

RESTORATION OF FORMER GRASSLAND  
IN SOUTH-CENTRAL TEXASWendy J. Leonard<sup>1\*</sup> and O. W. Van Auken<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>San Antonio Parks and Recreation Natural Areas, San Antonio, TX 78231<sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, The University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio TX 78249\*Corresponding author; Email: [wendy.leonard@sanantonio.gov](mailto:wendy.leonard@sanantonio.gov)

**Abstract.**—In the past, grasslands and savannas were common in many areas of south-central Texas, including the San Antonio area. With the advent of European settlers and their livestock, much of this area was converted to agriculture and rangeland. Today, most of San Antonio is developed, but some preservation has occurred. Restored grassland, mechanically cleared of *Juniperus ashei* (juniper, Ashe juniper) and other woody species in 2013, was examined and compared to adjacent non-cleared woodland. The woodland examined was dominated by *Diospyros texana* (Texas persimmon) and *Juniperus ashei*. Richness in the woodland canopy was 15 species. The understory below the canopy had 25 woody species. In the restored grassland area, herbaceous plant cover was 41.8%, woody plant cover 5.8%, bare soil 2.9%, and litter cover 49.5%. Species richness was 71, with 60 herbaceous and 11 woody species (percent cover of each from <0.1-7.1%). The most common species in the restored grassland in descending order were *Nassella leucotricha* (Texas winter grass), *Calyptracarpus vialis* (straggler daisy), *Carex planostachys* (cedar sedge), *Sporobolus crypandrus* (sand dropseed), *D. texana*, and *Verbesina virginica* (frost weed). Several C<sub>4</sub> grass species were present with low cover but may increase in abundance over time. Four of the six most common restored grassland species were present below the woodland canopy and 12 woody species were present in the restored grassland as juveniles. Cost of restoration was approximately \$38,500 (\$7,500 supplies, \$31,000 labor).

Keywords: restoration, grassland, savanna, Ashe juniper, prairie

Understanding patterns of species recruitment and identifying factors that control recruitment are major ecological, conservation and management needs (Russell & Fowler 2002). Identification of minimally disturbed native prairie ecosystems for use as reference areas in restoration is difficult (see Kettle et al. 2000; Long et al. 2014; Ratajczak et.al. 2016; Millikin et al. 2016). Five main factors caused changes in North American native prairies: (1) the last glacial retreat (Van Devender 1995), (2) presence of Native Americans (Collins & Wallace 1990), (3) the arrival of the Europeans and their animals (Inglis 1964), (4) reductions of carnivores (Ripple et al. 2015)

Recommended citation:

Leonard, W.J. & O.W. Van Auken. 2019. Restoration of former grassland in southcentral Texas. Texas J. Sci. 71: Article 1. [https://doi.org/10.32011/txjsoci\\_71\\_1\\_Article2](https://doi.org/10.32011/txjsoci_71_1_Article2).

and (5) reduced fire frequency and intensity (Beschta & Ripple 2009; Leonard & Van Auken 2013; Nelson Dickerson & Van Auken 2016). In the future, global climate changes will no doubt have considerable effects (Grunstra & Van Auken 2015).

Increasing temperature was important in causing modifications in plant communities over the past 20,000 years, and changes were gradual compared to alterations seen today. Native grasslands and savannas in Central Texas were common in the past, but today they are sparse, especially tallgrass prairie (Glaser 2012; Harmon-Threatt & Chin 2016; Comer et al. 2018), with juniper/oak/persimmon (*Juniperus/Quercus/Diospyros*) or mesquite (*Prosopis*) woodlands replacing many of the prairie or grassland communities (Riskind & Diamond 1988). Changing management strategies and their effects on long-lived species and communities are difficult to follow, especially in private property states like Texas (Carpenter & Brandimarte 2014). Changes in environmental conditions cause ecological succession in plant communities including prairie habitats (Van Auken & Bush 2013). As European emigrants came to Texas, they converted grassland to cropland in areas where rainfall was sufficient and soils were deep. Where soils were shallow and rainfall was reduced, domestic animals were introduced. In this rangeland, the grasses were reduced by domestic herbivores, and grassland fires were reduced because of lack of fuel (Collins & Wallace 1990). Various woody species encroached or were introduced and the grasslands changed resulting in more savanna and woodland (Riskind & Diamond 1988; Diamond et al. 1995; Van Auken 2000; 2009; Van Auken & Bush 2013).

