

1   **Title Page**

2

3   Pitch Pine Stands Recover, Adapt, and Persist in the Absence of Fire Under the Influence of  
4   Elevation and Topographic Factors

5

6   Authors and affiliations:

7   Jeff Licht<sup>1</sup>, Risa McNellis<sup>2</sup>, and Nicholas G. Smith<sup>2</sup>

8

9   <sup>1</sup>School for the Environment, University of Massachusetts, Dorchester, MA, USA 02110

10   <sup>2</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA 79409

11

12   Key words

13   *Pinus rigida*, Pitch pine, Mount Desert Island, fire, elevation, resilience, adaptivity, chemical,  
14   geography

15

16   **ABSTRACT**

17       Globally rare pitch pine (*Pinus rigida*) is thought to depend on intermittent fire, which  
18   encourages reproduction and niche preservation. At Mt. Desert island in Acadia National Park  
19   (ME, USA) a stand-replacing conflagration enveloped a portion of the island in 1947. However,  
20   there has been no recurrence of fire. Other populations on the island have been unaffected by fire  
21   disturbance for over one hundred years. Fire history is shown to influence plant form and  
22   functioning, yet these impacts are not well quantified for pitch pine in relation to factors such as  
23   elevation and topography, which are also known to impact traits of this species. We studied the  
24   impact of fire history on traits of pitch pine individuals across elevation (9.5 to 404 m) and  
25   topographic (flat, ledge and cliff) gradients at Mt. Desert Island. Traits included growth, stand  
26   density, photosynthetic water use efficiency, and foliar nutrients. We also measured site data  
27   such as soil nutrients, soil water retention, elevation, slope, and aspect. Elevation was found to be  
28   a greater driver of persistence than fire history and there was little interaction between elevation  
29   and fire history. Our data indicates that fire return intervals were likely too infrequent to support  
30   selection for recovery capacity traits; instead, persistence capacity traits increased in response to  
31   low intensity disturbances. Trees at upper elevations were smaller, narrower, and less canopied

than those at lower elevations and had greater water use efficiency, indicating a preference for stress resistance overgrowth at harsher, high elevation sites. At modest elevation trees exhibited greater capacity for growth and a reduction in stress tolerance traits due to more favorable conditions, including greater soil moisture retention. Our data provide criteria for management of pitch pine survival where persistence capacity is greatest at flat and cliff locations in both burned and unburned populations.

**Commented [SN1]:** I think this clause could be deleted as it is repeated from above.

## INTRODUCTION

On Mt. Desert Island (MDI) in Maine USA, globally threatened pitch pine (*Pinus rigida* Miller) dwell at the edge of their northeastern range. Some fire ecologists in the Northeast USA suggest that wildfire is required every six to twenty-five years to perpetuate and rejuvenate pitch pines (Jordan *et al* 2003) such as these. Yet, on MDI, pitch pine survives despite fire suppression (Miller *et al* 2017), which has persisted in the aftermath of the infamous 1947 conflagration (Fig. 1). It is not entirely clear what factors contribute to recovery and persistence of pitch pine in the absence of fire (Patterson Saunders and Horton 1983; Parshall *et al* 2003). In coastal Atlantic states further south, there is less concern since natural fire (Foereid *et al* 2015) and anthropogenic controlled burns (Carlo *et al* 2016) comprise a system where there is reduced fuel, removal of evergreen competition and opening of canopies (Neill *et al* 2007).

**Commented [RM2]:** I don't think abbreviating Mt Desert Island is necessary unless you're working with a page or word limit. More abbreviations tends to just be more confusing for readers!

At MDI, trees in low-lying undisturbed (non-1947 fire) areas (Fig. 2) appear to engage in more seedling recruitment than trees in the upper elevation fire zone. Indeed, reaction to fire absence manifests as physiological and morphological adjustments over many years (Little 1953). On the island, cone serotiny (Givnish 1981), thick bark, and epicormic re-sprouting (Renninger *et al* 2013) have disappeared in formerly fire-prone pitch pine ecosystems (Jordan *et al* 2003). Suppression makes it likely that such former fire adaptive mechanisms are no longer required for stand sustenance and are unnecessary investments which reduce competition with other evergreens (Buma *et al* 2013). Critically, it is not clear if, in combination with a long period without fire, recovery accelerates the disappearance of adaptive traits (Heuss 2018) or if this is a result of extrinsic responses to other, low intensity disturbances. Previous studies (e.g., Ibáñez *et al* 2019) have framed resilience as an artifact of recovery (Charpentier 2020) specifically in the absence of further fire disturbance and adaptation to climate change (Swanston *et al* 2018). We attempt to distinguish between recovery and persistence capacity through a new

63 qualitative model which explains pitch pine responses to fire history and non-fire environmental  
 64 constraints as a function of elevation and topography (Dunne *et al* 2004) (Fig. 3). The model is  
 65 informed by earlier resilience theories (Jordan Patterson and Windisch 2003; Howard and  
 66 Stelacio 2011; Ibáñez *et al* 2019). Here, we hypothesize that pitch pine populations exhibit non-  
 67 mutually exclusive responses: (1) **recovery capacity** (*REC<sub>c</sub>*) as a measure of plant performance  
 68 (Ibáñez *et al* 2019) long after fire disturbance (Patterson Saunders and Horton 1983) and (2)  
 69 **persistence capacity** (*PER<sub>c</sub>*) that reflects responses in the absence of disturbance (Brand and Jax  
 70 2007).

71 Each capacity metric reflects physical responses, such as the tradeoffs between growth  
 72 and stress avoidance and colony retreat and expansion (Swanston *et al* 2018), as a function of  
 73 stand density (Churchill *et al* 2012) and as an ‘ecologically stable strategy’ (Day and Greenwood  
 74 2011). *REC<sub>c</sub>* is the better understood of the two pathways given the extensive literature covering  
 75 resilience (Ibáñez *et al* 2019) and tree health (Fuller and Quine 2016). *PER<sub>c</sub>*, on the other hand,  
 76 explains a trend where shade-intolerant pitch pine out-compete other evergreens, such as red  
 77 spruce (*Picea rubens*), hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) and balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*), thus  
 78 expanding into new, mostly uninhabited territory. There is a scarcity of the biogeochemical,  
 79 elevation, and topographical data at MDI needed to inform the functionalities within this model.  
 80 To remedy this, we consider soil and plant nutrition including carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and  
 81 stable isotope analysis to determine how intrinsic water use efficiency (*iWUE<sub>δ</sub><sup>13</sup>C*), soil moisture  
 82 retention, growth and stand density are affected by fire history and topography.

