# **Spatial distribution of roots across three dryland ecosystems and plant functional types**

JESSICA G. SWINDON<sup>1</sup>, WILLIAM K. LAUENROTH<sup>1,2</sup>, DANIEL R. SCHLAEPFER<sup>1</sup>, AND INGRID C. BURKE<sup>1,\*</sup>

1*Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511* 2*Department of Botany, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071*

 ABSTRACT.—Roots play a critical role in carbon storage, carbon cycling, and resource acquisition in dryland ecosystems, yet their distribution and production patterns are poorly understood. We aimed to compare the vertical and horizontal distribution of roots of the dominant plant functional types across 3 dryland ecosystems in the western Great Plains of the United States. We collected consecutive soil cores from directly under plants to 29 cm away from the center of plant individuals (horizontal plane), to a 20-cm depth (vertical plane). Across the 3 ecosystem types, grass root biomass decreased with depth and, for the sagebrush steppe, at a distance beyond 6.5 cm from the center of the plant. At the 10–20 cm depth increment, there was no horizontal pattern in root biomass. Uniformity in root biomass in the 10–20 cm depth and at distances >6.5 cm from the plant center is best explained by the overlap of roots of individual and neighboring plants to maximize belowground resource uptake. There was much lower root biomass in the surface 20 cm adjacent to shrubs than adjacent to grasses in the sagebrush steppe, and while grass root biomass decreased significantly with depth and distance as described above, shrub roots were uniform in both planes. Our study confirms that root distribution in drylands differs among plant functional types, with grasses exploiting surface soils both horizontally and vertically to capitalize on surface resources, and shrubs capitalizing less on those resources.

 RESUMEN.—Las raíces desempeñan un papel fundamental en el almacenamiento de carbono, en el ciclo y en la adquisición de recursos en los ecosistemas de tierras áridas, aunque sus patrones de distribución y producción sean poco conocidos. Nuestro objetivo fue comparar la distribución vertical y horizontal de las raíces de plantas dominantes en tres ecosistemas de tierras áridas en las Grandes Llanuras occidentales de Estados Unidos. Recolectamos núcleos de suelo consecutivo extraídos debajo de las plantas a 29 cm del centro de las plantas (plano horizontal) y a 20 cm de profundidad (plano vertical). En los 3 tipos de ecosistemas, la biomasa radicular del pasto disminuyó con la profundidad y, en el caso de la estepa de la artemisa, a una distancia de más de 6.5 cm del centro de la planta. Cuando la profundidad aumentó de 10 a 20 cm no se encontró un patrón horizontal en la biomasa radicular. La uniformidad en la biomasa radicular a una profundidad de 10 a 20 cm y a distancias superiores a 6.5 cm desde el centro de la planta se explica mejor por la superposición de raíces de plantas individuales y vecinas que maximizan la captación de recursos subterráneos. La biomasa radicular fue mucho menor en la superficie cuya distancia a los arbustos adyacentes fue de 20 cm que las adyacentes a los pastos de la estepa de artemisa. Mientras que la biomasa de la hierba disminuyó significativamente con la profundidad y la distancia como se describió anteriormente, las raíces de los arbustos fueron uniformes en ambos planos. Nuestro estudio confirma que la distribución radicular en las tierras áridas difiere entre los tipos funcionales de las plantas, donde los pastos explotan las superficies de los suelos tanto horizontal como verticalmente para aprovechar los recursos superficiales, y los arbustos explotan menos tales recursos.

 Net primary production in dryland ecosystems is limited by water and nitrogen (Lauenroth et al. 1978, Burke 1989, Hooper and Johnson 1999, Yahdjian et al. 2011, Stevens et al. 2015), both of which can be considered "belowground resource constraints." Water and nitrogen availability vary temporally and spatially within dryland ecosystems (Burke 1989, Sala et al. 1992, Burke et al. 1999, Austin et al. 2004), and a plant's ability to survive is dependent on its ability to acquire these belowground resources. While previous literature has focused on defining speciesspecific root characteristics (Coupland and Johnson 1965), the effects of soil characteristics on root distribution (Weaver and Darland 1949, Fox et al. 1953, Burke et al. 1998), and belowground competition (Coffin and Lauenroth 1991, Hook et al. 1994), few studies have addressed the spatial distribution of the roots

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: indy.burke@yale.edu

WKL  $\bullet$  orcid.org/0000-0002-3079-4484 DRS  $\bullet$  orcid.org/0000-0001-9973-2065 ICB  $\bullet$  orcid.org/0000-0003-4717-6399

of individuals by plant functional types and in surface soils where belowground resources are most likely to be available.

