

Micro- and Macrohabitat Associations in Mojave Desert Rodent Communities

Author(s): Richard D. Stevens and J. Sebastián Tello

Source: Journal of Mammalogy, 90(2):388-403. 2009.

Published By: American Society of Mammalogists

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1644/08-MAMM-A-141.1>

URL: <http://www.bioone.org/doi/full/10.1644/08-MAMM-A-141.1>

BioOne (www.bioone.org) is a nonprofit, online aggregation of core research in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences. BioOne provides a sustainable online platform for over 170 journals and books published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Web site, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/page/terms_of_use.

Usage of BioOne content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non-commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

MICRO- AND MACROHABITAT ASSOCIATIONS IN MOJAVE DESERT RODENT COMMUNITIES

RICHARD D. STEVENS* AND J. SEBASTIÁN TELLO

Department of Biological Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA

Characterizing habitat associations of species is fundamental to understanding the mechanistic basis of community organization. Typically, investigators estimate microhabitat characteristics that account for significant amounts of variation in species composition. Nonetheless, highly resolved microhabitat characteristics may account for no more variation in species composition than coarse macrohabitat distinctions, particularly in heterogeneous environments. We describe micro- and macrohabitat associations of 13 species of nocturnal rodents distributed across 31 communities within the Mojave Desert. Rodent species composition, biomass of 81 perennial plant species, representation of 9 soil and rock classes, and the percent cover of annuals and grasses were quantified. Communities also were assigned to macrohabitats based on qualitative characteristics. Multivariate analysis of variance indicated highly significant community-wide differences among macrohabitats and species-specific analyses of variance substantiated differences for all but 1 species analyzed. Microhabitat characteristics accounted for approximately 55% of the variation in rodent species composition. Moreover, microhabitat characteristics accounted for 17% variation in rodent species composition over and beyond that shared with macrohabitat distinctions. Micro- and macrohabitat perspectives provide complimentary insights into species composition of rodent communities. Edaphic features in particular represented important environmental heterogeneity that likely acts both directly on rodent species composition and indirectly through influencing variation in plant species composition. Indeed, the Mojave Desert is represented by a spatial mosaic of species-rich and compositionally dynamic rodent communities that will provide many insights into the coexistence of species at regional spatial scales.

Key words: community structure, desert rodent, habitat selection, macrohabitat, metacommunity, microhabitat, scale, scale-dependence, spatial processes

Of the 4 great North American deserts (Chihuahuan, Great Basin, Mojave, and Sonoran), the Mojave has received the least focus in terms of organization of mammalian communities. This is especially true of rodents despite the fact that they are an important component of the mammalian fauna in many desert systems. In the Mojave Desert, rodents are represented by approximately 58 taxa (Patterson et al. 2005). Rodents play important ecological roles as consumers, secondary producers, and mechanical processors (Brown 1986). In particular, rodents are important seed and spore dispersers, consumers of vegetation, seeds, and fruits (Reichman and Price 1993), and represent a substantial resource base for many other predators (Kotler 1984).

Most of the area of North American deserts falls within the Basin and Range province of western North America

(MacMahon 1979). Accordingly, regular alternation of desert basins and mountain ranges combined with predictable but complex toposequences create considerable spatial heterogeneity (Whitford 2002). This is especially true in the Mojave Desert, the driest and least productive desert in North America. Even within a particular toposequence, edaphic characteristics and microclimates can be variable across short distances, further increasing spatial heterogeneity. Minute differences in relative humidity between different mountain slopes affect distribution of dominant plant species such as blackbrush (*Coleogyne ramosissima*), thereby creating substantial habitat heterogeneity across sharp but short gradients (Beatley 1975). Abundance of desert rodents has been demonstrated to exhibit strong relationships with environmental characteristics, and a better understanding of quantitative environmental characteristics important to distribution and abundance of desert rodents can greatly inform basic biology of poorly known desert systems.

Microhabitat characteristics commonly are used to understand variation in abundance of species and to identify important quantifiable niche dimensions. Particular microhabitat

* Correspondent: rstevens@lsu.edu




FIG. 1.—Map of the Mojave National Preserve demonstrating sampled communities. Acronyms are as follow: AP, alkali playa; BB, blackbrush woodland; CR, creosote bajada; JT, Joshua tree woodland; LB, lava bed; PJ, piñon-juniper woodland; SD, sand dune; YC, Mojave yucca woodland.

characteristics that are correlated with variation in abundance are inferred to reflect important decisions made by individuals that maximize fitness (i.e., density-dependent habitat selection—Rosenzweig 1991). Nonetheless, microhabitat characteristics are not the only salient forms of environmental heterogeneity. Macrohabitat features—more gross and discrete habitat differences typically defining different plant communities or life zones—also can affect consumer densities yet are not necessarily completely embodied by underlying microhabitat characteristics (Morris 1987). Variation among macrohabitats often is greater than variation among microhabitats within a macrohabitat. Accordingly, microhabitat variables may have limited ability to predict the abundance of consumer species, especially at large spatial scales. Distinction between microhabitat and macrohabitat selection has made evident the degree to which individuals are actively selecting particular microhabitat characteristics or are simply preferentially responding to coarser differences reflected in macrohabitats (Morris 1987). Indeed, before effects of specific microhabitat characteristics can be implicated as important in determining abundance of populations and ultimately the diversity of communities, effects of macrohabitat should be evaluated.

We describe the comparative community ecology of nocturnal rodents in the eastern Mojave Desert. Specifically, we examine 31 communities occurring in a series of interdigitating macrohabitats. We quantify microhabitat characteristics that are important in predicting abundance of common species and we evaluate the degree to which microhabitat characteristics predict rodent abundances over and beyond expectations from simple macrohabitat delimitations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site and sampling.—The Mojave National Preserve comprises close to 600,000 ha and its northern border is located approximately 80 km southwest of Las Vegas, Nevada, in San

Bernardino County, California (Fig. 1). Our study area was located on a broad alluvial fan complex consisting of 4 different materials: limestone, mixed plutonics, quartz monzonite, and mixed volcanics (Young et al. 2004). Elevation ranges from 85 to 2,417 m (Beever et al. 2006). Average precipitation ranges from 130 to 230 mm annually (Young et al. 2004). Dominant vegetation (Brooks et al. 2004) is *Larrea tridentata* (48% of study site), *Yucca brevifolia* (26%), and *Yucca schidigera* (18%).

Between September and November 2005, we sampled 31 communities from 8 of the most extensive macrohabitats within the Mojave National Preserve: creosote bajada (7 communities), Joshua tree woodland (5), blackbrush scrub (4), Mojave yucca woodland (6), piñon-juniper woodland (3), lava bed (2), sand dune (2), and alkali playa (2). Herein we refer to macrohabitats as large, coarse-grained discontinuities associated with discrete plant associations whereas we refer to microhabitat as small-scale, fine-grained, and quantifiable variation in floral and edaphic characteristics of communities. We sampled rodent species composition using paired 500-m transects separated by approximately 100 m. One Sherman live trap (H. B. Sherman Traps, Inc., Tallahassee, Florida) was placed every 5 m for a total of 101 traps on each transect and 202 traps sampling each community. Sampling was conducted for 3 nights (606 total trap-nights of effort) and animals were marked and released each morning. Rodent relative abundance data was based on the number of unique individuals caught during the 3 nights (i.e., recaptures not counted). Rodent relative abundances were square-root transformed before analyses to normalize the count data and so that dominant species did not dominate results (Legendre and Legendre 1998). Pocket mice (*Chaetodipus* and *Perognathus*) can become inactive during the coldest portions of the year (Kenagy and Bartholemew 1985). Although we caught pocket mice during the entire field season, this does not ensure that no individuals became inactive during our sampling; estimates of relative abundance for these 2 genera may be conservative. The ground squirrels *Spermophilus tereticaudus* and *Ammospermophilus leucurus* are primarily diurnal and as such their relative abundance more reflects the amount of time traps were open in the morning and afternoon than their actual relative abundance on the sampling transects. Sciurids were not considered in any analysis. *Reithrodontomys megalotis* was captured at 2 communities and had relative abundances too low to make meaningful species-specific analyses; this species was excluded from analyses focusing on species-specific patterns. Rodent sampling adhered to Louisiana State University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee protocol 06-033 based on guidelines approved by the American Society of Mammalogists (Gannon et al. 2007). Voucher specimens are deposited in the Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University. Data are available from the authors upon request.