83 Fire history is revealed by subsurface charcoal remnants found in previous fire zones.  
 84 Charcoal pyrogenic carbon (PyC) is abundant in selected areas of the north side of Cadillac  
 85 Mountain (Patterson Edwards and Maguire 1987) and downslope pockets along the Park Loop  
 86 Road at Gorham cliffs. These deposits suggest the possibility of recalcitrant soil C and high  
 87 mineral holding capacity long after a fire event (Pingree and DeLuca 2017). Both fire history  
 88 artifacts like charcoal (Licht *et al* 2017) and increasing elevation have been shown to increase  
 89 water use efficiency (Wang *et al* 2017). Given the difference in fire histories between  
 90 populations, this provides a nearly ideal testbed to better clarify aspects of chemical geography  
 91 (Verma and Jayakumar 2012) and address a number of key questions with regard to leaf traits,  
 92 tree growth, and stand dynamics.

Commented [RM3]: Again, more abbreviations are more confusing. I recommend just referring to recovery capacity and persistence capacity to reduce the number of acronyms

Commented [RM4]: Do you mean that each capacity metric reflects an ecologically stable strategy?

Commented [RM5]: Recovery capacity needs a better explanation here. This paragraph would be a great spot to clearly link recovery capacity to fire history and persistence capacity to elevation so that it's very obvious why you chose those as independent variables for the analysis

Commented [SN6]: Elevation is an aspect of topography, right?

Commented [SN7]: Citation for this?

Commented [RM8]: Between which populations?

Commented [RM9]: Which aspects?

93 Our foremost aim is to examine a proposed model through an analysis of four key pitch  
 94 pine populations according to the interactive influence of fire and elevation. Given previous  
 95 studies of fire involvement and post-fire photosynthetic response (Chen Wang and Jia 2017), we  
 96 hypothesize that pitch pine growth and population expansion is greater at non-fire sites with low  
 97 elevation due to higher soil C, higher foliar C (Butak 2014), more negative  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (Licht and  
 98 Smith 2020), and greater soil water retention (positive indicators of  $PERC$ ). We further theorize  
 99 that trees at low elevations display a greater propensity for growth in height, canopy, and DBH  
 100 through more competitive resource conservation (Stambaugh *et al* 2015). Additionally, we  
 101 hypothesize that ubiquitous contours (Howard and Stelacio 2011) at upper ledge elevations,  
 102 which limit clustering (stand density) elsewhere, will be less stressful for colonization (Lafon *et*  
 103 *al* 2014) and expansion on lower elevation flat and cliff surfaces. We predict this will increase  
 104 pioneering efforts at gentler slopes and more southerly aspect.

Commented [SN10]: Higher than what?

Commented [SN11]: What about the low elevation site with the more recent fire history?

Commented [RM12]: Not sure what "contours" refers to. I checked the referenced paper, but I'm still unclear on how it connects

Commented [SN13]: Is this the expectation regardless of fire history?

## 106 METHODS

### 107 Study Extraction Sites

108 We investigated fifteen pitch pine specimens at each of four sites at MDI (Table 1),  
 109 factorially crossed in a fire history (Miller *et al* 2014) by elevation design: (1) Wonderland trail  
 110 between 9 and 25 m elevation (low elevation, outside the footprint of the 1947 fire), (2) Gorham  
 111 cliffs between 24 and 36 m (low elevation, within the footprint), (3) St. Sauveur trail between  
 112 134 and 198 m (high elevation, outside the footprint) and (4) South Cadillac trail between 188  
 113 and 417 m (high elevation within the footprint).

### 115 Allometry

116 We measure individual tree height (m), canopy spread (m), and stem diameter at breast  
 117 height (DBH; cm). Tree height was estimated using nested, 2 m calibrated, aluminum rods  
 118 (Garelick, St. Paul, MN, USA). Canopy spread was measured using the span between the same  
 119 calibrated aluminum rods fixed with two landscape flags as a ground truth reference. DBH was  
 120 measured at 1.06 m using a ProSkit electronic digital caliper (Amelia, VA, USA).

### 121 Clustering

122 Mean distances were calculated between sampled trees ( $N = 167$ ) and up to five of their  
 123 nearest, reproductively mature, conspecific neighbors (within 5 m) in the same clump (Churchill

et al. 2012). Mean neighbor distance is a surrogate, but inverse, measure for stand density (Mosseler Rajora and Major 2004).

### **Topographic Features**

We used a Kodak Trimble Juno 3B unit to obtain horizontal resolution of data plotted using 5-7 satellite telecommunication vehicles to maintain a maximum position dilution of precision. These data were differentially corrected and have estimated accuracies in the horizontal and vertical direction of 2 m, while selective availability is set to zero. We also used multiple satellite-configured GPS data (USGS 2m LIDAR 2010) to determine coordinates for individual trees (Lubinski Hop and Gawler 2003) as well as slope and aspect attributes using ArcGIS (version 10). Mapping of this type of data has been used in the past to compare physiography and recalcitrant chemical biogeography, particularly in fire prone contexts (Szpakowski and Jensen 2019).

### **Isotopic Analysis**

We obtained C isotopic data ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ) and N isotopic data ( $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) of fully expanded leaves (needle cluster) for 15 individual pitch pines at each site. Sample fascicles were separated and dried for two days at 60 °C, ground in a SPEX ball mill (Metuchen, NJ, USA), weighed to 2 mg for leaf tissue and 5 mg for soil using a micro analytic balance (Cole-Palmer, Vernon Hills, IL, USA), and rolled in 5 x 9 mm tin capsules (Costech, Valencia, CA, USA). Combustion gasses were separated on a gas chromatograph column, passed through a diluter and reference gas box, and introduced into the spectrometer (Thermo Delta V+ IR-MS, Waltham, MA, USA).  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  was used to indicate water use efficiency (iWUE $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ) (Farquhar et al. 1989).

### **Foliar Tissue Analysis**

Leaf tissue was obtained from excision of basal fascicle bundles at 1.06 m height. 50 mL samples of needles were separated, cut and dried for two days at 60 °C. Then they were ground in a SPEX ball mill (Metuchen, NJ, USA), sieved to <10 mm, and <2 mL were fed to a Leco C/N-2000 Carbon-Nitrogen Analyzer (Leco Corp., St. Joseph, MI) coupled with the spectrometer to determine C and N concentrations. 35 mL aliquots were submitted for standard plant tissue nutrient analysis using a TJA Model 975 AtomComp ICP-AES (Thermo Jarrell-Ash Corp., Franklin, MA). The method comprised submersion in a 5 mL trace-metal-grade  $\text{HNO}_3$  treatment, then refluxed on hot block at 80 °C for two hours and diluted to 25 mL with 0.4 micron PTFE syringe filters to access extractable macro and micro inorganics.

