Diversity of lichens and bryophytes in hybrid aspen plantations in Estonia depends on landscape structure

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2017-0080.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Randlane, Tiina; University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Lai 40 Tullus, Tea; Estonian University of Life Sciences, Institute of Forestry and Rural Engineering Saag, Andres; University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Lai 40 Lutter, Reimo; Estonian University of Life Sciences, Institute of Forestry and Rural Engineering Tullus, Arvo; University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Lai 40 Helm, Aveliina; University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Lai 40 Tullus, Hardi; Estonian University of Life Sciences, Institute of Forestry and Rural Engineering Partel, Meelis; University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Lai 40
Keyword:	bryophytes, forest continuity, forest plantations, hybrid aspen, lichens
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	N/A

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 **Diversity of lichens and bryophytes in hybrid aspen plantations in**
2 **Estonia depends on landscape structure**

3
4 Tiina Randlane, Tea Tullus, Andres Saag, Reimo Lutter, Arvo Tullus, Aveliina Helm,
5 Hardi Tullus, and Meelis Pärtel

6
7 **T. Randlane, A. Saag, A. Tullus, A. Helm, and M. Pärtel.** Department of Botany,
8 Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, Lai 38–40, Tartu 51005,
9 Estonia (emails: tiina.randlane@ut.ee; andres.saag@ut.ee; arvo.tullus@ut.ee;
10 aveliina.helm@ut.ee; meelis.partel@ut.ee).

11 **T. Tullus, R. Lutter, and H. Tullus.** Department of Silviculture, Institute of Forestry and
12 Rural Engineering, Estonian University of Life Sciences, Kreutzwaldi 5, Tartu 51014,
13 Estonia (emails: tea.tullus@emu.ee; reimo.lutter@emu.ee; hardi.tullus@emu.ee).

14 **Corresponding author:** Tiina Randlane, Department of Botany, Institute of Ecology and
15 Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, Lai 38–40, Tartu 51005, Estonia; email:
16 tiina.randlane@ut.ee; tel.: +372 7376232

17

18 **Abstract:** Importance of single-species forest plantations in sustaining biodiversity
19 could be bigger than expected. We described the diversity of lichens and bryophytes in
20 15 midterm (16–17-year-old) hybrid aspen (*Populus tremula* × *P. tremuloides*)
21 plantations in Estonia. Species richness and composition data were linked with
22 environmental and landscape-scale variables. Altogether, 44 lichen and 37 bryophyte
23 species were recorded from plantations; richnesses of bryophytes and lichens were
24 positively correlated. Lichen species composition was significantly affected by
25 landscape-scale parameters (distance to the nearest present forest, distance to the
26 nearest forest continuously occurring in the same place since 1930s, and forest area in
27 the study plot vicinity in 1930s). Bryophyte species composition was affected mainly by
28 light conditions and forest area in 1930s. Among lichens, functional group of sexual
29 crustose species dominated in midterm plantations; appearance of asexual lichens of
30 different growth forms is expected during next years. Our results indicate importance of
31 long-term availability of good-quality forests as sources of propagules. Short-rotation
32 hybrid aspen plantations can provide temporary habitats for forest species and thus in
33 part contribute to preserving landscape-scale biodiversity, if they are close to possible
34 colonisation sources. Green-tree retention in plantations will probably raise the
35 biodiversity value of those short-term communities.

36 **Keywords:** bryophytes, forest continuity, forest plantations, hybrid aspen, lichens

37

38 **1. Introduction**

39 Forests are among the most important repositories of terrestrial biodiversity offering
 40 diverse habitats for various groups of organisms. In northern Eurasia and North
 41 America, the proportion of landscape covered by forests is currently (1990–2015)
 42 considered stable or even expanding (Keenan et al. 2015), while the effects of intensive
 43 forest management are still accompanied by a significant loss of forest biodiversity at all
 44 levels, exhibiting decrease of genetic diversity, species richness and ecosystem
 45 variability (Bernes et al. 2015). It has been suggested, that some negative impact of
 46 forest management on the biodiversity can be reduced by harvesting timber not from
 47 natural forests but from plantations of woody plants, considering that the sites chosen
 48 for plantations are not habitats crucial to biodiversity (Hartmann et al. 2010).
 49 Hybrid aspen (*Populus tremula* L. × *P. tremuloides* Michx.) is one of the fastest growing
 50 trees in northern Europe, suitable for the production of pulp- and energy-wood (Tullus
 51 et al. 2012a). This artificial cross is capable of growing faster and therefore shows
 52 higher biomass productivity than its parent species during the first 20–30 years (Yu
 53 2001) which is the recommended rotation period for this tree in northern Europe
 54 (Tullus et al. 2012a). Both parent species are widely distributed in the world, *P. tremula*
 55 in Eurasia, and *P. tremuloides* in North America. Currently, the area of hybrid aspen
 56 plantations in Nordic and Baltic countries is estimated to cover ca 9000 ha (Tullus et al.
 57 2015) and most of the plantations are established on the abandoned agricultural lands
 58 (Soo et al. 2009a). Studies about the nutritional status of soil in first generation hybrid
 59 aspen plantations on former agricultural fields revealed the decrease of soil reaction
 60 (pH) but did not show significant depletion of primary macronutrients (N, P, K) and soil
 61 organic carbon (Lutter et al. 2016).
 62 Forest plantations, especially single-species plantations, have earned a reputation of

63 being “green deserts” due to unsuitable conditions for several species (Bremer and
64 Farley 2010). However, recent studies addressing biodiversity issues in relation to
65 forest plantations reveal controversial results, depending on the taxonomic group
66 considered, and characteristics of studied plantations, such as age of trees, light
67 conditions or previous agricultural land use (Felton et al. 2010). In general, biodiversity
68 is frequently found to be higher within tree plantations compared to agricultural
69 croplands, but clearly lower than that on native forest land (Stephens and Wagner
70 2007).

71 In hybrid aspen or other *Populus* plantations, biodiversity studies have dealt with
72 understorey vegetation of vascular plants and bryophytes (Weih et al. 2003; Soo et al.
73 2009a, 2009b; Tullus et al. 2012b, 2015). Previously, it has been shown that both
74 vascular plant and bryophyte diversity increased with increasing age of plantations, and
75 a slow succession towards a shade-tolerant understorey occurs in midterm plantations,
76 compared to young plantations. However, the number of species that appeared
77 characteristic of natural forests growing on similar soil types was low (Tullus et al.
78 2015). The parent species of hybrid aspen (*Populus tremula* and *P. tremuloides*) support
79 diverse epiphytic bryophyte communities, especially at older age (Kuusinen 1996;
80 Boudreault et al. 2000), while data about epiphytic bryophytes in hybrid aspen
81 plantations are scarce; e.g. nine bryophyte species have earlier been recorded as
82 growing only on hybrid aspen trunks (in addition to 19 species that inhabited both
83 ground and tree bases or trunks) (Tullus et al. 2015).

84 Lichen-forming fungi, another group of spore-producing organisms besides bryophytes,
85 form also a species rich component of the forest biota (Will-Wolf et al. 2002). European
86 aspen (*Populus tremula*) is frequently pointed out as a special substrate for a great
87 number of epiphytic lichens housing more host-tree-specific lichens than any other

boreal tree species (Jüriado et al. 2003; Hedenås and Ericson 2004). The epiphytic lichen communities on aspen differ significantly between early and late successional forest stands and reach highest species richness values at the tree age of 80–100 yr while on younger trees the richness values are clearly lower (Ellis and Ellis 2013); in late successions a large number of cyanolichens characteristically occur on the basal trunks of aspens (Kuusinen 1994; Hedenås and Ericson 2000). In addition to the specific cyanobacterial lichens, the presence of *Populus tremula* individuals in forests supports a multitude of common species and can remarkably increase the lichen diversity of a stand (Jüriado et al. 2003). For example, 273 lichen species were recorded as aspen epiphytes in Scotland (Ellis and Ellis 2013); 27 threatened (categories CR, EN, VU and NT of the national red list according to Randlane et al. 2008) and altogether 120 lichen species were listed growing on aspen in Estonia (Marmor et al. 2017). Considerably less lichenized taxa (from 23 to 75) have been reported growing on trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) in different regions of North America (Sheard and Jonescu 1974; Case 1977; Boudreault et al. 2000; Rogers and Ryel 2008). However, all these data about aspen lichens are based on the studies performed in medium or old natural stands of hybrid aspen parent species (*Populus tremula* and *P. tremuloides*) while plantations of their hybrid have not been investigated in regard to lichen-forming fungi.

In general, epiphytic lichen diversity is influenced by tree level, stand level and large scale (e.g. climate, air pollution, landscape structure) effects. At the tree level, occurrence of lichen species mainly depends on the physical (e.g. roughness, hardness and water-holding capacity) and chemical properties (acidity) of the bark while forest tree species composition, moisture regime and habitat light availability (tree density and canopy cover) are considered the most influential factors for epiphytes at the stand

level (Jüriado et al. 2009; Ellis 2012). In addition, landscape-scale factors such as forest history, extent of woodlands, habitat fragmentation or connectivity have been used to explain the epiphytic biodiversity (e.g. Fritz et al. 2009; Marmor et al. 2010; Ellis 2012). These factors influence the community composition and richness mainly through the dispersal properties of lichens and bryophytes (Ellis 2012), and in single-species plantations, where tree- and stand-level factors vary little, they should play important role in shaping the epiphytic communities.