Sampling of vegetative characteristics of each community was based on a total of 4 additional transects, each 2 m wide and 50 m long, running perpendicular to each mammal transect. The positions of these vegetation transects were evenly spaced, located at 0-, 167-, 333-, and 500-m marks along the

mammal transects. On each transect, length, width, and height of each perennial plant were determined to estimate the sum of the biomass of each species. Within each vegetation transect, we calculated the percent cover of all grasses and all annual plants inside two 5×2 -m quadrats set between 15 and 20 m from the center of the vegetation transect. We estimated mean percent values in each quadrat based on independent assessments by 2 observers.

Soil microprofile was characterized based on ten 1-dm³ samples evenly spaced along mammal transects. Each sample was manually sieved and separated based on particle size into 9 categories: <1.4 mm, 1.4–<3.18 mm, 3.18–<4.75 mm, 4.75–<6.3 mm, 6.3–<12.5 mm, 12.5–<25 mm, 25–<50 mm, 50–<120 mm, and >120 mm. Each portion was weighed and mean proportional contribution of each particle size class was used for analyses.

We characterized species diversity of each macrohabitat using additive forms of α , β , and γ (Lande 1996). Specifically, mean α is the number of species shared among communities within a macrohabitat type, β is the mean number of unique species within communities, and γ is the sum of mean α and β .

Macrohabitat effects.—One-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to evaluate significant differences among macrohabitats based on rodent species composition of replicated communities. We also used discriminant function analysis (DFA) to illustrate significant differences determined by MANOVA. We conducted a posteriori least significant difference tests (Sokal and Rohlf 1995) to determine pairwise differences among macrohabitats based on site scores from the DFA. We also conducted 1-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) on each rodent species separately to determine which likely contributed to the significant MANOVA.

Microhabitat effects.—We characterized microhabitat using biomass of 81 perennial plant species, 9 soil microprofile classes, percent cover of grasses, and percent cover of annuals. We conducted a cluster analysis to investigate the similarity in the response of different rodent species to environmental gradients spanning our study system. Based on standardized Pearson correlation coefficients (Sokal and Rohlf 1995) of the relationship between each environmental variable and the relative abundance of each rodent species, we calculated a matrix of Euclidean distances among all species. Using these distances and an unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) algorithm, we built a dendrogram of relationships among rodent species that depicts their hierarchical clustering in terms of similarities or differences in their association to environmental characteristics.

We used principal component analysis (PCA) based on a covariance matrix to reduce redundancy and hence dimensionality of perennial and soil microprofile data sets separately. Perennials were square-root transformed so as to normalize data and reduce influence of species with very high biomass. PCA reduced perennial and soil microprofile data sets to 6 and 1 variables (principal components [PCs]), respectively, based on those derived axes that had eigenvalues greater than expected based on a broken-stick model (Jackson 1993).

For the community-wide focus we conducted a redundancy analysis (RDA) whereby perennial PCs, soil profile PC, annual percent cover, and grass percent cover were independent variables and rodent relative abundances at each community were dependent variables. RDA selects a combination of independent variables that maximally accounts for variation in dependent variables (Jongman et al. 1995). This analysis also provides amount of variation accounted for by dependent variables (i.e., adjusted R^2) as well as statistical significance of the result based on 10,000 permutations of the original data. This RDA was conducted using Matlab routines written by Peres-Neto et al. (2006). For species-specific analyses, stepwise multiple regression determined the linear combination of 9 (6 perennial PCs, 1 soil PC, grass variable, and annual variable) microhabitat variables that could best predict relative abundance of each species of nocturnal rodent.

We also were interested in amount of unique variation accounted for by microhabitat associations after controlling for macrohabitat affiliation of each community and whether microhabitat variables can explain significantly more variation in rodent relative abundances after accounting for simple macrohabitat designations. We conducted a partial RDA where microhabitat variables were the independent matrix and macrohabitat associations represented the covariate matrix. Macrohabitats were coded as dummy variables in a covariate matrix according to Legendre and Legendre (1998). Significance was based on 10,000 permutations of the original data. We used Matlab routines written by Peres-Neto et al. (2006) to conduct these analyses.

RESULTS

Our sampling of 31 communities from 8 different macrohabitats resulted in 18,786 trap-nights that generated 6,108 unique captures (i.e., not counting recaptures) of 15 species. Species were not distributed uniformly across macrohabitats or communities (Table 1). *Dipodomys merriami* and *Neotoma lepida* occurred in the greatest number of macrohabitats and communities, whereas *R. megalotis* exhibited the narrowest distribution, occurring in only 2 macrohabitats and 2 communities. On average, species occurred in 5.15 macrohabitats and 15 communities. Gamma diversity of macrohabitats ranged from 6 to 10 and mean α was always greater than β and varied from 4 to 7.25.

Macrohabitats differed significantly in terms of rodent species composition ($F = 8.48$, $d.f. = 91,77$, $P < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.52$). Least significant difference tests performed on DFA scores on the first 2 DFA axes for communities indicated that all macrohabitats were significantly different from at least 4 other macrohabitats (Fig. 2). Species-specific ANOVAs indicated that 11 of 12 species exhibited significant differences among macrohabitats (Table 2). *Perognathus longimembris* exhibited no significant differences in relative abundance across the 8 macrohabitats.

Relative abundances of rodents exhibited numerous and varied associations with microhabitat characteristics (Appendix I). However, species could be aggregated into 4 major groups

TABLE 1.—Presence or absence of nocturnal rodent species across 8 macrohabitats examined and estimates of α , β , and γ diversity. Occurrence within a macrohabitat is denoted with \times . γ refers to the total number of species found in all communities within a macrohabitat. Mean α refers to the average number of species within communities representing a macrohabitat. β refers to the number of unique species. Incidence represents the proportion of all 31 communities in which a species was encountered.

	Playa	Blackbrush	Creosote	Joshua tree	Lava	Piñon—juniper	Dune	Yucca	Incidence
Species									
<i>Chaetodipus formosus</i>		××	××	××	××	××	××	××	0.45
<i>Chaetodipus penicillatus</i>	××		××				××		0.13
<i>Dipodomys deserti</i>	××						××		0.10
<i>Dipodomys merriami</i>	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	0.97
<i>Dipodomys panamintinus</i>		××	××	××		××		××	0.61
<i>Neotoma lepida</i>	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	0.97
<i>Onychomys torridus</i>	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	××	0.84
<i>Perognathus longimembris</i>	××	××	××	××			××	××	0.52
<i>Peromyscus crinitus</i>		××			××				0.10
<i>Peromyscus eremicus</i>		××	××	××	××	××		××	0.68
<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	××	××	××	××		××		××	0.71
<i>Peromyscus truei</i>		××		××		××			0.16
<i>Reithrodontomys megalotis</i>				××		××			0.06
Diversity									
γ	7	10	9	10	6	9	7	8	
Mean α	4	7.25	6	7	5.5	6.33	6.5	6.3	
β	3	2.75	3	3	0.5	2.67	0.5	1.7	

corresponding to their microhabitat preferences (Fig. 3). The 1st group contains only *Peromyscus truei*. This species has the most dissimilar microhabitat preference, and is almost solely found in high-elevation communities, typically characterized by the presence of juniper (*Juniperus*) and rocky soils. The 2nd group contains *Chaetodipus formosus*, *Peromyscus crinitus*, *N. lepida*, and *Peromyscus eremicus* (Fig. 3). *C. formosus* and *P. crinitus* are associated with rocky habitats, and are particularly abundant in lava beds, and in the case of *C. formosus* also in rocky creosote bajadas. *N. lepida* and *P. eremicus* also were very abundant in mid- to low-elevation rocky sites, but they are more general in their habitat use, being present in a large number of communities (Table 1). The 3rd group consists entirely of heteromyid rodents: *Dipodomys deserti*, *Chaetodipus penicillatus*, *Perognathus longimembris*, and *D. merriami*. This group of species generally prefers communities of low elevation and fine to intermediate soil particles. *C. penicillatus* and *D. deserti* share the most similar habitat preferences; they are strongly associated with fine-particle substrates, such as sandy soils of sand dunes, or clayey soils of alkali playas. However, *P. longimembris*, and especially *D. merriami* are usually more generalist species, occurring in a large variety of habitats. The 4th and final group is formed by *Dipodomys panamintinus*, *Peromyscus maniculatus*, and *Onychomys torridus*. These species frequently are found in midelevation communities, associated mostly with yucca woodlands, Joshua tree woodlands, and blackbrush scrub (see also Table 1, Fig. 4, and Appendix I).