155 **Soil Analysis**

156 Soils (porous and acidic hornblende granite or Ellsworth schist) were uniformly shallow,  
157 homogeneous, low fertility (varying between .7-2.5 cm) and overlain with rapidly drying needle  
158 duff (Day *et al* 2005). All sites were excavated similarly by hand trowel and soil probe  
159 (Accuproducts, Saline, MI, USA). Aliquots were extracted from O<sub>a</sub>-A<sub>b</sub> horizon soil pockets of  
160 organic and mineral deposits within 50 cm of the tree base. 250 mL soil samples were sieved  
161 (#10) and measured in 2019. Drying was performed in an oven at 100°C for two days. Analysis  
162 was performed using a modified Mehlich method using inductively coupled plasma  
163 spectroscopy, pH measurement via proton activity of a 1:1 slurry and effective soil cation  
164 exchange capacity (CEC) via formic acid extraction. These methods are described more fully  
165 elsewhere (Licht and Smith 2018). Soil C and N were calculated using elemental analysis in a  
166 similar fashion to method above for foliar samples.

167 **Soil Water Retention (SWR)**

168 70 mL soil samples were extracted at 15 tree locations at each of four sites, from <7.5 cm  
169 (O<sub>a</sub>-A<sub>b</sub>) horizon above bedrock. In a laboratory, 50 g H<sub>2</sub>O were added to each aliquot to assess  
170 net water retention as a subset of soil moisture evaporation ( $\psi_g$ ) to determine net evaporative loss  
171 or adsorption to surfaces. Soil water retention analysis was conducted according to the Fields  
172 method (Licht and Smith 2018). Retention effects of gravitational and evaporation forces was  
173 made on a wet basis where  $W_m = g \text{ H}_2\text{O} \bullet (\text{g moist soil})^{-1}$  (Jingfang and Wenwei 2018).

174 **Statistical Analysis**

175 All data were analyzed using a similar linear model structure with elevation (high or low)  
176 and presence of the 1947 fire (yes or no) as categorical fixed factors. The interaction between  
177 elevation and presence of the 1947 fire was also included in each model. In total, 27 models were  
178 fit with the following dependent variables: tree height (m), canopy spread (m), DBH (cm), mean  
179 distance between neighbors (m), foliar: carbon (C, %), nitrogen (N, %), carbon/nitrogen (C/N,  
180 unitless),  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (‰),  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  (‰), calcium ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , g g<sup>-1</sup>), phosphorus (P, g g<sup>-1</sup>), potassium ( $\text{K}^+$ , g g<sup>-1</sup>),  
181 magnesium ( $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , g g<sup>-1</sup>), aluminum ( $\text{Al}^+$ , g g<sup>-1</sup>), zinc (Zn, g g<sup>-1</sup>), soil: C (g g<sup>-1</sup>), N (g g<sup>-1</sup>), C/N  
182 (unitless),  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  (g g<sup>-1</sup>), P (g g<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{K}^+$  (g g<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  (g g<sup>-1</sup>),  $\text{Al}^+$  (g g<sup>-1</sup>), Zn (g g<sup>-1</sup>), water retention  
183 (%), pH (unitless), and CEC (cmol<sub>c</sub> kg<sup>-1</sup>). Tree height, canopy spread, DBH, foliar P, foliar K,  
184 foliar Zn, soil P, soil Al, soil Zn, and soil C/N were log transformed to meet model assumptions

**Commented [SN14]:** This is the first time a date is mentioned I think, so it is not clear how this relates to the other sampling dates. If sampling was all done at similar times, then this probably isn't needed. If there was substantial differences, then maybe include everywhere.

**Commented [J15]:** NGS to take a further look at this explanation

185 of normality and heterogeneity of variances. Soil water retention was arcsin square root  
186 transformed to meet model assumptions.

187 All linear models were fit using the 'lm' function in R (R Core Team 2019). Significance  
188 tests for each fixed factor was performed using the 'anova' function in R (R Core Team 2019).  
189 Post-hoc Tukey's tests were done to examine significant interactions between elevation and the  
190 presence of the 1947 fire using the 'emmeans' package in R (Lenth 2018).  
191 Because aspect data is circular in nature, we analyzed aspect data using a Watson's Two-Sample  
192 Test of Homogeneity as implemented in the R package 'circular' (Agostinelli and Lund 2017).  
193 Specifically, one-to-one comparisons were done between each site in all six possible  
194 combinations.

195 All analyses were performed with R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2019).

196

## 197 **RESULTS**

### 198 **Aspect**

199 Watson's two sample t-tests indicated that the aspects of all sites differed with respect to  
200 one another except for the two sites that experienced the 1947 fire (Gorham Cliffs and South  
201 Cadillac Trail), which had similar aspects (Table 2 and Figure 1).

202

### 203 **Allometry and Stand Density**

204 There was a significant interaction between fire and elevation on tree height ( $P < 0.01$ ;  
205 Figure 2A and Table 3) and DBH ( $P < 0.05$ ; Figure 2C and Table 3), with trees at higher  
206 elevation that experienced the 1947 fire being shorter than those at low elevation that did not  
207 experience the fire and having a smaller DBH than all other sites. Canopy spread tended to be  
208 reduced at high elevation ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure 2B and Table 3), although Tukey's HSD tests  
209 revealed no difference between sites at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Distance between neighbors was greater at high  
210 elevation sites, particularly the one that experienced the 1947 fire ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure 2D and Table  
211 3).

212

213 **iWUE<sub>δ<sup>13</sup>C</sub>**

**Commented [SN16]:** C. Agostinelli and U. Lund (2017). R package 'circular': Circular Statistics (version 0.4-93). URL <https://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/circular/>

Trees at higher elevations experienced less negative  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  ( $P < 0.01$ , Fig. 3A and Table 4), reflecting greater water use efficiency, regardless of fire history. There were no significant differences between tree populations for  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  ( $P > 0.05$ , Figure 2B and Table 4)

#### **Foliar Organics**

On average, foliar C was greater at higher elevations, however the results were not statistically significant ( $P > 0.05$ , Figure 4A and Table 5); nor was there a difference in C/N between sites ( $P > 0.05$ , Figure 4C and Table 4). Our linear model suggested that fire accounted for a significant influence on foliar N ( $P < 0.05$ , Table 5), however post-hoc Tukey's tests found no difference between sites at  $\alpha = 0.05$  (Figure 4B).