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of restoration by determining the identity and relative cover of species present in a new grassland three years after mechanical removal of a *Juniperus/Diospyros* (juniper/persimmon) woodland and to compare it to adjacent non-cleared woodland. Plant species identity, density, basal area, and relative cover were variables measured or calculated.

## MATERIALS &amp; METHODS

*Site description.*—The study site was located within the City of San Antonio between the Blackland Prairie to the east, the Edwards Plateau to the north and northwest, and north of the South Texas Plains (Correll & Johnston 1979). Blackland Prairie vegetation exhibits local variation over short distance due to changes in topography and soil composition (Collins et al. 1975; Diggs et al. 1999). Thus, Blackland Prairie, including much of the study site was probably a mosaic of grassland and savanna in the past. Until recently, most of the study site was *Juniperus/Diospyros* woodland with little conservation of native plant communities, especially prairie or grassland communities (Stimson 2008; Spencer 2010). There were woody species present typical of the South Texas Plains (Correll & Johnston 1979; Stimson 2008; Spencer 2010).

The study site was a 2.0-ha urban natural area owned and managed by the City of San Antonio since 2007. Until purchase by the city, the site was part of the Voelcker Dairy Farm grazed by cattle for more than 100 years. The general nature of the park can be seen in an aerial photograph taken in 2015 (Fig. 1). Historically not always woodland, the majority of the park is currently dominated by evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs, with only small amounts of grassland. The restored grassland studied was just north of the park headquarters (see Fig. 1).

The study site was 350 m above mean sea level (AMSL) and approximately 20 km south of the Balcones Escarpment of the Edwards Plateau region of Central Texas (Correll & Johnston 1979; Leonard & Van Aiken 2013). The parent material was residuum weathered from Austin Chalk, which is magnesium or calcium bedrock (USDA NRCS 2006). Soils were dark colored, calcareous, neutral or slightly basic and are identified as Austin silty clay and Whitewright-Austin complex that are 24.5 cm to 109.2 cm deep (USDA NRCS 2006). Average precipitation is 78.7 cm/yr with peaks in May and September (10.7 cm and 8.7 cm respectively), highly variable and usually zero in July and August (NOAA 2004). The



Figure 1. Aerial photograph of part of Hardberger Park including the study area in 2015.

Depicted are three restoration plots by year of clearing most woody plants. A few large trees, including live oak (*Quercus fusiformis*), Ashe juniper (*Juniperus ashei*), and Texas Persimmon (*Diospyros texana*), were kept throughout the restoration plots and can be seen as dark spots in the aerial photograph. Ten transects (depicted by light dashed lines) were set up in the 2013 restored grassland. Woodland transects were placed in adjacent woodland and are described as Upper (Transect 1), Middle (Transect 2), and Lower (Transect 3) based on slight elevation differences on site.

study area had some plants typically found in the Edwards Plateau, Blackland Prairie, and South Texas Plains ecoregions (Correll & Johnston 1979; McMahan et al. 1984; Stimson 2008). The Buda formation (similar to the Austin Chalk) near the southern Edwards Plateau has woody plants consistent with many seen within the study site (Van Auken et al. 1979; Stimson 2008).

*Restoration.*—The current study site was approximately 2.0 ha and is adjacent to 25 ha of *Juniperus* woodland (Fig. 1). In the summer of 2013, most of the woody plants in the study area were cut down and mulched using a Barko 930 tractor (Brush Busters Land Clearing), but

no herbicide was applied. A few large trees were retained. During the Fall of 2013 and the Spring of 2014, volunteers disseminated native grass and wildflower seed throughout the site. Seed mixes included Prairie Starter Mix, applied at approximately 11 kg/ha, and NativeTexas Mix, applied at approximately 23 kg/ha (Native American Seed, Junction, TX.). Species composition in the seed mixes included various  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  grasses and native herbaceous plants. Density and identity of seeds in the soil was unknown. The aerial photograph shown (Fig. 1) was from the City of San Antonio's GIS database and edited using ArcGIS 10.1. Associated costs for this 2-ha section of grassland restoration, including staff and volunteer time, was approximately \$38,500.

