

# Functional trait variation among plant functional types in the Canadian Arctic tundra





Kendall IIda<sup>1</sup>, Oliver Sonnentag<sup>2</sup> Claire O'Brien<sup>3</sup>, Shayne Magstadt<sup>1</sup>, Antoine Caron-Guay<sup>2</sup>, Etienne Laliberté<sup>2</sup>, Cory Wallace<sup>3</sup>, Jennifer Baltzer<sup>3</sup>, and Sandra M. Durán<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Colorado State University, <sup>2</sup>Université de Montreal <sup>3</sup>Wilfrid Laurier University

Introduction



Shrubs are encroaching on Arctic tundra due to shifting climate and suppressed fire regimes
Plant traits linked to drought can predict shrub plant functional

Our results show differences in LA and LDMC across PFTs.



type (PFT) presence [1].

- •Varied surface water content of PFTs can be expressed through Normalized Difference in Water Indices (NDWI)
- Do traits related to carbon gain differ across PFTs?
   Is NDWI indicative of PFT presence?
   Do competing tundra shrub PFT traits differ in response to spatial distribution?

## Study area and methods



Assigned 7 PFTs to polygons by dominant vegetation [2].
Sampled traits for 3-5 individuals of 3-4 dominant species from polygons of each PFT.



	Alder	Birch	Lichen	Riparian	Sedge-
				shrub	moss
Alder					
Birch	0.85				
Lichen	0.01	0.01			
Riparian	0.01	0.01	0.95		
shrub					
Sedge-	0.01	0.01	0.85	0.85	
moss					





**Figure 1.** Location of TVC in upper North West Territories (NWT).

Estimated traits related to carbon standard protocols [3].
capture such as leaf area (LA), leaf water content (LWC), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), and equivalent water thickness (EWT) following standard protocols [3].
Leaf scans corrected in GIMP, area

•Leaf scans corrected in GIVIP, area calculations in Image J via *LeafArea* R package.

•Compared traits among PFTs using Kruskal- Wallis tests and post-hoc pairwise comparisons.

•Estimated traits related to carbon capture such as leaf area (LA), leaf water content (LWC), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), and equivalent water thickness (EWT) following standard protocols [3].



moss

**Figure 4.** Violin plots of two morphological traits showing differences among PFTs. Post-hoc pairwise Wilcoxon tests are shown on the right side of each panel.

### Future analyses



**Figure 7.** Alnus alnobetula in NWT, CA. Used with Permission from rkdanby under CC-BY-NC. 2016. https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/67222581

**Figure 8.** *Betula glandulosa* in NWT, CA. Used with Permission from andyfyonn under CC-BY-NC. 2019. https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/35256658



**Figure 3.** Spatial distribution of PFTs in the study area.





#### REFERENCES

Myers-Smith IH, Thomas HJD, Bjorkman AD. New Phytol. 2018 Nov 16. 221(4): 1742-748. doi.org/10.1111/nph.15592
 Wallace CA, Baltzer JL. Ecosystems. 2020. 23: 828-841. doi.org/10.1007/s10021-019-00435-0
 Perez-Harguindeguy N, et al. Aust J Bot. 2013 61:167-234. doi.org/10.1071/BT12225

1.Compare traits of dominant shrubs (*Alnus alnobetula, Betula glandulosa*) within PFTs as part of TVC encroachment analysis.

2.Link vegetation indices to trait variation among measured PFTs and discover implications for remote sensing capacity.

3. Evaluate variability of lichen traits.

#### Acknowledgements

This research was supported through funds from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grants and Canada Research Programs, ArcticNet, IVADO (AI, Biodiversity and Climate Change), the Polar Continental Shelf Program, and the Centre d'étude de la forêt awarded to O.S.