Canadian Journal of Forest Research

Short-term response to season of burn by amphibians and reptiles in a Florida longleaf pine-wiregrass sandhill

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2019-0219.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Greenberg, Katie; USDA Forest Service Zarnoch, Stanley; USDA Forest Service Austin, James; University of Florida
Keyword:	amphibian, longleaf pine-wiregrass sandhills, prescribed burn, season of burn, reptiles
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Short-term response to season of burn by amphibians and reptiles in a Florida longleaf pine-wiregrass sandhill

Cathryn H. Greenberg^a
Stanley J. Zarnoch^b
James D. Austin^c

^aUSDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Bent Creek Experimental Forest, 1577 Brevard Rd., Asheville, NC 28806¹, USA.

^bUSDA, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634

^cDepartment of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, 110 Newins Ziegler Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

*Corresponding author: kgreenberg@fs.fed.us, 828-667-5261 x 118, 828-667-9097

Abstract: We investigated how herpetofauna respond to burning, and burn season in longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*; Mill) sandhills by contrasting pre-burn species richness, diversity, evenness and captures of 6 reptile and 6 amphibian species to the first (Y+1) or second (Y+2) year post-burn, or between dormant- (DSB) and growing-season burns (GSB). Responses to burning overall or burn season were inconsistent among species; several showed no response; others responded positively, or negatively. Most responses were evident only Y+1. Reptile species richness, diversity, and evenness responses were not detected. Amphibian richness increased after burning overall; diversity and evenness decreased more in GSB than DSB in Y+1. Southern toad (*Anaxyrus terrestris*; Bonnaterre, 1789) captures increased, and Florida crowned snake (*Tantilla relict*a; Telford, 1871) decreased following burns overall, in Y+1. Ground skink (*Scincella lateralis*; Say, in James, 1922) captures increased more in DSB than GSB in Y+1. Florida gopher frog (*Lithobates capito*; Leconte, 1855) and Southeastern five-lined skink (*Plestiodon inexpectatus*; Taylor, 1923) captures increased, and oak toad (*A. quercicus*; Holbrook, 1840) decreased more in GSB than DSB in Y+2. Responses were likely due to changes in aboveground activity affecting captures, or (for amphibians especially) annual variability in captures unrelated to burns. Our results indicated that reptiles and amphibians of sandhills are resilient to short-term effects of burning overall and burn season.

Keywords: amphibians; dormant-season burns; growing-season burns; longleaf pine-wiregrass sandhills; prescribed fire; reptiles, sandhills; season of burn.

1. Introduction

Many reptile and amphibian species are endemic to the endangered longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris* Mill)-wiregrass (*Aristida stricta* Michaux) sandhill ecosystem (Means and Grow, 1985). Longleaf pine once occupied 38 million ha within the Southeastern US Coastal Plain landscape, from Virginia to Texas (Frost, 1993). Today, only 4% remains (USDA Forest Service, 2019) due to development and conversion to pine plantation or other uses (Noss et al., 1995; Brockway et al., 2015), with much of the remaining habitat degraded by fragmentation and fire exclusion (Means and Grow, 1985). Populations of many reptile and amphibian species characteristic of sandhills have declined accordingly, including some species of conservation concern such as sand skinks (*Plestiodon reynoldsii* (Stejneger, 1910)), gopher frogs (*Lithobates capito* (LeConte, 1855)), and striped newts (*Nothophthalmus perstriatus* (Bishop, 1941)) (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, 2016).

Historically, frequent, low-intensity, landscape-level fires (Tanner et al., 2018) curtailed hardwood encroachment (Greenberg and Simon 1999), thereby maintaining low-density, open-canopy uneven-aged longleaf pine forests with scattered or clumped midstory oaks (*Quercus* spp.), and a nearly continuous groundcover dominated by wiregrass and diverse herbaceous plants (Myers, 1990; Glitzenstein et al., 2012). During dry periods, fires historically burned through ephemeral ponds, reducing organic buildup and tree or shrub encroachment (Kirkman et al., 1999). Fires were most common during the growing-season, ignited by lightning strikes associated with late spring and summer thunderstorms (Myers, 1990), and by Native Americans and (later) European settlers (Huffman, 2006). Changes in policy and attitudes towards prescribed fire led to widespread fire suppression beginning in the 1930s (Frost, 1993).

After decades of fire exclusion and consequent hardwood encroachment, forest managers and ecologists came to recognize that frequent burning was critical for reducing fuel loads for wildfire prevention, and to restore and maintain the open-canopy and groundcover structure required by the diverse, fire-adapted plant and animal species characteristic of the sandhills ecosystem. Initially, most forest managers burned during the dormant-season (winter) due to drier fuels, and to avoid nesting season for ground-nesting gamebirds such as bobwhite quail (*Colinus virginianus* (Linnaeus, 1758)) (Brennan et al., 1998). Subsequent research showed that growing-season (late spring-summer) burns promote flowering by wiregrass and several herbaceous species (Platt et al., 1988), and associated higher fire temperatures can more effectively top-kill hardwood trees (Robbins and Myers, 1992). These findings led many forest managers to burn more during the growing-season to better mimic the natural disturbance regime, and potentially expedite ecosystem restoration (Brockway et al., 2015). Still, very little is known about how season of burning affects wildlife, especially reptile and amphibian species (Pilliod et al., 2003).

Direct, fire-related mortality of reptiles and amphibians is difficult to detect and evidence is largely anecdotal (Russell et al., 1999). Anecdotal observation (Vogl, 1973) or radio-tracking data (Humphries and Sisson, 2012; Pitt et al., 2013) indicates that direct mortality is minimal due to avoidance behaviors, such as burrowing in and under coarse woody debris (Means and Campbell, 1981; Pitt et al., 2013), burrowing underground (Pitt et al., 2013), finding refuge in existing refuges such as stumpholes (Humphries and Sisson, 2012), or in burrows created by gopher tortoises (*Gopherus Polyphemus*; Daudin, 1802) (Lips, 1991; Roznik et al., 2009) or small mammals, climbing trees, or moving into water (Humphries and Sisson 2012) or nearby

68 unburned areas (Komarek, 1969; Means and Campbell, 1981). Although fire-related mortality is
69 thought to be low, changes to forest structure (e.g., canopy- and ground cover) resulting from
70 either long-absence of fire or frequent burning in xeric sandhills or sand pine (*P. clausa* (Chapm.
71 ex Engelm.) Vasey ex Sarg.) scrub can influence relative abundance of some species (Greenberg,
72 2002).