*Survey methods.*—In Fall of 2015, ninety-four 1 m x 1 m quadrats were placed 10 meters apart along each of 10 transects that crossed the 2-ha reconstructed 2013 grassland. In each quadrat, each herbaceous and woody species was identified (Correll & Johnston 1979) and confirmed (USDA NCRS 2016) and density calculated. Percent cover of each species, litter, and bare ground were visually estimated (Van Auken et al. 2005). Total number of species (species richness) was tabulated and species diversity was calculated.

In the adjacent woodland, 25-m<sup>2</sup> quadrats were placed 10 m apart along three transects at slightly different elevations. Each overstory woody plant present in each quadrat was identified (Correll & Johnston 1979) and confirmed (USDA NCRS 2016) and density was calculated. In addition, five 20 cm x 50 cm quadrats were placed in each of the corners as well as one in the center of each 25-m<sup>2</sup> quadrat and the number of individuals of each understory woody species was counted and recorded (density and relative density were determined, see Van Auken et al. 2005). For each individual >1 cm in diameter and 1.37 m tall, basal diameter was measured with calipers and recorded. Basal area for each individual was determined and total basal area of each species was calculated as well as relative basal area. Mean values for overstory and understory were calculated (relative values were calculated but not presented). Sampling of the restored grassland and



woodland was adequate as demonstrated by leveling of density stabilization curves.

## RESULTS

A ground-level photograph shows the 2013 restoration landscape two years after woody plant removal, in Fall of 2015, with associated woodland in the background (Fig. 2). In the woodland, overstory woody plant density was 2,540 plants/ha in the upper or high elevation site (Table 1). Overall, woody plants with the highest density were *Diospyros texana* (Texas persimmon), *Juniperus ashei* (Ashe juniper) and *Celtis laevigata* (sugar hackberry). *Sideroxylon lanuginosum* (gum bumelia) and *Condalia hookeri* (blue-wood condalia) were common in the two higher elevation transects while *Prosopis glandulosa* (mesquite) was common in the lower two elevation transects. Highest basal area species were *D. texana*, *J. ashei*, with *C. laevigata* slightly lower. *Prosopis glandulosa* basal area was high, but it was only present in the two lower elevation transects (Table 1). Woodland overstory species richness was 15. Shannon species diversity ( $H'$ ) was 0.620 for the woodland overstory, while Simpson ( $D$ ) was 3.238. In the woodland understory, highest density of woody plants (juveniles or immatures), was *Smilax bona-nox* (green briar, a woody vine), *C. laevigata*, *Ulmus crassifolia* (cedar elm, and *S. lanuginosum* (Table 2). There were a total of 25 woody or succulent species including 12 trees, 9 shrubs, 2 woody vines and 2 cacti. There were two non-native species including *Nandina domestica* and *Ligustrum lucidum* found in the understory.

In the restored grassland, herbaceous plant cover was 41.8%, woody plant cover was 5.8%, bare soil was 2.9% and litter cover was 49.5%. Species richness was high with a total of 71 species, including 60 herbaceous and 11 woody species, with percent cover of each from <0.1-7.1%. Shannon species diversity ( $H'$ ) was high at 64.50 for the restored grassland, while the Simpson ( $D$ ) value was 0.500. The most common species in descending order were *Nassella leucotricha* (Texas winter grass) at 7.1% cover, *Calyptracarpus vialis* (straggler daisy) at 6.9%, *Carex planostachys* (cedar sedge) at 4.7%, *Sporobolus crypandus* (sand dropseed) at 4.1%, *D. texana* at 4.0%, and *Verbesina virginica* (frost weed) at 3.4% (Table 3). Twenty-two other species



Figure 2. Photograph depicting landscape 2 years following tree and shrub removal in 2015 at a grassland restoration site in Phil Hardberger Park, San Antonio, Texas.

Table 1. Mean density (plants/ha) and basal area (m<sup>2</sup>/ha) of overstory woody species identified in three woodland transects (at slightly different elevations) associated with the reconstructed prairie at Hardberger Park ("0" in the table indicates the species was not found in that transect, and "----" in the table indicates the species had a % density of < 1 and a comparable density in that transect).

