

1 **Title:** Fractal triads efficiently sample ecological diversity and processes across spatial scales

2 **Authors:** Elizabeth G. Simpson^{1*}, & William D. Pearse^{1,2}

3 **1** Department of Biology & Ecology Center, Utah State University, 5305 Old Main Hill, Logan, Utah,
4 USA **2** Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Buckhurst
5 Rd., Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 7PY UK

6 Corresponding author: *elizabeth.simpson@usu.edu

7 **Keywords:** spatial scaling, eco-phylogenetics, slope-aspect, sampling design, community ecology,
8 diversity-environment relationships

9 **Abstract**

10 The relative influence of ecological assembly processes, such as environmental filtering, competition,
11 and dispersal, vary across spatial scales. Changes in phylogenetic and taxonomic diversity across
12 environments provide insight into these processes, however, it is challenging to assess the effect of
13 spatial scale on these metrics. Here, we outline a nested sampling design that fractally spaces sam-
14 pling locations to concentrate statistical power across spatial scales in a study area. We test this
15 design in northeast Utah, at a study site with distinct vegetation types (including sagebrush steppe
16 and mixed conifer forest), that vary across environmental gradients. We demonstrate the power of
17 this design to detect changes in community phylogenetic diversity across environmental gradients
18 and assess the spatial scale at which the sampling design captures the most variation in empiri-
19 cal data. We find clear evidence of broad-scale changes in multiple features of phylogenetic and
20 taxonomic diversity across aspect. At finer scales, we find additional variation in phylo-diversity,
21 highlighting the power of our fractal sampling design to efficiently detect patterns across multiple
22 spatial scales. Thus, our fractal sampling design and analysis effectively identify important envi-
23 ronmental gradients and spatial scales that drive community phylogenetic structure. We discuss
24 the insights this gives us into the ecological assembly processes that differentiate plant communities
25 found in northeast Utah.

26 1 Introduction

27 Ecological community assembly processes, such as environmental filtering (Kraft et al. 2015), com-
28 petition (Mayfield and Levine 2010), dispersal (Vellend 2010), and facilitation (Valiente-Banuet and
29 Verdú 2007), determine the diversity and structure of plant communities. Ecological processes op-
30 erate at and across spatial scales: density-dependent biotic interactions tend to occur at local scales;
31 environmental filtering often constrains species at community scales; and biogeographic processes
32 define the species pool at regional to continental scales (Weiher et al. 1998; Cavender-Bares et al.
33 2009). These general trends simplify complex interactions between these processes that result in
34 observable patterns, and many processes, such as dispersal, explicitly operate across multiple spatial
35 scales (Chave 2013). Temporal scales similarly affects our understanding of process from pattern
36 (Cavender-Bares et al. 2009; Wiens 2018) and at longer time-scales evolutionary processes — like
37 selection, drift, and speciation — often play a key role in ecological assembly (Vellend 2010).

38 Phylogenetic diversity metrics represent the evolutionary history of an assemblage and provide good
39 proxies of an assemblage’s ecological structure, despite known difficulties in inferring ecological
40 processes from changes in phylogenetic pattern across environment (Webb et al. 2002; Cavender-
41 Bares et al. 2009; Mayfield and Levine 2010; Mouquet et al. 2012). These metrics are affected by
42 both the spatial grain, or sampled resolution, and spatial extent, or total study area of a study
43 (Wiens 1989; Levin 1992; Rahbek 2005). Making the spatial grain and extend of a study larger
44 increases (and eventually saturates) the number of species captured by that study (Crawley and
45 Harral 2001; Adler et al. 2005; Fridley et al. 2005). For phylodiversity metrics, increasing spatial
46 extent results in a larger species pool and phylogenetically clustered assemblages [where co-occurring
47 species are more related than expected by chance, Cavender-Bares et al. (2006) and Swenson et
48 al. (2006)]. Increasing a study’s spatial grain has a similar effect — assemblages shift from being
49 overdispersed (containing species less related to one-another than expected by chance) to being
50 clustered or phylogenetically random (Swenson et al. 2007). While these are general, and not
51 universal, patterns, it is uncontroversial to state that a study’s spatial grain and extent affect
52 observed diversity (Cavender-Bares et al. 2009; Vamosi et al. 2009; Pearse et al. 2013). However, it
53 is often challenging to know the spatial scales that influence a system’s diversity patterns *a priori*,

54 and thereby pick an appropriate grain and extent to best measure ecological processes of interest
55 (Wheatley and Johnson 2009; Jackson and Fahrig 2015).