 In a semiarid dryland region, the structure and function of an ecosystem is determined by the distribution and production of plant functional types, which include  $C_3$  grasses,  $C_4$ grasses,  $C_3$  forbs,  $C_4$  forbs, and shrubs. The most important functional types and the ones that are the most likely dominants are grasses and shrubs. Grouping species into plant functional types based on their morphological and physiological characteristics provides an important tool for assessing plant-ecosystem inter actions (Epstein et al. 1997, Sala et al. 1997). The coexistence of  $C_3$  grasses,  $C_4$  grasses, and shrubs in drylands may be partially explained by their ability to access different pools of belowground resources, which vary in time and space. For instance, studies on shrub and grass resource partitioning suggest that shrubs rely on deep-soil water stores, while grasses acquire water from the top 30 cm of soil (Walter 1971, Sala et al. 1989).

 Previous studies that have taken place across climate gradients have provided us with evidence that annual belowground resource availability is a function of mean annual temperature, mean annual precipitation, seasonality, and soil texture (Epstein et al. 1996, 1997, Paruelo and Lauenroth 1996, Sala et al. 1997). For instance, mean annual temperature, mean annual precipitation, and soil texture explained 67% to 81% of the variance in production of grasses across the Great Plains (Epstein et al. 1996, 1997). The location of available water in the soil profile is determined by soil texture and the overlap between monthly precipitation and monthly temperature (Sala et al. 1997), while nitrogen availability in drylands decreases with depth, is highest in finetextured soils, and has horizontal patterning such that it is higher close to individual plants than in interspaces (Vinton and Burke 1995, Burke et al. 1999).

 It was previously thought that aboveground plant cover could be used to predict belowground biomass distribution patterns, but studies have demonstrated that aboveground plant cover is not a reliable indicator (Sims and Singh 1978). Bare ground and low plant cover are common in water-limited ecosystems due to low regeneration rates and high intraspecific competition (Coffin and Lauenroth 1991,

Aguilera and Lauenroth 1993). The average root span is often larger than bare ground openings (Hook et al. 1991), resulting in root presence below the bare ground. For instance, in the shortgrass steppe, plant basal cover is approximately 20%–40%, with frequent bare ground openings averaging <15 cm in diameter (Milchunas et al. 1989, Coffin and Lauenroth 1992, Hook et al. 1994, Hook and Lauenroth 1994), while the average total root span of the common grass *Bouteloua gracilis* is 22 cm (Lee and Lauenroth 1994). Plants adjacent to openings extend roots horizontally under bare ground to maximize uptake of belowground resources (Hook et al. 1994).

 Aboveground biomass and net primary production have been well studied in relation to temporal and spatial belowground resource availability; however, few studies have identified horizontal and vertical root distribution patterns, despite the fact that 50% or more of the total net primary production of semiarid ecosystems occurs belowground (Sims et al. 1978, Milchunas and Lauenroth 2001). Our objective in this study was to describe the spatial distribution of the root systems of individual plants of the dominant grasses as they vary with depth and distance across 3 types of semiarid ecosystems in the western Great Plains of the United States: the shortgrass steppe, the northern mixed-grass prairie, and the sagebrush steppe. Because the shrub *Artemisia tridentata* is codominant along with grasses in the sagebrush steppe, we included it in our sampling. We had 2 key questions:

- (1) How does the spatial distribution of roots of an individual plant change with depth and distance from the plant center?
- (2) How does root biomass change with plant functional type and across sites of each ecosystem type?

#### **METHODS**

#### Site Description

 Within each ecosystem type, we sampled the horizontal and vertical distribution of roots of the dominant plant functional types across the shortgrass steppe, the northern mixedgrass prairie, and the sagebrush steppe. We sampled the shortgrass steppe and the northern mixed-grass prairie between 21 August and 28 August 2016, and the sagebrush steppe between 21 June 2017 and 25 June 2017, because we did not have access to the sagebrush site location in 2016. All 3 locations have a history of moderate cattle grazing during the growing season and are currently managed for this purpose. We controlled for soil texture by choosing sites with either sandyclay-loam, sandy-loam, or loam soils and tested soil texture using a protocol based on Klute (1986) and Gavlak et al. (1994).

 The shortgrass steppe at the Central Plains Experimental Range (CPER) is located 40 km south of Cheyenne, Wyoming, and 61 km northeast of Fort Collins, Colorado  $(40^{\circ}49' \text{ N}, 104^{\circ})$ 43W). The CPER is managed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agriculture Research Service (ARS) and was formerly part of the National Science Foundation Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) network (Lauenroth and Burke 2008). The average elevation is 1650 m, and monthly temperatures range from −9.8 °C in December to 30.7 °C in July. Mean annual temperature is 8.7 °C, and mean annual precipitation is 341 mm (PRISM 2018). The majority of precipitation comes in short and intense thunder storms during the summer months, with rainfall events that drop typically <5 mm (Lauenroth and Sala 1992). The dominant plant species in the shortgrass steppe are the C4 perennial grasses blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*) and buffalo grass (*Bouteloua dactyloides*), the subshrub prairie sagewort (*Arte misia frigida*), and plains prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia polyacantha*) (Lauenroth 2008) (nomenclature follows USDA–NRCS [2018]).