Relative abundance of each species of rodent was correlated with at least 4 microhabitat characteristics (Appendix I). *D. merriami* exhibited the greatest number of significant correlations (36). Moreover, its response was different from other species in that it exhibited primarily negative correlations with vegetative characteristics. All other species primarily exhibited positive correlations with vegetative characteristics, although

the identity of which perennial species was correlated with which rodent species was quite variable.

Principal component analysis reduced the 81 perennial shrub variables to 6 derived variables that accounted for 83.5% of the variation among communities. Correlations of original plant species with PCs can be used to interpret identity of derived variables (Appendix II; Table 3). All 6 PCs have straightforward interpretations reflecting transitions from one macrohabitat to another. A 2nd PCA reduced 9 soil particle sizes to 1 derived variable that accounted for 77% of the variation among communities. Correlations of original soil variables with this PC indicated that it represented an axis ranging from sandy soils at low values to rocky soils at high values.

Multiple regression indicated numerous significant relationships between microhabitat PCs and rodent relative abundances (Table 4). All species except *P. longimembris* could be significantly related to some form of microhabitat variation. Significant coefficients ranged from 0.20 for *O. torridus* to 0.87 for *D. merriami*. The soil PC significantly loaded into multiple regression models for 7 of 11 species, perennial PCs for 9 of 11 species, annuals for 2 of 11 species, and grasses for 9 of 11 species exhibiting significant relationships. Soil PC1 was the most frequent variable to load 1st, doing so for 5 species.

When all species were analyzed together, microhabitat PCs accounted for approximately 55% of the variation among communities in terms of rodent species composition. Sites with similar macrohabitat affinity tended to be ordered similarly in the multivariate space defined by the RDA (Fig. 4). The soil PC and the 1st perennial PC were the most important microhabitat variables accounting for rodent species composition across our study area (Fig. 4A). *O. torridus*, *P. longimembris*, *P. truei*, and *R. megalotis* exhibited weak relationships with the first 2 derived axes from RDA, whereas all other species exhibited moderate to strong relationships (Fig. 4B).





FIG. 2.—Results from discriminant function analysis illustrating differences among macrohabitats based on rodent abundances. A) Communities are arranged according to their positions on discriminant functions axes. Vector plot indicates the contribution of species to differences on each axis (inset, upper figure). B) Matrix indicates significant pairwise differences (asterisk, $P < 0.05$) between macrohabitats based on least significant difference tests conducted on discriminant function scores. Differences along axis 1 are represented in the upper triangle, whereas differences along axis 2 are represented in the lower triangle.

Microhabitat characteristics explained variation in rodent species composition beyond that expected from simple macrohabitat associations. Partial RDA indicated that when shared variation between microhabitat and macrohabitat variables is controlled, microhabitat still accounts for an additional 17% of the variation in rodent species composition ($P < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION

Our understanding of North American desert rodent community organization comes primarily from studies in the Chihuahuan and Sonoran deserts (Brown and Munger 1985; Heske et al. 1994; Price 1978; Rosenzweig and Winakur 1969) and to a lesser degree from the Great Basin (Parmenter and MacMahon 1983; Patterson and Brown 1991). Within the Mojave, investigators have tended to focus on the structure of communities in single habitat types such as creosote bajadas (Chew and Butterworth 1964; Garland and Bradley 1984), saltbush flats (Kenagy 1973; Kenagy and Bartholomew 1985), Joshua tree woodlands (Price et al. 2000), or sand dunes (Brown 1973). Our study represents a comprehensive exam-

TABLE 2.—Results from 1-way ANOVA evaluating differences among 8 macrohabitats regarding abundances of 13 species of rodents.

Species	F	P-value
<i>Chaetodipus formosus</i>	3.861	0.014
<i>Chaetodipus penicillatus</i>	4.310	0.015
<i>Dipodomys deserti</i>	391.963	<0.001
<i>Dipodomys merriami</i>	7.812	<0.001
<i>Dipodomys panamintinus</i>	3.965	0.005
<i>Neotoma lepida</i>	5.166	0.001
<i>Onychomys torridus</i>	2.516	0.041
<i>Perognathus longimembris</i>	0.935	0.484
<i>Peromyscus crinitus</i>	46.48	0.002
<i>Peromyscus eremicus</i>	3.536	0.011
<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	8.910	<0.001
<i>Peromyscus truei</i>	6.176	0.010

ination of comparative community ecology of rodents across multiple habitats in this region. Moreover, this study demonstrates that not only is the inclusion of numerous macrohabitats necessary to more comprehensively characterize rodent community structure in this desert but also that description based on fine-grained microhabitat characteristics significantly contributes to such a characterization.

Importance of edaphic characteristics.—Soil microprofile characteristics contributed greatly to canonical microhabitat axes important in explaining spatial variation in rodent species composition. Moreover, soil characteristics commonly were important microhabitat features for particular species (11 of 13 taxa). Although the examination of the importance of soil characteristics has been fairly common in studies of rodent community structure conducted outside North America (Corbalan 2006; Krasnov et al. 1996; Rogovin et al. 1994; Scott and Dunstone 2000; Shenbrot 1992; Shenbrot and Rogovin 1995), these characteristics have been only infrequently examined in North American deserts in general and the Mojave Desert in particular (Hardy 1945; Root et al. 2000). That soil micro-




FIG. 3.—Dendrogram produced by cluster analysis based on standardized Pearson correlation coefficients of the abundance of each species with the original environmental variables. Numbers mark the nodes that give origin to the 4 major clusters of species (see text for interpretation).




FIG. 4.—Results from redundancy analysis examining the relationship between rodent species composition and microhabitat variables. Symbols represent communities from particular macrohabitats. Arrows represent vectors describing the relationship of A) microhabitat variables and B) rodent species density to relationships defined by the redundancy axes. Microhabitat variables are as follows: P1–P6, 6 perennial principal components (PCs); S1, soil PC; Annual, annual percent cover; Grass, grass percent cover. Rodent vectors are as follow: C.FOR, *Chaetodipus formosus*; C.PEN, *Chaetodipus penicillatus*; D.DES, *Dipodomys deserti*; D.MER, *Dipodomys merriami*; D.PAN, *Dipodomys panamintinus*; N.LEP, *Neotoma lepida*; O.TORR, *Onychomys torridus*; P.LON, *Perognathus longimembris*; P.CRI, *Peromyscus crinitus*; P.ERE, *Peromyscus eremicus*; P.MAN, *Peromyscus maniculatus*; P.TRU, *Peromyscus truei*; R.MEG, *Reithrodontomys megalotis*.

profile affects rodent species composition is logical. Direct effects might include appropriate substrates within which to construct burrows (Luna et al. 2002; Romanach et al. 2005), substrates matching in color so as to enhance evasion of predators (Dice 1939; Krupa and Geluso 2000), and particle size that affects seed foraging efficiency (Wasserberg et al. 2005). Soils also may have indirect effects such as providing the proper substrate for important resource plants thereby enhancing productivity (Huerta-Martinez et al. 2004; Ward et al. 1993) and ultimately seed rain that provides a dietary source for many species. Indeed, edaphic characteristics are significant contributors to rodent community structure in this system and better appreciation of the relative contributions of direct and indirect effects of soil microprofile may greatly add to our mechanistic understanding of spatial variation in the distribution and relative abundance of rodents in North American deserts.

