

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Exploring the Urban Forest Herb Layer: A Patch-Size Perspective

Les Welker¹, Danica Doroski², & Marlyse Duguid¹

¹The Forest School at the Yale School of the Environment, New Haven, CT, 06511

²State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

*Author for correspondence: leslie.welker@yale.edu

28 **Introduction**

29 As urbanization accelerates globally, with a projected 68% of the world's population residing in
30 cities by 2050 (United Nations, 2018), human development continues to transform the natural landscape.
31 Native forests are increasingly fragmented and overlaid with impermeable surfaces. Remnant natural
32 areas within urban settings play a vital role in delivering ecosystem services and ameliorating some of the
33 effects of anthropogenic climate change (Luck and Wu, 2002). These patches of forest grow in
34 significance as cities expand around them (Hansen & Pauleit, 2014). Understanding these unique facets of
35 the urban landscape is critical to maintaining and improving the vitality of cities. While significant effort
36 and resources are dedicated to urban forests, we still possess a limited understanding of their communities
37 and dynamics (Alberti 2005). For instance, the understory and herb layer is an essential part of forest
38 ecology. The herbaceous community of rural forests can have a profound impact on the canopy, such as
39 through its capability to filter the composition of regenerating forests through competition for soil
40 nutrients (Lyon & Sharpe 2003) and light (Horsley 1993). The outcome of this competition on tree
41 seedlings is species specific (George & Bazzaz 2003). The herbaceous layer can have other broad impacts
42 on rural forest systems, through its outsized contribution to net primary productivity and carbon
43 sequestration (Muller 1978, Neufeld & Young 2003), and its similarly disproportionate role in nutrient
44 cycling (Muller 2003). Despite the important role that understory communities play in rural forests, there
45 is little published literature on the ecology of the understory layer in urban forests outside of the realm of
46 invasive species control.

47 The herb layer is understudied generally (Spicer et al. 2022), and there are even fewer
48 studies that investigate herbs in urban forests. Notably, there are several rural to urban gradient studies
49 that incorporate herbs, particularly along riparian corridors (Moffatt et al. 2004, Schwoertzig et al. 2016),
50 roadways (Cochard et al. 2016), and within vacant lots (Blouin et al. 2019), though most of these
51 examples are not explicitly focused on forested areas. While these types of studies characterizing plant
52 communities along urban to rural or land use intensity gradients are inherently valuable for understanding
53 how urban ecosystems broadly differ from rural ones, urban landscapes and their forests are

54 extraordinarily heterogeneous. They are split by development into remnant patches of various sizes, and
55 restoration or lot abandonment can allow previously developed areas to become regenerating forest
56 patches. Fragmentation such as this generates a unique matrix of community types which experience
57 different disturbance regimes (Pickett et al. 2001), degrees of edge effect (Murcia 1995), and limitations
58 on seed dispersal (Chazdon 2008).

59 There are few, if any, studies which investigate patterns of herb and understory diversity within
60 the context of urban forest patch size and land use history. Comparative research done in rural forests
61 likely does not describe the distinct communities found in urban forests, particularly when urban forests
62 possess such a level of heterogeneity even on local scales, with frequent anthropogenic disturbance
63 (Grimm et al. 2000) and greater pressure from invasive species (Cadotte et al. 2017). Previous research
64 (Doroski et al. 2022) demonstrates that the woody communities of urban forests may be more intact than
65 typically assumed, raising the possibility that the same holds true for the herbaceous layer. Any
66 management approach is contingent on understanding how various layers of the forest interact with one
67 another, and in urban forests, most questions regarding the herbaceous community remain important
68 knowledge gaps.

69 This study builds upon previous work done in New Haven's urban forest to further explore the
70 relationship between forest patch size and plant communities. The theory of island biogeography has been
71 used in previous research of urban forests to predict distribution of invasive plant species (Vidra and
72 Shear, 2008), and the richness and diversity of vascular plant species (Godefroid and Koedam, 2003).
73 Applying this framework to herb communities and their linkages with the mid and overstory across the
74 urban matrix can further our understanding of urban forests as ecological systems by revealing trends in
75 urban herbaceous communities in relation to patch size and anthropogenic disturbance, and through
76 identifying community features that may inform management of these crucial forested spaces.