#### **Foliar Macronutrients**

Foliar  $\text{Ca}^{+2}$  was negatively impacted by increasing elevation ( $P < 0.001$ , Figure 5A and Table 6). Our linear model suggested that foliar P was significantly higher at fire-involved sites ( $P < 0.01$ , Table 6), although this was not confirmed by post-hoc Tukey's tests (Figure 5B). Foliar  $\text{K}^{+}$  was reduced in the high elevation site that experienced fire as compared to the other sites (elevation x fire:  $P < 0.05$ , Figure 5C and Table 6). Neither foliar  $\text{Al}^{+}$  nor  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  differed by site ( $P > 0.05$  in both cases; Figure 5C and Table 6). Foliar Zn concentrations were 9% lower in the high elevation sites than on the low elevation sites ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure 5F and Table 6), due to a particularly strong reduction at the high elevation site that experienced fire.

#### **Soil Organics**

Soil C concentrations were greater at lower elevations ( $P < 0.05$ ) and sites that did not experience the 1947 fire ( $P < 0.05$ , Figure 6A and Table 7). Soil N did not vary between sites ( $P > 0.05$ , Figure 6B and Table 7). Soil C/N was 15% lower at high elevation sites ( $P < 0.05$ , Figure 6C and Table 7), but we found no significant disparity in C/N when either fire history or fire history by elevation interactions were examined ( $P > 0.05$  in both cases).

#### **Soil Macronutrients**

Soil  $\text{Ca}^{+2}$  decreased with elevation ( $P < 0.05$ , Figure 7A and Table 8). P,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  and Zn were not significantly different across sites (Table 8). However, fire accounted for a 48%



245 reduction in  $K^+$  at sites with fire history ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure 7C and Table 8). There was an  
246 interaction between elevation and fire history for  $Al^+$  ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure 7E and Table 8), which  
247 indicated....

Commented [NGS17]: Need to check this

### 248 249 Soil Water Retention, CEC, and pH

250 There was an interaction between elevation and fire history on SWR ( $P < 0.01$ , Figure  
251 10A and Table 9), with markedly higher values at Gorham cliffs, the low elevation site that  
252 experienced fire, as compared to other sites. Soil pH was not different between sites ( $P > 0.05$ ,  
253 Table 9). Our linear model indicated that CEC was higher at the high elevation sites ( $P < 0.05$ ,  
254 Table 9), but this was not confirmed by our post-hoc Tukey's tests, which indicated no  
255 difference between sites (Figure 10C).

### 256 257 DISCUSSION

258 Elevation, as opposed to fire, was the dominant driver of the plant and ecosystem  
259 processes we measured, which indicated that persistence capacity ( $PER_C$ ) was more important  
260 than recovery capacity ( $REC_C$ ) at MDI, at least over the last one hundred years according to  
261 twenty-four statistically significant response variable data. Our findings underscore differences  
262 between  $REC_C$  and  $PER_C$  pathways and provide an explanation to resolve an enigma of  
263 persistence in fire absence and the dominant influence of elevation.

Commented [RM18]: Are they all significant? I count only 20 response variables with significant relationships

264 Elevation played a role in several meaningful ways. We confirmed that increased  
265 elevation tends to improve efficiency (increased  $iWUE\delta^{13}C$  over growth (Wang *et al* 2017; Chen,  
266 Wang and Jia 2017). Further, we found distance between neighbors at higher elevation was  
267 greater compared to lower elevation sites, thus generating sparser tree numbers aggregated  
268 within  $REC_C$  compared to  $PER_C$ . At the highest elevation, South Cadillac trail, we expected to  
269 find the steepest slopes, but they were far less steep than those at Gorham cliffs, a low elevation  
270 site. We anticipated that low elevation (<50 m) populations would feature a greater number of  
271 conspecific neighbors as a function of no fire history, flat or cliff orientation, evidenced by a  
272 gentle slope (<10°), and tendency towards a southerly aspect ( $\mu = 180^\circ$ ). In fact, this theory was  
273 found correct, as Wonderland, which was by far the flattest terrain, trees achieved the widest  
274 distribution with the greatest distance between trees over the widest contiguous area as a function  
275 of  $REC_C$ . There was sufficient variability in some of the data, like stand density, to produce

Commented [NGS19]: Not clear what this means

Commented [RM20]: You measured distance between neighbors, not number of neighbors. So, would you expect a lower mean distance between neighbors at low elevations?

Commented [NGS21]: Is this correct?

Commented [RM22R21]: Wonderland has the lowest mean distance between neighbors, which I think means the trees are denser. Not sure how this relates to cliff orientation or aspect. Also- not sure if you can claim that this is a function of recovery capacity?

Commented [RM23]: Since we used mean distance between neighbors in the analysis, not stand density, it's worth it to be careful about how you reference stand density in the results/discussion. Also, you state that there is valuable information about differences between flat, cliff, and ledge communities but then you don't elaborate.

276 valuable information about differences between flat, cliff and ledge communities, even if at a  
277 small spatial scale.

278 Fire history was less important than elevation in the response variables we measured,  
279 even at high elevation ledge communities. We found little compelling empirical evidence that  
280 fire is a necessary ingredient in perpetuation at MDI. Fire return intervals have lengthened at  
281 MDI to the point where they are quite likely to be too intermittent to perpetuate previous fire  
282 resistance traits. A shift back to fire, accompanied by a re-introduction of serotinous  
283 characteristics, is not impossible in the future; however, current climate projections advise  
284 against this occurrence. Despite the absence of fire, there is the presence of fire remnants. The  
285 current study builds on previous work (Licht and Smith 2020) to determine how an obvious post-  
286 fire effect—anthropogenic fire charcoal (PyC)— changes according to elevation and topography  
287 in association with greater (more negative)  $iWUE_{\delta^{13}C}$ , negligible consumption of  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $K^{+}$  and  
288  $Mg^{2+}$ , and increased soil moisture holding capacity. In this study we hypothesized that  $iWUE_{\delta^{13}C}$   
289 , stored plant C, and soil water retention would change significantly as a result of fire history.  
290 However, besides an increase in soil water retention with fire at the low elevation site, this  
291 hypothesis was not supported. Instead, we found lower  $iWUE_{\delta^{13}C}$  at high elevations regardless of  
292 fire history, consistent with reported outcomes for non-glaciated populations in flat, sand plain  
293 New Jersey Pine Barrens (Mikita-Barbato *et al* 2015; Schafer and Bohrer 2016). We also found  
294 congruence between low elevation outcomes in the present study and those reported ( $\mu$  = 33m  
295 above sea level) in the New Jersey pine barrens (Carlo *et al* 2016). However, we could not draw  
296 any other useful comparisons between the studies due to a lack of data concerning clustering  
297 (stand density), slope, or aspect factors. There is evidence from previous investigations that post-  
298 fire PyC remnants, which endure in the soil layer (DeBano 1981), increase alkali cations (Kolden  
299 *et al* 2017) and solubilized minerals (Caldwell and Richards 1989) and are likely linked to  
300 thermal exfoliation (Shakesby and Doerr 2006). From the standpoint of reproduction, the  
301 absence of fire at locations such as *PERC*-oriented Wonderland trail (Butak 2014) does not  
302 appear to be slowing down expansion in that flat-sloped region nor in other cliff locations that  
303 we and others studied (Howard 2010).