Macrohabitat and microhabitat perspectives.—Interesting species-specific patterns emerged from our analyses. For example, *P. truei* exhibited only minor associations with DFA and RDA axes that summarized important variation in terms of rodent species composition. Nonetheless, this species fell out as the most distinct based on the cluster analysis. This species was restricted to high-elevation sites primarily in piñon–juniper woodlands. In fact, Hoffmeister (1981:4) pointed out that “no other species of *Peromyscus*, or any other small rodent, is as exclusively confined to the piñon–juniper belt or occurs as abundantly in it as does *P. truei*.” Although 8 other species occur in this macrohabitat, they tend to do so with relatively low relative abundance and tend not to have strong correlations with microhabitat characteristics found there. Thus, habitat specialization of *P. truei* makes it distinct from

others in the Mojave Desert. Moreover, the low proportional representation of the piñon–juniper macrohabitat likely explains weak associations with major axes of variation defined by RDA and DFA.

Dipodomys merriami exhibited a quite distinct response to microhabitat variables. Although this species occurred in approximately 97% of the communities we examined, it was different from all other species in its negative response to habitat variables. All significant correlations with vegetative characteristics except that with *L. tridentata* were negative, reflecting the well-known affinity of this species for open microhabitats (Rosenzweig and Winakur 1969). This is further demonstrated by the extreme position of this species on the 1st RDA axis. Use of more-open microhabitats has been related to foraging economics (Reichman and Oberstein 1977) or a response to minimize risk of predation (Bowers 1988; Kotler 1984; Price et al. 1984) or competitive interactions (Bowers et al. 1987; M’Closkey 1981; Price 1978). Nonetheless, *D. merriami* grouped with a relatively large assemblage of heteromyids in the cluster analysis and was not highly differentiated from others based on the DFA. These contrasting results highlight differences between microhabitat and macrohabitat perspectives.

Significant differences in relative abundances of rodents among macrohabitats demonstrate this important determinant of community organization in the Mojave Desert. Macrohabitat selection occurs when the precise mix and amount of resources required by an organism are related primarily to discontinuities at larger spatial scales. For example, production of seed and mast consumed by granivores can exhibit more variation among macrohabitats than among microhabitats within a macrohabitat. This is even more true as differences in plant species composition and age structure between macrohabitats increase

TABLE 3.—Results from principal component analysis on 81 perennial plant species. PC refers to a particular principal component, Variance explained refers to the amount of unique variation accounted for by that component, and Cumulative variance refers to the cumulative variation accounted for by a particular PC and all other PCs extracted prior. Gradient represents the interpretation of a particular PC.

PC	Variance explained	Cumulative variance	Gradient
1	33.8	33.8	Creosote to Joshua tree
2	17.6	51.4	Joshua tree/yucca to piñon–juniper
3	11	62.4	Amount of Joshua tree
4	9	71.4	Sage to piñon–juniper
5	7.5	78.8	Saltbush to piñon–juniper
6	4.7	83.5	Yucca to saltbush

(Morris 1987). Macrohabitat variables account for much of the variation embodying density-dependent habitat selection. In many cases macrohabitat associations account for more variation in species relative abundance than quantitative microhabitat variables (Coppeto et al. 2006; Jorgensen and Demarais 1999; Morris 1984, 1987), and in some cases the effect of microhabitat completely disappears once macrohabitat is accounted for (Morris 1984, 1987).

Considerations of macrohabitat distinctions alone can substantively account for spatial variation in rodent species composition. Thus, from a practical perspective, considering only differences among macrohabitats can account for more than the majority of variation in species composition among sites. Although for predictive and mechanistic purposes it is necessary to know the underlying microhabitat characteristics that drive spatial variation in species composition, such highly resolved information may not be necessary to account for major differences in species composition. Alternatively, results from partial RDA demonstrate that microhabitat variables do account for substantive unique variation not shared with macrohabitat distinctions. Indeed, micro- and macrohabitat represent complimentary perspectives that provide insight into variation in rodent species composition in the Mojave Desert.

Spatial and temporal dynamics at the regional scale.—Our results provide a perspective complementary to more typical intensive examinations of single communities, a perspective that can provide valuable insights into the mechanistic bases of community organization. Patterns described here have implications not only to spatial variation in community structure but also the coexistence of species of rodents at regional scales. For example, almost one-half of the species occurred in less than half of the communities. Moreover, the average Spearman rank correlation of pairwise relative abundances was close to 0 ($\bar{X} = 0.041$, 95% confidence interval = -0.032 – 0.114 , upper and lower extremes = -0.65 , 0.79), suggesting that although some relatively strong correlations do exist among species, relative abundances generally are not highly correlated. Idiosyncratic responses of species also are indicated by multivariate analyses. DFA and RDA indicate some concordance among rodent species in terms of microhabitat and macrohabitat preferences. Nonetheless, strong concordance would be indicated if all

TABLE 4.—Results of stepwise multiple regression analysis of the relationship between rodent species abundances and soil and perennial principal components (SPC and PPC, respectively), grass, and annual (ANN) variables.

Dependent variable	Independent variable(s)	Coefficient of determination	P-value
<i>Chaetodipus formosus</i>	SPC1, PPC1	0.471	<0.001
<i>Chaetodipus penicillatus</i>	SPC1	0.237	0.006
<i>Dipodomys deserti</i>	SPC1	0.319	0.001
<i>Dipodomys merriami</i>	PPC1, SPC1, grass, PPC6	0.867	<0.001
<i>Dipodomys panamintinus</i>	PPC1, PPC3	0.325	0.004
<i>Neotoma lepida</i>	PPC3, SPC1, PPC2	0.637	<0.001
<i>Onychomys torridus</i>	PPC2	0.198	0.012
<i>Perognathus longimembris</i>	No variables selected		
<i>Peromyscus crinitus</i>	SPC1, ANN, grass, PPC6	0.513	0.001
<i>Peromyscus eremicus</i>	SPC1, PPC2, PPC1	0.494	<0.001
<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	PPC1, ANN	0.538	<0.001
<i>Peromyscus truei</i>	PPC1, PPC2, PPC6, PPC5, PPC3	0.767	<0.001

species had response vectors (arrows) of similar length and direction. In contrast, response vectors are distributed throughout the space defined by these 2 analyses. Species do not appear to co-occur in a strongly coordinated fashion across this study area. Strong positive covariation would suggest concerted responses of species to spatial variation in environmental conditions across the landscape (Houlahan et al. 2007), whereas strong negative covariation can characterize competitive interactions (Stevens and Willig 2000; Tello et al. 2008) or compensatory dynamics (Goheen et al. 2005). Such a weak pattern of co-occurrence suggests a Gleasonian pattern of species distributions characterized by highly individualistic responses of species to the environment, the same type of pattern that has been demonstrated for other North American deserts (Brown and Kurzius 1987) as well as in comparative analyses of deserts around the world (Kelt et al. 1996).

Low α diversity is thought to be the rule for desert rodent communities, at least in North America (Brown and Kurzius 1987—mean species richness of 202 communities = 3.24). Moreover, local communities even when in close proximity are highly variable in terms of species composition because they do not share many species (Brown and Kurzius 1987), a pattern indicative of high β diversity. Most rodent species in the southwestern deserts were demonstrated to occur in <30% of the communities within their geographic range and almost one-half of all species examined occurred at <10 of 202 examined communities (Brown and Kurzius 1987). Similar patterns were not present in this Mojave Desert system. Species richness was relatively high (mean species richness across 31 communities = 6.29), communities shared many species, and β diversity was relatively low. Differences could be for a number of reasons. For example, many previous data have been collected at low-productivity communities not necessarily characteristic of the entire Mojave Desert. Moreover, even intensive, focused studies in the Mojave have been conducted on low-productivity

communities such as creosote bajadas or dunes (Brown 1973, 1975; Brown and Kurzius 1987; Hafner 1977); only the work of Price et al. (2000) has included higher-productivity habitats such as Joshua tree woodlands and reported a total of 10 species. Another possibility is the greater sampling effort employed here. Each community in our study was characterized using 606 trap-nights of effort. Other studies have typically used less effort and this may have made estimates of α diversity conservative. Lastly, these data were collected following a year of above-average precipitation in the Mojave Desert. Thus, an overall increase in α diversity and resultant decrease in β diversity could be the result of responses to a regional increase in productivity. Nonetheless, such a simple causal link has been questioned, at least in other North American deserts (Brown and Ernest 2002).