77 In this study, we aimed to understand how understory plant communities (and their respective
78 functional groups) respond to patch size, land use history, disturbance, and woody plant communities
79 across an urbanized area. We evaluated the richness and diversity of understory vegetation between

80 different size classes of park. At a finer scale, we aimed to investigate changes in understory diversity and
81 community composition in response to a suite of local site features, in addition to the wider context of
82 patch size. We hypothesized that we would observe greater species abundance nearer to edges, as well as
83 a greater proportion of introduced species both near edges and throughout smaller patches. We also
84 expected that a higher degree of anthropogenic disturbance would be associated with the proportion of
85 introduced species. We investigated the relationship of the mid and overstory to the understory layer,
86 expecting to observe suppressed total abundance and richness of understory species under fuller canopy
87 cover (i.e greater basal area). Finally, we investigated the distribution and importance of several
88 introduced species of special interest, and their impacts on native herbaceous species.

89

90 2. **Methods:**

91 *Site Description:*

92 New Haven is a city in southern Connecticut on the northern shore of the Long Island Sound. The
93 city covers 52.1 km², and currently houses a population of more than 135,000 people. New Haven
94 experiences a mean annual rainfall of 111.99 cm, and the average July and January temperatures are 24.0
95 and 0.8C, respectively (NOAA, 2018). It has a higher average canopy cover than most similarly sized
96 cities, at about 38% (Pelletier & O'Neil-Dunne, 2009).

97 The geology of the area is primarily glacial in origin, and it is characterized by glacial erratics, drumlins,
98 and trap rock ridges (Flint 1965), including the notable trap rock ridges of East and West Rock. However,
99 as New Haven is a built-up area, large portions are underlain with anthropogenic soil types, in addition to
100 its native inceptisols that are mostly Holyoke, Cheshire, and Hollis series soils, which result from
101 sandstone ablation till (NRCS, 2019). This study used plots from parks across New Haven and the
102 surrounding metropolitan area which were first established in 2018 (Doroski et al. 2019). We selected
103 plots for use in this study which occurred in parks with a forested area greater than 2 ha. A summary of
104 each park can be found in SI Table 1.

105 *Field Methods/procedures:*

106 We sampled 91 plots across 15 forested parks, though 1 patch (4 plots) were omitted from
107 analysis, leaving 87 plots across 14 parks (Figure 1). The plots were established in 2018 using a random
108 starting point and a sampling fraction of 1/10, so that the number of plots in each park was proportional to
109 the forested area, to capture heterogeneity in vegetation (Doroski et al 2019). When plots were
110 established, the centers were marked with painted iron rebar. We located the general area of the centers of
111 each plot using GPS coordinates in the mobile application Avenza, and then searched for the rebar. When
112 the rebar was no longer present, we used photos taken of each plot to find the approximate center. Once
113 we found the center, we followed the stratified sampling procedure used in Doroski et al 2019, which was
114 adapted from the Natural Areas Conservancy plots in New York City (Figure 2). We measured the
115 overstory trees greater than 5 cm DBH within a 10m radius, and midstory trees less than 5 cm in a 5m
116 radius. We identified each tree (including standing dead snags) to species when possible, or otherwise to
117 the genus.

118 For understory, we established 8 1m² subplots to uniformly sample the larger site. For each
119 cardinal direction, the bottom left corner of the subplots were situated 5m from the center, with the upper
120 left corner facing away from the center. For each ordinal direction, the subplot was situated extending
121 diagonally, with the innermost corner 7.5m from the center point. Within each understory subplot, we
122 assessed by eye the total ground cover of vegetation, live wood, coarse woody debris, leaf litter, soil, bare
123 rock, dumping (such as litter or landscaping waste), and impervious surfaces. For this measurement, totals
124 always equaled 100%. We identified and measured the percent cover of each species of plant present in
125 the plot. For most woody plants, we also counted the number of individuals and assigned a categorical
126 height class. Plants that were leaning, pinned, or fallen over were classified as their current height and not
127 their height if they were upright. Not all woody plants were tallied into height classes. Species of vines
128 and brambles for which individuals could be difficult to distinguish were omitted from height class
129 counts, but percent cover was still recorded (see SI table 2 for a list of species observed). The sum of
130 percent cover of each species of plant could exceed 100 within one subplot to fully account for species
131 which overlapped each other.