73 Small, isolated, ephemeral ponds (henceforth termed ponds) are critical in sustaining the
74 biological diversity of the xeric longleaf pine-wiregrass ecosystem by supporting semi-aquatic
75 reptile and pond-breeding amphibian species (Moler and Franz, 1987; Semlitsch and Bodie,
76 1998). Many amphibian species depend completely or facultatively on temporary ponds for
77 reproduction, and inhabit surrounding sandhill uplands after metamorphosis for most of their
78 adult lives (Moler and Franz, 1987). Some reptile species within sandhills, such as several turtle
79 species and swamp snakes (*Seminatrix pygaea* (Cope, 1871)), use ponds as their primary habitat
80 (Ashton and Ashton, 1985); others are fully terrestrial, but often include pond margins within
81 their home ranges (Palmer, 1995). Thus, the longleaf pine-wiregrass uplands surrounding ponds
82 are the primary habitat for most sandhill herpetofauna, and provide biological connectivity
83 (Smith et al. 2018).

84 Because both reptiles (e.g., Palmer, 1995) and amphibians (e.g., Wright, 2002; Greenberg et
85 al., 2017a) differ in seasonal periods of peak surface activity, season of burning could
86 differentially affect mortality or capture rates of species. For example, dormant-season burns
87 would impact winter-breeding amphibian species moving to or from breeding sites, or those
88 overwintering under leaf litter (Pilliod et al., 2003; Humphries and Sisson, 2012), whereas
89 growing-season burns would more likely impact summer-breeding adults, and metamorphs
90 emigrating from ponds. Short-term changes to forest structure or invertebrate prey abundance

(Hardy, 2003) after dormant- and (or) growing-season prescribed burns could also affect herpetofaunal abundance, or alter activity patterns and detectability as reflected by capture rates (O'Donnell et al., 2015). Despite a general consensus that frequent fire in longleaf pine-wiregrass sandhills maintains a forest structure required to sustain diverse, abundant herpetofaunal communities over the long-term (e.g., Greenberg 2002), there are very few studies that have addressed the immediate and short-term effects of prescribed burning, or how season of burn affects community composition and relative abundance of different herpetofaunal species.

We used data from 24-years of continuous, concurrent trapping with drift fences surrounding the upland perimeter of seven ponds, to compare short-term responses of reptile and amphibian communities (species richness, diversity, and evenness), and species (six reptile; six amphibian) to season of burning (dormant- versus growing-season) in a xeric, longleaf pine-wiregrass ecosystem. We hypothesized that responses to prescribed burning overall (regardless of season), and to dormant-season or growing-season burns would be few and (or) transient, given that herpetofaunal species in the longleaf pine-wiregrass ecosystem evolved with frequent fire.

2. Methods

2.1. Study area

Our seven study ponds were a representative selection of small (0.10-0.35 ha), ephemeral, groundwater-driven sinkhole ponds, embedded within xeric longleaf pine-wiregrass uplands of the Floridan Aquifer System region, Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida (Greenberg et al., 2015). Five study ponds (1, 2, 3, 5, 6) were all within about 0.7 km of one another; two (7, 8) were approximately 9.5 km south of the others (Figure 1). The upland forest matrix

surrounding study ponds was generally savanna-like sandhills with a wiregrass-forb ground cover and widely spaced longleaf pine trees. Hardwood and sand pine densities in the ecotones surrounding study ponds and the surrounding upland landscape were patchy and variable, but generally greater surrounding ponds 1, 2, and 3 (Figure 1).

We measured average weekly temperatures (February 1997-December 2017) ranging from a minimum of -1.0°C in January, to a maximum of 41.1°C in July, and average annual precipitation (1995-2017) of 139.2 cm, with more than half occurring during late spring and summer (unpubl. data). Heavy precipitation providing groundwater recharge was associated with thunderstorms and tropical systems in summer and fall, and wet autumn, winter, or spring frontal systems (Winsberg, 1990). Pond depths were generally highest in winter and lowest in summer due to rainfall patterns and groundwater recharge, and reduced evapotranspiration in winter (Greenberg et al., 2017a).

2.2. Prescribed burns

Upland landscapes surrounding our study ponds were burned multiple times at <1- to 6-year intervals, by Ocala National Forest personnel, within the 24-year study period (1994-2017). Prior to 2003, prescribed burns were conducted primarily during the dormant-season (January or February); subsequently, most were conducted during the growing-season (May, June, or July). Prescribed burns typically did not burn into the ponds, as most contained water on burn dates and were surrounded by a naturally occurring ring of bare sand that functioned as a fire break. Prescribed burns were conducted at a landscape (USFS forest “compartment”) level, with burn units ranging from 174-625 ha (431-1,545 acres) in size. Burn dates were the same for several study ponds, if they were located within the same burn unit. Generally, fires were ignited

aerially, with igniting dot heads dropped at approximately 15-30 m intervals across the entire burn unit. Fire intensity was generally low, and all prescribed burns were relatively complete, with 75-100% burned (D. Quisenberry, pers. comm.). For our study, we selected a subset of burns and ponds based on the following criteria: (1) burns were conducted within the dormant- (January or February) or growing- (May, June, or July) seasons; (2) at least two years (24 consecutive months) since a prior burn, and at least one year (12 consecutive months; in most cases, two years, 24 months) before the next burn; this limited range of pre- and post-burn years was necessary to maintain consistency and comparability of burn effects among ponds, due to the high frequency of prescribed burns and different numbers of years between burns among compartments; (3) traps were fully operational (e.g., minimal or no flooding) during all years used in analyses. We did not measure burn effects on vegetation structure, but illustrate immediate fire effects with before-after photographs at Pond 6 (Figure 2).