As exemplified by patterns of α and β diversity across our study area, the Mojave Desert is a dynamic biotic mosaic. This complexity manifests in other characteristics as well. For example, the Mojave Desert is highly heterogeneous in terms of climate. Temperature and the amount of winter snow vary regularly from north to south and the rain shadow effect creates large differences in precipitation from west to east (Ruffner 1978). Our study area occurs in the central Mojave and is characterized by relatively high precipitation and some of the greatest standing plant biomass in the desert (McAuliffe and McDonald 1995). Climate is temporally heterogeneous and unpredictable as well (Davidowitz 2002). Such variability creates conditions of “feast and famine” in terms of resources available to desert rodents (Polis 1991) that ultimately affects distribution. Based on overlapping species range maps obtained from Patterson et al. (2005), with the Mojave ecoregion defined by Olson et al. (2001), it becomes apparent that most rodent species occurring in the Mojave are not endemic. In fact, representative species occur in other ecoregions and tend to have large geographic distributions that do not overlap the entire Mojave Desert but terminate there (53 of 58 or 91%). Because most species are at the edge of their geographic distribution in the Mojave Desert, such fluctuations in productivity likely correspond to dramatic fluctuations in the distribution of desert rodents in this system. Indeed, this study represents a single point estimate in time and species-habitat relationships are likely to fluctuate as plant species richness and individual plant biomass fluctuates across macrohabitats and within microhabitats in response to variable precipitation. Dispersal-mediated changes in species composition in response to fluctuations in productivity may drive spatial and temporal patterns of community structure. Such spatial and temporal complexity suggests that large landscape-scale studies in general and the burgeoning metacommunity concept (Holyoak et al. 2005; Leibold and Miller 2004; Leibold et al. 2004) in particular may add greatly to our understanding of desert rodent community ecology, especially in the Mojave Desert.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by grants from the National Science Foundation (DEB-0535939) and the Louisiana Board of Regents (LEQSF-2006-09). A. Gates provided invaluable field assistance. We

also thank the National Park Service, especially D. Hughson, for permission to work in the Mojave National Preserve as well as for logistical support. We thank J. Andre and R. Fulton for verifying plant identifications. D. Kelt provided an exceptional review that greatly improved the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- BEATLEY, J. C. 1975. Climates and vegetation pattern across the Mojave/Great Basin Desert transition of southern Nevada. *American Midland Naturalist* 93:53–70.
- BEEVER, E. A., M. HUSO, AND D. A. PYKE. 2006. Multiscale responses of soil stability and invasive plants to removal of non-native grazers from an arid conservation reserve. *Diversity and Distributions* 12:258–268.
- BOWERS, M. A. 1988. Seed removal experiments on desert rodents: the microhabitat by moonlight effect. *Journal of Mammalogy* 69: 201–204.
- BOWERS, M. A., D. B. THOMPSON, AND J. H. BROWN. 1987. The spatial organization of a desert rodent community: food addition and species removal. *Oecologia* 72:77–82.
- BROOKS, M., J. MATCHETT, C. WALLACE, AND T. ESQUE. 2004. Fuels mapping and fire hazard assessment in a desert ecosystem. *Arid Lands Newsletter* 55. <http://ag.arizona.edu/OALS/ALN/aln55/brooks.html>. Accessed 5 January 2008.
- BROWN, J. H. 1973. Species diversity of seed-eating rodents in sand dune habitats. *Ecology* 54:775–787.
- BROWN, J. H. 1975. Geographic ecology of desert rodents. Pp. 315–341 in *Ecology and evolution of communities* (M. L. Cody and J. M. Diamond, eds.). Belknap Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- BROWN, J. H. 1986. The roles of vertebrates in desert ecosystems. Pp. 51–75 in *Pattern and process in desert ecosystems* (W. G. Whitford, ed.). University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- BROWN, J. H., AND S. K. M. ERNEST. 2002. Rain and rodents: complex dynamics of desert consumers. *BioScience* 52:979–987.
- BROWN, J. H., AND M. A. KURZIUS. 1987. Composition of desert faunas: combinations of coexisting species. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 24:227–237.
- BROWN, J. H., AND J. C. MUNGER. 1985. Experimental manipulation of a desert rodent community: food addition and species removal. *Ecology* 66:1545–1563.
- CHEW, R. M., AND B. B. BUTTERWORTH. 1964. Ecology of rodents in Indian Cove (Mojave Desert) Joshua Tree National Monument, California. *Journal of Mammalogy* 45:203–225.
- COPPELO, S. A., D. A. KELT, D. H. VAN VUREN, J. A. WILSON, AND S. BIGELOW. 2006. Habitat associations of small mammals at two spatial scales in the northern Sierra Nevada. *Journal of Mammalogy* 87:402–413.
- CORBALAN, V. 2006. Microhabitat selection by murid rodents in the Monte Desert of Argentina. *Journal of Arid Environments* 65: 102–110.
- DAVIDOWITZ, G. 2002. Does precipitation variability increase from mesic to xeric biomes? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 1: 143–154.
- DICE, L. R. 1939. Variation in the cactus-mouse, *Peromyscus eremicus*. *Contributions from the Laboratory of Vertebrate Genetics, University of Michigan* 8:1–27.
- GANNON, W. K., R. S. SIKES, AND THE ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MAMMALOGISTS. 2007. Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the use of wild animals in research. *Journal of Mammalogy* 88:809–823.