132 It was occasionally difficult to identify species of very small woody germinants, and nondescript,
133 out of flowering season herbs or graminoids. Some groups were routinely identified to a higher
134 taxonomic level (e.g. *Carex*, *Smilax*, *Vitis*), but in most cases, the narrowest identification possible was
135 made, often to genus, but occasionally higher (in the case of *Poaceae*). Percent cover of bryophytes was
136 typically recorded as a plant “species” (moss), but ultimately removed from analyses. We retained
137 *Dendrolycopodium obscurum* (flat-branched tree clubmoss), since it was a specific identifiable species
138 with a higher amount of structure. We did not record the occurrence of lichens on rock surfaces.

139 Finally, we measured the level of various forms of disturbance at each site, including cover of
140 trails, paths, impervious surfaces, and dumping, as well as signs of fire or hydrology. These
141 measurements were taken as a percentage of cover for the entire 314.16m² site. For other indicators of
142 disturbance, such as cut stumps, and windthrown trees, we counted the number of each in the site. We had
143 one binary form of disturbance, for the presence or absence of signs of white-tail deer. However, white-
144 tail deer are extremely abundant in even small forest patches in the area, and we believe that nearly all
145 sites were impacted by them, regardless of obvious signs.

146 147 *Statistical Analysis*

148 From our data, we built an understory species matrix for use in analyses, and an associated set of
149 environmental characteristics, in addition to a complete list of observed species, their nativity status in
150 Northeastern America, and their functional groups (Tree sapling, shrub, vine, herb, and graminoid). We
151 ultimately removed 4 plots from this dataset, constituting all of the plots from one park, due to concerns
152 about management activities in the park (evidence of targeted removal of trees and introduced species,
153 and landscaping).

154 Analyses were conducted using the statistical freeware R (version 3.6.3; Bates et al. 2017; R Core
155 Development Team, 2018). We used Vegan and BiodiversityR to construct species accumulation curves
156 and to calculate chao estimates, diversity, species richness, abundance, and evenness for different growth
157 forms, plant native status, and park size classes.

158 We built linear models to assess the relationship between these diversity measures and site
159 characteristics (Forested area size, distance of a plot to an edge, and basal area of overstory trees). We
160 used hierarchical, linear mixed-effects models for this set of analyses to account for potential spatial
161 autocorrelation associated with park-level characteristics. Specifically, we assumed a common slope for
162 the random effects and included ‘park’ to represent different intercepts. We included interior or edge
163 status of plots as a binary (0=interior and 1=edge) predictor, and included basal area of overstory trees,
164 total forested patch size, and an index generated from anthropogenic forms of disturbance as continuous
165 predictors. To further explore trends in understory diversity, we selected abundant introduced species of
166 interest to use as predictors of native herb diversity measures in similar linear models. To permit
167 comparison of the effect sizes of the predictor terms in each model, predictor variables were standardized
168 by centering (the binary predictor) and by dividing by two standard deviations (the continuous predictor),
169 following Gelman (2008).

170 We note that we did not use model selection nor rely on statistical significance and multivariate
171 analyses for our causal inference. Instead, we relied primarily on evaluating standardized coefficient
172 estimates (i.e., conditional effect sizes) considering published evidence of edge effect and patch size on
173 species diversity. We report p and R^2 values in our tables, given their value in indicating the precision of
174 effect size estimates, but in the text focus on coefficient estimates.

175

176 **3. Results**

177 We measured 165 species of plants in the understory across 87 plots. A species accumulation
178 curve suggests that effort was sufficient to get a comprehensive sampling of species present (Fig. 3). To
179 assess the diversity of understory plants across the city, we calculated the Shannon diversity index,
180 richness, abundance, and evenness (Table 1). We calculated these same measures for subsets of the full
181 dataset, including park size, and edge or interior status of plots, as well as plant nativity and different
182 plant functional groups (tree, shrub, herb, and vine). Small parks demonstrated a marginally higher mean
183 Shannon diversity and richness, and considerably higher understory abundance than large parks. Both size

184 classes showed similar evenness. Edge plots show larger Shannon diversity, abundance, richness, and
185 evenness than interior plots. Native species had a much greater Shannon diversity, richness, and evenness
186 than introduced species, which had a slightly higher mean abundance. Of the plant functional groups,
187 herbs had the greatest Shannon diversity and richness, while shrubs and vines were the most abundant.
188 Trees had the greatest evenness.