304 Developing further insights into the ecological stoichiometry of pitch pine at MDI is a  
305 worthwhile goal given earlier discoveries by Fernandez (2008). Our nutrient analysis derived  
306 from burned and unburned trees was similar to a methodology in a New Jersey study (Renninger

Commented [RM24]: Climate projections advise against resuming prescribed fire or they don't believe natural fires will return? Is there a citation for this?

Commented [NGS25]: This is already said above (without the citations)

Commented [NGS26]:  $\mu$  is never defined

Commented [RM27R26]:  $\mu$  is used previously for aspect in degrees

Commented [RM28]: mean distance between neighbors?

Commented [RM29]: Is this correct? You associate Wonderland with recovery capacity in the previous paragraph. If each site typically uses a different pathway, it would be worth explaining that at the beginning of the discussion as well as the evidence supporting why.

Commented [RM30]: What earlier discoveries?

307 *et al* 2013) and produced some similar results. Since elevation is a key factor, we noted foliar Zn  
 308 was higher at lower elevations at MDI; this was consistent with findings by others in another  
 309 New Jersey investigation (Kolker *et al* 2013). In both Maine and New Jersey, it is possible  $PER_C$   
 310 may be enhanced by higher concentrations of foliar  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $K^+$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$ , P,  $Al^+$  and Zn ( $Mg^{2+}$  foliar  
 311 availability was not significant in this study). We were particularly interested in P, a limiting  
 312 factor (Verma and Jayakumar 2012); it is sometimes found to co-occur with pools of greater C  
 313 (Preston and Schmidt 2006). Scientists elsewhere assert that fire-induced sedimentary charcoal  
 314 produces soil C enrichment (Patel *et al* 2016) as measured in soil columns (Hart Horn and  
 315 Grissino-Mayer 2008). One could argue that charcoal remnants likely play a role in  $REC_C$  at  
 316 burned-over Cadillac Brook (below the heights of South Cadillac trail), but it is not known to  
 317 what extent these benefit the larger ecosystem. We conjecture that soil C persistence since the  
 318 1947 fire at burned-over areas such as South Cadillac trail reflects a lack of pyrogenic carbon  
 319 removal (Doerr *et al* 2018), though elsewhere lower C availability is attributable to greater  
 320 consumption by fungi (Luo *et al* 2017). P concentration at upper elevations at MDI contrasted  
 321 with more modest availability at other, low-lying pinelands at MDI and in New Jersey  
 322 (Renninger *et al* 2013; Alkañiz *et al* 2018). One explanation for substantial soil P availability is  
 323 that it derives from charcoal remnants; however, lacking mycorrhizal studies we were unable to  
 324 confirm the extent of P liberated from the charcoal in the two 1947 fire precincts.

325 Climate is likely the final arbiter of decline rather than stand-replacing fire disturbance in  
 326 the case of long-term pitch pine livelihood. Recent climate change models anticipate negative  
 327 impact on future vegetative status at MDI (Fernandez *et al* 2015), but these do not specifically  
 328 address the adaptability of pitch pine nor the extent to which plasticity (Day *et al* 2014) is  
 329 shaping tendency towards  $PER_C$  or  $REC_C$ . What has been clear for at least two decades is the  
 330 effect of global climate change on ecophysiology traits. Day, Greenwood and White (2001)  
 331 found that an uptick in annual temperatures signaled increased leaf-air vapor pressure deficits  
 332 which negatively impacted pitch pine stomata response and limited gas exchange. In a related  
 333 report, scientists found that warming trends (Kunkel *et al* 2013) increased pitch pine difficulties  
 334 in reproduction (Ledig Smouse and Hom 2015). This includes weather-related effects such as  
 335 episodic drought, harsh winds, and salt spray (Schmitt 2015; Fernandez *et al* 2015), as well as  
 336 conditions that increased cold intolerance (Berang and Steiner 1985). Increases in annual winter  
 337 temperatures (Lesk *et al* 2017) coupled with an absence of fire cause concern about a quite

Commented [RM31]: Which are?

Commented [RM32]: Citation?

Commented [RM33]: Foliar or soil? A limiting factor to what?

338 different disturbance—potential invasion within the next decade of an herbivore, Southern Pine  
339 Beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis* or ‘SPB’). Although deer and rodent damage (Ledig *et al* 2013)  
340 historically impeded tree survival in pine barrens, SPB has already paid a deadly visit to Long  
341 Island, NY (Dodds *et al* 2018). Unless its progress is deterred by other insect predators like  
342 Dubious Checkered Beetle (*Thanasimus dubius*; Coulson and Klepzig 2011), it is possible that  
343 pitch pines along with understory plants, butterflies and moth members of the Acadia ecosystem  
344 will suffer the same fate experienced in more southerly locations (Lesk *et al* 2017). According to  
345 several authors (Day *et al* 2005; Lee *et al* 2019) warming climate impacts the suitability of  
346 habitat and pitch pine tendencies to consolidate, regenerate or migrate may be in jeopardy. These  
347 effects are likely to eventually limit aspects of  $PER_C$  such as niche expansion, if they have not  
348 already, through a combination of diminished open space capacity, loss of enriched substrates,  
349 and elimination of ‘safe sites.’

350 Pitch pine is considered an important guardian of underlying heath communities at MDI;  
351 it is foundational as a necessary ecosystem component in a stressed environment. Despite  
352 increasing climate pressures, trees retreating into ever more sparse conditions reinforces their  
353 facilitator status (Connell and Slatyer 1977). This species explicitly maintains the livelihood of  
354 underlying flora through a sharing and distribution of ecoservices. Nevertheless, competitive  
355 advantages enjoyed currently may even give way to ‘mesophication’—negative feedback for  
356 shade intolerant trees like pitch pine (Nowacki and Abrams 2008), perhaps more widespread at  
357 the confluence of fire suppression, overabundance of deer, and climate change.