- GARLAND, T., JR., AND W. G. BRADLEY. 1984. Effects of highway on Mojave Desert rodent populations. *American Midland Naturalist* 111:47–56.
- GOHEEN, J. R., E. P. WHITE, S. K. M. ERNEST, AND J. H. BROWN. 2005. Intra-guild compensation regulates species richness in desert rodents. *Ecology* 86:567–573.
- HAFNER, M. S. 1977. Density and diversity in Mojave desert rodent and shrub communities. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 46:925–938.
- HARDY, R. 1945. The influence of types of soil upon the local distribution of some mammals in southwestern Utah. *Ecological Monographs* 15:71–108.
- HESKE, E. J., J. H. BROWN, AND S. MISTRY. 1994. Long-term experimental study of a Chihuahuan Desert rodent community: 13 years of competition. *Ecology* 75:438–445.
- HOFFMEISTER, D. F. 1981. *Peromyscus truei*. *Mammalian Species* 161:1–5.
- HOLYOAK, M., R. D. HOLT, AND M. A. LEIBOLD (EDS.). 2005. *Metacommunities: spatial dynamics and ecological communities*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- HOULAHAN, J. E., ET AL. 2007. Compensatory dynamics are rare in natural communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104:3273–3277.
- HUERTA-MARTINEZ, F. M., J. A. VAZQUEZ-GARCIA, E. GARCIA-MOYA, L. LOPEZ-MATA, AND H. VAQUERA-HUERTA. 2004. Vegetation ordination at the southern Chihuahuan Desert (San Luis Potosi, Mexico). *Plant Ecology* 174:79–87.
- JACKSON, D. A. 1993. Stopping rules in principal components analysis: a comparison of heuristical and statistical approaches. *Ecology* 74:2204–2214.
- JONGMAN, R. H. G., C. J. F. TER BRAAK, AND O. F. R. VAN TONGEREN. 1995. *Data analysis in community and landscape ecology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- JORGENSEN, E. E., AND S. DEMARAIS. 1999. Spatial scale dependence of rodent habitat use. *Journal of Mammalogy* 80:421–429.
- KELT, D. A., ET AL. 1996. Community structure of desert small mammals: comparisons across four continents. *Ecology* 77:746–761.
- KENAGY, G. J. 1973. Daily and seasonal patterns of activity and energetics in a heteromyid rodent community. *Ecology* 54:1201–1219.
- KENAGY, G. J., AND G. A. BARTHOLOMEW. 1985. Seasonal reproductive patterns in five coexisting California rodent species. *Ecological Monographs* 55:371–397.
- KOTLER, B. 1984. Risk of predation and the structure of desert rodent communities. *Ecology* 65:689–701.
- KRASNOV, B., G. SHENBROT, I. KHOKHLOVA, AND E. IVANITSKAYA. 1996. Spatial patterns of rodent communities in the Ramon erosion cirque, Negev Highlands, Israel. *Journal of Arid Environments* 32:319–327.
- KRUPA, J. J., AND K. N. GELUSO. 2000. Matching the color of excavated soil: cryptic coloration in the plains pocket gopher (*Geomys bursarius*). *Journal of Mammalogy* 81:86–96.
- LANDE, R. 1996. Statistics and partitioning of species diversity and similarity among multiple communities. *Oikos* 76:5–13.
- LEGENDRE, P., AND L. LEGENDRE. 1998. *Numerical ecology*. 2nd ed. Elsevier Press, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- LEIBOLD, M. A., AND T. E. MILLER. 2004. From metapopulations to metacommunities. Pp. 133–150 in *Ecology, genetics, and evolution of metacommunities* (I. A. Hanski and O. E. Gaggioti, eds.). Elsevier Press, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- LEIBOLD, M. A., ET AL. 2004. The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. *Ecology Letters* 7: 601–613.
- LUNA, F., C. D. ANTINUCCI, AND C. BUSCH. 2002. Digging energetics in the South American rodent *Ctenomys talarum* (Rodentia, Ctenomyidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 80:2144–2149.
- MACMAHON, J. A. 1979. North American deserts: their floral and faunal components. Pp. 21–82 in *Arid land ecosystems* (D. W. Goodall, R. A. Perry, and K. M. W. Howes, eds.). Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- McAULIFFE, J. R., AND E. V. McDONALD. 1995. A Piedmont landscape in the eastern Mojave Desert: examples of linkages between biotic and physical components. *San Bernardino County Museum Association Quarterly* 42:53–63.
- M'CLOSKEY, R. T. 1981. Microhabitat use in coexisting desert rodents: the role of population density. *Oecologia* 50:310–315.
- MORRIS, D. W. 1984. Patterns and scale of habitat use in two temperate zone small mammal faunas. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 62:1540–1547.
- MORRIS, D. W. 1987. Ecological scale and habitat use. *Ecology* 68:362–369.
- OLSON, D. M., ET AL. 2001. *Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on earth*. *BioScience* 51:933–938.
- PARMENTER, R. R., AND J. A. MACMAHON. 1983. Factors determining the abundance and distribution of rodents in a shrub-steppe ecosystem—the role of shrubs. *Oecologia* 59:145–156.
- PATTERSON, B. D., AND J. H. BROWN. 1991. Regionally nested patterns of species composition in granivorous rodent assemblages. *Journal of Biogeography* 18:395–402.
- PATTERSON, B. D., ET AL. 2005. *Digital distribution maps of the mammals of the Western Hemisphere, version 2.0*. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia.
- PERES-NETO, P. R., P. LEGENDRE, S. DRAY, AND D. BORCARD. 2006. Variation partitioning of species data matrices and comparison of fractions. *Ecology* 87:2614–2625.
- POLIS, G. A. 1991. Desert communities: an overview of patterns and processes. Pp. 1–26 in *The ecology of desert communities* (G. A. Polis, ed.). University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- PRICE, M. V. 1978. Role of microhabitat in structuring desert rodent communities. *Ecology* 59:910–921.
- PRICE, M. V., N. M. WASER, AND T. A. BASS. 1984. Effects of moonlight on microhabitat use by desert rodents. *Journal of Mammalogy* 65:353–356.
- PRICE, M. V., N. M. WASER, AND S. A. McDONALD. 2000. Elevational distribution of kangaroo rats (genus *Dipodomys*): long-term trends at a Mojave Desert site. *American Midland Naturalist* 144:352–361.
- REICHMAN, O. J., AND D. OBERSTEIN. 1977. Selection of seed distribution types by *Dipodomys merriami* and *Perognathus amplus*. *Ecology* 58:636–643.
- REICHMAN, O. J., AND M. V. PRICE. 1993. Ecological aspects of heteromyid foraging. Pp. 539–574 in *Biology of the Heteromyidae* (H. H. Genoways and J. H. Brown, eds.). Special Publication 10, The American Society of Mammalogists.
- ROGOVIN, K. A., G. I. SHENBROT, A. V. SUROV, AND M. IDRIS. 1994. Spatial organization of a rodent community in the western Raasthan Desert (India). *Mammalia* 58:243–260.
- ROMANACH, S. S., E. W. SEABLOOM, O. J. REICHMAN, W. E. ROGERS, AND G. N. CAMERON. 2005. Effects of species, sex, age, and habitat on geometry of pocket gopher foraging tunnels. *Journal of Mammalogy* 86:750–756.
- ROOT, J. J., E. E. JORGENSEN, AND S. DEMARAIS. 2000. Soil texture uses by sympatric rats on the White Sands dune complex. *Journal of Mammalogy* 45:533–535.
- ROSENZWEIG, M. L. 1991. Habitat selection and population interactions: the search for mechanism. *American Naturalist* 137:S5–S28.

- ROSENZWEIG, M. L., AND J. WINAKUR. 1969. Population ecology of desert rodent communities: habitats and environmental complexity. *Ecology* 50:558–572.
- RUFFNER, J. A. 1978. *Climates of the states: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration narrative summaries, tables and maps for each state with overview of state climatologist programs*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Detroit, Michigan.
- SCOTT, D. M., AND N. DUNSTONE. 2000. Environmental determinants of the composition of desert-living rodent communities in the northeast Badia region of Jordan. *Journal of Zoology (London)* 251:481–494.
- SHENBROT, G. I. 1992. Spatial structure and niche patterns of a rodent community in the south Bukhara Desert (Middle Asia). *Ecography* 15:347–357.
- SHENBROT, G. I., AND K. A. ROGOVIN. 1995. Temporal variation in spatial organization of a rodent community in the southwestern Kyzylkum Desert (Middle Asia). *Ecography* 18:370–383.
- SOKAL, R. R., AND F. J. ROHLF. 1995. *Biometry*. 3rd ed. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York.
- STEVENS, R. D., AND M. R. WILLIG. 2000. Community structure, abundance, and morphology. *Oikos* 88:48–56.
- TELLO, J. S., R. D. STEVENS, AND C. W. DICK. 2008. Patterns of species occurrence and density compensation: a test for interspecific competition in bat ectoparasite infracommunities. *Oikos* 117: 693–702.
- WARD, D., L. OLSVIGWHITTAKER, AND M. LAWES. 1993. Vegetation–environment relationships in a Negev Desert erosion cirque. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 4:83–94.
- WASSERBERG, G., Z. ABRAMSKY, N. VALDIVIA, AND B. KOTLER. 2005. The role of vegetation characteristics and foraging substrate in organizing a centrifugal gerbil community. *Journal of Mammalogy* 86:1009–1014.
- WHITFORD, W. G. 2002. *Ecology of desert systems*. Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- YOUNG, M. H., E. V. McDONALD, T. G. CLADWELL, S. G. BENNER, AND D. G. MEADOWS. 2004. Hydraulic properties of desert soil chronosequence in the Mojave Desert, USA. *Vadose Zone Journal* 3:956–963.

Submitted 1 June 2008. Accepted 26 August 2008.

Associate Editor was John L. Koprowski.

APPENDIX I

Significant relationships among environmental variables (plants and soil particle size) and rodent species abundances. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients describe degree of association between a particular rodent species' relative abundance and microhabitat characteristics (2 right columns). Stepwise multiple regression is based on microhabitat variables that were significantly correlated with rodent relative abundances (middle 3 columns). Variables in bold accounted for a significant amount of unique variation in a particular principal component (PC) and loaded into the stepwise multiple regression.