 The northern mixed-grass prairie site is located within the High Plains Grassland Research Station (HPGRS) and is managed by the USDA–ARS. The site is located 8 km west of Cheyenne, Wyoming,  $(41^{\circ}12'N, 104^{\circ}54'W)$ and has an average elevation of 1930 m. Mean monthly temperatures range from −8.8 °C in December to 27.9 °C in July, and mean annual temperature is 7.4 °C. Mean annual precipitation is 393 mm (PRISM 2018). The vegetation is a mixture of  $C_3$  perennial grass species including western wheatgrass (*Pascopyrum smithii*), needle and thread (*Hesperostipa comata*), and the C<sub>4</sub> perennial grass *B. gracilis* (Schuman et al. 2009).

 The sagebrush steppe site is located within the Thunder Basin National Grassland (TBNG), 64 km northeast of Douglas, Wyoming (43°  $25'$  N,  $104^{\circ}56'$  W), and is managed by The Nature Conservancy. The average elevation is 1500 m. Mean monthly temperatures range from  $-11.1$  °C in December to 31.7 °C in July, and mean annual temperature is 8.1 °C. Mean annual precipitation is 331 mm (PRISM 2018). The overwhelmingly dominant shrub is big sage brush (*Artemisia tridentata*), and the understory consists of a mixture of several  $C_3$ and  $C_4$  perennial grasses and forbs including *B. gracilis, H. comata,* and *P. smithii* (Pennington et al. 2017).

## Field Studies

 At each site, we laid out a total of 5 transects (30 m long) that were placed 50 m apart. At each transect we identified 20 individuals of the dominant plant functional type and randomly selected 2 individuals for sampling. There were 10 samples associated with each individual: 5 distances (0, 6.5, 13, 19.5, and 26 cm), with each distance containing 2 depths (0 to 10 cm and 10 to 20 cm). At the shortgrass steppe, we sampled 9 individuals of the  $C_4$ perennial bunchgrass *B. gracilis;* at the northern mixed-grass prairie we sampled 9 individuals of either *P. smithii* or *H. comata*, both  $C_3$ perennial grasses; and at the sagebrush steppe we sampled 10 individuals of the shrub *A. tridentata* and 10 individuals of the perennial grasses *B. gracilis* or *H. comata* for a total of 10 individuals per functional type. Because our objective was to sample the dominant grasses in each of the ecosystems, we assumed functional plant type similarities and ignored species details (Sala et al. 1997).

 To estimate root biomass with depth (vertical plane) and distance away from an individual (horizontal plane), we used a 6.5-cm internal diameter core to a depth of 20 cm because approximately 75% of total root biomass is within the top 20 cm of soil (Leetham and Milchunas 1985). For each individual, we extracted 5 soil cores consecutively in a straight line of a random direction with the first core directly over the individual. We assumed, based on previous work (Hook et al. 1994), that the majority of the root biomass we sampled was from our target individuals, but we did not have a way to be sure that this was true.

 At the sagebrush steppe, we collected cores for 10 *A. tridentata.* The soil core could not be placed directly over the *A. tridentata* individual due to its size; therefore, we extracted the soil cores on a random side adjacent to the stem. We separated each core into 2 depths, 0 to 10 cm and 10 to 20 cm. We sampled 38 individuals, with each individual associated with 5 distances and 2 depths. In total, we processed 380 samples: 280 grass root samples across the 3 sites and 100 samples of sagebrush roots.

#### Laboratory Analysis

 In the laboratory, we air-dried the soil samples when possible or oven-dried them at 55 °C for 48 h. Using water, we washed the soil away from the belowground biomass in accordance with the methods of Lauenroth and Whitman (1971). The resulting biomass was dried at 55 °C for 48 h and hand separated into crowns, fine roots, and coarse roots  $(>= 2$ mm diameter) and weighed (Robertson et al. 2009). The washed and sorted samples were ashed in a muffle furnace at 450 °C for 4 h to eliminate contamination from residual soil particles (Harmon et al. 1999). The ash-free dry weight was expressed as grams of dry weight per meter squared  $(g/m^2)$ .

