

2011

(Editorial) A long term view of rare plant reintroduction. A response to Godefroid et al. 2011: How successful are plant reintroductions?

Matthew A. Albrecht
Missouri Botanical Garden


Edward O. Guerrant Jr.
Portland State University, guerran@pdx.edu

Joyce Maschinski
Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden

Kathryn Kennedy
Missouri Botanical Garden

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/esm_fac

 Part of the [Other Environmental Sciences Commons](#), [Plant Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sustainability Commons](#)

Citation Details

Albrecht, Matthew A.; Guerrant, Edward O. Jr.; Maschinski, Joyce; and Kennedy, Kathryn, "(Editorial) A long term view of rare plant reintroduction. A response to Godefroid et al. 2011: How successful are plant reintroductions?" (2011). *Environmental Science and Management Faculty Publications and Presentations*. 32.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/esm_fac/32

This Post-Print is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Science and Management Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Response to Godefroid et al. (2011): How successful are plant reintroductions?

A long-term view of rare plant reintroduction

Drawing on a literature review and survey questionnaires, Godefroid et al. (2011) explore how demographic, genetic, and ecological factors influence success rates in plant reintroductions and present valuable recommendations to improve plant reintroduction success. But we are concerned that the generally dismal picture they paint may erroneously be viewed by conservation practitioners, land managers, and policy makers as being broadly representative of reintroduction in general and cause hesitation or even rejection of reintroduction as a beneficial conservation tool.

Acknowledging time constraints inherent in their analyses, they characterize a 52% survival rate of outplanted individuals over four years as being quite low and assert that short-term trends in vital rates strengthen their conclusion that “reintroduction is generally unlikely to be a successful conservation strategy as currently conducted.” We question the predictive value of such short-term trends for evaluating long-term success. Based on empirical data and simulation modeling, initial short-term population decline is the expectation (Guerrant and Fielder, 1996). This demographic cost of reintroduction can be substantial, even in populations projected to grow rapidly once the survivors reach reproductive maturity. Reintroduced population persistence greatly depends upon life history, type and size of propagule planted (Abrecht and Maschinski 2011). Without additional information on the taxa and life histories represented in their figures, conclusions about project trajectories are premature.

The outcome of any review will depend upon the species, timescales, nature of studies and specific data considered. To archive and synthesize data on plant reintroductions, the Center for Plant Conservation (CPC) established the *CPC International Reintroduction Registry* (CPCIRR, http://www.centerforplantconservation.org/reintroduction/MN_ReintroductionEntrance.asp) recently reviewed in Maschinski and Haskins (2011). Surprisingly, CPCIRR data are largely independent of Godefroid et al. (2011); only 4% of the combined species ($n = 336$) were common to both datasets. Of the 49 reintroductions in the CPCIRR with known status as of 2009, 92% survived, 76% had reached reproductive maturity, 33% had produced a next generation, and in 16% the next generation had reproductive individuals (Guerrant 2011). Fates of the remaining reintroduced populations could not be determined due to lack of monitoring information. Thus, we, too, encourage sustained, long-term monitoring and reporting of reintroduced populations.

The CPCIRR data show that reintroduced populations can have long-term persistence (24+ years), and documenting population sustainability requires more than four years, especially for long-lived perennials (Maschinski and Haskins 2011). In our rapidly changing world, reintroduced populations can increase a species' distribution and abundance, contribute to metapopulation dynamics, and yield insight into the species biology, thereby reducing extinction risk.

Although there are undoubtedly biases in reporting successes over failed projects, as Godefroid et al. (2011) correctly highlight, emerging long-term results from plant reintroductions indicate they hold much promise as a conservation tool. We encourage conservation practitioners to consult published guidelines (see Maschinski and Haskins 2011 and references therein) to improve the chance of reintroduction success and to report failed and successful projects. Conducting reintroductions as experiments is an effective and efficient way to identify specific techniques and management treatments that enhance population persistence. Godefroid et al (2011) report a number of factors associated with greater success. Of 89 CPCIRR reintroduction projects with adequate information, 70% were designed to test specific hypotheses on factors influencing reintroduction success. These help diagnose the cause(s) of failed reintroductions and improve future attempts, which is nearly impossible when reintroductions are conducted without an experimental framework (Godefroid et al. 2011).

Reintroduction science is making demonstrable progress, but it is still a young science. The ability of reintroduction to contribute to endangered species recovery is significant, and enhanced when it is part of larger, integrated strategies that encompass in situ and ex situ practices.

References

- Albrecht M. A., and J. Maschinski. 2011. Influence of founder population size, propagule stages, and life history on the survival of reintroduced plant populations. In *Plant reintroduction in a changing climate: promises and perils*. eds J. Maschinski, K.E. Haskins. Island Press, Washington DC.
- Godefroid, S., Piazza, C., Rossi, G., Buord, S., Stevens, A.-D., Agurajua, R., Cowell, C., Weekley, C.W., Vogg, G., Iriondo, J.M., Johnson, I., Dixon, B., Gordon, D., Magnanon, S., Valentin, B., Bjureke, K., Koopman, R., Vicens, M., Virevaire, M., Vanderborgh, T., 2011. How successful are plant species reintroductions? *Biological Conservation* 144, 672-682.
- Guerrant, E.O. Jr., 2011. Characterizing two decades of rare plant reintroductions, In *Plant reintroduction in a changing climate: promises and perils*. eds J. Maschinski, K.E. Haskins. Island Press, Washington DC.
- Guerrant, EO Jr., and PL Fiedler 2004. Accounting for Sample Decline During Ex Situ Storage and Reintroduction. Pages 365-385 In Guerrant, EO Jr, K Havens, and M Maunder (eds.) *Ex Situ Plant Conservation: Supporting Species Survival in the Wild*. Island Press. Covelo.
- Maschinski, J., Haskins, K.E., 2011. *Plant reintroduction in a changing climate: promises and perils*. Island Press Washington DC.

*Matthew A. Albrecht
Center for Conservation & Sustainable Development
Missouri Botanical Garden
P.O. Box 299
St. Louis, MO 63166-0299
United States
Tel: +1 3145770262; fax: +1 5770847
E-mail address: matthew.albrecht@mobot.org*

*Edward O. Guerrant Jr.
Berry Botanic Garden, Portland, OR, USA
Current address:
Rae Selling Berry Seed Bank and Plant Conservation Program
Department of Environmental Science and Management
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR. 97207, USA*

*Joyce Maschinski
Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden, Coral Gables, FL, USA*

*Kathryn Kennedy
Center for Plant Conservation, Missouri Botanical Garden, St Louis, MO.*