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Irish forests

- Forest cover reduced to <1% by 1900s

- Increased to 10% today

- 1% of land area native woodland
  - Oak, Ash dominated

- Remaining area is plantation forest
  - Non-native conifers (Sitka spruce)
  - 55% state owned, now being reforested
  - 45% privately owned, afforestation of agricultural land

- Target of 17% cover by 2030
Irish Forest policy

- Developed to incorporate sustainable forest management in recent years

- Forest biodiversity guidelines (2000)
  - Planting of species mixtures
  - Broadleaf species
  - Areas for biodiversity enhancement
    - Retained habitats
    - Open space

- Recent planting trends
  - Increase in mixes
  - Increase in broadleaves
Research questions

− What lives in Irish native woodlands?
  ■ Are there any specialist species?

− What species are supported in plantations?
  − Monocultures and mixes
  − Second rotation

− What management practices can enhance plantation forest biodiversity?
PLANFORBIO Research Programme

1. Forestbio

2. Hen Harrier

3. Rhododendron control

4. BIOPLAN Integrating research and management
Using spiders to detect habitat change

- Influenced by vegetation structure
  - Prey availability
  - Web attachment
  - Hiding places for active hunters
  - Stable microclimate
  - Protection from predators

- Abundant
- Taxonomically well known
- Found in all vegetation layers
- Occupy a strategic position in food webs
Experimental design

- 2001 and 2007

- Plantations
  - 1st rotation Ash (4)
  - 1st rotation Sitka spruce (7 sites)
  - 2nd rotation Sitka spruce (5)

- Commercially mature plantations

- Range of soil types, altitudes

- Min 6ha size, 100m wide

- Native woodlands
  - Native ash dominated (5)
  - Native oak dominated (5)

- Appeared on 1920s maps
Spider sampling

- Pitfall traps
  - 6 pitfalls per plot
    - 2m apart
  - Between 3-5 plots per site
  - May-August

- Habitat variables
  - Stand structure
  - Vegetation structure
  - Deadwood cover
  - Litter cover and depth
Over view of results

- 6871 adult individuals identified in 97 species
  - 19 forest assoc. species
  - 2 assoc. with ancient, B/L
  - 24 open assoc. species

- Analyses
  - Link diversity measures to habitat parameters
Spider assemblages among forest types

- SS 1\textsuperscript{st} rotation plantation
- SS 2\textsuperscript{nd} rotation plantation
- Ash plantation
- Oak Native woodland
- Ash native woodland

Axis 2 vs 3

Axis 2 $r^2 = 34\%$; Axis 2 $r^2 21\%$
Assemblages and habitat variables

- SS 1st rotation plantation
- SS 2nd rotation plantation
- Ash plantation
- Oak Native woodland
- Ash native woodland

Correlations with axes: $r^2 > 0.2$
Richness analyses

**Total species richness** \((F = 21.7_{2.89} p<0.001)\)
Spruce plantation > Ash plantation and Native
Native > Ash plantation

**Forest-associated species’ richness**
\((F = 13.3_{2.89} p<0.001)\)
Spruce plantation > Ash plantation and Native
## Native woodlands: relationship with habitat variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total species richness</th>
<th>Forest associated species’ richness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Model deviance = 35%, df 3,33)</td>
<td>(Model deviance = 24%, df 1,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-vascular ground veg (Z=-2.26, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>- Non-vascular ground veg (Z=-2.11, p&lt;0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Litter depth (Z=-2.57, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coarse woody debris (Z=-2.18, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Microneta viaria** (D = 53%, df 2,33)
+ Leaf litter cover (Z= 2.44, p<0.05)
+ Understorey cover (Z= 2.25, p<0.05)

**Agyneta ramosa** (D = 41%, df 2,33)
+ Understorey cover (Z= 3.01, p<0.01)
+ Tree distance (Z= 1.94, p<0.05)
Spruce plantations

**Total species richness**
(Model deviance = 43%, df $3,40$)
- **Canopy cover** ($Z=-2.71$, $p<0.01$)
- **Non-vascular ground veg** ($Z=-1.95$, $p<0.05$)
+ **Lower field layer veg** ($Z=1.91$, $p<0.05$)

**Forest associated species’ richness**
(Model deviance = 29%, df $1,40$)
- **Canopy cover** ($Z=-1.83$, $p<0.06$)

**Lepthyphantes alacris** ($D=15\%$, df $2,40$)
- **Canopy cover** ($Z=-2.18$, $p<0.05$)
+ **Needle litter cover** ($Z=1.82$, $p<0.06$)

**Lepthyphantes flavipes** ($D=14\%$, df $2,40$)
- **Canopy cover** ($Z=-2.18$, $p<0.05$)

**Lepthyphantes tenebricola** ($D=23\%$, df $1,40$)
- **Canopy cover** ($Z=-2.76$, $p<0.01$)
Ash plantations (Pearson Correlations, n=17)

**Total species richness**
+ **Vascular ground veg** ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.01$)

**Forest-associated species’ richness**
+ **Vascular ground veg** ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.01$)
+ **Canopy cover** ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$)
- **Non-vascular ground veg** ($r = -0.51$, $p < 0.05$)
Potential biodiversity indicators

- Across all forest types
  - Neg with non-vacular ground veg
  - Predominately moss, less structurally diverse

- Native woodlands
  - Specialists positive with leaf litter cover, understory, tree distance
  - Assemblages: structural diversity of vegetation layers

- Sitka spruce plantations
  - Neg with canopy cover
  - LFL pos with total SR = generalists

- Ash plantations
  - Specialists: positive with vascular ground veg and canopy cover
Forest management for spiders?

- Emulate structural characteristics of native woodlands

- Promote vegetation layers, in particular understory and vascular ground veg
  - SS not ecological ‘desert’ BUT,
  - Generalists and open species
    - Not just through opening canopy
    - More open canopy = generalists?

- Greater structural diversity under the canopy
  - Increase mixed plantations (BL species)
  - Forest biodiversity guidelines
Conclusions

- Management to promote forest specialists
  - Total SR not necessarily native woodland specialists

- How much of a forest associated fauna actually exists in Ireland?
  - Saproxylic species

- Reforestation
  - Felling etc

- Other taxonomic groups
  - Complementarity
  - Testing indicators
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