Species responses to the changes in their ecosystems are currently often studied using functional-trait-based approach (see review in Hevia et al. 2017). Species respond to environmental conditions individually, using species' adaptive traits, however, the response of many individual species comprising a community is scaled up to a complex shift in compositional structure of the community; understanding the community response to environmental or habitat change may be simplified through the search for trait-based rules structuring community composition (Ellis and Coppins 2007a). Among functional traits controlling successional trends of lichens, characters related to thallus gross morphology, reproductive strategy, and lichen compounds have been mentioned. The generally accepted succession of epiphytic lichens, considering functional traits, starts with pioneer species which tend to be smaller and reproduce sexually by small ascospores while late-successional competitive species tend to be larger, with a greater investment in large vegetative diaspores and local establishment (Ellis 2012). Such trait-based approach is considered useful not only for describing and understanding community responses but also for conservation practices (e.g. Leppik et al. 2015) and predicting changes in communities (Ellis and Coppins 2007a).

Improved knowledge about species diversity and succession of communities in single-species forest plantations might help to understand the possible importance of these

plantations in sustaining landscape-scale biodiversity. We aim to investigate the lichen biota and bryophyte flora in the first generation midterm hybrid aspen plantations and answer the following questions:

1. Do midterm hybrid aspen plantations support low or high species diversity of lichen-forming fungi and bryophytes?
2. Which functional species groups dominate among lichens and bryophytes inhabiting hybrid aspen plantations?
3. Which environmental and landscape factors influence the richness and composition of lichens and bryophytes in hybrid aspen plantations?

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Study sites

The study was carried out in Estonia which is situated in Northern Europe, on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea. Estonia is lying in the moderate climate zone and in the hemiboreal forest zone, a transitional zone between the boreal coniferous and temperate deciduous forests. The 15 study sites were located in southern Estonia (57.752°N–58.590°N, 25.247°E–27.405°E) (Figure 1). The studied hybrid aspen plantations were established in 1999 and 2000 on previous mineral agricultural soil, using 1-year-old clonal micropropagated plants originating from Finland (Tullus et al. 2007). For site preparation, whole-area or strip ploughing had been carried out before planting the trees to reduce competition between young seedlings and field layer. The size of plantations varied from 0.7 to 32 ha, and the average planting density was 1300 trees per hectare. Permanent circular experimental plots, with an area of 0.1 ha and with on average 106 aspens per plot, were established in 2003 and 2004 in hybrid aspen plantations to monitor above-ground growth development and productivity of

the trees (Tullus et al. 2007).

2.2. Data collection

Lichen and bryophyte data were collected during 2015 from 15 midterm (16- to 17-year-old) hybrid aspen plantations, within squares of 10 x 10 m in size (one square in each plantation; squares located in the centre of the above-mentioned permanent experimental plots). Squares were located in a typical part of the microrelief in plantation and surrounded by a buffer plantation zone of at least 15 meters in order to avoid the edge effect. The presence of all bryophyte and lichenized species was recorded on all possible substrates within the established squares – on bark of hybrid aspens (141 trees altogether in all studied plantations), and a few other young trees (*Betula* sp. and *Salix* sp., occurring only rarely within the squares, with the maximum height of 2 m), dead wood (mainly on fallen twigs, but also a dead standing hybrid aspen tree in one square) and ground. In every square, the abundance of each species was estimated visually using a classical cover-abundance scale of (+)1–5 where + indicates one-two specimens recorded, with a small cover area; 1 – few specimens with cover up to 5%, 2 – any number, with cover 6–20%, 3 – any number, with cover 21–50%, 4 – any number, with cover 51–75%, 5 – any number, with cover 76–100%. Specimens that were difficult to identify in the field were collected for later determination. A stereomicroscope and light microscope were used for the identification of taxa in the laboratory. In a few cases standardized thin-layer chromatography (Orange et al. 2001) was applied to identify secondary compounds in lichens. Nomenclature of lichenized taxa follows Randlane et al. (2016). Data on lichen species frequency in Estonia were derived from Randlane and Saag (1999), the eSamba, database of Estonian lichens (www.eseis.ut.ee), and the eBiodiversity database

(<http://elurikkus.ut.ee/>). Lichenized taxa were grouped according to the ecological indicator values of species by Wirth (2010). Nomenclature and frequency data of bryophytes are according to Vellak et al. (2015). Bryophyte species were classified into life strategy categories based on Dierssen (2001) and into groups according to the ecological indicator values of taxa as specified by Düll (1991). The voucher specimens of lichens are deposited in the lichenological herbarium of the Natural History Museum at the University of Tartu (TU).

Different environmental characteristics were gathered from the permanent experimental plots: soil properties during 2013–2014 according to the methods described in Lutter et al. (2016), light data and measures of hybrid aspen trees in 2015, in the middle of the growing season, according to Tullus et al. (2015). Additionally, for each studied site we estimated landscape-scale factors: (a) a distance to nearest currently present natural forest; (b) distance to the nearest natural forest that have continuously occurred in the same locality for at least 75–80 years, and (c) historical (1930s) and current (2000) cover of forest in the surrounding landscape. Distances to natural forests were estimated by using recent (2015) aerial photos of Estonia, provided by Estonian Land Board. Forest continuity was estimated by using historical topographic maps (1:50,000) of the Estonian Land Board from 1935–1939 and 1969. Historical and current forest cover was estimated by calculating the forest cover percentage in the radius of 500 m around the study plots for 1930s and in 2000, respectively. Habitat availability within radius of 500 m has been found to describe local lichen and bryophyte diversity better than smaller or larger scales (Löbel et al. 2006). All observed characteristics are listed in Table 1.

2.3. Statistical analyses

Pearson correlation was used to link species richnesses of lichens and bryophytes. To visualize the result, we used Type II (Major Axis) regression, R package “lmodel2”, function “lmodel2” (Legendre 2014) for obtaining trendline. Type II regression is not dependent on the selection of x and y axis and can visualize correlative relationships. For investigating the effect of environmental and landscape-scale factors (listed in Table 1) on diversity of lichens and bryophytes, we used linear regression models, R function “lm” (R Core Team 2016). As several variables were highly correlated (Table A1) and could not be included to a single model, we used information-theoretic approach by weighting models according to Akaike Information Criterion adjusted for small sample size (AICc, Burnham and Anderson 2002). We used R package “MuMIn” (Barton 2016) and function “dredge”, as well as option “subset” which included to a single model only dependent variables which were not strongly correlated ($|r| < 0.3$). From all possible models we considered these for which delta-AICc was < 2 , which is generally considered as equally supported. We checked the spatial pattern of model residuals according to Moran’s I, R package “ape”, function “Moran.I” (Paradis et al. 2005). No significant spatial autocorrelation was detected. We also analysed separately diversity of sexual and vegetative lichen groups.

To test, which environmental and landscape-scale variables influence the species composition of lichens and bryophytes in aspen plantations, non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination was applied. We used R package “vegan” (Oksanen et al. 2013), function “metaMDS” and Bray-Curtis dissimilarities, based on the species abundance data. The significance of r^2 of the regression model describing the relationship between the given environmental or landscape-scale factor and the two NMDS ordination axes scores was tested with a random permutation test (999 permutations), using the function “envfit”.

All variables were ln-transformed (except pH which is already in log-scale) prior analyses, and all percentages or proportions were logit-transformed.

3. Results

3.1. Diversity of lichens

Altogether, 44 species of lichenized fungi were found in fifteen hybrid aspen plantations. The majority of them were common taxa frequently recorded in Estonia, with the exception of *Arthonia patellulata*, *Athallia cerinella*, *Diplotomma pharcidium* and *Leptorhaphis tremulae*, which are known in less than ten localities in Estonia so far (Table 2). One species, *Candelariella lutella*, was recorded for the first time nationally, in 13 separate study plots of this research (Oja et al. 2016). The number of lichenized taxa in study plots varied from 14 to 32, and the mean number of lichen species in a plot was 25. The most frequent species were: *Caloplaca cerina*, *Lecania naegelii*, *Lecanora chlarotera* and *Xanthoria parietina* (present in all plots), *Candelariella lutella*, *Gyalolechia flavorubescens*, *Lecania cyrtella*, *Lecanora sambuci*, *L. symmicta*, *Lecidella euphorea*, *Phaeophyscia ciliata*, *Physcia adscendens*, *P. stellaris*, and *Physcia tenella* (present in > 80% of plots) (Table 2).

According to the substrate, 43 of the recorded species grew on trunks and branches of trees, and one species, *Peltigera rufescens*, inhabited soil. Among the epiphytes, almost all species were recorded on hybrid aspen, with the exception of *Scoliciosporum sarothamni* which was found on a young *Betula* spp. only. Some species, e.g. *Lecanora carpinea*, *L. symmicta*, *Melanohalea olivacea* and few others, were additionally recorded from *Betula* spp. and *Salix* spp. (Table 2).

Evaluation of recorded taxa according to the characteristic traits of species revealed some traits which were dominating. According to the growth form of the thallus, the

species were divided between three main morphologies – species with crustose (59%), foliose (34%) and fruticose (7%) thalli (Table 2). In almost all recorded taxa photobiont belonged to the group of coccoid green alga; lichens with cyanobacteria as photobiont were not found; two fungi, *Leptorhaphis tremula* and *Mycomicrothelia wallrothii*, are considered to be not lichenized (Smith et al. 2009). Among all recorded taxa, the majority of the species (75%) shared the strategy of reproducing sexually; of them the two non-lichenized species, *L. tremula* and *M. wallrothii*, had perithecia while all the other species had apothecia as fruiting bodies. All vegetatively reproducing species had soredia as vegetative diaspores (Table 2); no taxa with isidia, phyllidia or other attached vegetative propagules were found.

According to the ecological indicator values attributed to lichenized taxa (Wirth 2010), the recorded species can be characterized by the following features: generally preferring light, tolerating low or medium moisture, various values of substrate pH (between 4.1–4.8 and 6.6–7.5) and eutrophication (Table 2; Figure 2).