358 The model we proposed is not built on a quantitative framework nor is it intended as a  
359 predictive model, *per se*, yet results attached to this model are useful in several ways. First, these  
360 metrics provide a context for describing recovery or persistence in mathematical relationships  
361 along an adaptivity curve. Second, our method operationalizes recovery and persistence  
362 mechanisms fit to an ecological framework (Brand and Jax 2007). Finally, our model may be  
363 used to better understand how pitch pine in other ecosystems outside of the Northeast U.S.  
364 discriminate between  $REC_C$  and  $PER_C$  at a given elevation and within certain topographic  
365 parameters. The data presented here provides a fuller understanding of current regeneration and  
366 expansion concepts which are essential to an appreciation of influences on persistence in the  
367 absence of forest or prescribed fire.

368

Commented [RM34]: Do you mean suitable habitat?

## CONCLUSION

Here, we present an explanatory model of pitch pine post-fire recovery and persistence capacities to analyze population status as a function of fire and topography. We found adaptivity effects (growth, expansion into greater stand density) account for greater growth and stand density on more hospitable terrain, with little impact from fire history. This is likely due to the fact that fire return intervals are so infrequent as to reduce recovery features found elsewhere (e.g., cone serotiny). Flat and ledge pitch pine populations exhibited greater buoyancy than trees in more strenuous cliff situations. We also identified a selective preference for either growth at low elevations or stress tolerance at high elevations using multiple plant and ecosystem metrics. Our findings unravel an enigma about persistence in a post-fire milieu during a critical phase of the Anthropocene age (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000). At lower elevations, which represent the vast majority of pitch pine populations in the Northeast US, we predict newly pioneered locations reflect a continuation of *PERC* signaled by significant differences in density, slope, and aspect. At a time when continued climate change may tip the scale away from survival, our findings encourage the use of a model by forest managers to better understand the imposition of fire absence on flat and ledge communities.

## Data Availability Statement

Data used in this article can be found at the following repository:

[https://github.com/SmithEcophysLab/mtDesertIsland\\_Pinusrigida](https://github.com/SmithEcophysLab/mtDesertIsland_Pinusrigida)

(DOI:10.5281/zenodo.4663255).

## Author Contributions

JL and NS conceived the work, contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and to drafting the manuscript, gave final approval of the version submitted, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work. Questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved. JL carried out sample collection and field measurements, conducted soil water retention tests and prepared samples for EA-IRMS analysis. NS performed C/N foliar analysis, conducting statistical analyses and formulating figures and tables.

400 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

401 Research at MDI was conducted under permit ACAD-2020-SCI-0014 from the U.S.  
402 Department of Interior granted to Jeff Licht. Mike Day, PhD, suggested topics for study and  
403 located some of the sites for the study. Cartographer Jill Phelps Kern created geospatial figures.  
404 Remote sensing devices were supplied by Tora Johnson, PhD. Field sampling was assisted by  
405 Mimi Licht and Laura Brumleve. Site measurements were greatly facilitated by staff at National  
406 Park Service, Mt. Desert Island, Bar Harbor, ME. Our thanks to several anonymous reviewers  
407 prior to submission.

408  
409 **ORCID**

410 Jeff Licht: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2248-2050>  
411 Nicholas Smith: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7048-4387>  
412 Risa McNellis: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3538-9269>

413  
414 **FUNDING INFORMATION**

415 Professor Nick Smith was supported by funding at Texas Tech and partial funding for  
416 Jeff Licht to complete this paper was supported by a grant (P20AP00312) from the U.S.  
417 Department of Interior.

418  
419 **REFERENCES**

420 Brand, F. and Jax, K. (2007). Focusing the meaning (s) of resilience: resilience as a descriptive  
421 concept and a boundary object. *Ecology and society*, 12(1).  
422 Buma, B., Brown, C., Donato, D., Fontaine, J. and Johnstone, J. (2013). The impacts of changing  
423 disturbance regimes on serotinous plant populations and communities. *BioScience*, 63(11),  
424 866-876.  
425 Butak, A. (2014). Vegetation Composition, Structure, and Ecophysiology of Maritime Ledge  
426 Ecosystems, University of Maine, Orono  
427 (<http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd/2212>).  
428 Caldwell, M. and J. Richards. 1989. Hydraulic lift: water efflux from upper roots improves  
429 effectiveness of water uptake by deep roots. *Oecologia*, 79, 1-5.

430 Carlo, N., Renninger, H., Clark, K., and Schäfer, K. (2016). Impacts of prescribed fire on *Pinus*  
 431 *rigida* Mill. in upland forests of the Atlantic Coastal Plain. *Tree physiology*, 36(8), 967-982.

432 Certini, G. (2005) Effects of fire on properties of forest soils: a review. *Oecologia* 143:1–10

433 Charpentier, J. (2020). Wildland Fire Disturbance - Recovery Dynamics in Upland Forests at  
 434 Acadia National Park, Maine. Doctoral dissertation, Antioch University.  
 435 <https://aura.antioch.edu/etds>

436 Chen Z., Wang G. and Jia Y. (2017). Foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  Showed No Altitudinal Trend in an Arid  
 437 Region and Atmospheric Pressure Exerted a Negative Effect on Plant  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ , *Frontiers in*  
 438 *Plant Science*, 8, 1-9.

439 Churchill, D., Larson, A., Dahlgreen, M., Franklin, J., Hessburg, P. and Lutz, J. A. (2013).  
 440 Restoring forest resilience: from reference spatial patterns to silvicultural prescriptions and  
 441 monitoring. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 291, 442-457.

442 Connell, J. and Slatyer, R. (1977). Mechanisms of succession in natural communities and their  
 443 role in community stability and organization. *The American Naturalist*, 111(982), 1119-1144.

444 Copenheaver, C., White, A. and Patterson, W., III (2000). Vegetation development in a southern  
 445 Maine pitch pine-scrub oak barren. *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society*, 19-32.

446 Coulson, R. and Klepzig, K. (2011). Southern Pine Beetle II. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-140.  
 447 Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station.  
 448 153-160.

449 Crutzen, Paul and Eugene Stoermer 2000. The “Anthropocene.” *Global Change Newsletter* (41):  
 450 17–18.

451 Day, M., Schedlbauer, J., Livingston, Greenwood, M., White, M. and Brissette, J. (2005).  
 452 Influence of seedbed, light environment, and elevated night temperature on growth and  
 453 carbon allocation in pitch pine (*Pinus rigida*) and jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) seedlings. *For*  
 454 *Ecol & Manag*, 205(1), 59-71.