2.3. Amphibian and reptile sampling

We installed drift fences 7.6-m long and spaced 7.6-m apart around the terrestrial perimeter of each pond near the high-water line, such that 50% of each pond was fenced, with fences and spaces equally distributed and encircling ponds. Pitfall traps (19-liter buckets) were positioned inside and outside at each end of each fence (four per fence), and a double- or single-ended funnel trap (one of each per fence) was positioned at the midpoint of each fence on opposite sides, to detect directional movement to and from ponds. Additionally, we placed a PVC pipe (5-cm diameter; approximately 1.4-m height) between each drift fence to attract treefrogs. We placed a sponge in each pitfall trap and moistened as needed during trap checks. All traps were checked approximately three times weekly from 31 January 1994 through December 2017. We

identified, sexed (when possible), and measured snout-vent length (SVL) of captured animals. All individuals were marked by pond number and year of capture by toe- (anurans and lizards) or scale- (snakes) clipping; exceptions were recent metamorphs of some anuran species that were too small to toe-clip. Because all ponds were sampled continuously and in proportion to basin size we did not adjust for trapnights.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Numerous prescribed burns occurred within our study area during our long-term study. Three dormant-season burns (DSB), each affecting 3 to 5 ponds (total 11 pond-burns used in analyses) and four growing-season burns (GSB), each affecting 2 to 3 ponds (total 9 pond-burns used in analyses) met our selection criteria (Table 1). To achieve a reasonable degree of balance, we included one pre-burn and two post-burn years (the first (Y+1) and second (Y+2) years after the burn date) in our analyses, except in two cases when one of the post-burn years was eliminated from analyses due to prolonged flooding of traps that compromised data (Table 1). A “burn year” included a full year (12 months) prior to (pre-burn) or after (Y+1 or Y+2) respective burn dates. All first-captured individuals, and recaptures from prior years, were included in capture totals for each pond and year; recaptures from the same year were omitted. We determined that spatial arrangement of ponds was not relevant to our analyses, as inter-pond movement by amphibians was uncommon in our study (e.g., Greenberg and Tanner, 2005a; 2005b), and unlikely to affect results.

Response variables for analysis were species richness (number of species), Shannon-Weiner diversity index (H'), and evenness (H' divided by the natural logarithm of species richness) of reptiles and amphibians (separately), and relative abundance of species that were sufficiently

common for statistical analysis. We used a two factor fixed effects repeated measures mixed model with season (DSB, GSB) and burn year (pre-burn, Y+1, Y+2) and their interaction (SAS Institute Inc., 2011) for analysis of all response variables. Amphibian captures exhibited little year-to-year correlation, so for simplicity we did not use repeated measures for amphibian species only; this helped to avoid non-convergence problems that often occur with such complex models. The random component was burn within season. The repeated measures factor was year, where the subject was defined as pond within burn within season. Several covariance matrices (variance components, autoregressive 1, and compound symmetry) were compared using the AICc criterion. For reptiles, compound symmetry was usually best, and was used for all reptile models. Examination of residuals revealed that reptile species captures exhibited a normal distribution; amphibian species captures generally exhibited a clumped distribution, and therefore a negative binomial distribution was used. All community (H' , richness, evenness) metrics for both reptiles and amphibians were analyzed using a normal distribution and repeated measures. We tried incorporating annual rainfall and pond hydroregime (mean depth, number of times dried per burn-year, percent weeks with depth > 0 cm in week of burn) covariates but they did not improve the models and thus were not included. We used PROC MIXED for all normality models, and PROC GLIMMIX for negative binomial models (SAS Institute Inc., 2011).

Our primary interest was to determine how herpetofaunal communities and species responded to prescribed burns overall, and if they responded differently to DSB and GSB. Since this was not a designed study with true controls or burns assigned to specific ponds and years, the effects of burn season and year are confounded, and could not be evaluated. The mixed model ANOVA provided the basic analysis for testing season of burn and year, but we mainly

wanted to test specific hypotheses that would control for pre-burn levels of the variables which would provide higher statistical power. Therefore, we additionally developed and tested *a priori* contrasts specifically targeting our questions, using an approach similar to a before-after-control impact analysis (BACI; Smith, 2002) that adjusted the effects of each burn to its pre-burn level, for each pond used in analysis (Table 1). The overall main effect of burns was tested by estimating contrasts between pre-burn and Y+1, and (separately) pre-burn and Y+2. Season of burn effects contrasts were tested under the null hypothesis that the change in each response variable from the pre-burn year to Y+1 or Y+2 (respectively) was the same for DSB and GSB (e.g., $H_0: (Y+1 \text{ DSB} - \text{pre-burn DSB}) = (Y+1 \text{ GSB} - \text{pre-burn GSB})$; similarly for Y+2).

3. Results

3.1. Mixed-model ANOVA

Total captures and results from the overall two factor fixed effects repeated measures model are shown in Table 2. Among the six amphibian species tested, a season of burn effect was detected only for oak toads (*Anaxyrus quercicus* (Holbrook, 1840)). A year effect was detected for southern toads (*A. terrestris* (Bonnaterre, 1789)), oak toads, narrowmouth toads (*Gastrophryne carolinensis* (Holbrook, 1835)), and Florida gopher frogs (*Lithobates capito* (LeConte, 1855)); a season x year interaction effect was detected only for Florida gopher frogs. A season of burn and year effect was detected for amphibian species richness. A season of burn and season x year interaction effect was detected for amphibian diversity. A year and season x year interaction effect was detected for amphibian evenness.

Among the six reptile species tested, a season of burn, year, and season x year interaction was detected only for ground skinks (*Scincella lateralis* (Say, in James, 1822 “1823”)).

Southeastern five-lined skinks (*Plestiodon inexpectatus* (Taylor, 1932)) exhibited a season x year interaction effect. There were no significant main effects or interactions for reptile species richness, diversity, or evenness. Further analysis was not focused on all multiple comparisons within a significant main effect, but on the two types of *a priori* contrasts defined in the statistical section. The mixed model ANOVA provided the basic analysis for testing season of burn and year, and was needed for testing the more important specific hypotheses via contrasts that controlled for pre-burn levels of the variables.