3.2. Diversity of bryophytes

Altogether, 37 bryophyte species were found in hybrid aspen plantations. In addition, few specimens were identified at the genus level (*Pellia* sp. and *Pohlia* sp.). The majority of the recorded taxa belonged to common species, with the exception of *Leskea polycarpa*, *Plagiomnium medium* and *Tortula truncata* that are sporadically found in Estonia (Table 3). The number of bryophyte species per study plot varied from 8 to 19 and the mean number of bryophyte species was 13. The most frequent species were *Amblystegium serpens*, *Brachythecium rutabulum*, *Oxyrrhynchium hians* (in 100% of plots), *Brachythecium salebrosum*, *Plagiomnium cuspidatum*, and *Sciuro-hypnum curtum* (present in > 80% of plots).

According to the substrate, 21 species inhabited only the ground, 13 species were recorded growing on the ground and on the trunks/tree bases of hybrid aspens, and three species (*Leskea polycarpa*, *Orthotrichum speciosum* and *Pylaisia polyantha*) were found only on trunks (Table 3). Seven bryophyte species were recorded, besides ground and tree trunks, growing also on deadwood.

On the basis of life strategy categories according to Dierssen (2001), the bryophyte flora of hybrid aspen plantations was dominated by competitive perennials (38%), followed by perennial stayers (24%) and stress tolerant perennials (14%), while the share of short-living bryophyte species was small (Table 3).

According to the ecological indicator values attributed to bryophyte species (Düll 1991), the recorded species can be characterized as generally preferring moderate to high light and humidity levels and moderately acid pH of substrate (Figure 2).

Between the total species richnesses of bryophytes and lichens, a significant positive correlation ($r = 0.56$, $p = 0.03$) was revealed (Figure 3).

3.3. The effect of environmental and landscape-scale variables on lichen and bryophyte biota in hybrid aspen plantations

Species richnesses of lichens and bryophytes in hybrid aspen plantations increased with historical forest cover around the study plot in 1930s, and bryophyte richness additionally increased with the density of trees in the study plot (Table 4, Figure 4). The positive effect of historical forest cover was significant both for diversity of sexual and vegetative lichens ($t = 2.6$, $p = 0.02$, and $t = 2.2$, $p = 0.04$, respectively).

Effect of environmental and landscape-scale variables on species composition of lichens and bryophytes was studied by using NMDS ordination. Lichen species composition was significantly and strongly influenced by landscape-scale variables: distance from

currently present nearest forest, distance from continuously occurring forest and historical forest cover in the surroundings. At the same time, variables linked with soil and light conditions or tree characteristics did not significantly influence the variation of lichen species composition (Table 5, Figure 5). Bryophyte species composition was significantly affected by the phosphorus content in soil, by canopy openness and amount of canopy-transmitted solar radiation (Table 5, Figure 6). Similarly to lichens, historical (in 1930s) forest cover in the surrounding landscape had significant effect on the variation of bryophyte species composition.

4. Discussion

4.1. Species diversity of lichens and bryophytes in midterm hybrid aspen plantations

Single-species forest plantations are generally considered habitats with low number of inhabiting species (Bremer and Farley 2010). We detected 44 lichen and 37 bryophyte species in fifteen studied hybrid aspen plantations, with 25 species of lichens and 13 bryophytes in average per plot of 100 m² size (Tables 2 and 3). One of the parent species of hybrid aspen, *Populus tremula*, is widely known to support high diversity of epiphytes at the medium tree age; e.g. Ellis and Ellis (2013) recorded 139 lichen species from 40 aspen trees which age varied from 27 to 165 yrs, with a mean of 80 yrs. However, stands of young (less than 20 yr) aspens have only rarely been investigated in regard to lichen-forming fungi. Davies et al. (2014) reported 23 epiphytic lichen species and three bryophytes on 15-year-old aspens grown at two experimental sites in Scotland. Compared with these data, the species richness of lichens and mosses in midterm (16- to 17-year-old) plantations of hybrid aspen was remarkable.

337 Strong positive correlation between lichen and bryophyte species richnesses (Figure 3)
338 indicates that the diversity of two groups are influenced by similar factors. An opposite
339 relationship, the negative association between the species numbers of lichens and
340 mosses growing on the same substrate, has been earlier demonstrated in epiphytic
341 communities (e.g. Löbel et al. 2006; Degtjarenko et al. 2016). In our study, almost all
342 lichens (except one, *Peltigera rufescens*) inhabited trunks and branches of aspens and
343 few other young trees (mainly *Betula* spp.) while majority of bryophytes (34 species out
344 of 37) were recorded growing on ground. The lack of lichens on ground in hybrid aspen
345 plantations is probably due to the absence of the available free substrate as ground
346 lichens are generally poor competitors with faster growing ground-dwelling vascular
347 plants and the more vigorous bryophytes (Gilbert 1993). The lack of mosses on trees
348 could be connected with time factor and also with the current light and moisture
349 conditions on the trunks of young aspens since epiphytic lichens generally dominate
350 over mosses in drier and lighter niches on trees (Sales et al. 2016). The other potential
351 substrates for these groups of organisms were limited as the amount of deadwood was
352 small in the studied stands and any kind of rocks or boulders were not available
353 because the plantations had been established on abandoned agricultural lands, crop
354 fields or grassland (Tullus et al. 2007), where erratic boulders and other stones were
355 obviously cleared on purpose.

356 The majority of both lichens and bryophytes recorded in studied plantations were
357 common species (Tables 2 and 3). Although one lichenized fungus, *Candelariella lutella*,
358 was recorded for the first time nationally, it is probably not rare in Estonia but has been
359 overlooked due to its very small size (Oja et al. 2016). In general, aspen epiphytes
360 include only a small number of specialist lichen species (e.g. *Arthonia patellulata* and
361 *Lecanora populicola*), which are known only from aspen, in addition to numerous

common species associated with more nutrient-rich bark conditions (Lewis and Ellis 2010). Our results are in accordance with these findings (Table 2). The so-called nationally valuable, i.e. protected, threatened or rare species with up to 10 localities in Estonia, were not recorded among bryophytes, while a few species belonging currently to the rare taxa were found among lichens.

4.2. Functional species groups among lichens and bryophytes in studied plantations

We used functional-trait-based approach of species' groups to describe the current stage of lichen successions in midterm hybrid aspen plantations; functional groups related to thallus gross morphology and reproductive strategy (Ellis and Coppins 2007a) were applied. Among lichens, functional group of sexually reproducing crustose species formed the most numerous group (25 taxa, Table 2); such species (e.g. *Athallia pyracea*, *Lecania naegelii*, *Lecanora carpinea*, *L. chlarotera*, *L. populicola*, *Lecidella elaeochroma* etc.) are considered early colonists of aspen bark, becoming less abundant as the tree ages, and are replaced progressively by asexually reproducing crustose lichens, foliose lichens and bryophytes on mid-aged trees (Ellis and Ellis 2013). Higher frequencies of crustose lichens on younger trees are considered indicative of an open bark community, characterized by lower levels of competition for space and light (Ellis and Coppins 2006). In addition, we recorded one vegetatively reproducing crustose lichen, *Scoliciosporum sarothamni*, 15 foliose species, both sexually and asexually reproducing, and three asexual fruticose species in studied midterm plantations (Table 2). We also found 16 bryophyte species growing on the trees, but only three of them inhabited explicitly tree trunks. Among all recorded bryophytes, species with different life strategies were present, but perennials, including competitive and stress tolerant

perennials, dominated (Table 3). These data indicate that hybrid aspens growing in midterm plantations provide substrate to lichen species from other functional groups besides pioneers – sexual crustose taxa – and also to some bryophytes, already at the tree age of 16–17 years.

According to the ecological indicator values that are ascribed to lichen (Wirth 2010) and bryophyte species (Düll 1991), the two groups of spore-producing organisms found in hybrid aspen plantations showed some differences: compared to bryophytes, lichen species preferred stronger light, lower humidity and higher temperature levels (Figure 2). Both groups tolerated various values of substrate pH, and lichens also various eutrophication levels (data for bryophytes not available). These differences in ecological preferences of the two groups are explained by the fact that they generally inhabited different substrates in studied plantations – recorded lichen species were mostly epiphytic (with one exception), and bryophytes were mainly epigeic, growing on the ground (Tables 2 and 3) where light was evidently less and moisture more available than on aspen trunks.

4.3. Factors affecting species diversity of lichens and bryophytes

We used linear modeling and NMDS ordination to study the effects of several environmental and landscape variables on lichen and bryophyte species richnesses and compositions in hybrid aspen plantations. None of the studied environmental factors had significant effect on lichen diversity measures. Richness of bryophytes was positively correlated with tree density on study plot (Figure 4), and bryophyte species composition was significantly affected by the environmental parameters connected to the light conditions – the amount of canopy-transmitted solar radiation and canopy openness (Table 5, Figure 6). Although bryophytes are generally regarded as shade

412 plants, there is a wide range in the light responses of different bryophyte species
413 (Marshall and Proctor 2004). The bryoflora of the current study also contained species
414 with variable light preferences, ranging from shade tolerant species (with light index 3)
415 to light-demanding species (with light index 8) (Figure 2). Like in young (7- to 8-year-
416 old) hybrid aspen plantations (Tullus et al. 2012b), the share of light-preferring species,
417 typical of open grassland communities, was continuously high in midterm plantations
418 as the species with light indices 5–7 formed the most numerous group (Figure 2).