455 Day, M., Greenwood, M. and White, A. (2001). Age-related changes in foliar morphology and  
 456 physiology in red spruce and their influence on declining photosynthetic rates and  
 457 productivity with tree age. *Tree Physiology*, 21(16), 1195-1204.

458 Day, M., and Greenwood, M. (2011). Regulation of ontogeny in temperate conifers. In *Size-and*  
 459 *age-related changes in tree structure and function* (pp. 91-119). Springer, Dordrecht.

460 Day, M., Zazzaro, S. and Perkins, L. (2014). Seedling ontogeny and environmental plasticity in  
 461 two co-occurring shade-tolerant conifers and implications for environment–population  
 462 interactions. *American journal of botany*, 101(1), 45-55.  
 463 Doerr, S., Santin, C., Merino, A., Belcher, C., and Baxter, G. (2018). Fire as a removal  
 464 mechanism of pyrogenic carbon from the environment: effects of fire and pyrogenic carbon  
 465 characteristics. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 6, 127.  
 466 Dunne, J., Saleska, S., Fischer, M. and Harte, J. (2004). Integrating experimental and gradient  
 467 methods in ecological climate change research. *Ecology*, 85(4), 904-916.  
 468 Evans, S., Dueker, M., Logan, J. and Weathers, K. (2019). The biology of fog: results from  
 469 coastal Maine and Namib Desert reveal common drivers of fog microbial  
 470 composition. *Science of the Total Environment*, 647, 1547-1556.  
 471 Farquhar G., Ehleringer J. and Hubick K. (1989) Carbon Isotope Discrimination and  
 472 Photosynthesis. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology* 40, 503–  
 473 537.  
 474 Fernandez, I. (2008). *Carbon and nutrients in Maine forest soils* (Vol. 200). Department of Plant,  
 475 Soil & Environmental Sciences.  
 476 Fernandez, I., Schmitt, C., Birkel, S., Stancioff, E., Pershing, A., Kelley, J., Runge, J., Jacobson,  
 477 G. *et al* (2015). Maine’s climate future: 2015 update. University of Maine, Orono, ME. 24  
 478 pp.  
 479 Foereid, B., Lehmann, J., Wurster, C., and Bird, M. (2015). Presence of black carbon in soil due  
 480 to forest fire in the New Jersey pine barrens. *J. Earth Sci. Eng.* 5, 91–97. doi: 10.17265/2159  
 481 Fuller, L. and Quine, C. (2016). Resilience and tree health: a basis for implementation in  
 482 sustainable forest management. *Forestry: An International Journal of Forest*  
 483 *Research*, 89(1), 7-19.  
 484 Harris, T., Rajakaruna, N., Nelson, S. and P. Vaux. (2012). Stressors and threats to the flora of  
 485 Acadia National Park, Maine: Current knowledge, information gaps, and future directions.  
 486 *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society*, 139 (3), 323-344.  
 487 Hart, J., Horn, S. and Grissino-Mayer, H. (2008). Fire history from soil charcoal in a mixed  
 488 hardwood forest on the Cumberland Plateau, Tennessee, USA1. *The Journal of the Torrey*  
 489 *Botanical Society*, 135(3), 401-410.



490 Heuss, Molly (2018). Evaluating The Impacts Of Southern Pine Beetle On Pitch Pine Forest  
 491 Dynamics In A Newly Invaded Region. Masters thesis, University of Vermont, pp.67.

492 Howard, L. (2010). Community composition and fire dynamics of high elevation pitch pine  
 493 woodlands in northeastern West Virginia. *WV Division of Natural Resources, Elkins, WV*.

494 Howard, L. and Stelacio, M. (2011). Fire and the development of high-elevation pitch pine  
 495 communities in northeastern West Virginia. *Bulletin of the New Jersey Academy of Science*,  
 496 56(2), 19-23.

497 Ibáñez, I., Acharya, K., Juno, E., Karounos, C., Lee, B. R., McCollum, C., ... & Tourville, J.  
 498 (2019). Forest resilience under global environmental change: Do we have the information we  
 499 need? A systematic review. *PloS one*, 14(9), e0222207.

500 Inglett, P., Reddy, K., Newman, S., and Lorenzen, B. (2007). Increased soil stable nitrogen  
 501 isotopic ratio following phosphorus enrichment: historical patterns and tests of two  
 502 hypotheses in a phosphorus-limited wetland. *Oecologia*, 153(1), 99-109.

503 Jagels, R., Jiang, M., Marden, S. and Carlisle, J. 2002. Red spruce canopy response to acid fog  
 504 exposure. *Atmos. Res* 64: 169-178.

505 Jingfang, Q., and Wenwei, L. (2018). A survey about characteristics of soil water retention  
 506 curve. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 153, No. 6, p.  
 507 062076). IOP Publishing.

508 Jordan, M., Patterson III, W. and Windisch, A. (2003). Conceptual ecological models for the  
 509 Long Island pitch pine barrens: implications for managing rare plant communities. *Forest*  
 510 *Ecology and Management*, 185(1-2), 151-168.

511 Kunkel, K., Stevens, L., Stevens, Sun, Janssen, S., Wuebbles, D. and Dobson, J. (2013).  
 512 Regional climate trends and scenarios for the US national climate assessment: Part 1. Climate  
 513 of the Northeast United States. NOAA technical report NESDIS 142-1. Washington, DC. 87  
 514 pp.

515 Lafon, C., Grissino-Mayer, H., Aldrich, S., DeWeese, G., Flatley, W., LaForest, L. and Hoss, J.  
 516 (2014). Three centuries of Appalachian fire history from tree rings. *Three centuries of*  
 517 *Appalachian fire history from tree rings.*, (SRS-199), 99-103.

518 Lambers, H., Chapin, F. and Pons, T. (2006). Photosynthesis, respiration and long distance  
 519 transport. In *Plant Physiology Ecology*: 11-99, Springer, New York.