56 Fractal sampling designs provide a potential solution to the problem of knowing the appropriate
57 spatial scale at which to measure biodiversity by systematically spacing sampling locations at in-
58 creasingly closer or farther distances (Ewers et al. 2011; Marsh and Ewers 2013). Fractal sampling
59 captures information more efficiently than grid or transect designs (Kallimanis et al. 2002) for a
60 comparatively smaller time, effort, and financial input per sampling location than many other sam-
61 pling strategies (Halley et al. 2004; Albert et al. 2010; Luzuriaga et al. 2012). Additionally, this
62 design does not need to be oriented across a linear environmental gradient already known to af-
63 fect diversity, making them useful for exploratory work in comparison with traditional straight-line
64 transects (Marsh and Ewers 2013).

65 However, current fractal designs cannot be extended or intensified to include additional spatial
66 scales while maintaining initial sampling locations. Given that we often do not know, *a priori*, the
67 appropriate spatial scale for sampling, it would be valuable for a fractal sampling design to have the
68 flexibility to add or exclude spatial scales as needed. We outline, in Figure 1, a equilateral-triangle-
69 based fractal sampling design, whereby we nest additional fractals within an existing layout. This
70 means that, Marsh and Ewers (*c.f.* 2013), we add two new points, not three, to nest triangles
71 within each other. This allows us to intensify or expand the design as needed, to assess questions
72 at different spatial scales, while maintaining temporal continuity among sampling locations.

73 We use this fractal sampling design to assess changes in plant phylogenetic and species diversity,
74 and inferred ecological processes, across aspect and elevation in northeastern Utah. The multi-scale
75 nature of this design allows us to couple this diversity-environment assessment with a variance
76 components analysis to pinpoint the spatial scale(s) at which species and phylogenetic diversity
77 varied most. We demonstrate the statistical power of fractally-nested designs across spatial scales,
78 along with their ability to efficiently detect changes in diversity across environmental gradients and
79 flexibility to address broader and finer spatial scales as needed.

2 Material and Methods

We aimed to test the ability of nested fractal sampling to quantify how phylogenetic and species diversity vary across environment, whether this variation is scale dependent, and at what scale that variation drives differences in diversity between assemblages. Below, we outline our approach to address each of these questions in turn. First, we demonstrated how a fractal sampling design provides more statistical power across spatial scales than random sampling. Then, we assessed how diversity metrics vary across elevation and aspect by surveying vascular assemblages using this sampling design in the field. Finally, we assessed whether spatial scale influences these metrics, by partitioning the variance associated with calculating that metric across the spatial scales in our fractal design. All software packages referenced below are for R (R Core Team 2020), and all data collected and code to reproduce analyses are openly released (Supplementary material Appendix 2, 3).

2.1 Study site, description, and survey methods

Our field site, located along the Right Hand Fork of the Logan River in Cache National Forest, UT (41.77003, -111.59168), contains a variety of potentially interacting environmental gradients (Figure 1). The elevation spans 1719–2106 meters from riparian to ridge-line habitat. Numerous cliffs, rocks, and up to 54° slopes add fine-scale variation across the site. Overall vegetation type reflects aspect direction; sagebrush steppe on south-facing slopes and conifer forest on north-facing slopes (Lowry et al. 2007). Local land-use includes recreation along two trails that cross the site and permitted livestock grazing in about half of the plots (USDA Forest Service 2018).

We determined sampling location coordinates *a priori* at our site using a fractal sampling design (Figure 1) and navigated to these locations using a GPS, accurate to within 10 meters. At each 1 m² plot we comprehensively surveyed each vascular plant species' percent canopy cover by dividing each plot into four quadrants and using a 10 x 10 0.25 m² grid to standardize cover estimates. Plants were identified using local herbarium resources, identification experts, and field guides. During June-August 2017, we established and surveyed 27 plots in three triad levels at 1990, 663, and 221 meters apart. During June-October 2018, we added an additional 54 plots in a 4th triad level at

107 74 meters apart) and surveyed all 78 plots. Due to safety concerns (the sites were on or close to
108 cliffs), we did not survey 3 of the 81 plots in 2018. We report here results from the 2018 survey, but
109 release the surveys, sampling locations, and meta-data for both the 2017 and 2018 surveys along
110 with replicated analysis for the 2017 data (Supplementary material Appendix 2,3). All trends are
111 qualitatively identical between the two surveys (Figures 3 and Supplementary material Appendix
112 1 Figure A2). To represent each plot's topography, we measured aspect (in degrees, converted to
113 a north-south gradient using a cosine function) using a compass, the slope (in degrees, average
114 of uphill and downhill from the plot) using a clinometer, and the elevation (in meters) using the
115 altimeter in a GPS.