419 Most tested landscape-scale factors strongly influenced the richness and composition of
420 lichens and bryophytes. Only current forest cover in the plot surroundings did not have
421 any effect on studied biodiversity elements. Forest cover in the surroundings of study
422 plot in 1930s strongly determined the richness of both bryophytes and lichens (Figure
423 4), including the [richness of sexual as well as vegetative lichen taxa](#). Distance from study
424 plot to the nearest contemporary forest, and the distance from study plot to the nearest
425 continuously occurring forest affected significantly the variation of lichen species
426 composition (Table 5, Figure 5). These results indicate the importance of landscape
427 structure and quality on species colonisation patterns. First colonizers among epiphytes,
428 sexual crustose lichens, are characterized by long-range dispersal via ascospores while
429 both vegetative propagules of lichens (Dettki and Esseen 2003) and large fraction of
430 bryophyte diaspores (Sundberg 2005) are suitable for short distance dispersal. This is
431 explained by the fact that sexual diaspores commonly are distinctly smaller than
432 asexual, and thus seem to fit to a ruderal strategy of dispersal over longer distances,
433 including between unoccupied patches (Calviño-Cancela et al. 2013). In our study, the
434 distances from study plot to closest forest remained between 35 and 670 m (Table 1).
435 Various values of the effective dispersal distance for asexual lichens are suggested, but
436 generally they remain within a few hundreds of meters (Walser 2004). For example, for

437 an epiphytic foliose lichen *Lobaria pulmonaria*, the maximum dispersal ranges 30–75 m
438 for vegetative propagation by isidioid soredia and thallus fragments have been reported
439 (Öckinger et al. 2005; Jüriado et al. 2011). However, it is commonly accepted that
440 extreme events, like wind storms, or long-distance vectors, like birds, may carry not
441 only the light sexual propagules, but also the heavier vegetative propagules of lichens,
442 several hundreds of meters (Walser 2004). Therefore it is not impossible that asexual
443 lichen species would colonize the trees in plantations located farther from the closest
444 forest than the generally accepted effective dispersal distance of these species, but the
445 process may need time. Bryophytes, in general, are considered to have high potential for
446 generative and vegetative propagation, being able to disperse long-distance (Frahm
447 2008). Though, on smaller spatial scale, many bryophyte species may be dispersal
448 limited (Snäll et al. 2003; Kimmerer 2005), emphasizing the importance of vicinity to
449 propagule sources. Adjacent land-use and high structural connectivity of landscape has
450 been shown to be highly important in determining the community development in
451 young or restored forests (Crouzeilles and Curran 2016).

452 Furthermore, our results demonstrated that not only distance from closest forest was
453 vital for the dispersal of lichens and bryophytes, but also the forest quality, i.e. its area
454 and ecological continuity. A study by Marmor et al. (2011) in the coniferous forests in
455 Estonia revealed that forest continuity was the most important variable explaining the
456 number of epiphytic lichen species at the forest stand scale. The significant effect of
457 forest continuity on the lichen species richness has been related both to the low
458 dispersal capacity and to the specific microhabitat or substrate preferences of several
459 species. Similarly to our results, the strong effect of forest history on lichen biota has
460 been described by Ellis and Coppins (2007b) who showed that species richness was
461 better explained by historic woodland structure compared to the present one. Effect of

historical forest cover on current species richness indicates possible time-lags in the landscape (Kuussaari et al. 2009). Species extinctions take time and historically larger and better connected forests still likely have higher richness of lichens and bryophytes in the remaining habitat patches, thus also influencing the colonisation patterns of nearby plantations. Epiphytic lichens and bryophytes can have considerably delayed responses to changes in environmental conditions or landscape structure due to low rates of extinction (Snäll et al. 2004, Johansson et al. 2013a). For example, Johansson et al. (2013b) showed that habitat connectivity (density of oak trees) of almost 180 years ago determined the current occurrence of epiphytic lichens in Swedish landscapes. It is additionally possible, that in continuously occurring and historically larger forests, extant lichen and bryophyte populations are still larger, genetically more diverse and more viable, providing also more propagules for establishing new populations (Scheidegger & Silke 2009, Jüriado et al. 2011). Such time-lags can also provide conservation opportunity – in landscapes where historically large forest habitats have harboured high diversity of lichens and bryophytes, increase in forest cover can help to avoid possible future extinctions by enhancing functional connectivity between populations and increasing metapopulation size (Johansson et al. 2013a). Our results show that even short-rotation hybrid aspen plantations can in part contribute to mitigating the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation, but only if they are close to possible colonisation sources.

To conclude, hybrid aspen plantations support remarkable species diversity of lichen-forming fungi as well as bryophytes already at such young age as 16–17 years. The predicted felling age of hybrid aspen is less than 30 years (Tullus et al. 2012a), thus an increase in species richness of both studied groups can be expected during the next dozen or more years, considering that the increasing diameter of tree stems and stumps

left after harvest will provide new habitats for bryophytes and lichens (Tullus et al. 2012b). This assumption is in accordance with recently described unimodal trend in species richness on European aspen revealing the addition of species to a lichen community during an earlier phase of tree growth (20–80 yr), with a peak (80–100 yr) and subsequent loss of species from a community during a later phase of tree growth (>100 yr) (Ellis and Ellis 2013). It can also be assumed that the current successional stage of epiphytic lichen communities in studied plantations, that is composed mainly of sexual crustose species, will change during the following years and more asexual species, both crustose, foliose and fruticose, will inhabit the trees since greater competitive ability of asexual lichens in establishment within more crowded micro-habitats has been suggested (Ellis and Coppins 2007a). Similar results were received in the eucalypt plantations of different ages in Spain where crustose lichens with sexual reproduction were especially linked to young and intermediate stages, whereas asexual lichens were more frequently recorded in later stage (Calviño-Cancela et al. 2013). But in contrary to eucalypt plantations, where lichen species richness and abundance remained low also in mature stands, hybrid aspen plantations may achieve some ecological value at their later ages. In regions where historical forests areas are present and nearby, hybrid aspen plantations can increase functional connectivity for number of lichen and bryophyte species and provide support for preservation of landscape-scale biodiversity. To additionally increase the effectiveness of hybrid aspen plantations, green-tree retention in hybrid aspen plantations should be considered as recommended for native aspen forests (Hazell and Gustafsson 1999; Rosenvald and Lõhmus 2008). In the case of leaving retention trees in plantations, the planted stands may act not only as sink habitats which the species can colonize and where they can survive until felling, but also as surviving points after cutting majority of trees, and where from the species

can disperse further from the plantation area. Green-tree retention in hybrid aspen plantations will probably raise the overall biodiversity value of these short-term plantations. However, it is not currently known which lichen and bryophyte species really are able to colonize the hybrid aspens by their felling age, and thus further studies of epiphytic communities in hybrid aspen plantations should be performed before their clear-cut.

Acknowledgements

The study has been financed by the Estonian State Forest Management Centre through the project “Smart biodiversity conservation in Estonian natural and managed forests: ecoinformatical solutions in a case-study in southern Estonia” to MP, by the Estonian Research Council through the personal research funding (PUT1017 to TR) and institutional research fundings (IUT14-29, IUT21-4 and IUT34-9), and by the European Regional Development Fund (Centre of Excellence EcolChange). Two anonymous reviewers are thanked for valuable comments, and Ede Oja is acknowledged for the help in identification of some *Lecanora* species.

References

- Barton, K. 2016. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.15.6.
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- Berglund, H., and Jonsson, B.G. 2005. Verifying an extinction debt among lichens and fungi in northern Swedish boreal forests. *Conserv. Biol.* **24**: 338–348.
[doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00550.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00550.x).
- Bernes, C., Jonsson, B.G., Junninen, K., Lohmus, A., Macdonald, E., Müller, J., and Sandström, J. 2015. What is the impact of active management on biodiversity in

- 537 boreal and temperate forests set aside for conservation or restoration? A systematic
538 map. Environ. Evid. **4**(25): 1–22, s13750-015-0050-7.
- 539 Bremer, L.L., and Farley, K.A. 2010. Does plantation forestry restore biodiversity or
540 create green deserts? A synthesis of the effects of land-use transitions on plant
541 species richness. Biodivers. Conserv. **19**: 3893–3915. doi:10.1007/s10531-010-
542 9936-4.
- 543 Boudreault, C., Gauthier, S., and Bergeron, Y. 2000. Epiphytic lichens and bryophytes on
544 *Populus tremuloides* along a chronosequence in the southwestern boreal forest of
545 Québec, Canada. Bryologist **103**(4): 725–738. doi:10.1639/0007-
546 2745(2000)103[0725:ELABOP]2.0.CO;2.
- 547 Burnham, K.P., and Anderson, D.R. 2002. Model Selection and Multi-Model Inference. A
548 Practical Information-Theoretic Approach. Springer Verlag, New York.
- 549 Calviño-Cancela, M., López de Silanes, M.E., Rubido-Bará, M., and Uribarri, J. 2013. The
550 potential role of tree plantations in providing habitat for lichen epiphytes. For. Ecol.
551 Manage. **291**: 386–395. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.11.023.
- 552 Case, J.W. 1977. Lichens on *Populus tremuloides* in Western Central Alberta, Canada.
553 Bryologist **80**: 48–70. doi:10.2307/3242510.
- 554 Crouzeilles, R., and Curran, M. 2016. Which landscape size best predict the influence of
555 forest cover on restoration success? A global meta-analysis on the scale of effect. J.
556 Appl. Ecol. **53**: 440–448. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12590
- 557 Davies, C., Ellis, C.J., Iason, G.R., and Ennos, R.A. 2014. Genotypic variation in a
558 foundation tree (*Populus tremula* L.) explains community structure of associated
559 epiphytes. Biol. Lett. **10**: 20140190. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0190.