3.2 Overall Burn Contrasts

The overall effect of burning (averaged over season of burn, and ignoring any possible interaction effects) on herpetofauna, based on the contrasts between the pre-burn year and each post-burn year (Y+1, Y+2, respectively) was most evident in Y+1, and responses varied among herpetofaunal species (Table 3; Figure 3). Among amphibians, southern toad and oak toad captures increased in Y+1 compared to pre-burn (Figure 3). Florida gopher frog captures increased during Y+2 relative to pre-burn; this was due to a Y+2 increase in GSB but little change in DSB (Figure 3), and reflects the season x year interaction seen in the ANOVA (Table 2). Capture rates of pinewoods treefrogs (*Hyla femoralis* (Daudin, 1800)), narrowmouth toads, and southern leopard frogs (*L. sphenoccephalus* (Cope, 1886)) did not change from pre-burn to either post-burn year. Total amphibian species richness increased during Y+1 compared to the pre-burn year. Evenness decreased during Y+1 (only) due mainly to decreased evenness in GSB, with little change in DSB (Figure 4); again, this reflects the season x year interaction effect in the ANOVA (Table 2). Among reptiles, ground skink captures increased in Y+1 compared to pre-burn; this was due to a substantial Y+1 increase in DSB, with little change in GSB (Figure 3),

reflecting the season x year interaction seen in the ANOVA (Table 2). Florida crowned snake (*Tantilla relicta* (Telford, 1966)) captures decreased during Y+1 compared to pre-burn; no differences were detected for Y+2 (Figure 3). Six-lined racerunners, southeastern five-lined skinks, mole skinks, and swamp snakes showed no response to burns overall in either post-burn year. Reptile species richness, diversity, and evenness did not differ before and after burning.

3.3. Season of Burn Contrasts

Contrasts comparing amphibian species responses to season of burn indicated that oak toad captures decreased more in GSB than in DSB in Y+2 relative to pre-burn levels, whereas Florida gopher frogs increased more in GSB than in DSB in Y+2, relative to pre-burn levels (Table 3; Figure 3). Post-burn captures of southern toads, narrowmouth toads, pinewoods treefrogs, and southern leopard frogs did not differ between DSB and GSB, relative to their pre-burn levels. Amphibian species diversity and evenness decreased more in GSB than DSB in Y+1 relative to pre-burn levels; in Y+2, no differences in species richness, diversity and evenness were detected between DSB and GSB, relative to pre-burn levels (Table 3; Figure 4). Among reptile species, ground skink captures increased from pre-burn levels more in DSB than in GSB in Y+1 (Table 3; Figure 3), whereas southeastern five-lined skinks captures increased from pre-burn levels more in GSB than in DSB in Y+2. Post-burn captures of six-lined racerunners (*Cnemidophorus sexlineatus* (Linnaeus, 1766)), mole skinks (*Plestiodon egregious* (Baird, 1959)), swamp snakes, Florida crowned snakes (Figure 3), or reptile species richness, diversity, and evenness (Figure 4), did not differ between DSB and GSB, relative to their pre-burn levels (Table 3).

4. Discussion

Our results indicated that growing- and dormant-season burns overall had few and transient short-term effects on herpetofaunal communities and tested species. Half of the 12 species examined did not show a response to burning overall or season of burn, and most responses were seen only the first year post-burn. Reptile species richness, diversity, and evenness were unaffected by season of burn or burning overall. Amphibian species richness, diversity, and evenness differed before and after burning, or between growing- and dormant-season burns during the first-year post-burn. Reptile and (especially) amphibian populations (e.g. Greenberg et al. 2018) are influenced by multiple biotic and edaphic factors, making it difficult to determine whether responses to burning or burn season were biologically meaningful.

We observed little to no evidence of direct, fire-related mortality, and thus suggest that species responses were most likely due to changes in surface activity affecting capture rates, or (for amphibians in particular) annual variability in capture rates unrelated to burns (Greenberg et al. 2018). Although post-burn wiregrass and herbaceous groundcover recovery is rapid (within a year or less) in longleaf pine-wiregrass savanna (e.g., Langford et al., 2007), possible differences in the timing of burning and groundcover recovery between dormant- and growing-season burns could affect species differently, based on their annual periods of peak activity. However, it seems unlikely that responses observed only during the second-year post-burn would be directly associated with changes to vegetation structure. Possibly, a delayed response could be associated with longer-term changes in prey availability that differed between dormant- and growing-season burns (Hardy 2003). We were unable to determine if herpetofauna used ponds as refugia during burns (e.g., Humphries and Sisson 2012), or if our results might have changed had ponds been dry and fires burned through them within our study period.

Although some amphibian community metrics and species showed a short-term response to season of burn, we emphasize that these results should be interpreted cautiously. Trapping adjacent to ponds may potentially confound detection of fire effects on amphibian populations with other factors affecting breeding and recruitment. Ponds function as a “magnet” for many pond-breeding amphibian species during their respective breeding seasons, although many spend the majority of their lives in the surrounding uplands. In contrast, ponds are not critical in the life history of most terrestrial reptiles and thus capture rates near ponds are likely to better reflect their response to burns and structural changes within the surrounding upland matrix.

Pond-breeding amphibian populations are highly variable (Greenberg et al., 2018) relative to reptiles that lay eggs on land (pers. obs.), as breeding effort and juvenile recruitment are heavily influenced by weather and hydroregime characteristics such as the timing, depth, and duration of water in ponds. Further, amphibian species differ in their life history requirements such as breeding seasons and rates of aquatic larval development within ponds (Greenberg et al., 2017a, 2017b), thus their responses might also be expected to differ. Juvenile recruitment is also influenced by seemingly stochastic underwater dynamics of competition and predation on amphibian eggs and larvae, often resulting in highly variable recruitment among seemingly-similar ponds, even within years (Greenberg et al., 2017b). Thus, capture rates and community-level metrics such as diversity and evenness are likely to vary dramatically among years independently of burns, for amphibians in particular.