116 2.2 Overview of our nested fractal sampling design

117 We outline our sampling design here, and in Figure 1. First, we placed three sampling locations
118 at the vertices of an equilateral triangle whose side length spanned the spatial extent of the study
119 area (c. 1990 meters). From each of the points, we added two additional sampling locations at the
120 vertices of three new equilateral triangles whose sides were $\frac{1}{3}$ the length of the first triad. We
121 continued to nest sampling locations inward to add a third and (in 2018) a fourth triad level. By
122 only adding two sites as each triad level (spatial scale) is added, instead of three (*c.f.* Marsh and
123 Ewers 2013, where each successive triad is centered at what would be the higher level's site), we
124 saved 3^1 plots for the 2nd triad level, 3^2 plots for the 3rd triad level, and thus when we added a
125 fourth triad level (in 2018) to our existing field system we saved 3^3 (27) plots. The improved the
126 efficiency of our fractal sampling design gave us temporal continuity in sampling locations as we
127 investigated a finer spatial scale in our study area.

128 Here we provide a brief overview of how our sampling design concentrates plot comparisons across
129 spatial scales to effectively address multi-scale questions; see Marsh and Ewers (2013) for a formal
130 review of the statistical power of fractal designs. In Figure 2, we compare the pairwise distances
131 among plots for fractal designs (in red and blue) with a distribution of randomly-placed designs (in
132 grey). Fractal designs concentrate pairwise distances (or comparisons) of plots at specific spatial
133 scales (in red, Figure 2), sacrificing comparability (and so statistical power) at some distances (in

134 blue, Figure 2). This maximizes information content across all the spatial scales within the study's
135 spatial extent. Conversely, random sampling designs diffusely compare sites across spatial scales,
136 concentrating information at the median spatial distance within the study's spatial extent.

137 **2.3 Diversity across environment**

138 We calculated the diversity of the plant assemblage at each plot using two species-level and three
139 phylogenetic diversity metrics that provide different insights about community structure and the
140 potential drivers of community assembly (Tucker et al. 2017). Our first two metrics, species richness
141 and Faith's PD (Faith 1992), both capture the richness of diversity at each site. Faith's PD corre-
142 lates with species richness because it adds the phylogenetic branch lengths of all species present in
143 a community, however it often gives more information about a community because it accounts for
144 relatedness among species. Other metrics— SES_{MPD} and SES_{MNTD} —place the relative phyloge-
145 netic divergence of species at a site in the context of the wider species pool (Webb 2000; Kembel
146 2009). This provides a specific context for how the each sampled community may have been as-
147 sembled from this possible species pool, as opposed to drawing from a larger phylogeny which may
148 include taxa that are not relevant to the sampled community. We also assessed a standard metric
149 of diversity, Simpson's diversity index (Simpson 1949), to test the effectiveness of this metric to
150 represent changes in diversity across environment. All metrics were calculated using pez (Pearse
151 et al. 2015), picante (Kembel et al. 2010), vegan (Oksanen et al. 2019), and the phylogenetic tree
152 generated from Zanne et al. (2014) using `pez::congeneric.merge`. We modeled community variation
153 across gradients using an additive linear model of each diversity metric across aspect and elevation
154 for all 78 surveyed plots. To test the ability of our design to detect changes in diversity-environment
155 relationships at different spatial scales, we re-fit these models using only the 26 plots from the 3rd
156 triad level and only the 8 plots from the 2nd triad level.

157 **2.4 The effect of spatial scale on diversity**

158 We assessed whether our design captured different information at different spatial scales, using a
159 variance components analysis to contrast how variance partitions across our nested triads. We

160 calculated the amount of variation in each diversity metric attributable to a given triad level in
161 our fractal design using variance components analysis following Crawley (2012). We fit a Bayesian
162 linear hierarchical model with default priors using rstanarm (Goodrich et al. 2020), structured to
163 sequentially partition the variance present in the modeled diversity metric from the largest (first)
164 triad through to the smallest (fourth) triad. We fit our model in a Bayesian rather than frequentist
165 framework to avoid singular fits associated with fitting the largest triad level, which contains only
166 three groups. To ensure that our Bayesian approach to estimating variance was robust, we compared
167 our observed data to underlying data whose nested structure was randomly broken. Thus, in 999
168 bootstrap randomizations, we randomly permuted sites' locations and performed the same variance
169 components analysis. We ranked our observed (real, unpermuted) data within these bootstrap
170 randomization, significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, to statistically test whether each biodiversity metric showed
171 an unexpected spatial pattern at that triad level.