Species	Upper Transect		Middle Transect		Lower Transect	
	Density (plants/ha)	Basal Area (m <sup>2</sup> /ha)	Density (plants/ha)	Basal Area (m <sup>2</sup> /ha)	Density (plants/ha)	Basal Area (m <sup>2</sup> /ha)
<i>Diospyros texana</i>	1009	4.9	1540	9.9	866	4.7
<i>Juniperus ashei</i>	922	8.8	267	3.2	287	1.4
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	331	2	83	3.2	89	0.8
<i>Sideroxylon</i> <i>lanuginosum</i>	70	<0.1	66	0.4	11	0.1
<i>Condalia hookeri</i>	87	0.1	117	0.5	33	0.1
<i>Eysenhardtia texana</i>	52	0.2	22	0.1	0	0
<i>Ulmus crassifolia</i>	17	0.2	50	1	0	0
<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i>	17	---	0	0	0	0
<i>Berberis trifoliolata</i>	26	---	0	0	0	0
<i>Forestiera pubescens</i>	9	---	0	0	33	---
<i>Prosopis glandulosa</i>	0	0	66	2	100	2.8
<i>Nandina domestica</i>	0	0	5	---	---	---
<i>Sapindus saponaria</i>	0	0	10	---	11	0.1
<i>Quercus fusiformis</i>	0	0	10	---	0	0
<i>Yucca elata</i>	0	0	10	---	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2540</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>2246</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>1430</b>	<b>10</b>



Table 2. Density (plants/ha) and relative density (%) of understory woody species identified in three woodland transects (at slightly different elevations) associated with the reconstructed prairie at Hardberger Park ("0" in the table indicates the species was not found in that transect, and "----" in the table indicates the species had a % density of < 1 and a comparable density in that transect).

Species	Upper Transect		Middle Transect		Lower Transect	
	Density (plants/ha)	% Density	Density (plants/ha)	% Density	Density (plants/ha)	% Density
<i>Smilax bono-nox</i> *	11492	64	2345	12	667	6
<i>Forestiera</i>						
<i>pubescens</i> **	1796	10	782	4	778	7
<i>Sideroxylon</i>						
<i>lanuginosum</i>	1257	7	3517	19	111	1
<i>Mahonia trifoliolata</i> *	898	5	1172	6	1222	11
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	718	4	2540	13	4167	38
<i>Diospyros texana</i>	539	3	977	5	889	8
<i>Juniperus ashei</i>	359	2	391	2	444	4
<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	359	2	---	---	0	0
<i>Quercus virginiana</i>	180	1	391	2	833	8
<i>Eysenhardtia</i>						
<i>texana</i> **	---	---	195	1	56	---
<i>Ulmus crassifolia</i>	---	---	5275	27	278	3
<i>Ptelea trifoliata</i> **	---	---	---	---	0	0
<i>Morus microphylla</i>	0	0	---	---	0	0
<i>Cylindropuntia</i>						
<i>leptocalulis</i> ***	0	0	1172	6	611	6
<i>Condalia hookeri</i>	0	0	195	1	667	6
<i>Clematis</i>						
<i>drummondii</i> *	0	0	---	---	0	0
<i>Opuntia</i>						
<i>compressa</i> ***	0	0	195	1	56	---
<i>Sapindus saponaria</i>	0	0	---	---	0	0
<i>Colubrina texensis</i> **	0	0	195	1	0	0
<i>Aloysia gratissima</i> **	0	0	0	0	111	1
<i>Styphnolobium affine</i>	0	0	0	0	56	---
<i>Fraxinus</i>						
<i>pennsylvanica</i>	0	0	0	0	56	---
<i>Prosopis glandulosa</i>	0	0	0	0	---	---
<i>Nandina domestica</i> **	0	0	0	0	---	---
<i>Yucca elata</i>	0	0	---	---	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>17598</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>19342</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>11002</b>	<b>99</b>

\*woody vine

\*\*shrub

\*\*\*cactus

Table 3. Mean percent cover in descending order of the main species found in the restored grassland. A total of 71 species were identified, 28 with cover equal or greater than 0.1 % is listed in the table. There were 43 species with cover values less than 0.1 % but not presented.