Responses to burning did not seem to correspond among some species with similar habits. For example, six-lined racerunners, southeastern five-lined skinks, and ground skinks are non-fossorial (Ashton and Ashton, 1985), yet differed in their responses. Six-lined racerunners showed no response to burning, ground skink captures increased the first year after dormant-

compared to growing-season burns, and southeastern five-lined skink captures increased the second year after growing- compared to dormant-season burns. Mole skinks and Florida crowned snakes showed no response to season of burning, as might be expected given their semi-fossorial habits. Swamp snake captures also showed no response to burning, likely because they generally do not inhabit the upland matrix surrounding ponds (Ashton and Ashton 1985). Similarly, amphibian responses did not appear to correspond among species with similar breeding habits. For example, oak toad captures decreased during the second year after growing-season burns compared to dormant-season burns, but other summer-breeding species (Greenberg et al. 2017a) including pinewoods treefrogs, southern toads, and narrowmouth toads showed no response to growing- or dormant- season burns. Similarly, Florida gopher frogs and southern leopard frogs breed throughout most of the year, with juveniles emigrating ponds during late spring and summer (Greenberg et al., 2017a); yet, Florida gopher frog captures increased after growing-season burns compared to dormant-season burns during the second post-burn year, whereas southern leopard frog captures did not.

Results are inconsistent among the few studies addressing short-term effects of burning or season of burn in xeric, pine-dominated forests and conditions analogous to those within our study area. Hardy (2003) reported no difference in amphibian or reptile species richness or abundance between dormant- and growing-season burns at ephemeral ponds within an upland sandhills matrix. Schurbon and Fauth (2003) reported that prescribed burns decreased amphibian species richness at temporary ponds for two years, primarily because salamanders (including several *Ambystoma* spp. that did not occur at our study ponds) rarely used recently burned sites. In contrast, Langford et al. (2007) reported a greater abundance of herpetofauna in recently burned Mississippi pine savanna, but no difference in species diversity between burned and

unburned uplands. Noss and Rothermel (2015) reported higher tadpole survival in recently-burned ponds than ponds burned more than three years prior. Brown et al. (2011) reported no short-term negative effects of low-intensity growing-season prescribed burns, or high-severity wildfires on juvenile amphibian captures, and increased post-burn captures of two amphibian genera. We suggest that inconsistencies among studies, including ours, are due to variable among-year populations unrelated to burning, particularly for pond-breeding amphibians.

Several studies indicate that longer-term changes to canopy cover, or groundcover of wiregrass and herbaceous plants, leaf litter, or bare ground in xeric longleaf pine or sand pine forest resulting from either fire exclusion or frequent burning, can influence relative abundance of some species. For example, scrub lizards (*Sceloporus woodi* (Weigmann, 1828)), sand skinks, six-lined racerunners, mole skinks, and Florida crowned snakes are more abundant in recently-disturbed sand pine scrub with low canopy cover and a high proportion of bare sand compared to mature, forested sand pine scrub (Campbell and Christman, 1982; Means and Campbell, 1981; Mushinsky, 1985; Greenberg et al., 1994; Greenberg, 2002; Button et al., *in press*), whereas southeastern five-lined skinks are more abundant in sites that were not recently burned, with greater leaf litter accumulation (Mushinsky, 1992; Greenberg et al., 1994). Densities of gopher tortoises and their burrows, used as refugia by many herpetofaunal species (Jackson and Milstry, 1989; Lips, 1991), are greater in open, regularly-burned sandhills with abundant groundcover (Diemer, 1986). In contrast, Litt et al. (2001) and Meshaka and Layne (2002) reported few differences in the diversity or abundance of herpetofaunal species between long-unburned and frequently-burned Florida sandhills. Our study compared only short-term herpetofaunal responses to frequently-burned sandhills, and was not designed to compare responses between long-unburned and regularly-burned sandhills.

Our study showed that individual reptile and amphibian species responded differently to burning overall or season of burn; responses ranged from none, to positive, or negative. Further, most responses were seen only the first year post-burn. Our study illustrated that prescribed burning overall and season of burn are unlikely to adversely affect reptile or amphibian communities or species in the short-term, and most responses are short-lived.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

Funding was provided by the USDA Forest Service Ocala National Forest; Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration Program; Southern Research Station's Intensive Management Practices Assessment (now defunct) and Upland Hardwood Ecology and Management research work units; Southern Region (R8); Department of Energy-Savannah River Operations (IA Agreement DE-AI09-76SR00056); and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (contracts NG99-014 and C1195). We thank the many field assistants/site managers over the years, without whom this study would not have been possible: K. Garren, J. Weibe, S.A. Johnson, D.A. Johnson, J.S. Staiger, T. Sheltra (deceased), R.E. Ashton (deceased), D. Wooten, S. Wazny, M. Welker, C. Bugbee, S. Doucette-Riisse, C.J. Kovach, R. Lara, L. Tirado, I. Luque-Montes, A. Heh, M. Bainum, C. Hartmann, G. Kamener, S. Button, and R. Barker. J. Beach (deceased) volunteered full-time, 1994-2006. Many others helped as volunteers or short-term substitutes. David Quisenberry and John Ramsey were especially helpful in providing information on prescribed burns in the Ocala National Forest. We also thank University of Florida professors

- 394 G.W. Tanner (retired) and A. Storfer, and Ocala National Forest staff L. Lowery (deceased), R.
395 Lowery, C. Sekerak, J. Hinchee, and the fire crew for assistance.

Draft

References

- Ashton Jr, R.E., and Ashton, P.S. 1985. Handbook of Reptiles and Amphibians of Florida, Part 2: Lizards, Turtles and Crocodilians. Windward Publ. Inc., Miami, Florida.
- Brennan, L.A., Engstrom, R.T., Palmer, W.E., Hermann, S.M., Hurst, G.A., Burger, L.W., and Hardy, C.L. 1998. Wither wildlife without fire? Trans. 63rd N. Amer. Wildl. Nat. Res. Conf., pp. 402-414.
- Brockway, D.G., Outcalt, K.W., Tomczak, D.J., and Johnson, E.E. 2015. Restoring longleaf pine forest ecosystems in the Southern United States. Restoration of boreal and temperate forests 13: 445.
- Brown, D.J., Baccus, J.T., and Forstner, M.R.J. 2011. Potential positive effects of fire on juvenile amphibians in a southern USA pine forest. J. Fish Wildl. Manage. 2: 135-145.
- Button, S.T., Sovie, A.R., Greenberg, C.H., and Austin, J.D. *In press*. Evaluating the ecology of *Tantilla relict*a in Florida pine-wiregrass sandhills using multi-season occupancy models. J. Herpetology xx: xx-xx.
- Campbell, H.W., and Christman, S.P. 1982. The herpetological components of Florida sandhill and sand pine scrub associations. In: Herpetological Communities. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildlife Research Report 13: 163-171.