172 **3 Results**

173 We used our fractal sampling design to assess changes in biodiversity metrics across environment
174 and differing spatial scales. We identified a total of 120 species within our plots at RHF and
175 surveyed a mean of 11 species/plot within a range of 5 to 21 species/plot. All phylogenetic diversity
176 metrics (PD, SES_{MPD} , and SES_{MNTD}) varied significantly across aspect; SES_{MPD} also varied
177 across elevation (Figure 3). For SES_{MNTD} , sampling at the 2nd and 3rd triad levels (*i.e.*, with
178 only 8 and 26 sites) would have been sufficient to detect these relationships in the 2018 survey
179 (Figure 3). We only needed the 3rd triad level to detect changes in SES_{MPD} and Faith's PD for
180 the 2018 survey as well. We found similar trends in the 2017 data, detecting changes in SES_{MNTD}
181 and Faith's Pd across aspect at the 3rd triad level (Supplementary Material Appendix 1 Figure
182 A2).

183 For each diversity metric calculated, we used a variance components analysis to assess the variance
184 associated with each spatial scale in our fractal sampling design (Figure 4). Species richness and
185 Faith's PD significantly associated with the largest, 1st triad level, accounting for 75% and 84% of
186 the variance in each of these metrics. Additionally, Faith's PD significantly associated with variance
187 in both other triads, 2% and 11% of the variance at the 2nd and 3rd levels respectively. In a similar
188 pattern, species richness associated with 6% of the variance at the 3rd triad level. Both SES_{MNTD}
189 and SES_{MPD} pick up larger amounts of variance across spatial scales. They account for 27% and
190 34% of variance (SES_{MNTD}) and 16% and 16% of variance (SES_{MPD}) at the variation 2nd and
191 3rd triad levels respectively.

192 4 Discussion

193 Our fractal sampling design captured empirical changes in multiple plant biodiversity metrics across
194 different environmental gradients and spatial scales. Among the phylogenetic diversity metrics we
195 calculated, Faith's PD, a metric that includes information about the overall evolutionary history of
196 species in a community, detected the most information about community differences, at the largest
197 spatial scale we studied. Conversely, SES_{MNTD} , a metric that focuses on more recent evolutionary
198 history, detected the most information about how assemblages change at smaller spatial scales.
199 Below, we discuss how this design, coupled with modeling change across environment and a variance
200 components analysis, provides a practical and effective way to assess how diversity and inferred
201 ecological processes change across space and environment.

202 4.1 Abiotic conditions dominate broad-scale assembly

203 We predominantly detected changes in assemblage structure across aspect. We show shifts from
204 phylogenetically clustered assemblages (containing closely related species) on south-facing slopes
205 (less PD, negative SES_{MNTD} and SES_{MPD} ; Figure 3) to more distantly related assemblages on
206 north-facing slopes (more PD, near-zero to positive SES_{MNTD} and SES_{MPD} ; Figure 3). Studies of
207 species diversity across aspect find that communities on south-facing slopes tend to contain fewer
208 species than north-facing slopes (Cantlon 1953; Olivero and Hix 1998; Fridley 2009), while we found
209 no difference in the number of species on opposing slopes. However, they also find that south-facing
210 assemblages tend to have more consistently similar species compositions, compared to north-facing
211 assemblages.

212 In the Northern hemisphere, greater sun exposure on south-facing slopes intensifies heat, plant tissue
213 damage, and reduces soil moisture in an already arid climate (Lowry et al. 2007), which likely limits
214 the number and type of species able to grow and persist (Keddy 1992; Weiher et al. 1998). Our
215 phylogenetic diversity metrics align with this constraint leading to lower phylogenetic diversity (less
216 PD) on south-facing slopes. Additionally, that the metrics we calculated that account for species
217 richness (SES_{MNTD} and SES_{MPD}) change across this gradient demonstrates that environment
218 constrains phylogenetic diversity to clades whose members can tolerate these conditions.

219 Conversely, north-facing slopes receive less sun exposure which results in cooler temperatures and
220 better soil moisture retention — a more favorable set of growth conditions in an otherwise resource-
221 limited environment (Moeslund et al. 2013). The phylogenetic clustering we observe on south-facing
222 slopes does not inherently indicate environmental filtering (Mayfield and Levine 2010). However,
223 we observe changes in diversity across environment aligning with studies that demonstrate that
224 environment constrains (and thereby filters) phylogenetic (Webb 2000; Helmus et al. 2007), species
225 (Luzuriaga et al. 2012; Laliberté et al. 2014), and functional diversity (Luzuriaga et al. 2012; Maire
226 et al. 2012; Bello et al. 2013).