- 560 Degtjarenko, P., Marmor, L., and Randlane, T. 2016. Changes in bryophyte and lichen
561 communities on Scots pines along an alkaline dust pollution gradient. Environ. Sci. .
562 Pollut. Res. **23**: 17413–17425. doi:10.1007/s11356-016-6933-5.
- 563 Dettki, H., and Esseen, P.A. 2003. Modelling long-term effects of forest management on
564 epiphytic lichens in northern Sweden. For. Ecol. Manage. **175**: 223–238.
565 doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(02)00131-7.
- 566 Dierssen, K. 2001. Distribution, ecological amplitude and phytosociological
567 characterization of European bryophytes. Bryophytorum Bibliotheca, Band **56**.
568 Berlin, Stuttgart.
- 569 Düll, R. 1991. Zeigewerte von Laub- und Lebermoosen. Scripta Geobotanica **18**: 175–
570 215.
- 571 eBiodiversity database. Available from <http://elurikkus.ut.ee/> [accessed 12 December
572 2016].
- 573 Ellis, C.J. 2012. Lichen epiphyte diversity: a species, community and trait-based review.
574 Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol. Syst. **14**: 131–152. doi:10.1016/j.ppees.2011.10.001.
- 575 Ellis, C.J., and Coppins, B.J. 2006. Contrasting functional traits maintain lichen epiphyte
576 diversity in response to climate and autogenic succession. J. Biogeogr. **33**: 1643–
577 1656. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2006.01522.x.
- 578 Ellis, C.J., and Coppins, B.J. 2007a. Reproductive strategy and the compositional
579 dynamics of crustose lichen communities on aspen (*Populus tremula* L.) in Scotland.
580 Lichenologist **39**(4): 377–391. doi:10.1017/S0024282907006937.
- 581 Ellis, C.J., and Coppins, B.J. 2007b. 19th century woodland structure controls stand-
582 scale epiphyte diversity in present-day Scotland. Divers. Distrib. **13**: 84–91.
583 doi:10.1111/j.1366-9516.2006.00310.x.

- 584 Ellis C.J., and Ellis S.C. 2013. Signatures of autogenic epiphyte succession for an aspen
585 chronosequence. *J. Veg. Sci.* **24**: 688–701. doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2012.01492.x.
- 586 eSamba. Database of Estonian lichens. Available from <http://www.eseis.ut.ee> [accessed
587 12.12.2016].
- 588 Felton, A., Knight, E., Wood, J., Zammit, C., and Lindenmayer, D. 2010. A meta-analysis of
589 fauna and flora species richness and abundance in plantations and pasture lands. *Biol.*
590 *Conserv.* **143**: 545–554. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.11.030.
- 591 Frahm, J.P. 2008. Diversity, dispersal and biogeography of bryophytes (mosses).
592 *Biodivers. Conserv.* **17**: 277–284. doi:10.1007/s10531-007-9251-x.
- 593 Fritz, Ö., Niklasson, M., and Churski, M. 2009. Tree age is a key factor for the
594 conservation of epiphytic lichens and bryophytes in beech forests. *Appl. Veg. Sci.* **12**:
595 93–106. doi:10.1111/j.1654-109X.2009.01007.x.
- 596 Gilbert, O.L. 1993. The lichens of chalk grassland. *Lichenologist* **25**: 379–414.
597 doi:10.1017/S0024282993000477.
- 598 Hartmann, H., Daoust, G., Bigué, B., and Messier, C. 2010. Negative or positive effects of
599 plantation and intensive forestry on biodiversity: A matter of scale and perspective.
600 *Forestry Chronicle* **86**: 354–364. doi:10.5558/tfc86354-3.
- 601 Hazell, P., and Gustafsson, L. 1999. Retention of trees at final harvest—evaluation of a
602 conservation technique using epiphytic bryophyte and lichen transplants. *Biol.*
603 *Conserv.* **90**: 133–142. doi:10.1016/S0006-3207(99)00024-5.
- 604 Hedenås, H., and Ericson, L. 2000. Epiphytic macrolichens as conservation indicators:
605 successional sequence in *Populus tremula* stands. *Biol. Conserv.* **93**: 43–53.
606 doi:10.1016/S0006-3207(99)00113-5.

- 607 Hedenås, H., and Ericson, L. 2004. Aspen lichens in agricultural and forest landscapes:
608 the importance of habitat quality. *Ecography* **27**: 521–531. doi:10.1111/j.0906-
609 7590.2004.03866.x.
- 610 Hevia, V., Martín-López, B., Palomo, S., García-Llorente, M., deBello, F., and Gonzáles, J.A.
611 2017. Trait-based approaches to analyze links between the drivers of change and
612 ecosystem services: Synthesizing existing evidence and future challenges. *Ecol. Evol.*
613 **7**(3): 831–844. doi:10.1002/ece3.2692.
- 614 Johansson, V., Ranius, T., and Snäll, T. 2013a. Epiphyte metapopulation persistence after
615 drastic habitat decline and low tree regeneration: time-lags and effects of
616 conservation actions. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **50**(2): 414–422.
- 617 Johansson, V., Snäll, T., and Ranius, T. 2013b. Estimates of connectivity reveal non-
618 equilibrium epiphyte occurrence patterns almost 180 years after habitat decline.
619 *Oecologia* **172**(2): 607–615.
- 620 Jüriado, I., Liira, J., Csencsics, D., Widmer, I., Adolf, C., Kohv, K., and Scheidegger, C. 2011.
621 Dispersal ecology of the endangered woodland lichen *Lobaria pulmonaria* in
622 managed hemiboreal forest landscape. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **20**: 1803–1819.
623 doi:10.1007/s10531-011-0062-8.
- 624 Jüriado, I., Liira, J., and Paal, J. 2009. Diversity of epiphytic lichens in boreo-nemoral
625 forests on the North-Estonian limestone escarpment: the effect of tree level factors
626 and local environmental conditions. *Lichenologist* **41**: 81–96.
627 doi:10.1017/S0024282909007889.
- 628 Jüriado, I., Paal, J., and Liira, J. 2003. Epiphytic and epixylic lichen species diversity in
629 Estonian natural forests. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **12**: 1587–1607.
630 doi:10.1023/A:1023645730446.

- 631 Keenan, R.J., Reams, G.A., Achard, F., de Freitas, J.V., Grainger, A., and Lindquist, E. 2015.
632 Dynamics of global forest area: results from the FAO Global Forest Resources
633 Assessment 2015. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **352**: 9–20. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.06.014.
- 634 Kimmerer, R.W. 2005. Patterns of dispersal and establishment of bryophytes colonizing
635 natural and experimental treefall mounds in northern hardwood forests. *Bryologist*
636 **108**(3): 391–401.
- 637 Kuusinen, M. 1994. Epiphytic lichen flora and diversity on *Populus tremula* in old-
638 growth and managed forests of southern and middle boreal Finland. *Ann. Bot. Fen.*
639 **31**: 245–260.
- 640 Kuusinen, M. 1996. Epiphyte flora and diversity on basal trunks of six old-growth forest
641 tree species in southern and middle boreal Finland. *Lichenologist*. **28**(5): 443–463.
642 doi: 10.1006/lich.1996.0043.
- 643 Kuussaari, M., Bommarco, R., Heikkinen, R. K., Helm, A., Krauss, J., Lindborg, R., Öckinger,
644 E., Pärtel, M., Pino, J., Rodà, F., and Stefanescu, C., 2009. Extinction debt: a challenge
645 for biodiversity conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **24**(10): 564–571.
- 646 Legendre, P. 2014. lmodel2: Model II Regression. R package version 1.7-2.
647 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lmodel2>
- 648 Leppik, E., Jüriado, I., Suija, A., and Liira, J. 2015. Functional ecology of rare and common
649 epigeic lichens in alvar grasslands. *Fung. Ecol.* **13**: 66–76.
650 doi:10.1016/j.funeco.2014.08.003.
- 651 Lewis, J.E.J., and Ellis, C.J. 2010. Taxon compared to trait-based analysis of epiphytes,
652 and the role of tree species and tree age in community composition. *Plant Ecol.*
653 *Divers.* **3**: 203–210. doi:10.1080/17550874.2010.505966.

- 654 Löbel, S., Snäll, T., and Rydin, H. 2006. Species richness patterns and metapopulation
655 processes – evidence from epiphyte communities in boreo-nemoral forests.
656 Ecography **29**: 169–182. doi:10.1111/j.2006.0906-7590.04348.x.
- 657 Lutter, R., Tullus, A., Kanal, A., Tullus, T., and Tullus, H. 2016. The impact of short-
658 rotation hybrid aspen (*Populus tremula* L. × *P. tremuloides* Michx.) plantations on
659 nutritional status of former arable soils. For. Ecol. Manage. **362**: 184–193.
660 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2015.12.009.
- 661 Marmor, L., Törra, T., and Randlane, T. 2010. The vertical gradient of bark pH and
662 epiphytic macrolichen biota in relation to alkaline air pollution. Ecol. Indic. **10**: 1137–
663 1143. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2010.03.013.
- 664 Marmor, L., Törra, T., Saag, L., and Randlane, T. 2011. Effects of forest continuity and
665 tree age on epiphytic lichen biota in coniferous forests in Estonia. Ecol. Indic. **11**:
666 1270–1276. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.01.009.
- 667 Marmor, L., Randlane, T., Jüriado, I., and Saag, A. 2017. Host tree preferences of red-
668 listed epiphytic lichens in Estonia. Baltic Forestry **23**(2): 364–373.
- 669 Marshall, M., and Proctor, M.C.F. 2004. Are bryophytes shade plants? Photosynthetic
670 light responses and proportions of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and total carotenoids.
671 Ann. Bot. **94**: 593–603. doi:10.1093/aob/mch178.
- 672 Öckinger, E., Niklasson, M., and Nilsson, S.G. 2005. Is local distribution of the epiphytic
673 lichen *Lobaria pulmonaria* limited by dispersal capacity or habitat quality? Biodivers.
674 Conserv. **14**: 759–773. doi:10.1007/s10531-004-4535-x.
- 675 Oja, E., Gerasimova, J., Suija, A., Lõhmus, P., and Randlane, T. 2016. New Estonian
676 records and amendments: Lichenized fungi. Folia Cryptog. Estonica **53**: 123–126.
677 doi:10.12697/fce.2016.53.14.