- 419
420 Diemer, J.E. 1986. The ecology and management of the gopher tortoise in the southeastern
421 United States. *Herpetologica* 125-133.
422
- 423 Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2016. Florida's Imperiled Species
424 Management Plan. Tallahassee, Florida.
425
- 426 Frost, C.C. 1993. Four centuries of changing landscape patterns in the longleaf pine ecosystem.
427 *Tall Timbers Fire Ecol. Conf. Proc.* 18: 17-44.
428
- 429 Glitzenstein, J.S., Streng, D.R., Masters, R.E., Robertson, K.M., and Hermann, S.M. 2012. Fire-
430 frequency effects on vegetation in north Florida pinelands: Another look at the long-term
431 Stoddard fire research plots at Tall Timbers Research Station. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 264:
432 197-209.
433
- 434 Greenberg, C.H., Neary, D.G., and Harris, L.D. 1994. Effect of high-intensity wildfire and
435 silvicultural treatments on reptile communities in sand-pine scrub. *Conserv. Biol.* 8:
436 1047-1057.
437
- 438 Greenberg, C.H., and Simons, R.W. 1999. Age, composition, and stand structure of old-growth
439 oak sites in the Florida high pine landscape: implications for ecosystem management and
440 restoration. *Nat. Areas J.* 19: 30-40.
441

- 442 Greenberg, C.H. 2002. Fire, habitat structure and herpetofauna in the Southeast. In: The role of
443 fire in nongame wildlife management and community restoration: Traditional uses and
444 new directions, proceedings of a workshop. Sept. 15, 2000, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.
445 *Edited by* W.M. Ford, K.R. Russell, and C.E. Moorman. USDA Forest Service General
446 Technical Report NE-288, pp. 91-99
447
- 448 Greenberg, C.H., and Tanner, G.W. 2005a. Spatial and temporal ecology of eastern spadefoot
449 toads on a Florida landscape. *Herpetologica* 61: 20-27.
450
- 451 Greenberg, C.H., and Tanner, G.W. 2005b. Spatial and temporal ecology of oak toads (*Bufo*
452 *quercicus*) on a Florida landscape. *Herpetologica* 61: 422-434.
453
- 454 Greenberg C. H., Goodrick, S., Austin, J.D., and Parresol, B.R. 2015. Hydroregime prediction
455 models for ephemeral groundwater-driven sinkhole wetlands: A planning tool for climate
456 change and amphibian conservation. *Wetlands* 35: 899-911.
457
- 458 Greenberg, C.H., Zarnoch, S.J., and Austin, J.D. 2017a. Weather, hydroregime, and breeding
459 effort influence juvenile recruitment of anurans: implications for climate change.
460 *Ecosphere* 8: e01789
461
- 462 Greenberg, C.H., Johnson, S.A., Owen, R., and Storfer, A. 2017b. Amphibian breeding
463 phenology and reproductive outcome: An examination using terrestrial and aquatic
464 sampling *Can. J. Zool.* 95: 673-684.

- 465
466 Greenberg, C.H., Zarnoch, S.J., and Austin, J.D. 2018. Long term amphibian monitoring at
467 wetlands lacks power to detect population trends. *Biol. Conserv.* 228: 120-131.
468
- 469 Hardy, C.L. 2003. Flora and fauna community response to seasonal applications of prescribed
470 fire in longleaf pine forests of the North Carolina sandhills. PhD Dissertation,
471 Mississippi State University, Mississippi.
472
- 473 Huffman, J.M. 2006. Historical fire regimes in southeast pine savannas. PhD Dissertation,
474 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. 71pp.
475
- 476 Humphries, W.J., and Sisson, M.A. 2012. Long distance migrations, landscape use, and
477 vulnerability to prescribed fire of the gopher frog (*Lithobates capito*). *J. Herpetol.* 46:
478 665-670.
479
- 480 Jackson, D.R., and Milstrey, E.G. 1989. The fauna of gopher tortoise burrows. Florida
481 Nongame Wildl. Prog. Tech. Rep. 5: 86-98.
482
- 483 Kirkman, L.K., Golladay, S.W., Laclaire, L., and Sutter, R. 1999. Biodiversity in southeastern,
484 seasonally ponded, isolated wetlands: Management and policy perspectives for research
485 and conservation. *J. North Amer. Benth. Soc.* 18: 553-562.
486
- 487 Komarek, E.V. 1969. Fire and animal behavior. *Tall Timbers Fire Ecol. Conf. Proc.* 9: 161-207.

488

489 Langford, G.J., Borden, J.A., Major, C.S., and Nelson, D.H. 2007. Effects of prescribed fire on
490 the herpetofauna of a southern pine savanna. *Herpetol. Conserv. Biol.* 2: 135-43.

491

492 Lips, K.R. 1991. Vertebrates associated with tortoise (*Gopherus Polyphemus*) burrows in four
493 habitats n southern-central Florida. *J. Herpetol.* 25: 477-481.

494

495 Litt, A.R., Provencher, L., Tanner, G.W., and Franz, R. 2001. Herpetofaunal responses to
496 restoration treatments in longleaf pine sandhills in Florida. *Rest. Ecol.* 9: 462-474.

497

498 Means, D.B., and Campbell, H.W. 1981. Effects of prescribed burning on amphibians and
499 reptiles. In: *Prescribed fire and wildlife in southern forests. Edited by G.W. Wood.* The
500 Belle Baruch Forest Science Institute Clemson University, Georgetown, South Carolina,
501 pp. 89–97.