Species/environmental variable	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R ²	P-value	Standardized β	r	P-value
<i>Chaetodipus formosus</i>	0.671	<0.001			
<i>Eriogonum inflatum</i>			0.559	0.710	<0.001
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>			0.354	0.434	0.015
6.3–12.5 mm			0.290	0.528	0.002
50–120 mm				0.653	<0.001
25–50 mm				0.646	<0.001
12.5–25 mm				0.588	<0.001
<1.4 mm				-0.496	0.005
<i>Atriplex hymenelytra</i>				0.460	0.009
<i>Encelia farinosa</i>				0.460	0.009
<i>Opuntia basilaris</i>				0.407	0.023
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>				-0.395	0.028
<i>Ephedra</i> cf. <i>trifurca</i>				0.391	0.030
<i>Chaetodipus penicillatus</i>	0.639	<0.001			
<i>Argemone munita</i>			0.605	0.745	0.000
1.4–3.18 mm			-0.357	-0.594	0.000
<i>Machaeranthera canescens</i>				0.625	0.000
3.18–4.75 mm				-0.547	0.001
<1.4 mm				0.532	0.002
<i>Stephanomeria</i>				0.509	0.003
4.75–6.3 mm				-0.441	0.013
<i>Dipodomys deserti</i>	0.988	<0.001			
<i>Petalonyx thurberi</i>			-0.404	0.678	<0.001
<i>Machaeranthera canescens</i>			1.235	0.964	<0.001
1.4–3.18 mm			-0.057	-0.596	<0.001
<1.4 mm			0.064	0.610	<0.001
<i>Stephanomeria</i>				0.733	<0.001
<i>Argemone munita</i>				0.701	<0.001
3.18–4.75 mm				-0.546	0.001
4.75–6.3 mm				-0.492	0.005
6.3–12.5 mm				-0.433	0.015
<i>Dipodomys merriami</i>	0.754	<0.001			
<1.4 mm			0.451	0.593	<0.001
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>			0.537	0.697	<0.001
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>			-0.228	-0.603	<0.001
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>				-0.619	<0.001
<i>Echinocereus engelmannii</i>				-0.651	<0.001
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				-0.654	<0.001
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>				-0.572	0.001
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				-0.555	0.001
<i>Prunus fasciculata</i>				-0.533	0.002
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>				0.532	0.002
4.75–6.3 mm				-0.531	0.002
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				-0.527	0.002
<i>Yucca baccata</i>				-0.525	0.002
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				-0.520	0.003
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				-0.508	0.004
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				-0.506	0.004
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>				-0.493	0.005
6.3–12.5 mm				-0.490	0.005
3.18–4.75 mm				-0.482	0.006
<i>Opuntia phaeacantha</i>				-0.454	0.010
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>				-0.438	0.014
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>				-0.437	0.014
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>				-0.433	0.015

APPENDIX I.—Continued.

Species/environmental variable	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R^2	P -value	Standardized β	r	P -value
<i>Opuntia basilaris</i>				-0.408	0.023
<i>Fallugia paradoxa</i>				-0.401	0.025
<i>Pinus monophylla</i>				-0.400	0.026
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>				-0.390	0.030
>120 mm				-0.386	0.032
50–120 mm				-0.378	0.036
<i>Verbena gooddingii</i>				-0.377	0.037
<i>Rhus trilobata</i>				-0.377	0.037
<i>Artemisia ludoviciana</i>				-0.377	0.037
<i>Pellaea mucronata</i>				-0.377	0.037
<i>Quercus turbinella</i>				-0.377	0.037
<i>Baccharis sergiloides</i>				-0.374	0.038
<i>Coleogyne ramosissima</i>				-0.372	0.039
<i>Dipodomys panamintinus</i>	0.745	<0.001			
<i>Chaetopappa ericoides</i>			0.494	0.396	0.027
<i>Tetradymia stenolepis</i>			0.408	0.537	0.002
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>			0.392	0.580	0.001
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>			0.260	0.527	0.002
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>				0.568	0.001
1.4–3.18 mm				0.538	0.002
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>				-0.468	0.008
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.442	0.013
25–50 mm				-0.399	0.026
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>				0.396	0.027
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>				0.375	0.037
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>				-0.374	0.038
<i>Neotoma lepida</i>	0.723	0.001			
<i>Opuntia basilaris</i>			0.414	0.530	0.002
<i>Physalis hederifolia</i>			0.319	0.380	0.035
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>			0.349	0.647	0.000
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>			0.305	0.633	0.000
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>				0.588	0.001
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				0.553	0.001
3.18–4.75 mm				0.535	0.002
<i>Yucca shidigera</i>				0.509	0.003
4.75–6.3 mm				0.453	0.011
<i>Lycium andersonii</i>				0.450	0.011
<i>Echinocereus engelmannii</i>				0.444	0.012
<1.4 mm				-0.433	0.015
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				0.428	0.016
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>				0.426	0.017
1.4–3.18 mm				0.424	0.018
<i>Encelia virginensis</i>				0.413	0.021
<i>Opuntia echinocarpa</i>				0.374	0.038
<i>Ferocactus cylindraceus</i>				0.368	0.042
<i>Onychomys torridus</i>	0.499	<0.001			
<i>Krascheninnikovia lanata</i>			0.538	0.504	0.004
<i>Tetradymia stenolepis</i>			0.400	0.365	0.043
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>			-0.320	-0.410	0.022
<i>Adenophyllum cooperi</i>				0.453	0.011
>120 mm				-0.404	0.024
<i>Senecio flaccidus</i>				0.400	0.026
12.5–25 mm				-0.383	0.033
25–50 mm				-0.381	0.034
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				-0.378	0.036
<i>Perognathus longimembris</i>	0.399	0.001			
<i>Mirabilis multiflora</i>			0.419	0.398	0.026
<i>Datura wrightii</i>			0.388	0.421	0.018
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>			-0.338	-0.382	0.034
Unknown sp. 2				0.398	0.026

APPENDIX I.—Continued.

Species/environmental variable	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R^2	P -value	Standardized β	r	P -value
<i>Peromyscus crinitus</i>	0.968	<0.001			
<i>Atriplex confertifolia</i>			-4.289	0.591	<0.001
<i>Ephedra cf. trifurca</i>			4.749	0.685	<0.001
<i>Sphaeralcea ambigua</i>			0.142	0.481	<0.001
<i>Eriogonum inflatum</i>			0.126	0.764	<0.001
<i>Opuntia basilaris</i>			0.124	0.730	<0.001
<i>Atriplex hymenelytra</i>				0.741	<0.001
<i>Encelia farinosa</i>				0.741	<0.001
>120 mm				0.660	<0.001
50–120 mm				0.622	<0.001
<i>Psoralea fremontii</i>				0.591	<0.001
25–50 mm				0.441	0.013
12.5–25 mm				0.422	0.018
<1.4 mm				-0.389	0.031
1.4–3.18 mm				-0.356	0.049
<i>Peromyscus eremicus</i>	0.625	<0.001			
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>			0.408	0.379	0.035
<i>Eriogonum inflatum</i>			0.397	0.529	0.002
<i>Menodora scoparia</i>			0.313	0.459	0.009
<i>Opuntia basilaris</i>			0.260	0.559	0.001
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				0.546	0.001
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				0.526	0.002
<i>Encelia virginensis</i>				0.510	0.003
<i>Ferocactus cylindraceus</i>				0.488	0.005
<i>Salvia mohavensis</i>				0.459	0.009
Unknown sp. 3				0.459	0.009
Unknown sp. 4				0.459	0.009
<i>Mirabilis pumila</i>				0.459	0.009
<i>Viguiera parishii</i>				0.455	0.010
<i>Lotus rigidus</i>				0.454	0.010
<1.4 mm				-0.443	0.013
<i>Yucca baccata</i>				0.439	0.013
<i>Sphaeralcea ambigua</i>				0.437	0.014
<i>Lycium andersonii</i>				0.428	0.016
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>				0.419	0.019
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				0.416	0.020
<i>Baileya multiradiata</i>				0.412	0.021
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>				0.410	0.022
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>				0.383	0.033
<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i>				0.380	0.035
12.5–25 mm				0.362	0.045
<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>	0.745	<0.001			
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>			0.544	0.727	<0.001
<i>Adenophyllum cooperi</i>			0.319	0.480	0.006
Mean annuals			0.254	0.479	0.006
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>			0.222	0.490	0.005
3.18–4.75 mm				0.588	0.001
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>				-0.566	0.001
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				0.543	0.002
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>				0.542	0.002
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>				-0.541	0.002
1.4–3.18 mm				0.526	0.002
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>				0.520	0.003
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				0.515	0.003
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>				0.461	0.009
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>				0.451	0.011
4.75–6.3 mm				0.447	0.012
<i>Yucca baccata</i>				0.442	0.013
Unknown sp. 2				0.402	0.025
<i>Mirabilis multiflora</i>				0.402	0.025
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>				0.385	0.032

APPENDIX I.—Continued.