- 678 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., Minchin, P.R., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson,
679 G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., and Wagner, H. 2013. Vegan: Community Ecology
680 Package. R package version 2.0-10. Available from [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)
681 [project.org/package=vegan](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan).
- 682 Orange, A., James, P.W., and White, F.J. 2001. Microchemical methods for the
683 identification of lichens. British Lichen Society.
- 684 Paradis, E., Claude, J., and Strimmer, K. 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and
685 evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics* **20**: 289–290.
- 686 Randlane, T., and Saag, A. (editors) 1999. Second checklist of lichenized, lichenicolous
687 and allied fungi of Estonia. *Folia Cryptog. Estonica* **35**: 1–132.
- 688 Randlane, T., Jüriado, I., Suija, A., Lõhmus, P., and Leppik, E. 2008. Lichens in the new
689 Red List of Estonia. *Folia Cryptog. Estonica* **44**: 113–120.
- 690 Randlane, T., Saag, A., and Suija, A. 2016. Lichenized, lichenicolous and allied fungi of
691 Estonia. Ver. Dec 31, 2016. [http://esamba.bo.bg.ut.ee/](http://esamba.bo.bg.ut.ee/checklist/est/home.php) [checklist/est/home.php](http://esamba.bo.bg.ut.ee/checklist/est/home.php)
692 [accessed 12 January 2017].
- 693 Ranius, T., Eliasson, P., and Johansson, P. 2008. Large-scale occurrence patterns of red-
694 listed lichens and fungi on old oaks are influenced both by current and historical
695 habitat density. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **17**: 2371–2381. doi:10.1007/s10531-008-9387-3.
- 696 R Core Team 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
697 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 698 Rogers, P.C., and Ryel, R.J. 2008. Lichen community change in response to succession in
699 aspen forests of the southern Rocky Mountains. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **256**: 1760–1770.
700 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.05.043.

- 701 Rosenvald, R., and Lõhmus, A. 2008. For what, when, and where is green-tree retention
702 better than clear-cutting? A review of the biodiversity aspects. *Forest Ecology and*
703 *Management* **255**:1–15.
- 704 Sales, K., Kerr, L., and Gardner, J. 2016. Factors influencing epiphytic moss and lichen
705 distribution within Killarney National Park [online]. *Bioscience Horizons* **9**: hzw008.
706 doi:10.1093/biohorizons/hzw008.
- 707 Sheard, J.W., and Jonescu, M.E. 1974. A multivariate analysis of the distribution of
708 lichens on *Populus tremuloides* in western-central Canada. *Bryologist* **77**: 514–530.
- 709 Smith, C.W., Aptroot, A., Coppins, B.J., Fletcher, A., Gilbert, O.L., James, P.W., and Wolseley,
710 P. 2009. *The Lichens of Great Britain and Ireland*. The British Lichen Society, London.
- 711 Snäll, T., Ribeiro Jr., P.J., and Rydin, H. 2003. Spatial occurrence and colonisations in
712 patch-tracking metapopulations: local conditions versus dispersal. *Oikos* **103**(3):
713 566–578.
- 714 Snäll, T., Hagström, A., Rudolphi, J., and Rydin, H. 2004. Distribution pattern of the
715 epiphyte *Neckera pennata* on three spatial scales – importance of past landscape
716 structure, connectivity and local conditions. *Ecography* **27**: 757–766.
- 717 Soo, T., Tullus, A., Tullus, H., and Roosalu, E. 2009a. Floristic diversity responses in
718 young hybrid aspen plantations to land-use history and site preparation treatments.
719 *For. Ecol. Manage.* **257**: 858–867. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.10.018.
- 720 Soo, T., Tullus, A., Tullus, H., Roosalu, E., and Vares, A. 2009b. Change from agriculture
721 to forestry: floristic diversity in young fast-growing deciduous plantations on former
722 agricultural land in Estonia. *Ann. Bot. Fenn.* **46**: 353–364. doi:10.5735/085.046.0410.
- 723 Stephens, S.S., and Wagner, M.R. 2007. Forest plantations and biodiversity: a fresh
724 perspective. *J. For.* **105**: 307–313.

- 725 Sundberg, S. 2005. Sporophyte size positively influences short-range spore dispersal in
726 *Sphagnum*, but what happens further away? *Oikos* **108**: 115–124.
727 doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2005.12916.x.
- 728 Tullus, A., Tullus, H., Vares, A., and Kanal, A. 2007. Early growth of hybrid aspen (*Populus*
729 *tremula* L. x *P. tremuloides* Michx.) plantations on former agricultural lands in Estonia.
730 *For. Ecol. Manage.* **245**: 118–129. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2007.04.006.
- 731 Tullus, A., Rytter, L., Tullus, T., Weih, M., and Tullus, H. 2012a. Short-rotation forestry
732 with hybrid aspen (*P. tremula* L. x *P. tremuloides* Michx.) in Northern Europe. *Scand. J.*
733 *For. Res.* **27**: 10–29. doi:10.1080/02827581.2011.628949.
- 734 Tullus, T., Tullus, A., Roosalu, E., Lutter, R., and Tullus, H. 2015. Vascular plant and
735 bryophyte flora in midterm hybrid aspen plantations on abandoned agricultural land.
736 *Can. J. For. Res.* **45**: 1183–1191. doi:10.1139/cjfr-2014-0464.
- 737 Tullus, T., Tullus, A., Roosalu, E., and Tullus, H. 2012b. Bryophyte vegetation in young
738 deciduous forest plantations. *Baltic Forestry* **18**(2): 205–2013.
- 739 Vellak, K., Ingerpuu, N., Leis, M., and Ehrlich, L. 2015. Annotated checklist of Estonian
740 bryophytes. *Folia Cryptog. Estonica* **52**: 109–127. doi:10.12697/fce.2015.52.14.
- 741 Walser, J.-C. 2004. Molecular evidence for limited dispersal of vegetative propagules in
742 the epiphytic lichen *Lobaria pulmonaria*. *Am. J. Bot.* **91**: 1273–1276.
743 doi:10.3732/ajb.91.8.1273.
- 744 Weih, M., Karacic, A., Munkert, H., Verwijst, T., and Diekmann, M. 2003. Influence of
745 young poplar stands on floristic diversity in agricultural landscapes (Sweden). *Basic*
746 *Appl. Ecol.* **4**: 149–156. doi:10.1078/1439-1791-00157.
- 747 Will-Wolf, S., Esseen, P.A., and Neitlich, P. 2002. Monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem
748 function: forests. *In* *Monitoring with Lichens – Monitoring Lichens*, vol. 7. *Edited by*

- 749 P.L. Nimis,, C. Scheidegger and P.A. Wolseley. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht,
750 The Netherlands. pp. 203–222. doi:10.1007/978-94-010-0423-7_14.
- 751 Wirth, V. 2010. Ökologische Zeigerwerte von Flechten – erweiterte und aktualisierte
752 Fassung. *Herzogia* **23**: 229–248. doi:10.13158/heia.23.2.2010.229.

Draft

753 Table 1. Main characteristics of the study plots in midterm hybrid aspen plantations.

Characteristic	Abbr.	Mean ± SE	Min	Max
Tree-layer and environmental variables				
Tree height (m)	H	18.9±0.8	11.3	22.2
Tree diameter at breast height (cm)	DBH	14.9 ±0.7	7.9	18.4
Density of trees (trees ha ⁻¹)	Den_T	940 ±51.5	600.0	1300.0
Basal area of trees (m ² ha ⁻¹)	BA	18.2 ±2.0	5.8	33.4
Soil pH _{KCl}	S_pH	5.4 ±0.2	4.1	6.8
Soil P (mg kg ⁻¹)	S_P	101.2 ±13.0	36.0	203.0
Soil K (mg kg ⁻¹)	S_K	110.5 ±14.2	44.0	211.0
Soil organic C (%)	S_C	1.2 ±0.2	0.5	2.7
Soil N (%)	S_N	0.1 ±0.007	0.1	0.2
Canopy openness (%)	Can_O	16.1 ±1.7	8.4	28.2
Transmitted total radiation (mol m ⁻² d ⁻¹)	Tr_TR	6.2 ±0.7	3.3	10.8
Landscape-scale variables				
Distance from continuous forest, growing since 1935–1939 (m)	Dis_O	314.3 ±45.0	70.0	670.0
Distance from forest in 2015 (m)	Dis_C	211 ±46.1	35.0	670.0
Forest area in the radius of 500 m around the study plot in 1930s (ha)	For_O	8.3 ±2.8	0.1	0.25
Forest area in the radius of 500 m around the study plot in 2000 (ha)	For_C	35.3 ±7.04	36.5	78

754

755 Table 2. List of recorded lichen species, their frequency (percentage of occurrences) and substrate in the study plots (n= 15) of midterm
 756 hybrid aspen plantations, frequency class in Estonia, functional groups, type of reproductive diaspores, and ecological indicator values.