## Data Analysis

 We conducted a 2-way analysis of variance to test whether root biomass differed with distance and depth from the center of plants. We fit a linear mixed-effects model with the R package lme4 v1.1.18.1 (Bates et al. 2015) using restricted maximum likelihood and in cluding distance, depth, and the interaction as fixed effects. We calculated ANOVA tables with *F* statistics for the fixed effects with the package lmerTest v3.0.1 (Kuznetsova et al. 2017). We fit a model for each site separately for which we included individual plants as random effects of intercept and of slope of distance. Additionally, we fit a model for all sites combined for which we included sites and individual plants within sites as random effects. To test whether the mean root biomass at each distance and depth was significantly different from other units when the associated fixed effect was significant, we conducted a post hoc pairwise comparison test (Tukey's honest significant difference [HSD] with the package emmeans v1.2.4 [R Core Team 2018]).

 We tested for differences in total root biomass and root biomass distribution patterns between plant functional types at the sagebrush steppe site using paired-sample *t* tests (grasses vs. shrubs and  $C_3$  grasses vs.  $C_4$ grasses). An additional paired-sample *t* test was used to test for significant differences in total root biomass between fine and coarse root distribution for *A. tridentata*. All tests were conducted using the statistical software R (R Core Team 2018), and all references to significant differences are at the  $P \leq 0.05$ level.

#### **RESULTS**

## Depth, Distance, and their Interaction on Grass Root Distribution

 Root biomass was consistently higher in the 0–10 cm depth than in the 10–20 cm depth on average for all distances and sites (*F* = 144.2, *P* < 0.001; Fig. 1**,** Tables 1, 2). On average across all sites, grass root biomass directly under a plant individual (distance 0) declined from  $180 \pm 12$  g/m<sup>2</sup> (marginal mean  $\pm$  SE) in the 0–10 cm depth to  $94 \pm 12$  g/m<sup>2</sup> in the 10– 20 cm depth, a 48% decrease (Tukey's HSD: *P* < 0.05). On average, grass root biomass declined with distance in the 0–10 cm depth but not in the 20–30 cm depth (Fig. 1) based on a significant interaction term between distance and depth  $(F = 8.04, P < 0.001)$ ; Table 2). The highest amount of root biomass occurred within the 0–10 cm depth and within a 3.25-cm radius of individual plants (Table 1).

#### Site and Plant Functional Type

 Root biomass was quite variable within each site, with coefficients of variation ranging from 23% to 85%. Mean grass root biomass averaged across distances and summed across the 0–20 cm depth was greatest at the northern mixed-grass prairie site  $(257 \pm 49 \text{ g/m}^2)$ ; observed mean  $\pm$  SD), followed by the shortgrass steppe site  $(213 \pm 63 \text{ g/m}^2)$  and the sagebrush steppe site  $(205 \pm 98 \text{ g/m}^2; \text{ Table 1}).$ There was significantly higher grass root biomass at the northern mixed-grass prairie than at the sagebrush steppe site (Tukey's HSD: *P* < 0.05), whereas root biomass at the shortgrass site did not differ from either. ANOVAs of individual sites confirmed that root biomass declined significantly with depth (all values of  $P < 0.001$ ; Table 2, Fig. 2). The analyses also showed that distance did not have a significant effect on root biomass at the shortgrass steppe



Fig. 1. Grass root biomass by distance and by depth (**A,** 0–10 cm; **B,** 10–20 cm) from individual plants across 3 dryland sites in the western United States: the shortgrass steppe, the northern mixed-grass prairie, and the sagebrush steppe. The bars represent marginal mean root biomass and the error bars a 95% confidence interval from the linear mixed model with sites and individual plants

or the northern mixed-grass prairie sites (Fig. 2A–D). Root biomass declined significantly with distance and in interaction with depth, at the sagebrush steppe site (interaction term *F* = 13.54, *P* < 0.001; Table 2). We found a significant drop of root biomass between distances 6.5 cm and 13 cm in the 0–10 cm depth but not in the 10–20 cm depth (Fig. 2E, F).

We compared grass root distribution  $(C_3)$ and C4 grasses) to shrub root distribution (*A. tridentata*) at the sagebrush steppe site and found that depth and distance did not have a significant effect on *A. tridentata* roots (fine or coarse), while grass root biomass decreased with both distance and depth. Overall, there was significantly lower root biomass for roots of the shrub *A. tridentata*  $(28 \pm 14 \text{ g/m}^2)$  than for grasses  $(108 \pm 80 \text{ g/m}^2)$  within the 0–20 cm depth. We also compared the root distribution patterns of  $C_3$  grasses with  $C_4$  grasses within the sagebrush steppe site. There were no significant differences in total root biomass or root biomass distribution by depth or distance between the C4 perennial bunchgrass *B. gracilis* and the  $C_3$  perennial bunchgrass *H*. *comata.*

#### **DISCUSSION**

 Root biomass decreased rapidly with soil depth by about 50% between the 0–10 cm depth and the 10–20 cm depth. Root biomass in the 0–10 cm depth did not vary with distance except for in the sagebrush steppe where it also dropped at a distance of 6.5 cm; we found no relationship with distances in the 10–20 cm depth. Our results indicate that mean total root biomass in the surface soil layers (0–20 cm) was highest at the northern mixed-grass prairie, and particularly high compared to the sagebrush steppe. Root distribution patterns were similar for the 2 grassdominated sites, but differed for the sagebrush steppe. When examining differences between plant functional types at the sagebrush steppe, we found that grass root distribution decreased significantly with depth and distance up to 6.5 cm away, while shrub roots were uniform in both directions.