Species	Common Name	Mean % Cover
<i>Nassella leucotricha</i>	Texas wintergrass	7.1
<i>Calyptracarpus vialis</i>	Straggler daisy	6.9
<i>Carex planostachys</i>	Cedar sedge	4.7
<i>Sporobolus cryptandrus</i>	Sand dropseed	4.1
<i>Diospyros texana</i>	Texas persimmon	4.0
<i>Verbesina virginica</i>	Frost weed	3.4
<i>Elymus canadensis</i>	Canada wildrye	2.9
<i>Setaria vulpiseta</i>	Plains bristlegrass	2.8
<i>Panicum obtusum</i>	Vine mesquite	1.8
<i>Bouteloua curtipendula</i>	Side oats grama	0.9
<i>Croton monanthogynus</i>	Prairie tea	0.8
<i>Tridens texanus</i>	Texas fluffgrass	0.7
<i>Bothriochloa laguroides</i>	Silver beardgrass	0.7
<i>Schizachyrium scoparium</i>	Little bluestem	0.6
<i>Abutilon incanum</i>	Indian mallow	0.6
<i>Berberis trifoliata</i>	Agarita	0.4
<i>Sorghastrum nutans</i>	Indian grass	0.4
<i>Amphiachyris dracunculoides</i>	Prairie broomweed	0.3
<i>Oxalis dillenii</i>	Slender yellow woodsorrel	0.2
<i>Aloysia gratissima</i>	Whitebrush	0.2
<i>unknown c3</i>	C <sub>3</sub> grass	0.2
<i>Condalia hookeri</i>	Brazilian bluewood	0.2
<i>Eriochloa sericea</i>	Texas cupgrass	0.2
<i>Parietaria pensylvanica</i>	Pennsylvania pellitory	0.2
<i>Ratibida columnifera</i>	Upright prairie coneflower	0.2
<i>Clematis drummondii</i>	Drummond's clematis	0.1
<i>Tragia glanduligera</i>	Brush noseburn	0.1
<i>Tripsacum dactyloides</i>	Eastern gamagrass	0.1

had percent cover values equal to or greater than 0.1% (Table 3), and 43 other species had cover values less than 0.1% (not presented). There were 19 species of grasses identified including three  $C_3$  and 16  $C_4$  species. Total cover for the  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  grasses was 10.2% and 12.3%, respectively.

## DISCUSSION

Vegetation in world-wide grasslands has been estimated at about 24% of Earth's terrestrial surface, or more than  $4.6 \times 10^9$  ha (Shantz 1954). Grasslands were the largest North American biome covering  $370 \times 10^6$  ha in the U.S., Mexico and Canada (Sims 1988). Unfortunately, most grassland in central North America has been converted to farmland. Estimates suggest that less than 1% of the original, native tallgrass prairie remains (Glaser 2012; Harmon-Threatt & Chin 2016; Comer et al. 2018), consequently the need for restoration and conservation. San Antonio, in the south-central part of Texas, is situated in part on what is called the "Blackland Prairie" biome (Correll & Johnston 1979). Blackland Prairies are one of the poorest conserved and most degraded of all the grassland types (Comer et al. 2018), thus making comparisons of the re-vegetated community with other local grasslands difficult. A number of biomes meet in the San Antonio area of south-central Texas resulting in a diverse mix of plant species in the study area (Stimson 2008).

Blackland Prairie is considered tallgrass prairie, which had many tall grass species including little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), Switch grass (*Panicum virgatum*) and others (Diamond and Smeins 1985; Sims 1988). Present in the San Antonio grasslands in the past were *Schizachyrium scoparium*, *Paspalum plicatulum* and *Sorghastrum nutans* communities over Alfisol soils (Diamond and Smeins 1985). Two of these species (*Schizachyrium scoparium* and *Sorghastrum nutans*, but no *Paspalum plicatulum* or *Andropogon gerardii*) were found in the restored area of our study but at low cover compared to mature tallgrass prairie (Collins et al. 1975; Sims 1988; Van Auken et al. 1992a, 1992b; Diggs et al. 1999). These species

were not present in the woodland understory adjacent to the restored area of the Park. It is anticipated that these C<sub>4</sub> grass species will continue to increase in cover as the restored area develops in time. This would appear to be the trend, depending on conditions imposed on the restored area.

There is quite a bit known about *Juniperus* woodlands in Central Texas (Diamond et al. 1995; Van Auken 2000, 2008), but not as much about grasslands or prairies in this area (Riskind & Diamond 1988; Van Auken et al. 1992A, 1992B), especially about how to restore and conserve them (Collins et al. 1975; Diggs et al. 1999; Leite et al. 2013; Morris et al. 2014; German et al. 2015). Grasslands are not static, and disturbances, especially fire, certainly seem to be required to maintain them (Tilman 1988; Collins and Wallace 1990; Howe 1994; Van Auken 2000; Foster & Collins 2009; Van Auken & Bush 2013; Keddy 2017), but little information is available about restoring them from woodlands. Mechanical or chemical treatments have been used to clear woodlands or shrub lands and have been shown to work well in South Texas woodlands (Scifres 1980; Smeins & Merrill 1988). While considerable work on fire and mowing of grasslands has been investigated and some reported (Collins and Wallace 1990), little work has been done investigating the effects of fire and mowing on South Texas Blackland Prairie. Chronic high levels of grazing can degrade grassland habitat quality (Martin and Cleveland 2011), and frequent fire and mowing can have depressive effects on grass production (Smeins 1972); while annual herbicide use can shift the plant community in Blackland Prairies to favor annual forbs over C<sub>4</sub> grasses (Hickman and Derner 2007).