502

503 Means, D.B., and Grow, G. 1985. The endangered longleaf pine community. *Enfo*, 85: 1-12.

504

505 Meshaka Jr, W.E., and Layne, J.N. 2002. Herpetofauna of a long-unburned sandhill habitat in
506 south-central Florida. *Flor. Sci.* 35-50.

507

508 Moler, P.E., and Franz, R. 1987. Wildlife values of small isolated wetlands in the southeastern
509 coastal. Plain. *Edited by: R.R. Odum, K.A. Riddleberger, and J.C. Ozier.* Proc. 3rd S.E.
510 Nongame and End. Wildl. Sympos., Georgia Dept. Nat. Res., Atlanta. pp. 234-240.

- 511
- 512 Mushinsky, H.R. 1985. Fire and the Florida sandhill herpetofaunal community with special
513 attention to responses of *Cnemidophorus sexlineatus*. *Herpetologica* 41: 333–342.
- 514
- 515 Mushinsky, H.R. 1992. Natural history and abundance of southeastern five-lined skink, *Eumeces*
516 *inexpectatus*, on a periodically burned sandhill in Florida. *Herpetologica* 48: 307–312.
- 517
- 518 Myers, R. 1990. Scrub and high pine. In: Myers, R.L., Ewel, J.J. (Eds.), *Ecosystems of Florida*.
519 University of Central Florida Press, Orlando, Florida pp. 150-193.
- 520
- 521 Noss, R.F., LaRoe, E.T., and Scott, J.M. 1995. *Endangered Ecosystems of the United States: A*
522 *Preliminary Assessment of Loss and Degradation*, USDI, National Biological Service,
523 Washington, DC, Biological Report 28. 59 pp.
- 524
- 525 Noss, C.F., and Rothermel, B.B. 2015. Juvenile recruitment of oak toads (*Anaxyrus quercicus*)
526 varies with time-since-fire in seasonal ponds. *J. Herpetol.* 49: 364-370.
- 527
- 528 O'Donnell, K.M., Thompson III, F.R., and Semlitsch, R.D. 2015. Prescribed fire and timber
529 harvest effects on terrestrial salamander abundance, detectability, and microhabitat use. *J.*
530 *Wildl. Manage.* 79: 766-775.
- 531
- 532 Palmer, W.M. 1995. *Reptiles of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press.
- 533

- 534 Pilliod, D.S., Bury, R.B., Hyde, E.J., Perl, C.A., and Corn, P.S. 2003. Fire and amphibians in
535 North America. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 178: 163-181.
536
- 537 Pitt, A.L., Tavano, J.J., Baldwin, R.F., and Waldrop, T.A. 2013. Effects of fuel reduction
538 treatments on movement and habitat use of American toads in a southern Appalachian
539 hardwood forest. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 310: 289-299.
540
- 541 Platt, W.J., Evans, G.W., and Davis, M.M. 1988. Effects of fire season on flowering forbs and
542 shrubs in longleaf pine forests. *Oecologia* 76, 353-363.
543
- 544 Robbins, L.E., and Myers, R.L. 1992. Seasonal effects of prescribed burning in Florida. A
545 review. Misc. Publ. No. 8, Tall Timbers Res. Sta., Tallahassee, Florida. 96pp.
546
- 547 Roznik, E.A., Johnson, S.A., Greenberg, C.H., and Tanner, G.W. 2009. Terrestrial movements
548 and habitat use of gopher frogs in longleaf pine forests: a comparative study of juveniles
549 and adults. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 259: 187-194.
550
- 551 Russell, K.R., Van Lear, D.H., and Guynn Jr, D.C. 1999. Prescribed fire effects on herpetofauna:
552 Review and management implications. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 27: 374-384.
553
- 554 SAS Institute Inc. 2011. SAS/STAT® 9.3 User's Guide. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North
555 Carolina, USA.
556

- 557 Schurbon, J.M., and Fauth, J.E. (2003). Effects of prescribed burning on amphibian diversity in a
558 southeastern US national forest. *Conserv. Biol.* 17: 1338-1349.
559
- 560 Semlitsch, R.D., and Bodie, J.R. (1998). Are small, isolated wetlands expendable? *Conserv.*
561 *Biol.* 12: 1129-1133.
562
- 563 Smith, E., 2002. BACI design. In: El-Shaarawi, A.H., Piegorisch, W.W. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of*
564 *Environmetrics*, vol. 1. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, pp. 41-148.
565
- 566 Smith, L.L., Subalusky, A.L., Atkinson, C.L, Earl, J.E., Mushet, D.M., Scott, D.E., Lance, S.L.,
567 and Johnson, S.A. 2018. Biological connectivity of seasonal ponded wetlands across
568 spatial and temporal scales. *J. Am. Water Res. Assoc.* 1-20. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12682)
569 [1688.12682](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12682).
570
- 571 Tanner, B., Douglas, M., Greenberg, C., Chamberlin, J., and Styers, D. 2018. A Macroscopic
572 Charcoal and Multiproxy Record from Peat Recovered from Depression Marshes in
573 Longleaf Pine Sandhills, Florida, USA. *Quaternary* 1: 25.
574
- 575 USDA Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis Program, Tue Feb 26 14:14:40 GMT 2019.
576 Forest Inventory EVALIDator web-application Version 1.8.0.00. St. Paul, MN: USDA
577 Forest Service, Northern Research Station. [Available at
578 <https://apps.fs.fed.us/Evalidator/evalidator.jsp>]
579

580 Vogl, R.J. 1973. Effects of fire on the plants and animals of a Florida wetland. *Am. Midl. Nat.*
581 89: 334-347.

582

583 Winsberg, M.D. 1990. *Florida Weather*. Univ. Central FL Press, Orlando, Florida.

584

585 Wright, A.H. 2002. *Life-histories of the frogs of Okefinokee swamp, Georgia*. North American
586 *Salientia (Anura)* No. 2. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

Draft

Table 1. Date and season of prescribed burns at each study pond used in data analyses, and years (most included 1 year pre-burn and 2 years post-burn) omitted from analyses due to prolonged flooding of traps that compromised capture data.