520 Ledig, F., Hom, J. and Smouse, P. (2013). The evolution of the New Jersey pine  
 521 plains. *American journal of botany*, 100(4), 778-791.  
 522 Ledig, F., Smouse, P. and Hom, J. (2015). Postglacial migration and adaptation for dispersal in  
 523 pitch pine (Pinaceae). *American journal of botany*, 102(12), 2074-2091.  
 524 Lee, C., Robinson, G., Robinson, I., and Lee, H. (2019). Regeneration of pitch pine (*Pinus*  
 525 *rigida*) stands inhibited by fire suppression in Albany Pine Bush Preserve, New York.  
 526 *Journal of forestry research*, 30(1), 233-242.  
 527 Lesk, C., Coffel, E., D'Amato, A., Dodds, K., and Horton, R. (2017). Threats to North American  
 528 forests from southern pine beetle with warming winters. *Nat. Clim. Change* 7, 713–717. doi:  
 529 10.1038/nclimate3375  
 530 Licht, J. and Smith, N. (2018). The influence of lignocellulose and hemicellulose biochar on  
 531 photosynthesis and water use efficiency in seedlings from a Northeastern US pine-oak  
 532 ecosystem. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 37(1), 25-37.  
 533 Licht, J. and Smith, N. (2020). Pyrogenic Carbon Increases Pitch Pine Seedling Growth, Soil  
 534 Moisture Retention, and Photosynthetic Intrinsic Water Use Efficiency in the Field. *Frontiers*  
 535 *in Forests and Global Change*, 3, 31.  
 536 Lubinski, S., Hop, K., & Gawler, S. (2003). US Geological Survey-National Park Service  
 537 Vegetation Mapping Program, Acadia National Park, Maine. *Project Report*.  
 538 Luo, J., Walsh, E., Miller, S., Blystone, D., Dighton, J., and Zhang, N. (2017). Root endophytic  
 539 fungal communities associated with pitch pine, switchgrass, and rosette grass in the pine  
 540 barrens ecosystem. *Fung. Biol.* 121, 478–487. doi: 10.1016/j.funbio.2017.01.005  
 541 Miller, K., Mitchell, B., Curtin, P. and Wheeler, J. (2014). Forest Health Monitoring, Northeast  
 542 Temperate Report, 2006-2013 NPS/NETN. <https://www.amazon.com/stream>  
 543 Miller, D., Castañeda, I., Bradley, R. and MacDonald, D. (2017). Local and regional wildfire  
 544 activity in central Maine (USA) during the past 900 years. *Journal of Paleolimnology*, 58(4),  
 545 455-466.  
 546 Mosseler, A., Rajora, O. and Major, J. (2004). Reproductive and genetic characteristics of rare,  
 547 disjunct pitch pine populations at the northern limits of its range in Canada. *Conservation*  
 548 *Genetics*, 5(5), 571-583.

549 Niinemets Ü., Keenan T. and Hallik L. (2015). A worldwide analysis of within-canopy variations  
550 in leaf structural, chemical and physiological traits across plant functional types. *New*  
551 *Phytologist* **205**, 973–993.

552 Nowacki, G., and Abrams, M. (2008). The demise of fire and “mesophication” of forests in the  
553 eastern United States. *Bioscience* 58, 123–138.

554 Parker, J., Fernandez, I., Rustad, L., and Norton, S. (2001). Effects of nitrogen enrichment,  
555 wildfire, and harvesting on forest-soil carbon and nitrogen. *Soil Science Society of America*  
556 *Journal*, 65(4), 1248-1255.

557 Parshall, T., Foster, D., Faison, E., MacDonald, D., and Hansen, B. (2003). Long-term history of  
558 vegetation and fire in pitch pine–oak forests on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. *Ecology* 84, 736–  
559 748. doi: 10.1890/0012-9658(2003)084

560 Patel, K., Jakubowski, M., Fernandez, I., Nelson, S., and Gawley, W. (2019). Soil Nitrogen and  
561 Mercury Dynamics Seven Decades After a Fire Disturbance: a Case Study at Acadia  
562 National Park. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 230 (2), 29.

563 Patterson, T., Maxwell, R., Harley, G., Oliver, J., Speer, J., Collins, S., ... and Russell, C. (2016).  
564 Climate–Growth Relationships of *Pinus rigida* (Mill.) at the Species’ Northern Range Limit,  
565 Acadia National Park, ME. *Northeastern naturalist*, 23(4), 490-500.

566 Patterson, III, W., Saunders, K. and Horton, L. (1983). Fire regimes of the coastal Maine forests  
567 of Acadia National Park. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, North  
568 Atlantic Region, Office of Scientific Studies, Boston, Mass. Publ. OSS 83-3.

569 Patterson, III, W., Edwards, K. and Maguire, D. (1987). Microscopic charcoal as a fossil  
570 indicator of fire. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 6(1), 3-23.

571 Pingree, M. and DeLuca, T. (2017). Function of wildfire-deposited pyrogenic carbon in  
572 terrestrial ecosystems. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 5, 53.

573 Preston, C. and Schmidt, M. (2006). Black (pyrogenic) carbon in boreal forests: a synthesis of  
574 current knowledge and uncertainties. *Biogeosci. Discuss.* 3, 211–271. doi: 10.5194/bgd-3-  
575 211-2006

576 Renninger, H., Clark, K., Skowronski, N. and Schäfer, K. (2013). Effects of a prescribed fire on  
577 water use and photosynthetic capacity of pitch pines. *Trees*, 27(4), 1115-1127.

578 Shakesby, R. and Doerr, S. (2006). Wildfire as a hydrological and geomorphological agent.  
579 *Earth-Science Reviews*, 74(3-4), 269-307.

580 Schier, G. and McQuattie, C. (1996). Response of ectomycorrhizal and nonmycorrhizal pitch  
 581 pine (*Pinus rigida*) seedlings to nutrient supply and aluminum: growth and mineral  
 582 nutrition. *Canadian journal of forest research*, 26(12), 2145-2152.  
 583 Stambaugh, M., Varner, J., Noss, R., Dey, D., Christensen, N., Baldwin, R., ... and Waldrop, T.  
 584 (2015). Clarifying the role of fire in the deciduous forests of eastern North America: reply to  
 585 Matlack. *Conservation Biology*, 29(3), 942-946.  
 586 Swanston, C., Brandt, L., Janowiak, M., Handler, S., Butler-Leopold, P., Iverson, L., et al.  
 587 (2018). Vulnerability of forests of the Midwest and Northeast United States to climate  
 588 change. *Clim. Change* 146, 103–116. doi: 10.1007/s10584-017-2065-2  
 589 Szpakowski, D. and Jensen, J. (2019). A review of the applications of remote sensing in fire  
 590 ecology. *Remote Sensing*, 11(22), 2638.  
 591 Verma, S. and Jayakumar, S. (2012). Impact of forest fire on physical, chemical and biological  
 592 properties of soil: A review. *Proceedings of the International Academy of Ecology and*  
 593 *Environmental Sciences*, 2 (3), 168.  
 594 Wang, H, Prentice, I., Davis, T., Keenan, T., Wright, I. and Peng, C. (2017) Photosynthetic  
 595 responses to altitude: an explanation based on optimality principles. *New Phytologist*, **213**,  
 596 976–982.  
 597 Watson, G. Goodness of fit tests on a circle. II. *Biometrika* (1962), 49, 57-63.