189 Total understory diversity, abundance, richness, or evenness were not well explained by
190 environmental characteristics. Some variables were statistically significant, but the overall ability of the
191 models to fully capture and explain the complexity of understory diversity was limited. The R-squared
192 values, which reflect how well a model fits the observed data, were relatively low. Despite this general
193 trend, there were several relationships of note, particularly in regard to the basal area of overstory trees,
194 which had a negative effect on abundance and richness of herb (-27.79 ± 13.87 and 1.4 ± 0.5 ,
195 respectively) and vine species (-45.15 ± 19.71 and -0.65 ± 0.37 , respectively), as well as on introduced
196 plants as a whole. The index of anthropogenic disturbance had a large effect on the abundance of herb
197 species (-27.91 ± 15.11) and the richness of vine species (-0.74 ± 0.4), but not on the diversity measures
198 of introduced species specifically.

199 The proportion of introduced species present in the community was significantly related to the
200 edge or interior status of a plot, the size of a park, and signs of anthropogenic disturbance, when these
201 variables were individually assessed with a t-test ($p=0.013$, <0.001 , 0.009 , respectively). When tested
202 together in a linear model, the size of the park was the most important for increasing the proportion of
203 introduced species (0.19 ± 0.06), where smaller parks had a larger proportion. Importantly, however, the
204 total abundance of native plants in the understory had no relationship to that of introduced plants ($p=$
205 0.24). Plant functional groups responded to these variables to different extents. T-tests for each variable
206 were highly significant for the proportion of introduced herbs and the proportion of introduced shrubs. On
207 the other hand, the only variable significant for the proportion of introduced vines was disturbance ($p=$
208 0.02), and none were significant for tree seedlings. When variables were assessed together in a linear
209 model for each functional group, only the proportion of introduced shrubs was well explained by the plot

210 variables. Anthropogenic disturbance was the most important, increasing the proportion of nonnative
211 shrubs (0.27 ± 0.11), followed by the park size class (0.18 ± 0.09).

212 Rank abundance plots (Fig. 4) demonstrate that total understory cover across the city was heavily
213 driven by several of the most abundant species. The species observed with the greatest abundance was
214 multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*) followed by winged euonymus (*Euonymus alatus*), greenbriar (*Smilax*
215 *spp.*) and common ivy (*Hedera helix*). Notably, the high abundance of some species was driven
216 overwhelmingly by just a few sites. For instance, the most abundant species, multiflora rose, was present
217 in 30 plots, but a full 90% of its abundance is attributable to 10 plots, and another abundant introduced
218 species, common ivy, occurred in 14 plots, but 90% of its abundance was due to just three. One native
219 herb species, wild sarsaparilla (*Aralia nudicaulis*), owes 86% of its abundance to a single plot. Many of
220 the most abundant native species in the understory are also widespread, i.e. they have a less skewed
221 distribution of their abundance. However, some introduced species, namely oriental bittersweet (*Celastrus*
222 *orbiculatus*) and winged euonymus, also follow this pattern (Fig. 5).

223 The communities of large and small parks differed, as did the communities of plots with evidence
224 of anthropogenic disturbance compared to those without. The presentation of the communities of different
225 understory functional groups was complex. Notably, the shrub communities of disturbed plots and small
226 parks resemble each other closely in regards to the most abundant shrub species of each respective group
227 (namely, multiflora rose, winged euonymus, and mapleleaf viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*). Large
228 parks share high shrub cover of winged euonymus and mapleleaf viburnum, but multiflora rose is very
229 rare by comparison. Large parks also had higher abundance of Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*)
230 and lowbush blueberry (*Vaccinium angustifolium*), which are both mostly associated with disturbed sites,
231 but were very rare in small parks. All but one species of vine were found in disturbed sites, and most
232 vines were more abundant in disturbed sites, except for common ivy, which was also almost exclusively
233 found in small parks. As such, the undisturbed plots of small parks contained the largest amount of
234 common ivy. Like the ivy, there are a few other individual species that drive much of the difference
235 between large and small parks. For instance, Japanese knotweed (*Polygonum cuspidatum*), the most