Burn date	Season	Ponds	Burn-Years Omitted
1/18/1996	Dormant	1, 2, 3	
1/13/1998	Dormant	1, 2, 3	Year 1 post-burn
2/26/2002	Dormant	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	
5/31/2010	Growing	7, 8	
6/9/2012	Growing	5, 6	Year 2 post-burn
6/22/2012	Growing	1, 2, 3	
7/26/2013	Growing	7, 8	

Table 2. Total number of captures (first captures and recaptures from prior years), for tested amphibian and reptile species, and results of mixed-model ANOVA comparing treatment (season of burn), year (one pre-burn and two post-burn years), and treatment x year interaction effects on reptile and amphibian captures and species richness, Shannon's diversity (H'), and evenness, Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida.

Species	Total	ANOVA RESULTS		
		P _{trt}	P _{yr}	P _{trtXyr}
Amphibians				
Southern toad (<i>Anaxyrus terrestris</i>)	2280	0.8475	0.0161	0.6587
Oak toad (<i>Anaxyrus quercicus</i>)	2273	0.0357	0.0005	0.1668
Narrowmouth toad (<i>Gastrophryne carolinensis</i>)	3584	0.3668	0.0348	0.4154
Pinewoods treefrog (<i>Hyla femoralis</i>)	2152	0.1846	0.9198	0.9623
Florida gopher frog (<i>Lithobates capito</i>)	444	0.9735	0.0284	0.0030
Southern leopard frog (<i>Lithobates sphenocephalus</i>)	578	0.2046	0.5505	0.4506
Amphibian species richness	---	0.0015	0.0231	0.8303
Amphibian species diversity	---	0.0279	0.0794	0.0004
Amphibian species evenness	---	0.1641	0.0089	0.0008
Reptiles				
Six-lined racerunner (<i>Cnemidophorus sexlineatus</i>)	1449	0.5255	0.1886	0.2236

Mole skink (<i>Plestiodon egregious</i>)	126	0.7459	0.3340	0.4938
Southeastern five-lined skink (<i>Plestiodon inexpectatus</i>)	676	0.1143	0.8197	0.0353
Ground skink (<i>Scincella lateralis</i>)	752	0.0283	0.0038	0.0088
Swamp snake (<i>Seminatrix pygaea</i>)	375	0.0541	0.8896	0.7999
Florida crowned snake (<i>Tantilla relict</i>)	485	0.4747	0.0765	0.4061
Reptile Species Richness	---	0.2576	0.5334	0.5093
Reptile Diversity	---	0.3378	0.9155	0.3847
Reptile Evenness	---	0.6108	0.7095	0.2802

Table 3. Contrasts for overall burn effects¹ (pre-burn versus one year post-burn (Y+1), and pre-burn versus second year post-burn (Y+2)), and contrasts for season of burn effects (dormant- and growing-season burns)², of total amphibian and reptile captures (first captures and recaptures from prior years), species richness, diversity (H'), evenness during Y+1 and Y+2 years post-burn, compared to pre-burn.

Species/Community-level metrics	Overall Burn Contrasts		Season of Burn Contrasts	
	Pre-burn:Y+1 p-value	Pre-burn:Y+2 p-value	Pre-burn:Y+1 p-value	Pre-burn:Y+2 p-value
Oak toad (<i>Anaxyrus quercicus</i>)	0.0078	0.7825	0.5616	0.0431
Southern toad (<i>Anaxyrus terrestris</i>)	0.0034	0.2371	0.3975	0.9211
Narrowmouth toad (<i>Gastrophryne carolinensis</i>)	0.2395	0.1104	0.2031	0.7946
Pinewoods treefrog (<i>Hyla femoralis</i>)	0.8271	0.6857	0.8427	0.9356
Florida gopher frog (<i>Lithobates capito</i>)	0.6309	0.0335	0.7791	0.0036
Southern leopard frog (<i>Lithobates sphenoccephalus</i>)	0.3876	0.8546	0.9867	0.2694
Species Richness	0.0084	0.5625	0.9093	0.5610
Species Diversity	0.1074	0.4638	<0.0001	0.0872
Species Evenness	0.0091	0.7101	0.0002	0.1934
Six-line racerunner (<i>Cnemidophorus sexlineatus</i>)	0.1640	0.0941	0.1640	0.7588
Mole skink (<i>Plestiodon egregious</i>)	0.4546	0.1423	0.2760	0.3682
Southeastern five-lined skink (<i>Plestiodon inexpectatus</i>)	0.5379	0.8595	0.5108	0.0120
Ground skink (<i>Scincella lateralis</i>)	0.0065	0.5032	0.0051	0.9292
Swamp snake (<i>Seminatrix pygaea</i>)	0.7467	0.8617	0.5076	0.7531
Florida crowned snake (<i>Tantilla relicta</i>)	0.0494	0.8832	0.8461	0.2716
Species Richness	0.2616	0.9483	0.5894	0.3578

Species Diversity	0.9622	0.7713	0.1704	0.5969
Species Evenness	0.5691	0.7114	0.1715	0.9534

¹Overall burn contrasts are defined as Y+1 minus pre-burn, and Y+2 minus pre-burn.
²Season of burn contrasts are defined as (dormant-season: Y+1 minus pre-burn) minus (growing-season: Y+1 minus pre-burn) and (dormant-season: Y+2 minus pre-burn) minus (growing-season: Y+2 minus pre-burn).

Draft

List of Figures

Figure 1. Locations of study ponds in the Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida.

Figure 2. Photograph of Pond 6 pre-burn (9 June, 2010), immediately post-burn (10 June, 2010), and one year post-burn (9 June 2011), Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida.

Figure 3. Least squares mean (+SE) captures of six six amphibian and six reptile species per pond, one year before (pre-burn), and one (Y+1) and two (Y+2) years after dormant- and growing-season burns, Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida.

Figure 4. Least squares mean (+SE) amphibian and reptile species diversity (H'), richness, and evenness per pond, one year before (pre-burn), and one (Y+1) and two (Y+2) years after dormant- and growing-season burns, Ocala National Forest, Marion County, Florida.