One expectation for how the spatial distribution of plant roots changes with depth and distance was that they would decrease smoothly away from the center of the plant both vertically and horizontally. The distributions we found did not consistently fit this expectation. At the sagebrush steppe, grass root biomass was strongly concentrated beneath plant individuals, with the highest amount of root biomass in the top 10 cm and within a 3.25-cm horizontal radius of the center of the plant. Evidence for a decreasing root biomass gradient existed only within the top 0–10 cm depth, as root biomass decreased with distance from the center of the plant to 6.5 cm away; however, this pattern did not hold true TARLE 1. Means and standard deviations (in parentheses) of observed root biomass (g/m<sup>2</sup>) by depth, distance, site, and plant functional type. At the shortgrass steppe we sampled 9 plant individuals of the C<sub>3</sub> peremial b

![](_page_5_Picture_760.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

 Fig. 2. Mean grass root biomass by distance and by depth (A, C, E: 0–10 cm; B, D, F: 10–20 cm) for individual plants at the shortgrass steppe (A, B), the northern mixed-grass prairie (C, D), and the sagebrush steppe (E, F). The bars represent marginal mean root biomass, and the error bars represent a 95% confidence interval from the linear mixed model for each site with individual plants as random effects. The letters above the bars (a, b, and c) signify statistically significant differences ( $P \le 0.05$ ) from Tukey's HSD tests per site (but for depth  $\times$  distance).

 TABLE 2. Two-way ANOVAs of fixed effects distance and depth for all sites combined (sites and plants as random effects) and for each site separately (plants as random effects).  $SS = \text{sum}$  of squares;  $MS = \text{mean}$  squares; Num-df/ den-df = numerator/denominator degrees of freedom (Satterthwaite's method for "all sites"; Kenward-Roger's method for analyses per site).

		SS	MS	Num-df	Den-df	$\boldsymbol{F}$	P
All sites	Distance	8719	2180	$\overline{4}$	2.2	1.71	0.389
	Depth	184,221	184,221		214.7	144.20	< 0.001
	Distance $\times$ depth	41,087	10,272	4	214.7	8.04	< 0.001
<b>CPER</b>	Distance	3407	852	$\overline{4}$	5	0.66	0.648
	Depth	88.828	88,828		40	109.37	< 0.001
	Distance $\times$ depth	6450	1613	4	40	1.99	0.115
<b>HPGRS</b>	Distance	4404	1101	$\overline{4}$	5	0.67	0.638
	Depth	62,599	62,599		40	61.31	< 0.001
	Distance $\times$ depth	770	193	$\overline{4}$	40	0.19	0.943
<b>TBNGG</b>	Distance	46,023	11,506	$\overline{4}$	6	6.39	0.024
	Depth	39,244	39,244		45	32.72	< 0.001
	Distance $\times$ depth	64,981	16,245	4	45	13.54	< 0.001

for distances past 6.5 cm or at any distances in the 10–20 cm depth. An important explanation for why we found a spatial distribution that did not meet the smoothly decreasing expectation is illustrated in Fig. 3. The smoothly decreasing expectation is what we might expect for an isolated plant (Hook et al. 1994,

Lee and Lauenroth 1994). We sampled undisturbed plant communities in which we assumed the presence of the maximum number of plants that can be supported by the average resource availability (Coffin and Lauenroth 1991, Sala et al. 1997). Overlapping root systems likely explains why we observed a

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

 Fig. 3. Conceptual drawing of the vertical and horizontal root distribution patterns of grasses in drylands. Roots of adjacent plants overlap to maximize belowground resource use. Scale is in centimeters.

relatively complex vertical and horizontal spatial distribution of roots at each site and as an average across sites (Figs. 1, 2). Further, differences in how bunchgrasses exploit belowground resources compared to rhizomatous grasses may have contributed to the complexity of the spatial distributions of root biomass we observed. Uniformity in root biomass increased with depth and with distances >6.5 cm, suggesting that the shallow soil profile and spaces next to plant individuals are being fully exploited by the roots of the individual and the neighboring plants to maximize below ground resource uptake.