Species/environmental variable	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R^2	P -value	Standardized β	r	P -value
<i>Lycium andersonii</i>				0.373	0.039
<i>Coleogyne ramosissima</i>				0.371	0.040
<i>Senecio flaccidus</i>				0.356	0.049
<i>Peromyscus truei</i>	0.899	<0.001			
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>			0.626	0.886	<0.001
<i>Echinocereus engelmannii</i>			0.218	0.430	0.016
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>			0.234	0.736	0.000
<i>Opuntia phaeacantha</i>			0.170	0.541	0.002
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>				0.824	0.000
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				0.745	0.000
<i>Ephedra viridis</i>				0.665	0.000
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>				0.659	0.000
<i>Fallugia paradoxa</i>				0.637	0.000
<i>Yucca baccata</i>				0.620	0.000
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				0.592	0.000
<i>Pinus monophylla</i>				0.562	0.001
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				0.553	0.001
<i>Quercus turbinella</i>				0.552	0.001
<i>Artemisia ludoviciana</i>				0.552	0.001
<i>Verbena gooddingii</i>				0.552	0.001
<i>Rhus trilobata</i>				0.552	0.001
<i>Pellaea mucronata</i>				0.552	0.001
>120 mm				0.500	0.004
<i>Prunus fasciculata</i>				0.483	0.006
<1.4 mm				-0.466	0.008
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.443	0.013
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				0.442	0.013
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>				-0.385	0.032
<i>Atriplex canescens</i>				0.377	0.036
<i>Reithrodontomys megalotis</i>	1.000				
<i>Opuntia phaeacantha</i>			0.907	0.357	0.049
<i>Chaetopappa ericoides</i>			0.453	0.891	<0.001
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>				0.891	<0.001
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>				0.570	0.001
Unknown sp. 1				0.428	0.016
<i>Escobaria vivipara</i>				0.423	0.018
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				0.408	0.023
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.386	0.032
<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i>				0.362	0.046

APPENDIX II

Relationships of perennial plant species to perennial principal components (PCs). Species listed for each PC were significantly correlated with that axis. Species in bold accounted for a significant amount of unique variation in a particular PC and loaded into the stepwise multiple regression.

Perennial PC/plant species	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R^2	P -value	Standardized β	r	P -value
Perennial PC1	0.995	<0.001			
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>			-0.629	-0.880	<0.001
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>			0.099	0.600	<0.001
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>			0.238	0.768	<0.001
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>			0.101	0.665	<0.001
<i>Yucca baccata</i>			0.232	0.828	<0.001
<i>Prunus fasciculata</i>			0.143	0.421	0.018
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>			-0.094	-0.756	<0.001
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>			0.055	0.450	0.001
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>			0.048	0.607	<0.001
<i>Coleogyne ramosissima</i>				0.570	0.001
<i>Echinocereus engelmannii</i>				0.582	0.001
<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i>				0.430	0.016
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.558	0.001
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				0.741	<0.001
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>				0.484	0.006
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				0.596	<0.001
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				0.461	0.009
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				0.554	0.001
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>				0.461	0.009
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				0.659	<0.001
Perennial PC2	0.954	<0.001			
<i>Fallugia paradoxa</i>			0.856	0.851	<0.001
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>			-0.167	-0.396	0.027
<i>Yucca shidigera</i>			-0.200	-0.388	0.031
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>			0.500	0.598	<0.001
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>			-0.324	0.407	0.023
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>			-0.182	0.464	0.008
<i>Artemisia ludoviciana</i>				0.840	<0.001
<i>Baccharis sergiloides</i>				0.557	0.001
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.402	0.025
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				0.481	0.006
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				0.740	<0.001
<i>Opuntia phaeacantha</i>				0.806	<0.001
<i>Pellaea mucronata</i>				0.840	<0.001
<i>Pinus monophylla</i>				0.842	<0.001
<i>Prunus fasciculata</i>				0.744	<0.001
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>				0.791	<0.001
<i>Quercus turbinella</i>				0.840	<0.001
<i>Rhus trilobata</i>				0.840	<0.001
<i>Verbena gooddingii</i>				0.840	<0.001
Perennial PC3	0.910	<0.001			
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>			0.407	0.804	<0.001
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>			0.311	0.754	<0.001
<i>Yucca shidigera</i>			0.343	0.700	<0.001
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>			0.210	0.512	0.003
<i>Acacia greggii</i>				0.380	0.035
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>				0.480	0.006
<i>Krameria</i> spp.				0.456	0.010
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>				0.567	0.001
<i>Opuntia parishii</i>				0.487	0.005
Unknown sp. 5				0.487	0.005
<i>Tetradymia stenolepis</i>				0.663	<0.001
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>				0.406	0.023
Perennial PC4	0.835	<0.001			
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>			-0.688	-0.521	0.003
<i>Prunus fasciculata</i>			0.557	0.501	0.004

APPENDIX II.—Continued.

Perennial PC/plant species	Regression			Pearson correlation	
	Adjusted R^2	P -value	Standardized β	r	P -value
<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i>			-0.262	-0.358	0.048
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>			0.248	0.417	0.020
<i>Artemisia ludoviciana</i>				0.686	<0.001
<i>Baccharis sergiloides</i>				0.487	0.005
<i>Chaetopappa ericoides</i> ^a				-0.521	0.003
<i>Fallugia paradoxa</i>				0.664	<0.001
<i>Opuntia chlorotica</i>				0.645	<0.001
<i>Opuntia phaeacantha</i>				0.481	0.006
<i>Pellaea mucronata</i>				0.686	<0.001
<i>Pinus monophylla</i>				0.680	<0.001
<i>Purshia tridentata</i>				0.527	0.002
<i>Quercus turbinella</i>				0.686	<0.001
<i>Verbena gooddingii</i>				0.686	<0.001
<i>Rhus trilobata</i>				0.686	<0.001
Perennial PC5	0.920	<0.001			
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>			0.622	0.620	<0.001
<i>Yucca shidigera</i>			0.395	0.418	0.019
<i>Atriplex polycarpa</i>			-0.314	-0.502	0.004
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>			0.218	0.604	<0.001
<i>Acacia greggii</i>			0.195	0.413	0.021
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>				0.466	0.008
<i>Chaetopappa ericoides</i>				0.466	0.008
<i>Datura wrightii</i>				-0.360	0.047
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>				0.367	0.042
<i>Ephedra viridis</i>				0.427	0.017
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>				0.586	0.001
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>				0.421	0.018
<i>Opuntia acanthocarpa</i>				0.519	0.003
<i>Opuntia echinocarpa</i>				0.393	0.029
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i>				0.364	0.044
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>				0.388	0.031
Perennial PC6	0.807	<0.001			
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>			0.730	0.812	<0.001
<i>Atriplex canescens</i>			0.301	0.410	0.022
<i>Atriplex polycarpa</i>			-0.230	-0.394	0.028
<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i>				0.521	0.003
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>				0.562	0.001
<i>Ephedra viridis</i>				0.516	0.003
<i>Gutierrezia microcephala</i>				0.671	<0.001
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>				0.473	0.007
<i>Lycium andersonii</i>				0.573	0.001
<i>Lycium cooperi</i>				0.475	0.007
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>				0.633	<0.001
<i>Mirabilis multiflora</i>				0.407	0.023
<i>Salazaria mexicana</i>				0.368	0.041
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>				0.613	<0.001
Unknown sp. 2				0.407	0.023
<i>Yucca baccata</i>				0.635	<0.001

^a Variable not considered because of high multicollinearity.