227 Change in phylogenetic structure across environment at Right Hand Fork provides evidence that
228 environmental filtering plays a role in community assembly across these plots. We recognize that
229 we have not experimentally quantified whether species presence or absence relies solely on abiotic
230 conditions (as is necessary to prove environmental filtering; Kraft et al. 2015), but we do show that
231 changes in environment map onto changes in ecological communities. By combining our spatially
232 explicit structure of our sampling design with a variance components analysis, we can, however,
233 precisely pinpoint the spatial scales at which environment is likely to be structuring community
234 assembly. For Faith's PD and species richness, the largest spatial scale (1st, spaced at 1990 meters),
235 captured the most variance in these metrics (84% and 75% respectively). Surprisingly, however,
236 these values are significantly less variation than our null expectations, and we suggest this surprising
237 result stems from two opposing forces. First, species richness (and so Faith's PD, which is often
238 correlated with it, Tucker et al. (2017).) is likely driven by processes such as lineage diversification
239 that operate across broader spatial scales than we measure here. We are currently extending the
240 sampling of our fractal system further in an attempt to capture additional processes operating
241 across ecological timescales. Second, while these metrics are less sensitive to finer-scale processes
242 than our other metrics (see below), they do still detect some pattern, thus reducing the variance
243 explained at the broadest scale.

244 The similarity in variance partitioning patterns between Faith's PD and species richness shows that
245 generally speaking, they represent similar information about communities in this system (Tucker
246 and Cadotte 2013). However, we were able to detect changes across environment with Faith's PD

247 but not species richness. This, coupled with our fractal design’s ability to capture slightly more
248 variance in Faith’s PD than species richness (9%), supports the use of phylogenetic diversity as a
249 more predictable and informative metric about assemblage composition.

250 4.2 Small-scale biotic assembly

251 Within the context of broad-scale assemblage differences driven by aspect, we found evidence for
252 differences in biotic interactions at more local scales that demonstrate further community differen-
253 tiation. Phylogenetic diversity metrics that account for the source pool of potential species (and
254 SES_{MPD}), capture variance across multiple, more local scales. Both SES_{MPD} and SES_{MNTD}
255 detected the most variation in assemblage structure at finer scales (SES_{MNTD} , 2nd and 3rd triad
256 level, 27% and 34% respectively, SES_{MPD} , 2nd and 3rd triad level, 16% and 16% respectively; Fig-
257 ure 4)). Since these phylodiversity metrics are calculated using a source pool of potential species,
258 they account for broad-scale structure when assessing local context (Webb et al. 2002; Kembel
259 2009), unlike our other metrics. We suggest this makes these metrics more sensitive to differen-
260 tiation at and across local spatial scales, giving us a more nuanced picture of local variation in
261 diversity. Perhaps most striking, SES_{MNTD} demonstrates strong spatial structure at the middle
262 two scales (2nd and 3rd triad) in our sampling design, accounting for close to $2/3$ of the variance
263 in this metric. The Brownian motion model of trait evolution assumed by many studies of phylo-
264 genetic assemblage more strongly predicts that close-relatives’ traits (Letten and Cornwell 2015).
265 This pattern of SES_{MNTD} being more strongly predictable than SES_{MPD} likely stems from the
266 inherently greater predictability of close-relatives’ niches under such models. This insight, along
267 with assumed phylogenetic conservatism, supports SES_{MNTD} as a strong diversity metric to detect
268 assemblage differences at and across the local spatial scales we assessed at Right Hand Fork.

269 4.3 Conclusion

270 We conclude that changes in phylogenetic diversity and inferred ecological process across environ-
271 ment and spatial scale can be efficiently detected using a fractal design and variance components
272 analysis. Phylogenetic diversity metrics gave us more information about assemblage composition

273 than species richness alone. Faith's PD accounted for broader patterns of species presence in
274 response to overall environment, while and SES_{MPD} reflected how biotic interactions generate lo-
275 calized environmental heterogeneity. Our spatially explicit design allows systematic comparison of
276 patterns and hypotheses at multiple spatial scales. An advantage of our fractal approach is that
277 it is impartial with regard to any particular environmental gradient, and can be intensified and
278 extended after establishment, which we leveraged to examine variation at a smaller spatial scale
279 than initially sampled. This flexibility allows us to continue to investigate questions about the re-
280 lationship between diversity and environment and the way spatial scale affects those relationships.
281 For example, this sampling framework could be extended to study other drivers of community as-
282 semblage across a landscape such as soil temperature and texture. Systematic exploration of this
283 system via a fractal sampling design will continue to allow us to investigate diversity across scale
284 and environment using this powerful and efficient sampling design.

285 **Declarations**

286 Acknowledgements – We would like to thank the members of the Pearse Lab for their feedback and
287 support and Mary Barkworth and Michael Piep for extensive assistance with learning to identify
288 Utah plants.