Herbicide, mowing, and fire can be useful tools to maintain grasslands, but frequency of treatments needs to be examined and understood. Grasslands will not remain as grasslands unless certain conditions are met. The process of change in community composition and structure is community succession and occurs in all plant communities (Tilman 1988; Foster & Collins 2009; Van Auken & Bush 2013; Keddy 2017).

To date, the succession in the restored area has followed a predictable trend (Tilman 1988; Van Auken & Bush 2013; Keddy 2017). The restored area was bare soil for a short time, with many local annuals establishing in the 1-2 years after clearing (personal observation and Fig. 2). However, some  $C_4$  grasses established and further development and spread of these grasses is expected as succession continues (Sims 1988; Van Auken et al. 1992a, 1992b; Van Auken and Bush 2013). In the future, a variety of additional  $C_4$  grasses should establish and those present will increase in cover, with a plateau of the  $C_4$  grasses occurring between 10 and 20 years after the establishment on the restoration site. However, management and certain treatments need to continue to prevent regression back into woodlands. Highlighting this need, seedlings or sprouts of twelve abundant woody species in the grassland were found during this study. In order to maintain the grassland, management treatments should include local mechanical or chemical treatment, rotational grazing, controlled burning, or a combination of these treatments to keep woody and invasive herbaceous plants from being recruited into the restored areas (Scifres 1980). Unfortunately, controlled burns and grazing are difficult to use at this time within the city limits. Future management of this grassland should include a combination of infrequent mowing (once every 5 years) and annual herbicide treatment of woody species. Treatments have to continue if the grassland is to remain rather than a savanna or even reconversion to woodland (Tilman 1988; Van Auken & Bush 2013; Keddy 2017).

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Charles Wu, UTSA library staff member for help with the references used in this paper.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Beschta, R. L. & W. J. Ripple. 2009. Large predators and trophic cascades in terrestrial ecosystems in the western United States. *Bio. Conserv.* 142(11):2401-2414.
- Carpenter, J. & C. Brandimarte. 2014. The Albert and Bessie Kronksky State Natural Area: A history of lands and people. Historic Sites and Structures Program. Unpublished draft, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (Available james.rice@tpwd.texas.gov).