At the sagebrush steppe site, root biomass distribution patterns differed between grasses and the shrub *A. tridentata.* Root biomass was uniform across all depths and distances for *A. tridentata,* while grass root biomass decreased with both depth and distance. Similar results have been found in the shortgrass steppe (Lee and Lauenroth 1994), the Patagonia steppe (Sala et al. 1989), and the African savanna (Walter 1971). The morphological differences between grass and shrub root systems allow the 2 functional types to utilize water at all depths of the soil profile. For instance, grasses concentrate their roots in the upper 30 cm of soil (Coupland and Johnson 1965, Bartos and Sims 1974) to exploit frequent and short-duration pulses of precipitation (Sala et al. 1992), while shrub root systems are generally deeper to allow them to tap into water in deep soil layers (Walter 1971). We also compared root distribution patterns between the  $C_3$  and  $C_4$ perennial bunchgrasses in the sagebrush steppe site, although we did not detect any significant differences between the 2 root systems. We likely did not see a significant difference between the root distribution patterns of the 2 grass types because they both rely on belowground resource pools in the top 20 cm of soil (Pearcy and Ehleringer 1984). The shrub *A. tridentata* produces roots in the deeper soil layers to access deep water stores, while also developing roots in the upper soil layers to optimize belowground resource uptake of summer precipitation as well as the mineral nutrients that are concentrated in surface soils and beneath plants (Burke 1989). Surprisingly, sagebrush root distributions did not match well-known resource island patterns for sagebrush, and a majority of the *A. tridentata* roots sampled in the 0–20 cm depth were thicker than 2 mm.

 Our study provides additional knowledge of plant-soil interactions in drylands by describing the root distribution patterns of 3 plant functional types across 3 types of semiarid dryland ecosystems. This study revealed that the spatial distribution of roots varies between grasses and shrubs, but not between  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  perennial bunchgrasses. For each of the ecosystem types, root biomass was concentrated beneath individual plants and in the surface soils, while below the 10-cm depth, there was no influence of distance from the center of a plant. Representation across 3 different types of dryland ecosystems provides strong inference for drylands in this region, a strength of regional studies across large spatial gradients (Burke et al. 1991, Vinton and Burke 1997, Gill et al. 1999, Barrett and Burke 2002, McCulley et al. 2005). However, lack of replication within the ecosystem types in this study limits inferences about the individual ecosystem types. The significance of root distribution patterns to ecosystem processes is an important consideration for understanding environmental and climatic change. Changes in precipitation and its seasonality, subsequent changes in soil water distribution in time and space, and changes in nitrogen deposition will very likely differentially influence plant functional types based on root distribution.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

 This work was supported by the Yale University School of Forestry and Environmen tal Studies and the University of Wyoming. The authors gratefully acknowledge Research

Leader Justin Derner for the USDA Agricultural Research Stations the Central Plains Experimental Range and the High Plains Grassland Research Station, as well as Trey Davis, Stewardship Director for The Nature Conservancy site in Thunder Basin, for helping us to identify sites and granting permission for the sampling at these long-term research sites.

## LITERATURE CITED

- AGUILERA, M., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1993. Neighborhood interactions in a natural population of the perennial bunchgrass *Bouteloua gracilis.* Oecologia 94:595–602.
- AUSTIN, A.T., L. YAHDJIAN, J.M. STARK, J. BELNAP, A. POR-PORATO, U. NORTON, D.A. RAVETTA, AND S.M. SCHA-EFFER. 2004. Water pulses and biogeochemical cycles in arid and semiarid ecosystems. Oecologia 141:221–235.
- BARRETT, J.E., AND I.C. BURKE. 2002. Nitrogen retention in semiarid ecosystems across a soil organic matter gradient. Ecological Applications 12:878–890.
- BARTOS, D.L., AND P.L. SIMS. 1974. Root dynamics in a shortgrass system. Journal of Rangeland Management 27:33–36.
- BATES, D., M. MAECHLER, B. BOLKER, AND S. WALKER. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software 67:1–48.
- BURKE, I.C. 1989. Control of nitrogen mineralization a sagebrush steppe landscape. Ecology 70:1115–1126.
- BURKE, I.C., T.G.F. KITTEL, W.K. LAUENROTH, P. SNOOK, C.M. YONKER, AND W.J. PARTON. 1991. Regional analysis of the central Great Plains. BioScience 41: 685–692.
- BURKE, I.C., W.K. LAUENROTH, R. RIGGLE, P. BRANNEN, B. MADIGAN, AND S. BEARD. 1999. Spatial variability of soil properties in the shortgrass steppe: the relative importance of topography, grazing, microsite, and plant species in controlling spatial patterns. Ecosystems 2:422–438.
- BURKE, I.C., W.K. LAUENROTH, M.A. VINTON, P.B. HOOK, R.H. KELLY, H.E. EPSTEIN, M.R. AGUIAR, M.D. ROB-LES, M.O. AGUILERA, K.L. MURPHY, ET AL. 1998. Plant–soil interactions in temperate grasslands. Pages 121–143 *in* Plant-induced soil changes: processes and feedbacks. Developments in Biogeochemistry, Volume 4. Springer, Dordrecht; [accessed 17 Septem ber 2017]. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/ 978-94-017-2691-7\_7
- COFFIN, D.P., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1991. Effects of competition on spatial distribution of roots of blue grama. Journal of Range Management 44:68–71.
- COFFIN, D.P., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1992. Spatial variability in seed production of the perennial bunchgrass *Bouteloua gracilis* (Gramineae). American Journal of Botany 79:347–353.
- COUPLAND, R.T., AND R.E. JOHNSON. 1965. Rooting characteristics of native grassland species in Saskatchewan. Journal of Ecology. 53:475–507.
- EPSTEIN, H.E., W.K. LAUENROTH, I.C. BURKE, AND D.P. COFFIN. 1996. Ecological responses of dominant grasses along two climatic gradients in the Great