289 Funding – EGS is supported in part by the Office of the Vice President and the College of Science at
290 Utah State University through a Presidential Doctoral Research Fellowship. WDP and the Pearse
291 lab are funded by NSF ABI-1759965, NSF 18 EF-1802605, and USDA Forest Service agreement
292 18-CS-11046000-041.

293 Statement of Authorship – All authors contributed to data collection, analysis, and manuscript
294 preparation but EGS did the majority of data collection.

295 Data accessibility - All data released in supplementary materials.

296 Conflict of Interest - The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

297 References

- 298 Adler, P. B. et al. 2005. Evidence for a general species–time–area relationship. – *Ecology* 86: 2032–
299 2039.
- 300 Albert, C. H. et al. 2010. Sampling in ecology and evolution—bridging the gap between theory and
301 practice. – *Ecography* 33: 1028–1037.
- 302 Bello, F. d. et al. 2013. Hierarchical effects of environmental filters on the functional structure of
303 plant communities: a case study in the French Alps. – *Ecography* 36: 393–402.
- 304 Cantlon, J. E. 1953. Vegetation and microclimates on north and south slopes of Cushtunk Moun-
305 tain, New Jersey. – *Ecol. Monogr.* 23: 241–270.
- 306 Cavender-Bares, J. et al. 2006. Phylogenetic structure of Floridian plant communities depends on
307 taxonomic and spatial scale. – *Ecology* 87: S109–S122.
- 308 Cavender-Bares, J. et al. 2009. The merging of community ecology and phylogenetic biology. – *Ecol.*
309 *Lett.* 12: 693–715.
- 310 Chave, J. 2013. The problem of pattern and scale in ecology: what have we learned in 20 years? –
311 *Ecol. Lett.* 16: 4–16.
- 312 Crawley, M. J. 2012. The R book. – John Wiley & Sons.
- 313 Crawley, M. and J. Harral. 2001. Scale dependence in plant biodiversity. – *Science* 291: 864–868.
- 314 Ewers, R. M. et al. 2011. A large-scale forest fragmentation experiment: the Stability of Altered
315 Forest Ecosystems Project. – *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* 366: 3292–3302.
- 316 Faith, D. P. 1992. Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. – *Biol. Conserv.* 61: 1–10.

- 317 Fridley, J. D. 2009. Downscaling climate over complex terrain: high finescale (< 1000 m) spatial
318 variation of near-ground temperatures in a montane forested landscape (Great Smoky Mountains).
319 – *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* 48: 1033–1049.
- 320 Fridley, J. D. et al. 2005. Connecting fine-and broad-scale species–area relationships of southeastern
321 US flora. – *Ecology* 86: 1172–1177.
- 322 Goodrich, B. et al. 2020. rstanarm: Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan. – R package
323 version 2.21.1.
- 324 Halley, J. et al. 2004. Uses and abuses of fractal methodology in ecology. – *Ecol. Lett.* 7: 254–271.
- 325 Helmus, M. R. et al. 2007. Phylogenetic measures of biodiversity. – *Am. Nat.* 169: E68–E83.
- 326 Jackson, H. B. and L. Fahrig. 2015. Are ecologists conducting research at the optimal scale? – *Glob.*
327 *Ecol.* 24: 52–63.
- 328 Kallimanis, A. S. et al. 2002. Accuracy of fractal dimension estimates for small samples of ecological
329 distributions. – *Landsc. Ecol.* 17: 281–297.
- 330 Keddy, P. A. 1992. Assembly and response rules: two goals for predictive community ecology. – *J.*
331 *Veg. Sci.* 3: 157–164.
- 332 Kembel, S. W. 2009. Disentangling niche and neutral influences on community assembly: assessing
333 the performance of community phylogenetic structure tests. – *Ecol. Lett.* 12: 949–960.
- 334 Kembel, S. W. et al. 2010. Picante: R tools for integrating phylogenies and ecology. – *Bioinformatics*
335 26: 1463–1464.
- 336 Kraft, N. J. et al. 2015. Community assembly, coexistence and the environmental filtering metaphor.
337 – *Funct. Ecol.* 29: 592–599.
- 338 Laliberté, E. et al. 2014. Environmental filtering explains variation in plant diversity along resource
339 gradients. – *Science* 345: 1602–1605.
- 340 Letten, A. D. and W. K. Cornwell. 2015. Trees, branches and (square) roots: why evolutionary
341 relatedness is not linearly related to functional distance. – *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 6: 439–444.
- 342 Levin, S. A. 1992. The problem of pattern and scale in ecology: the Robert H. MacArthur award
343 lecture. – *Ecology* 73: 1943–1967.
- 344 Lowry JH, J. et al. 2007. Land cover classification and mapping. – *Southwest Regional Gap Analysis*
345 *Final Report*. Moscow, ID: U.S. Geological Survey, Gap Analysis Program: 14–38.