- Collins, O. B., F. E. Smeins & D. H. Riskind. 1975. Plant communities of the Blackland Prairies of Texas. Pp. 75-88, *in* Prairie: a multiple view (M. K. Wali, ed.). University of North Dakota Press, xii+433 pp.
- Collins, S. L. & L. L. Wallace. 1990. Fire in North American tallgrass prairie. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 175 pp.
- Correll, D. S. & M. C. Johnston. 1979. Manual of the vascular plants of Texas. Texas Research Foundation, Renner, TX, 1881 pp.
- Comer, P. J., J. C. Hak, K. Kindscher, E. Muldavin & J. Singhurst. 2018. Continent-scale landscape conservation design for temperate grasslands of the Great Plains and Chihuahuan Desert. *Nat. Areas J.* 38(2):196-211.
- Diamond, D. D. & F. E. Smeins. 1985. Composition, classification, and species response patterns of remnant tallgrass prairies in Texas. *Amer. Midl. Nat.* 113(2):294-308.
- Diamond, D. D., G. A. Rowel & D. P. Keddy-Hector. 1995. Conservation of Ashe juniper (*Juniperus ashei* Buchholz) woodlands of the Central Texas Hill Country. *Nat. Areas J.* 15(2):189-197.
- Diggs, G. M., Jr., B. L. Lipcomb & R. J. O'Kennon. 1999. Shinner's & Mahler's illustrated flora of North Central Texas. Botanical Research Institute of Texas, Fort Worth, 1640 pp.
- Foster, B. L. & C. D. Collins. 2009. Colonization of successional grasslands by *Ulmus rubra* Muhl. in relation to landscape position, habitat productivity, and proximity to seed source. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.* 136(3):392-402.
- Glaser, A., ed. 2012. America's Grasslands Conference: Status, Threats, and Opportunities. Proceedings of the 1st Biennial Conference on the Conservation of America's Grasslands. August 15-17, 2011, Sioux Falls, SD.  
<https://www.nwf.org/~media/PDFs/Global-Warming/PolicySolutions/Americas%20Grasslands%20Conference%20Proceedings061312.ashx>. (Accessed June 28, 2017).
- German, E., T. Bassett, C. R. Zirbel & L. A. Brudvig. 2015. Dispersal and establishment filters influence the assembly of restored prairie plant communities. *Rest. Ecol.* 23(6):892-899.
- Grunstra, M. B. & O. W. Van Auken. 2015. Photosynthetic characteristics of *Garrya ovata* Benth. (Lindheimer's silktassle, Garryaceae) at ambient and elevated levels of light, CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature. *Phytologia* 97(2):103-119.
- Harmon-Threatt, A. & K. Chin. 2016. Common methods for tallgrass prairie restoration and their potential effects on bee diversity. *Nat. Areas J.* 36(4):400-411.
- Hickman, K. R. and J. D. Derner. 2007. Blackland Prairie vegetation dynamics following cessation of herbicide application. *Range. Eco. Manage.* 60(2):186-190.
- Howe, H. F. 1994. Managing species diversity in tallgrass prairie: Assumptions and implications. *Conserv. Biol.* 8(3):691-704.
- Inglis, J. M. 1964. A history of vegetation on the Rio Grande Plain. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Bulletin. Austin, TX. 45:1-38.
- Keddy, P. A. 2017. Plant Ecology: origins, processes, consequences. Cambridge University Press, University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom, xvi+624 pp.
- Kettle, W. D., P. M. Rich, K. Kindscher, G. L. Pittman & P. Fu. 2000. Land-use history in ecosystem restoration: A 40-year study in the prairie-forest ecotone. *Res. Ecol.* 8(3):307-317.



ARTICLE 2: LEONARD & VAN AUKEN

- Leite, M. D., L. R. Tambosi, I. Romitelli & J.P. Metzger. 2013. Landscape ecology perspective in restoration projects for biodiversity conservation: a review. *Natureza and Conservacao*. 11(1):108-122.
- Leonard, W. J. & O. W. Van Auken. 2013. Light levels and herbivory partially explain the survival, growth, and niche requirements of *Streptanthus bracteatus* A. Gray (bracted twistflower, Brassicaceae), a rare Central Texas endemic. *Nat. Areas J.* 33(3):276-285.
- Long, Q., B. L. Foster & K. Kindscher. 2014. Seed and microsite limitations mediate stochastic recruitment in a low-diversity prairie restoration. *Plant Ecol.* 215(11):1287-1298.
- Martin, B. & S. Cleveland. 2011. Community-based conservation and the use of grass banking in the northern prairies of Montana. Proceedings of the 1st Biennial Conference on the Conservation of America's Grasslands. August 15-17, 2011, Sioux Falls, SD.  
<https://www.nwf.org/~media/PDFs/Global-Warming/PolicySolutions/Americas%20Grasslands%20Conference%20Proceedings061312.ashx>. (Accessed June 28, 2017).
- McMahan, C. A., R. G. Frye & K. L. Brown. 1984. The vegetation types of Texas, including cropland. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Austin, Texas, 40 pp.
- Millikin, A. R., M. E. Jarchow, K. L. Olmstead, R. E. Krentz and M. D. Dixon. 2016. Site preparation drives long-term plant community dynamics in restored tallgrass prairie: a case study in southeastern South Dakota. *Environ. Manage.* 58(4):597-605.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-016-0736-9>. (Accessed March 2, 2016).
- Morris, L. R., T. A. Monaco & R. I. Sheley. 2014. Impact of cultivation legacies on rehabilitation seedlings and native species re-establishment in Great Basin shrub lands. *Rang. Ecol. & Manage.* 67(3):285-291.
- Nelson-Dickerson, T. & O. W. Van Auken. 2016. Survival, growth and recruitment of bigtooth maple (*Acer grandidentatum*) in central Texas relict communities. *Nat. Areas J.* 36(2):174-180.
- NOAA. 2004. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC. <https://www.noaa.gov/>. (Accessed July 14, 2017).
- Ratajczak, Z., J. M. Briggs, D. G. Goodin, L. Luo, R. L. Mohler, J. B. Nippert & B. Obermeyer. 2016. Assessing the potential for transition from tallgrass prairie to woodlands: Are we operating beyond critical fire thresholds? *Rang. Ecol. Manage.* 69(40):280-287.
- Ripple, W. J., R. L. Beschta & L. E. Painter. 2015. Trophic cascades from wolves to alders in Yellowstone. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 354(2):254-260.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.06.007>. (Accessed March 2, 2016).
- Riskind, D. H. & D. D. Diamond. 1988. An introduction to environments and vegetation. Pp. 1-15, in Edwards Plateau vegetation: Plant ecological studies in central Texas (B. B. Amos & F. R. Gehlbach, eds). Baylor Univ. Press, Waco, TX.
- Russell, F. L. & N. L. Fowler. 2002. Failure of adult recruitment in *Quercus buckleyi* populations on the eastern Edwards Plateau, Texas. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 148(2):201-217.
- Scifres, C. J. 1980. Brush management: Principles and practices for Texas and the Southwest. Texas A&M Univ. Press, College Station, TX, xii+360 pp.
- Shantz, H. L. 1954. The place of grassland in the earth's cover of vegetation. *Ecology* 35(1):143-145.
- Sims, P. L. 1988. Grasslands. Pp. 265-286, in North American terrestrial vegetation (M. C. Barbour & W. D. Billings, eds.). Cambridge Univ. Press.