Plains of the United States. Journal of Vegetation Science 7:777–788.

- EPSTEIN, H.E., W.K. LAUENROTH, I.C. BURKE, AND D.P. COFFIN. 1997. Productivity patterns of C3 and C4 functional types in the Great Plains of the United States. Ecology 78:722–731.
- FOX, R.L., J.E. WEAVER, AND R.C. LIPPS. 1953. Influence of certain soil-profile characteristics upon the distribution of roots of grasses. Agronomy Journal 45: 583–589.
- GAVLAK, R.G., D.A. HORNECK, AND R.O. MILLER. 1994. Plant, soil, and water reference methods for the Western Region. *In:* Western Regional Extension Publication WREP 125. 2nd edition. University of Alaska Cooperative Extension Service, Fairbanks, AK.
- GILL, R., I.C. BURKE, D.G. MILCHUNAS, AND W.K. LAUEN-ROTH. 1999. Relationship between root biomass and soil organic matter pools in the shortgrass steppe of eastern Colorado. Ecosystems 2:226–236.
- HARMON, M.E., K.J. NADELHOFFER, AND J.M. BLAIR. 1999. Measuring decomposition, nutrient turnover, and stores in plant litter. Pages 202–241 *in* Standard soil methods for long-term ecological research. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- HOOK, P., W.K. LAUENROTH, AND I.C. BURKE. 1994. Spatial patterns of roots in a semiarid grassland: abundance of canopy openings and regeneration gaps. Journal of Ecology 82:485–494.
- HOOK, P.B., I.C. BURKE, AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1991. Heterogeneity of soil and plant N and C associated with individual plants and openings in North American shortgrass steppe. Plant and Soil 138:247–256.
- HOOK, P.B., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1994. Root system response of a perennial bunchgrass to neighbourhood-scale soil water heterogeneity. Functional Ecology 8:738–745.
- HOOPER, D.U., AND L. JOHNSON. 1999. Nitrogen limitation in dryland ecosystems: responses to geographical and temporal variation in precipitation. Biogeochemistry 46:247–293.
- KLUTE, A. 1986. Hydrometer method. *In:* Methods of soil analysis. 2nd edition. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI.
- KUZNETSOVA, A., P.B. BROCKHOFF, AND R.H.B. CHRIS-TENSEN. 2017. lmerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models. Journal of Statistical Software 82:1–26.
- LAUENROTH, W.K. 2008. Vegetation of the shortgrass steppe. Pages 70–83 *in* Ecology of the shortgrass steppe: a long-term perspective. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- LAUENROTH, W.K., AND I.C. BURKE. 2008. Ecology of the shortgrass steppe: a long term perspective. Long Term Ecological Research Network Series. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- LAUENROTH, W.K., J.L. DODD, AND P.L. SIMS. 1978. The effects of water- and nitrogen-induced stresses on plant community structure in a semiarid grassland. Oecologia 36:211–222.
- LAUENROTH, W.K., AND O.E. SALA. 1992. Long-term forage production of North American shortgrass steppe. Ecological Applications 2:397–403.
- LAUENROTH, W.K., AND W.C. WHITMAN. 1971. A rapid method for washing roots. Rangeland Ecology and

Management/Journal of Range Management Archives 24:308–309.