236 abundant herb in small parks (due partially to its large size), is entirely absent from large parks, and garlic
237 mustard, the second most abundant in small parks, is relatively rare in large parks. Other herb species
238 which are fairly abundant in large parks are comparatively rare or absent in small parks, such as New
239 York fern (*Thelypteris noveboracensis*), Hay-scented fern (*Dennstaedtia punctilobula*) and Japanese
240 stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*). There are a number of rare herb species found in low abundance in
241 just one large park plot. There were many more species of herbs in disturbed sites, and in greater
242 abundance, across both park size classes. Despite the differences in large and small parks, some herbs
243 were found in abundance across both, including white wood aster (*Eurybia divaricata*), Solomon's seal
244 (*Polygonatum sp.*), and goldenrod (*Solidago spp.*). See Tables 3, 4 and 5, for full summaries of herb,
245 vine, and shrub species abundance across size class and disturbance strata.

246

247 **4. Discussion**

248 Research into urban understory plant communities has predominantly focused on comparisons to
249 rural forest types. Urban forests contend with unique disturbance regimes and landscape fragmentation
250 relative to rural forests, and their understory communities likely reflect these environmental drivers.
251 Using an observational study design, we described the diversity of the understory in urban forested
252 patches, and examined whether patch size was linked to changes in understory community composition or
253 measures of diversity. We expected that we would observe greater plant abundance nearer to edges,
254 which we did. However, the statistical relationship between abundance of both understory plants as a
255 whole, and for different functional groups, and the edge or interior status of a plot, was not very strong,
256 with the exception of vine species richness. Instead, abundance was more strongly predicted by the basal
257 area of a plot, and in the case of herbs, by the amount of anthropogenic disturbance. This dovetails with
258 another of our hypothesis concerning the suppression of abundance in areas with higher basal area, which
259 did hold true across most groups, affecting herbs, vines, shrubs, particularly introduced species of these
260 groups. In addition, the richness of herbs and vines (but not shrubs) were suppressed under high basal
261 area. The proportion of introduced species as a whole was best predicted by the size of a forested patch,

262 but this relationship was modified by the functional class of plant. Shrubs were the only functional group
263 where the proportion of introduced species was strongly related to multiple site environmental factors
264 (edge, patch size, disturbance), while herbs and vines had less clear, weak relationships.

265 These findings are, in some respects, surprising, particularly the seeming unimportance of edge or
266 interior status of a plot for all but vine species. Our findings can be further contextualized by the analysis
267 of understory community composition, which showed that there is a considerable amount of overlap
268 between large and small park communities. Large parks did have more species, which can likely be
269 partially explained by large parks also having a wider range of habitat types by virtue of their larger size
270 and greater landscape range (e.g. ridgetop sites). While there is much overlap in the communities, there
271 are important differences as well, with specific species occurring with much greater abundance in one
272 patch size and not the other.

273 There is also the interesting phenomenon of very large proportions of abundant introduced
274 species coming from relatively few sites, creating an illusion of widespread dominance, when it is
275 actually narrow hyper-dominance. This is the case for multiflora rose and common ivy, which both had
276 extraordinarily high abundance in a few sites, and are notably both found almost exclusively in small
277 parks. They are not broadly characteristic of small parks, which have varied and diverse communities
278 overall, but they are highly characteristic of some sites within small parks, which frequently also have
279 multiple other introduced species present. Meanwhile, there are several introduced species which are
280 distributed across park size, whether plots were along an edge or interior. These include Japanese
281 honeysuckle, winged euonymus, and oriental bittersweet. It is not surprising that introduced species are so
282 frequent in the understory of New Haven's urban forests, given the fragmented and anthropogenic
283 landscape. It is surprising, however, that the understory communities of large parks and small parks
284 would be so difficult to disentangle. We had expected that small parks would be more uniformly
285 degraded, and instead found that besides a few outlying plots, they were fairly similar in some respects to
286 large parks.

