis that pine litter facilitates the germination and growth of radiata pine seeds. Using a manipulative glasshouse experiment, radiata pine seeds were sown in pots and exposed to varying quantities of different litter treatments (pine litter, native litter and a 50-50 mix of pine and native litter). The germination and subsequent growth and survival of pines were measured over a period of 2 months. Litter depth but not litter type was found to be an important determinant of pine seedling establishment. With the exception of treatments that were covered by a small layer of litter (i.e. 1 cm)

increases in litter depth resulted in delayed and lower rates of seedling emergence. Although pine and native leaves are different shapes (i.e. needle vs. broadleaf) and form very differently structured litter layers (dense mat vs. loosely structured), both litters appear to cause similar physical resistance to seedling establishment. These results indicate that litter accumulation resulting from pine intrusion can alter the establishment of pine seedlings. Given the invasive nature of radiata pine, it is highly likely that increased litter depth resulting from pine-litter intrusion will influence the establishment of many native species.

In summary, significant quantities of pine litter were found to intrude into native woodland adjacent to pine plantations, which in turn, appears to be responsible for observed shifts in ecosystem structure and function. This is of particular concern in instances where pine plantations are situated adjacent to native vegetation that has been set aside specifically for conservation purposes. I therefore suggest the provision of a buffer zone around plantations in order to minimise intrusive impacts of plantations on native biodiversity. Whilst this can be achieved using a number of techniques, careful consideration of the structure of native vegetation is needed when selecting the appropriate technique. Having an inappropriate buffer may have an undesirable influence on native vegetation.