- Smeins, F. E. 1972. Influence of fire and mowing on vegetation of the Blackland Prairie of Texas. Pp. 214-226, *in* Third Midwest Prairie Conference Proceedings. Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Smeins, F. E. & L. B. Merrill. 1988. Long term change in a semiarid grassland. Pp. 101-114, *in* Edward's Plateau vegetation: Plant ecological studies in Central Texas (B. B. Amos & F. R. Gehlbach, eds.), Baylor University Press, Waco, TX.
- Spencer, G. B. 2010. Last farm standing on Buttermilk Hill. LJB CommuniCo, San Antonio, TX, vii+232 pp.
- Stimson, S. Associates. 2008. Voelcker Park Master Plan: Final Report. Falmouth, Massachusetts, vi+440 pp.
- Tilman, D. 1988. Plant strategies and the dynamics and structure of plant communities. Princeton, NJ, xiii+362 pp.
- USDA NRCS. 2006. Web Soil Surveys, Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC. USDA NCRS Plants database. <http://plants.usda.gov/core/profile?symbol=ACGR3>. (Accessed March 2, 2016).
- Van Auken, O. W., A. L. Ford & A. Stein. 1979. A comparison of some woody upland and riparian plant communities of the southern Edwards Plateau. Southwest. Nat. 24(1):165-180.
- Van Auken, O. W. 2000. Shrub invasions of semiarid grasslands. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 31:197-216.
- Van Auken, O. W. 2008. Ecology and Management of western North American *Juniperus* communities: A dynamic vegetation type. Ecological Studies Vol. 196. Springer, NY, vii+315 pp.
- Van Auken, O. W. 2009. Causes and consequences of woody plant encroachment into western North American grasslands. J. Env. Manage. 90(10):2931-2942.
- Van Auken, O. W., J. K. Bush & D. D. Diamond. 1992a. Changes in species composition and biomass in the Coastal Prairie of Texas when light and nutrients are altered. Can. J. Bot. 70(10):1777-1783.
- Van Auken, O. W., J. K. Bush & D. D. Diamond. 1992b. The role of light and nutrients in determining dominance of *Paspalum plicatulum* (Michx.) and *Schizachyrium scoparium* (Michx.) Nash, two C<sub>4</sub> grasses. Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 119(4):401-406.
- Van Auken, O. W., J. K. Bush & S. A. Elliott. 2005. Ecology-Laboratory Manual. Pearson Custom Publishing, Boston, MA, vi+171 pp.
- Van Auken, O. W. & J. K. Bush. 2013. Invasion of Woody Legumes. Springer Briefs in Ecology, Springer, NY, vii+67 pp.
- Van Devender, T. R. 1995. Desert grassland history: Changing climates, evolution, biography, and community dynamics. Pp. 68-99, *in* The Desert Grassland (M. P. McClaran & T. R. Van Devender, eds.), University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.