Species	Species abbreviation (on Fig. 5)	Frequency (%)	Substrate ^a	Frequency cl ^b	Functional groups ^c	Reproductive diaspores ^d	Ecological indicator values ^e				
							L	T	F	R	N
<i>Arthonia mediella</i> Nyl.	Arth.med	13	P	st fq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Arthonia patellulata</i> Nyl.	Arth.pat	67	P	st r	sex cru	ap					
<i>Athallia cerinella</i> (Nyl.) Arup et al.	Calo.cla	53	P	r	sex cru	ap	7	6	3	7	6
<i>Athallia pyracea</i> (Ach.) Arup et al.	Calo.pyr	100	P, S	fq	sex cru	ap	7	x	3	7	5
<i>Caloplaca cerina</i> (Ehrh. ex Hedw.) Th. Fr.	Calo.cna	100	P	fqq	sex cru	ap	7	x	5	7	5
<i>Candelariella lutella</i> (Vain.) Räsänen	Cand.lut	87	B, P	st fq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Diplotomma pharcidium</i> (Ach.) M. Choisy	Dipl.pha	7	P	st r	sex cru	ap					
<i>Evernia prunastri</i> (L.) Ach.	Ever.pru	47	P	fqq	veg fru	sor	7	5	4	3	4
<i>Gyalolechia flavorubescens</i> (Huds.) Søchting et al.	Calo.flu	87	P	fqq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Hypogymnia physodes</i> (L.) Nyl.	Hypo.phy	47	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	x	3	3	3
<i>Hypogymnia tubulosa</i> (Schaer.) Hav.	Hypo.tub	7	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	5	3	5	4
<i>Lecania cyrtella</i> (Ach.) Th. Fr.	Lia.cyr	93	P	fq	sex cru	ap	7	5	3	7	6
<i>Lecania naegelia</i> (Hepp) Diederich & Van den Boom	Lia.nae	100	P	fq	sex cru	ap	6	5	3	7	7
<i>Lecanora argentata</i> (Ach.) Malme	Leca.arg	40	B, P	fqq	sex cru	ap	5	5	4	5	3
<i>Lecanora carpinea</i> (L.) Vain.	Lec.car	73	B, P	fqq	sex cru	ap	6	5	3	5	4
<i>Lecanora chlarotera</i> Nyl.	Leca.chl	100	P	fqq	sex cru	ap	6	5	3	6	5
<i>Lecanora leptyroides</i> (Nyl.) Degel.	Leca.lep	80	P, S	fqq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Lecanora populicola</i> (DC.) Duby	Leca.pop	67	P	fq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Lecanora pulicaris</i> (Pers.) Ach.	Leca.pul	7	P	fqq	sex cru	ap	7	4	3	3	4

<i>Lecanora sambuci</i> (Pers.) Nyl.	Leca.sam	87	P	st fq	sex cru	ap	7	6	3	7	6
<i>Lecanora symmicta</i> (Ach.) Ach.	Leca.sym	87	B, P	fqq	sex cru	ap	7	4	5	5	4
<i>Lecidella elaeochroma</i> (Ach.) M. Choisy	Leci.ela	67	P	fqq	sex cru	ap	6	5	3	6	5
<i>Lecidella euphorea</i> (Flörke) Hertel	Leci.eup	87	P	fqq	sex cru	ap					
<i>Leptorhaphis tremulae</i> Körb.		7	P	r	sex cru	per					
<i>Melanelixia subaurifera</i> (Nyl.) O. Blanco et al.	Mela.sub	60	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	6	5	5	6	5
<i>Melanohalea olivacea</i> (L.) O. Blanco et al.	Mela.oli	40	B, P	fqq	sex fol	ap					
<i>Mycomicrothelia wallrothii</i> (Hepp) D. Hawksw.	Myco.wal	13	P	st fq	sex cru	per					
<i>Parmelia sulcata</i> Taylor	Parm.sul	67	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	x	3	5	7
<i>Peltigera rufescens</i> (Weiss) Humb.		7	G	fqq	sex fol	ap	8	x	3	8	5
<i>Phaeophyscia ciliata</i> (Hoffm.) Moberg	Phae.cil	87	P	fq	sex fol	ap					
<i>Phaeophyscia orbicularis</i> (Neck.) Moberg	Phae.orb	7	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	x	x	7	9
<i>Physcia adscendens</i> (Fr.) H. Olivier	Phys.ads	93	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	x	3	7	8
<i>Physcia aipolia</i> (Ehrh. ex Humb.) Fürnr.	Phys.aip	7	P	fqq	sex fol	ap	7	x	3	7	5
<i>Physcia stellaris</i> (L.) Nyl.	Phys.ste	93	P	fqq	sex fol	ap	7	4	3	6	6
<i>Physcia tenella</i> (Scop.) DC.	Phys.ten	87	P	fqq	veg fol	sor	7	x	3	6	7
<i>Physconia distorta</i> (With.) J.R. Laundon	Phys.dis	47	P	fqq	sex fol	ap	7	5	5	7	6
<i>Ramalina farinacea</i> (L.) Ach.	Ram.far.	80	B, P	fqq	veg fru	sor	6	5	4	5	4
<i>Rinodina exigua</i> Gray	Rino.exi	27	B, P	fq	sex cru	ap	7	5	3	7	7
<i>Rinodina pyrina</i> (Ach.) Arnold	Rino.pyr	60	P	fq	sex cru	ap	7	4	5	7	3
<i>Scoliosporum chlorococcum</i> (Stenh.) Vězda	Scol.chl	7	B	fq	sex cru	ap	6	5	3	3	6
<i>Scoliosporum sarothamni</i> (Vain.) Vězda	Scol.sar	47	B, P	st fq	veg cru	sor					
<i>Tuckermannopsis chlorophylla</i> (Willd.) Hale	Tuck.chl	7	P	fqq	veg fru	sor	6	4	6	3	3

<i>Xanthoria parietina</i> (L.) Th. Fr.	Xant.par	100	P	fqq	sex fol	ap	7	x	3	7	8
<i>Xanthoria polycarpa</i> (Hoffm.) Th. Fr. ex Rieber	Xant.pol	73	B, P	fqq	sex fol	ap	7	x	3	7	8

^aB – *Betula* spp., G – ground, P – *P. tremula* × *P. tremuloides*, S – *Salix* spp.

^bfqq – very frequent, 51 or more localities; fq – frequent, 21–50 localities; st fq – rather frequent, 11–20 localities; st r – rather rare, 6–10 localities; r – rare, 3–5 localities (according to Randlane et al. 1999)

^csex cru – sexually reproducing crustose species, sex fol – sexually reproducing foliose species, veg cru – vegetatively reproducing crustose species, veg fol – vegetatively reproducing foliose species, veg fru – vegetatively reproducing fruticose species (traits based on Smith et al. 2009)

^dap – species with apothecia, per – species with perithecia, sor – species dispersing with soredia

^eL – light value (5 – sites in half-shade, 6 – intermediate value between 5 and 7, 7 – sites in half-light, 8 – sites in light), T – temperature value (3 – cool areas, 4 – intermediate value between 3 and 5, 5 – moderately cool to moderately warm areas, 6 – mostly mild areas), F – moisture value (3 – dry habitats tolerated but often also in moist habitats, 4 – also in dry habitats but only at high air moisture, 5 – dry habitats usually avoided, precipitation mainly over 700 mm/yr, 6 – precipitation usually over 800 mm/yr), R – reaction (acidity) value (3 – rather acid, pH 4.1–4.8; 5 – moderate acid, pH 4.5–5.6; 6 – weakly acid, pH 5.3–6.1; 7 – subneutral, pH 5.7–6.5; 8 – neutral, pH 6.6–7.5), N – eutrophication value (3–4 – weak/rather weak eutrophication, 5–6 – moderate/clear eutrophication, 7 – rather strong eutrophication, 8 – strong eutrophication, 9 – very strong eutrophication) according to Wirth (2010); x – the value is determined as ‘of broad amplitude’ by Wirth (2010).

758 Table 3. List of recorded bryophyte species, their frequency (percentage of occurrences) and substrate in the study plots (n= 15) of
759 midterm hybrid aspen plantations, frequency class in Estonia, life strategy categories, and ecological indicator values.

Species	Species abbreviation (on Fig. 6)	Frequency (%)	Substrate ^a	Frequency class ^b	Life strategy categories ^c	Ecological indicator values ^d			
						L	T	F	R
<i>Amblystegium serpens</i> (Hedw.) Schimp.	Ambl.ser	100	G, P, W	fq	p	5		4	6
<i>Atrichum undulatum</i> (Hedw.) P. Beauv.	Atri.und	33	G	fq	s	6		6	4
<i>Brachytheciastrum velutinum</i> (Hedw.) Ignatov & Huttunen	Brac.vel	13	G	fq	p	5	3	4	6
<i>Brachythecium erythrorrhizon</i> Schimp.	Brac.ery	13	G	fq	p	8	1	7	6
<i>Brachythecium mildeanum</i> (Schimp.) Schimp.	Brac.mil	7	G	fq	p	8	4	7	6
<i>Brachythecium rivulare</i> Schimp.	Brac.riv	33	G	fq	pc		3	7	5
<i>Brachythecium rutabulum</i> (Hedw.) Schimp.	Brac.rut	100	G, P	fq	cp	5		4	
<i>Brachythecium salebrosum</i> (Hoffm. ex F. Weber & D. Mohr) Schimp.	Brac.sal	93	G, P, W	fq	cp	6	4	4	5
<i>Calliergonella cuspidata</i> (Hedw.) Loeske	Call.cus	40	G, P	fq	pc	8	3	7	7
<i>Campylidium sommerfeltii</i> (Myrin) Ochyra	Camp.som	47	G, P	fq	p	3	1	6	4
<i>Chiloscyphus pallescens</i> (Ehrh. ex Hoffm.) Dumort.	Chil.pal	7	G	fq	pc	5	3	8	7
<i>Chiloscyphus polyanthos</i> (L.) Corda	Chil.pol	13	G	fq	pc		4	9	2
<i>Cirriphyllum piliferum</i> (Hedw.) Grout	Cirr.pil	60	G, P	fq	pc	7	3	5	6
<i>Eurhynchiastrum pulchellum</i> (Hedw.) Ignatov & Huttunen	Eurh.pul	7	G	fq	ps	6	4	4	6
<i>Eurhynchium angustirete</i> (Broth.) T.J. Kop.	Eurh.ang	27	G, P	fq	p	5	4	4	7
<i>Hygroamblystegium varium</i> (Hedw.) Mönk.	Hygr.var	7	G	fq	p	5	5	5	6
<i>Hylocomium splendens</i> (Hedw.) Schimp.	Hylo.spl	13	G	fq	pc	6	3	4	5
<i>Hypnum cupressiforme</i> Hedw.	Hypn.cup	13	G, W	fq	ps	5		4	4
<i>Kindbergia praelonga</i> (Hedw.) Ochyra	Kind.pra	33	G, P	fq	p	6	4	6	5
<i>Leptobryum pyriforme</i> (Hedw.) Wilson	Lept.pyr	7	G	fq	f			6	7