- 346 Luzuriaga, A. L. et al. 2012. Assemblage of a semi-arid annual plant community: abiotic and biotic
347 filters act hierarchically. – *PLOS ONE* 7: e41270.
- 348 Maire, V. et al. 2012. Habitat filtering and niche differentiation jointly explain species relative
349 abundance within grassland communities along fertility and disturbance gradients. – *New Phytol.*
350 196: 497–509.
- 351 Marsh, C. J. and R. M. Ewers. 2013. A fractal-based sampling design for ecological surveys quan-
352 tifying β -diversity. – *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 4: 63–72.
- 353 Mayfield, M. M. and J. M. Levine. 2010. Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the phyloge-
354 netic structure of communities. – *Ecol. Lett.* 13: 1085–1093.
- 355 Moeslund, J. E. et al. 2013. Topographically controlled soil moisture drives plant diversity patterns
356 within grasslands. – *Biodivers. Conserv.* 22: 2151–2166.
- 357 Mouquet, N. et al. 2012. Ecophylogenetics: advances and perspectives. – *Biol. Rev.* 87: 769–785.
- 358 Oksanen, J. et al. 2019. vegan: Community Ecology Package. – R package version 2.5-6.
- 359 Olivero, A. M. and D. M. Hix. 1998. Influence of aspect and stand age on ground flora of southeastern
360 Ohio forest ecosystems. – *Plant Ecol.* 139: 177–187.
- 361 Pearse, W. D. et al. 2013. Barro Colorado Island’s phylogenetic assemblage structure across fine
362 spatial scales and among clades of different ages. – *Ecology* 94: 2861–2872.
- 363 Pearse, W. D. et al. 2015. Pez: Phylogenetics for the environmental sciences. – *Bioinformatics* 31:
364 2888–2890.
- 365 R Core Team. 2020. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. – R Foundation
366 for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
- 367 Rahbek, C. 2005. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness patterns.
368 – *Ecol. Lett.* 8: 224–239.
- 369 Simpson, E. H. 1949. Measurement of diversity. – *Nature* 163: 688–688.
- 370 Swenson, N. G. et al. 2006. The problem and promise of scale dependency in community phyloge-
371 netics. – *Ecology* 87: 2418–2424.
- 372 Swenson, N. G. et al. 2007. The influence of spatial and size scale on phylogenetic relatedness in
373 tropical forest communities. – *Ecology* 88: 1770–1780.

- 374 Tucker, C. M. and M. W. Cadotte. 2013. Unifying measures of biodiversity: understanding when
375 richness and phylogenetic diversity should be congruent. – *Divers. Distrib.* 19: 845–854.
- 376 Tucker, C. M. et al. 2017. A guide to phylogenetic metrics for conservation, community ecology and
377 macroecology. – *Biol. Rev.* 92: 698–715.
- 378 USDA Forest Service. 2018. Logan Canyon Cattle Allotment Annual Operating Instructions. –
379 *Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest*.
- 380 Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center. 2007. AGRC 5m auto-correlated DEM from 1m
381 GSD NAIP. – URL: <https://gis.utah.gov/data/elevation-and-terrain/>.
- 382 Valiente-Banuet, A. and M. Verdú. 2007. Facilitation can increase the phylogenetic diversity of plant
383 communities. – *Ecol. Lett.* 10: 1029–1036.
- 384 Vamosi, S. M. et al. 2009. Emerging patterns in the comparative analysis of phylogenetic community
385 structure. – *Mol. Ecol.* 18: 572–592.
- 386 Vellend, M. 2010. Conceptual synthesis in community ecology. – *Q. Rev. Biol.* 85: 183–206.
- 387 Webb, C. O. 2000. Exploring the phylogenetic structure of ecological communities: an example for
388 rain forest trees. – *Am. Nat.* 156: 145–155.
- 389 Webb, C. O. et al. 2002. Phylogenies and community ecology. – *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 33:
390 475–505.
- 391 Weiher, E. et al. 1998. Community assembly rules, morphological dispersion, and the coexistence
392 of plant species. – *Oikos*: 309–322.
- 393 Wheatley, M. and C. Johnson. 2009. Factors limiting our understanding of ecological scale. – *Ecol.*
394 *Complex.* 6: 150–159.
- 395 Wiens, J. A. 1989. Spatial scaling in ecology. – *Funct. Ecol.* 3: 385–397.
- 396 Wiens, J. J. 2018. Patterns of local community composition are linked to large-scale diversification
397 and dispersal of clades. – *Am. Nat.* 191: 184–196.
- 398 Zanne, A. E. et al. 2014. Three keys to the radiation of angiosperms into freezing environments. –
399 *Nature* 506: 89.