- LEE, C.A., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1994. Spatial distributions of grass and shrub root systems in the shortgrass steppe. American Midland Naturalist 132: 117–123.
- LEETHAM, J.W., AND D.G. MILCHUNAS. 1985. The composition and distribution of soil microarthropods in the shortgrass steppe in relation to soil water, root biomass, and grazing by cattle. Pedobiologia 20:311–325.
- MCCULLEY, R.L., I.C. BURKE, J.A. NELSON, W.K. LAUEN-ROTH, A.K. KNAPP, AND E.F. KELLY. 2005. Regional patterns in carbon cycling across the Great Plains of North America. Ecosystems 8:106–121.
- MILCHUNAS, D.G., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 2001. Belowground primary production by carbon isotope decay and long-term root biomass dynamics. Ecosystems 4:139–150.
- MILCHUNAS, D.G., W.K. LAUENROTH, P.L. CHAPMAN, AND M.K. KAZEMPOUR. 1989. Effects of grazing, topography, and precipitation on the structure of a semiarid grassland. Vegetation 80:11–23.
- PARUELO, J.M., AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1996. Relative abundance of plant functional types in grasslands and shrublands of North America. Ecological Applications 6:1212–1224.
- PEARCY, R.W., AND J. EHLERINGER. 1984. Comparative ecophysiology of C3 and C4 plants. Plant, Cell and Environment 7:1–13.
- PENNINGTON, V.E., K.A. PALMQUIST, J.B. BRADFORD, AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 2017. Climate and soil texture influence patterns of forb species richness and composition in big sagebrush plant communities across their spatial extent in the western U.S. Plant Ecology 218:957–970.
- PRISM CLIMATE GROUP. 2018. 30-year normals 1981– 2010. Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering, Oregon State University. http://prism .oregonstate.edu/normals
- R CORE TEAM. 2018. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. http://www.R-project.org/
- ROBERTSON, G.P., D.C. COLEMAN, C.S. BLEDSOE, AND P. SOLLINS. 2009. Standard soil methods for long-term ecological research. 1st edition. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- SALA, O.E., R. GOLLUSCIO, W.K. LAUENROTH, AND A. SORIANO. 1989. Resource partitioning between shrubs and grasses in the Patagonian steppe. Oecologia 81:501–505.
- SALA, O.E., W.K. LAUENROTH, AND R. GOLLUSCIO. 1997. Plant functional types in temperate semi-arid regions. Pages 217–233 *in* T.M. Smith, H.H. Shugart, and F.I. Woodward, editors, Plant functional types: their relevance to ecosystem properties and global change. International Geosphere–Biosphere Programme. Cam bridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- SALA, O.E., W.K. LAUENROTH, AND W.J. PARTON. 1992. Long-term soil water dynamics in the shortgrass steppe. Ecology 73:1175–1181.
- SCHUMAN, G.E., L.J. INGRAM, P.D. STAHL, J.D. DERNER, G.F. VANCE, AND J.A. MORGAN. 2009. Influence of management on soil organic carbon dynamics in northern mixed-grass rangeland. Pages 169–180 *in* R. Lal and R.F. Follett, editors, Soil carbon

sequestration and the Greenhouse Effect. SSSA Special Publications 57. 2nd edition. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI. https://doi.org/ 10.2136/sssaspecpub57.2ed.c11

- SIMS, P.L., AND J.S. SINGH. 1978. The structure and function of ten western North American grasslands: III. Net primary production, turnover and efficiencies of energy capture and water use. Journal of Ecology 66:573–597.
- SIMS, P.L., J.S. SINGH, AND W.K. LAUENROTH. 1978. The structure and function of ten western North American grasslands: I. Abiotic and vegetational characteristics. Journal of Ecology 66:251–285.
- STEVENS, C.J., E.M. LIND, Y. HAUTIER, W.S. HARPOLE, E.T. BORER, S. HOBBIE, E.W. SEABLOOM, L. LADWIG, J.D. BAKKER, C. CHU, ET AL. 2015. Anthropogenic nitrogen deposition predicts local grassland primary production worldwide. Ecology 96:1459–1465.
- [USDA–NRCS] UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRI-CULTURE–NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SER-VICE. 2018. The PLANTS Database. USDA–NRCS, Greensboro, NC.
- VINTON, M.A., AND I.C. BURKE. 1995. Interactions between individual plant species and soil nutrient status in shortgrass steppe. Ecology 76:1116–1133.
- VINTON, M.A., AND I.C. BURKE. 1997. Contingent effects of plant species on soils along a regional moisture gradient in the Great Plains. Oecologia 110:393–402.
- WALTER, H. 1971. Natural savannas. *In:* Ecology of tropical and subtropical vegetation. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, United Kingdom.
- WEAVER, J.E., AND R.W. DARLAND. 1949. Quantitative study of root systems in different soil types. Science 110:164–165.
- YAHDJIAN, L., L. GHERARDI, AND O.E. SALA. 2011. Nitrogen limitation in arid-subhumid ecosystems: a metaanalysis of fertilization studies. Journal of Arid Environments 75:675–680.

*Received 11 July 2018 Revised 1 December 2018 Accepted 10 December 2018 Published online 11 July 2019*