<i>Leskea polycarpa</i> Hedw.	Lesk.pol	7	P	p	p	7	5	4	7
<i>Lophocolea heterophylla</i> (Schrad.) Dumort	Loph.het	47	G, P	fq	cp	4	3	4	3
<i>Orthotrichum speciosum</i> Nees	Orth.spe	47	P	fq	s	7	2	5	5
<i>Oxyrrhynchium hians</i> (Hedw.) Loeske	Oxyl.hia	100	G, P, W, S	fq	cp	7	4	5	7
<i>Pellia</i> sp.	Pell.sp	7	G						
<i>Plagiomnium affine</i> (Blandow ex Funck) T.J. Kop.	Plag.aff	33	G	fq	pc	5	4	5	5
<i>Plagiomnium cuspidatum</i> (Hedw.) T.J. Kop.	Plag.cus	87	G, P, W	fq	pc	4	3	5	7
<i>Plagiomnium medium</i> (Bruch & Schimp.) T.J. Kop.	Plag.med	7	G	p	pc	5	1	7	5
<i>Plagiomnium undulatum</i> (Hedw.) T.J. Kop.	Plag.und	7	G	fq	pc	4	3	6	6
<i>Pleurozium schreberi</i> (Willd. ex Brid.) Mitt.	Pleu.sch	20	G	fq	pc	6	3	4	2
<i>Pohlia</i> sp.	Pohl.sp	13	G						
<i>Pylaisia polyantha</i> (Hedw.) Schimp.	Pyla.pol	73	P	fq	ps	8	3	5	7
<i>Rhizomnium punctatum</i> (Hedw.) T.J. Kop.	Rhiz.pun	7	G	fq	l	3	3	6	4
<i>Rhytidiadelphus squarrosus</i> (Hedw.) Warnst.	Rhyt.squ	13	G	fq	pc	7	3	6	5
<i>Rhytidiadelphus triquetrus</i> (Hedw.) Warnst.	Rhyt.tri	13	G	fq	pc	7	3	4	5
<i>Sanionia uncinata</i> (Hedw.) Loeske	Sani.unc	13	G, P	fq	ps			7	3
<i>Sciuro-hypnum curtum</i> (Lindb.) Ignatov	Schy.cur	87	G, P, W	fq	pc	3	4	6	3
<i>Sciuro-hypnum reflexum</i> (Starke) Ignatov & Huttunen	Schy.ref	13	G, W	fq	ps	4	2	5	4
<i>Tortula truncata</i> (Hedw.) Mitt.	Tort.tru	7	G	p	a	7	4	7	5

^aG – ground, P – *P. tremula* × *P. tremuloides*, S – *Salix* spp., W – deadwood

^bfq – frequent, 31 or more localities; p – sporadically, 8–30 localities (according to Vellak et al. 2015)

^cs – short-lived shuttle, a – annual shuttle, cp – pioneer colonists, f – fugitives, l – long-lived shuttle, p – perennials, pc – competitive perennials, ps – stress tolerant perennials (according to Dierssen 2001)

^dL – light value (3 – shade species, 4 intermediate value between 3 and 5, 5 – half-shade species, 6 – intermediate value between 5 and 7, 7 – half-light species, 8 – light species), T – temperature value (1 – cold areas, 2 – intermediate value between 1 and 3, 3 – cool areas, 4 – intermediate value between 3 and 5, 5 – moderately warm areas), F – moisture value (4 – intermediate value between 3 (dry habitats) and 5, 5 – moderately moist habitats, 6 – intermediate value between 5 and 7, 7 – moist habitats, 8 – intermediate value between 7 and 9, 9 – temporarily water-logged habitats) and R – reaction (acidity) value (2 – intermediate value

between 1 (strongly acid) and 3; 3 – acid, pH<5; 4 – intermediate value between 3 and 5; 5 – moderately acid, pH 5.0–6.0; 6 – intermediate value between 5 and 7; 7 – weakly acid to weakly neutral, pH 6.0–6.9); x – species with broad amplitude (according to Düll 1991)

760

Draft

761 Table 4. Best models (with delta AICc < 2) describing lichen and bryophyte species
 762 richness in hybrid aspen plantations.

Dependent	Delta AICc	R ² adj	Independent variable	Estimate	SE	t	P
Lichen species richness	0	0.36	Forest area in 1930s	0.07	0.02	3.0	0.011
	1.05	0.42	Soil K	0.14	0.09	1.6	0.145
			Forest area in 1930s	0.07	0.02	2.9	0.014
Bryophyte species richness	0	0.58	Forest area in 1930s	0.09	0.02	3.9	0.002
			Density of trees	0.59	0.20	3.0	0.012

763

Table 5. Relationships between lichen/bryophyte species compositions (NMDS ordinations; Figures 5 and 6, accordingly) and environmental variables in midterm hybrid aspen plantations.

Environmental or landscape factor	Lichens		Bryophytes	
	r ²	p-value	r ²	p-value
Tree height	0.15	0.358	0.13	0.441
Diameter at breast height	0.17	0.291	0.24	0.198
Tree density	0.13	0.439	0.04	0.78
Basal area	0.03	0.844	0.08	0.612
Soil pH	0.15	0.373	0.02	0.899
Soil P	0.01	0.936	0.49	0.022
Soil K	0.19	0.268	0.03	0.84
Soil organic C	0.07	0.623	0.02	0.895
Soil N	0.2	0.228	0.24	0.19
Canopy openness	0.02	0.88	0.51	0.025
Transmitted total radiation	0.04	0.78	0.52	0.023
Distance from continuous (since 1930s) forest	0.47	0.015	0.27	0.165
Distance from forest in 2015	0.62	0.004	0.02	0.906
Forest area in the vicinity in 1930s	0.56	0.004	0.42	0.042
Forest area in the vicinity in 2000	0.31	0.13	0.23	0.218

Note: The r² values indicate the strength of correlation between respective environmental or landscape-scale factor and the NMDS ordination axes scores. P-values are based on random permutations of the data; significant (*p* < 0.05) relationships are indicated in bold.

771 Table A1. Correlation matrix of studied environmental and landscape-scale variables, and species richnesses of bryophytes (Bry_R) and
 772 lichens (Lic_R; for abbreviations of variables see Table 1) in midterm hybrid aspen plantations.

	H	DBH	Den_T	BA	S_pH	S_P	S_K	S_C	S_N	Can_O	Tr_TR	Dis_O	Dis_C	Lic_R	Bry_R
H	1														
DBH	0,93	1													
Den_T	0,31	0,15	1												
BA	0,89	0,86	0,62	1											
S_pH	-0,14	-0,21	0,23	-0,08	1										
S_P	0,28	0,41	0,01	0,34	-0,01	1									
S_K	-0,08	-0,08	0,09	-0,06	0,61	-0,04	1								
S_C	0,05	0,09	0,62	0,39	0,11	-0,05	0,08	1							
S_N	-0,24	-0,32	0,42	-0,03	0,14	-0,47	0,17	0,65	1						
Can_O	-0,27	-0,44	-0,24	-0,43	-0,18	-0,49	-0,18	-0,21	0,2	1					
Tr_TR	-0,23	-0,37	-0,25	-0,39	-0,13	-0,48	-0,24	-0,18	0,18	0,98	1				
Dis_O	-0,37	-0,5	-0,09	-0,42	0,1	-0,2	0,14	-0,22	0,23	0,48	0,41	1			
Dis_C	-0,11	-0,24	-0,02	-0,18	0,14	-0,35	-0,32	0,19	0,43	0,38	0,42	0,34	1		
Lic_R	-0,33	-0,32	0,11	-0,23	0,05	-0,31	0,4	0,1	0,28	0,18	0,08	0,64	0,02	1	
Bry_R	-0,03	-0,2	0,45	0,06	0,08	-0,19	-0,04	0,08	0,18	0,17	0,12	0,62	0,37	0,56	1

Figure captions

Figure 1. Location of the studied hybrid aspen plantations (indicated with grey circles) in southern Estonia.

Figure 2. Distribution of recorded lichen and bryophyte species in groups according to ecological indicator values of lichens (based on Wirth 2010) and bryophytes (based on Düll 1991).

Figure 3. Correlation between total species richnesses of lichens and bryophytes in 10 × 10 m study plots (axes are in log-scale; type II regression line is used to depict the linear relationship between significantly correlated variables).

Figure 4. Effect of environmental and landscape-scale parameters on species richness estimates for lichens and bryophytes within 10 × 10 m study plots (axes are in log-scale). Only variables included to best models (Table 4) are shown.

Figure 5. NMDS ordination of study plots and lichen species (stress 0.12). The arrows indicate the direction and strength of correlation (r^2) for environmental vectors that were significantly ($p < 0.05$) related to ordination (see also Table 5). Study plots are indicated with grey circles. Forest abund. 1930s – forest area in the vicinity of study plot in 1930s, Distance 2015 – distance from study plot to natural forest in 2015, Distance 1930s – distance from study plot to continuous (since 1930s) forest. For abbreviations of species names see Table 2.

798 Figure 6. NMDS ordination of study plots and bryophyte species (stress 0.19). The
799 arrows indicate the direction and strength of correlation (r^2) for environmental vectors
800 that were significantly ($p < 0.05$) related to ordination (see also Table 5). Study plots are
801 indicated with grey circles. Forest abund. 1930s – forest area in the vicinity of study plot
802 in 1930s, Soil P – concentration of available P in soil A-horizon, Canopy open. – canopy
803 openness, Trans. total – transmitted total radiation. For abbreviations of species names see
804 Table 3.

Draft

Figure 1. Location of the studied hybrid aspen plantations (indicated with grey circles) in southern Estonia.

203x287mm (300 x 300 DPI)

NMDS2