287 Our findings can inform management of urban forests in several ways. Firstly, we show that the
288 quality of the understory layer can vary widely in smaller forested areas, in ways which are partially
289 explained by disturbance and edge proximity. Areas of small parks can resemble the communities of
290 larger parks, particularly when they are interior or undisturbed. This indicates that small parks are not
291 inherently degraded and are likely worth the investment of management for biodiversity and ecosystem
292 services. Secondly, the link between basal cover and reduced richness of introduced species, while
293 unsurprising, confirms that focusing management efforts on canopy gaps and/or managing for dense
294 canopy cover by protecting existing trees (such as through de-vining stewardship) could be an effective
295 way to reduce the forest health threats posed by some introduced species. However, other introduced
296 species, like winged euonymus, are widespread in the understory in interior and undisturbed areas of
297 forest, and where it occurs in high abundance, few other species of shrub grow. Shrubs are a major
298 component of the understory and midstory that can influence biogeochemical cycling and recruitment.
299 Winged euonymus currently grows beneath both disturbed and intact native forests in New Haven parks,
300 with no relationship to basal area, and may change their future trajectories. It is important to further study
301 the role that widespread and abundant introduced shrubs are playing in woody seedling recruitment and
302 understory dynamics within urban forests, and also to assess their potential to spread to rural forests.

303 Understanding how heterogeneity within the urban forest matrix may affect understory
304 communities can contextualize urban forests generally and improve our ability to manage these forests in
305 a changing environment. The understory is a crucial but understudied component of urban forests, and our
306 research begins to fill this knowledge gap by interrogating the role of plot-specific environmental factors
307 in understory diversity and composition. Our patch framework had limited capacity to predict trends in
308 overall measures of diversity but did reveal some key similarities and differences in the understory
309 communities of urban forest patches across New Haven, such as the widespread prevalence of winged
310 euonymus, and comparatively narrow range of other introduced species. These findings are particularly
311 important for prioritizing further research into the function of the understory in urban forests, and how
312 composition interacts with functionality. Our results add to a growing body of literature on urban forests

313 that highlight the complexities driving community composition, and the need to assess urban forests
314 independently of rural baselines.

315

316 **5. References:**

317 Alberti, Marina. “The Effects of Urban Patterns on Ecosystem Function.” *International Regional Science*
318 *Review* 28, no. 2 (2005): 168–92.

319 https://econpapers.repec.org/article/saeinrsre/v_3a28_3ay_3a2005_3ai_3a2_3ap_3a168-192.htm.

320 Blouin D, Pellerin S, Poulin M (2019) Increase in non-native species richness leads to biotic
321 homogenization in vacant lots of a highly urbanized landscape. *Urban Ecosyst* 22:879–892.

322 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-019-00863-9>

323 Chazdon, Robin. “Beyond Deforestation: Restoring Forests and Ecosystem Services on Degraded Lands.”
324 *Science* (New York, N.Y.) 320 (July 1, 2008): 1458–60. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1155365>.

325 Cochard, Arnaud, Josephine Pithon, Marie Jagaille, Veronique Beaujouan, Guillaume Pain, and Herve
326 Daniel. “Grassland Plant Species Occurring in Extensively Managed Road Verges Are Filtered by
327 Urban Environments.” *PLANT ECOLOGY & DIVERSITY* 10, no. 2–3 (2017): 217–29.

328 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17550874.2017.1350764>.

329 Doroski, Danica A., Mark A. Bradford, Marlyse C. Duguid, Richard A. Hallett, Clara C. Pregitzer, and
330 Mark S. Ashton. “Diverging Conditions of Current and Potential Future Urban Forest Patches.”
331 *Ecosphere* 13, no. 3 (2022): e4001. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.4001>.

332 Flint, & State Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut. “The surficial geology of the New
333 Haven and Woodmont quadrangles, with map.” State Geological and Natural History Survey of
334 Connecticut. (1965).

335 Gelman, A. (2008). Scaling regression inputs by dividing by two standard deviations. *Statistics in*
336 *Medicine*, 27(15), 2865–2873. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.3107> (2008).

337 George LO Bazzaz FA. . 2003. The herbaceous layer as a filter determining spatial pattern in forest tree
338 regeneration. Pages 265–282 in Gilliam FS Roberts MR.. eds. *The Herbaceous Layer in Forests of*
339 *Eastern North America*. New York Oxford University Press.

340 Godefroid, Sandrine, and Nico Koedam. “How Important Are Large vs. Small Forest Remnants for the
341 Conservation of the Woodland Flora in an Urban Context?” *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 12,
342 no. 4 (2003): 287–98. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3697491>.

343 Hansen, Rieke, and Stephan Pauleit. “From Multifunctionality to Multiple Ecosystem Services? A
344 Conceptual Framework for Multifunctionality in Green Infrastructure Planning for Urban Areas.”
345 *Ambio* 43, no. 4 (May 2014): 516–29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0510-2>.

