

The effects of having different unmanaged (wild) plant species in California vineyards and how they influence spider abundance, taxonomic diversity, and guild diversity

Culler, Brooke M., F. Fogarty, E. E. Jochim, E. K. Meineke



PRESENTER:
Brooke Culler
Cal Poly Humboldt



Plant-Dwelling Spiders Care Where They Live: Higher Diversity and Greater Abundance On Native Plant Species, Specific Plant Types, and in Areas With Vegetation Richness

	TOTAL	Continuum	Matthiasson	Staglin
All Vegetation Spp.	33	9	16	16
Native Spp.	18	30	8	9
Non-Native Spp.	14	0	22	21
Spiders Collected	237	61	121	55
Spiders (WV.)	221	54	115	52
Spiders (G.V.)	16	7	6	3
Spider Family Count	10	10	9	7
Spider Genera Count	30	20	17	15
Spider Guild Count	6	6	6	6
WV Transect 1 Veg. Spp.	-	5	9	8
WV Transect 2 Veg. Spp.	-	6	10	10

Guild Type	TOTAL	Grapevines	Wild Veg	Continuum	Matthiasson	Staglin
Active	19	3	16	3	15	1
Ambushers	25	2	23	12	7	6
Foliage Runners	36	3	33	12	10	14
Orb Weavers	45	1	44	12	15	18
Space Web Weavers	67	0	67	11	50	6
Stalkers	42	7	35	8	25	9

Spider Family	TOTAL	Grapevines	Wild Veg
Anyphaenidae	25	0	25
Araneidae	45	1	44
Clubionidae	11	3	8
Dictynidae	60	0	60
Oxyopidae	19	3	16
Philodromidae	3	1	2
Salticidae	42	7	35
Therididae	7	1	6
Thomisidae	22	1	21
[UNIDENTIFIED]	3	0	3

Funding made possible by:

The National Science Foundation, DBI #1950536

UC DAVIS

NSF

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:
Sincerest thanks to Dr. Frank Fogarty, whose constant guidance helped me see this project through from start to finish, and for his remarkable patience when explaining the nuances of statistics that made this data as accurate as possible.

To Dr. Emily Meineke, whose mentorship during my summer at UC Davis inspired me every day, for her genuine love of science and invertebrates, and for giving me full flexibility to design my own project.

To Dave Eng, for assisting me with specimen collection and sharing his enthusiasm for entomology.

To Emma Jochim, for introducing me to the basics of spider identification.

Finally, insurmountable thanks to the owners of the three sampled vineyards, for trusting me with their land, crops, and precious spiders.

Scan me to view a slideshow of all the spider specimens! There are some lookers in there.

BACKGROUND:
Spiders are very effective biocontrol agents, particularly when their communities are more diverse. In the progression of more sustainable and natural agriculture, supporting spider communities in California vineyards has potential to keep vines safer from pests. The viability of this idea is unstudied for the Central Valley of California, where both wine production and biodiversity are highly concentrated. I decided to observe spider taxonomic and guild richness, as well as abundance, on crop and non-crop vegetation in vineyards, while recording a site's plant species richness and assigning each of those species to be native or not. I set out to determine what factors support more spiders, more spider diversity, and ultimately, how those factors may encourage spider communities on the vines themselves.

- METHODS**
- Assigned two plots for three vineyard sites. Each plot consisted of two transects: one for wild vegetation and one for a nearby grapevine row.
 - Collected spiders using a beat sheet and aspirator from 15 individual plants (or cluster of grape leaves) per transect.
 - For wild vegetation, determined plant species and classified it as native or non-native.
 - Counted spider specimens, identified all via microscope to genus level, identified sex, and assigned guild type as described by *Cardoso et al 2011*.
 - Performed Poisson linear regression for all predictor and response variables.