400 Figure Captions




Figure 1: **Overview of fractal sampling design.** (a) A conceptual overview of how to build a fractal sampling design, in this case of three levels—‘triads’. First, choose three, initial plots ([1], yellow), at the vertices of an equilateral triangle that spans the greatest distance of interest at the study site. These sampling locations are the first and largest ‘triad’, and so the three plots in the first ‘triad level’. To build the second triad level, add two additional plots at the vertices of new equilateral triangles whose sides are $\frac{1}{3}$ the length of the first triad. Critically, these new plots ([2], orange) are nested *within* the first triad level, and thus only two additional sites are needed because none of the outer site positions need be moved (*c.f.* Marsh and Ewers 2013). The third triad level ([3], dark orange) is analogously established within the second triad level. (b) Fractal sampling design applied at Right Hand Fork. We established and surveyed an initial set of three triad levels of plots in summer 2017 and re-surveyed them in 2018 (warm colors that match triad levels in (a)). To assess whether we had sampled at a fine enough spatial scale to capture changes in diversity across environment, we added and surveyed a 4th triad level during summer 2018 (blue). The nested nature of our design allowed us to add these plots within the sampling arrangement, allowing us to continue monitoring from the third triad level sites. Distance between plots in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th triad levels are 1990, 663, 221, and 74 meters respectively (*i.e.*, as in (a), each triad is nested in third). Due to safety concerns, we did not (re-)survey some plots in 2018 (black). Background grayscale shows elevation based on five-meter digital elevation model (Utah Automated Geographic Reference Center 2007).




Figure 2: **Our fractal sampling design concentrates statistical power across spatial scales (red dots) compared to random sampling designs with the same number of sampling locations (gray dots).** (a) 2-triad, 9 plot, (b) 3-triad, 27 plot, and (c) 4-triad, 81 plot fractal sampling designs, built as described in Figure 1, all show the number of comparisons possible across a maximum sampling distance of 1900 meters for a fractal sampling design (red and blue dots) compared to the distribution of comparisons possible for 1000 randomly chosen sampling locations (gray dots, 95% confidence intervals shown as bars). Points in red demonstrate where there are more comparisons for a given distance class than the random sampling design distribution; (a) $5/9$ plots, (b) $13/27$ plots, and (c) $20/81$ plots. Conversely, points in blue demonstrate fewer comparisons for a given distance class than the distribution of random sampling locations. The layout of the fractal sampling points is embedded in the upper right corner of each plot.




Figure 3: **Changes in phylogenetic diversity across environment detected at different spatial scales by our fractal sampling design.** (a) SES_{MNTD} , (b) Faith's PD, and (c) SES_{MPD} were greater on more northern aspects, and (d) SES_{MPD} decreased as elevation increased. While models of diversity across environment were tested for all triad levels (see Fig. 1) only significant models are plotted (with 95% confidence intervals). We detected a change in SES_{MNTD} aspect and the 4th–2nd triad level and a change in SES_{MPD} across aspect at the 4th and 3rd triad level. While changes in Faith's PD across aspect and SES_{MPD} across elevation were detectable only at the finest sampling of the fourth triad level SES_{MNTD} was more sensitive and thus able to detect changes with less sampling. Points are color-coded based on their triad level; blue is the 4th level with 78 surveyed locations, dark orange is the 3rd level with 26 surveyed locations, light orange is the 2nd level with 8 surveyed locations, and yellow is the 1st level with 3 surveyed locations.




Figure 4: **Spatial scales, represented by the fractal sampling design, capture variance in phylodiversity metrics.** For each diversity metric, (a) SES_{MNTD} , (b) Faith's PD, (c) SES_{MPD} , (d) species richness, the red dots show the percent of variance captured by each successive spatial scale in our fractal sampling design, calculated using a variance components analysis. Randomized diversity values for each triad level (999 iterations) shown as gray violin plots. Filled red circles indicate percent of variance values that are significantly different from the randomized diversity variance at each triad level (violin plots). These spatial scales directly account for a portion of the variance in each of these diversity metrics. P-values for calculated percentages of variance that are significantly different from the random distribution of potential variation captured by each triad level: SES_{MNTD} (2nd = 0.002, 3rd < 0.001, 4th = 0.001), Faith's PD (1st = 0.001, 2nd = 0.048, 3rd < 0.001), SES_{MPD} (2nd = 0.010, 3rd = 0.021, 4th = 0.004), species richness (1st = 0.026, 3rd = 0.011).