346 Horsley, Stephen B. “Mechanisms of Interference between Hay-Scented Fern and Black Cherry.”
347 Canadian Journal of Forest Research 23, no. 10 (October 1, 1993): 2059–69.
348 <https://doi.org/10.1139/x93-257>.

349 Luck, Matt, and Jianguo Wu. “A Gradient Analysis of Urban Landscape Pattern: A Case Study from the
350 Phoenix Metropolitan Region, Arizona, USA.” *Landscape Ecology* 17 (December 1, 2002): 327–39.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020512723753>.

352 Lyon, Jonathan, and William Sharpe. “Impacts of Hay-Scented Fern on Nutrition of Northern Red Oak
353 Seedlings.” *Journal of Plant Nutrition - J PLANT NUTR* 26 (March 1, 2003): 487–502.
354 <https://doi.org/10.1081/PLN-120017661>.

355 Moffatt SF, McLachlan SM, Kenkel NC (2004) Impacts of land use on riparian forest along an urban-
356 rural gradient in southern Manitoba. *Plant Ecol* 174:119–135.
357 <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:VEGE.0000046055.27285.fd>

358 Muller, Robert N. “The Phenology, Growth and Ecosystem Dynamics of *Erythronium Americanum* in the
359 Northern Hardwood Forest.” *Ecological Monographs* 48, no. 1 (1978): 1–20.
360 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937357>.

361 Muller RN. 2003. Nutrient relations of the herbaceous layer in deciduous forest ecosystems. Pages 15–37
362 in Gilliam FS Roberts MR.. eds. *The Herbaceous Layer in Forests of Eastern North America*. New
363 YorkOxford University Press.

364 Murcia, Carolina. “Edge Effects in Fragmented Forests: Implications for Conservation.” *Trends in*
365 *Ecology & Evolution* 10, no. 2 (February 1, 1995): 58–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)88977-6)
366 [5347\(00\)88977-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)88977-6).

367 Neufeld HS Young DR. . 2003. Ecophysiology of the herbaceous layer in temperate deciduous forests.
368 Pages 38–90 in Gilliam FS Roberts MR.. eds. *The Herbaceous Layer in Forests of Eastern North*
369 *America*. New York Oxford University Press.

370 NOAA National Centers for Environmental information. 2018. “Climate at a Glance: City Time Series.”
371 <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/>.

372 Pelletier, J., and J. O’Neil-Dunne. 2009. “A Report on the City of New Haven’s Existing and Possible
373 Tree Canopy.” The Spatial Analysis Lab at the University of Vermont’s Rubenstein School of the
374 Environment and Natural Resources. [http://gis.w3.uvm.edu/utc/Reports/TreeCanopy_](http://gis.w3.uvm.edu/utc/Reports/TreeCanopy_Report_NewHaven.pdf)
375 [Report_NewHaven.pdf](http://gis.w3.uvm.edu/utc/Reports/TreeCanopy_Report_NewHaven.pdf).

376 Pickett, S. T. A., M. L. Cadenasso, J. M. Grove, C. H. Nilon, R. V. Pouyat, W. C. Zipperer, and R.
377 Costanza. 2001. “Urban Ecological Systems: Linking Terrestrial Ecological, Physical, and
378 Socioeconomic Components of Metropolitan Areas.” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*
379 32: 127–57.

380 Schwoertzig E, Ertlen D, Tremolieres M (2016) Are plant communities mainly determined by
381 anthropogenic land cover along urban riparian corridors? *Urban Ecosyst* 19:1767–1786.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-016-0567-8>

383 Spicer, Michelle Elise, et al. "Herbaceous plant diversity in forest ecosystems: patterns, mechanisms, and
384 threats." *Plant Ecology* 223.2 (2022): 117-129.

385 United Nations. 2018. "World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision."
386 <https://population.un.org/wup/publications/Files/WUP2018-KeyFacts.pdf>

387 Vidra, Rebecca L., and Theodore H. Shear. "Thinking Locally for Urban Forest Restoration: A Simple
388 Method Links Exotic Species Invasion to Local Landscape Structure." *Restoration Ecology* 16, no. 2
389 (2008): 217–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2008.00387>

390