1	
2	Restored eelgrass (Zostera marina L.) as a refuge for epifaunal biodiversity in mid-Western
3	Atlantic coastal bays
4	
5	Jonathan S. Lefcheck ^{1†} , Scott R. Marion ² , Robert J. Orth ¹
6	
7	¹ Virginia Institute of Marine Science, The College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, VA 23062,
8	USA
9	² Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Marine Resources Program, Newport, OR 97365, USA
10	
11	⁺ Corresponding author. Email: <u>jslefche@vims.edu</u> . Phone: +1 804 684 7150. Mailing address: PO
12	Box 1346, Rt 1208 Greate Rd, Gloucester Point, VA 23062, USA
13	

14 <u>Running head:</u> Eelgrass restoration enhances biodiversity

15 Abstract:

16 As nearshore ecosystems are increasingly degraded by human activities, active restoration is a 17 critical strategy in ensuring the continued provision of goods and services by coastal habitats. After 18 being absent for nearly six decades, over 1800 ha of the foundational species eelgrass (Zostera 19 marina L.) has been successfully reestablished in the coastal bays of the mid-western Atlantic, USA, 20 but nothing is known about the recovery of associated animal communities in this region. Here, we determine the patterns and drivers of functional recovery in epifaunal invertebrates associated 21 with the restored eelgrass habitat from 2001-2013. After less than a decade, the invertebrate 22 23 community in the restored bed was richer, more even, and exhibited greater variation in functional 24 traits than a nearby reference bed. Analysis of a suite of environmental and physical variables using 25 random forests revealed these differences were primarily due to the increasing area and density of 26 eelgrass directly attributable to ongoing restoration efforts. Based on analysis of functional traits, 27 we propose that the rapid life histories of constituent organisms may have played a key role in their 28 successful recovery. We also speculate that diverse epifaunal communities may have contributed to 29 the restoration success through a predefined mutualism with eelgrass. Given that restored eelgrass 30 now make up 32% of total seagrass cover in the mid-Atlantic coastal bays, this restoration may 31 conserve regional biodiversity by providing new and pristine habitat, particularly given the general decline of existing eelgrass in this region. 32

33 Keywords: seagrass, restoration, functional traits, grazers

34 Introduction

35 Coastal habitats are becoming increasingly impacted through anthropogenic forcing (Halpern et al. 2008), leading to loss of important and valuable services such as food production, 36 37 pollution control, shoreline buffering, and carbon storage (Barbier et al. 2011). At the same time, 38 human impacts are driving the rapid and irreversible loss of marine biological diversity (McCauley 39 et al. 2015). As biodiversity has been generally shown to promote ecosystem functioning in marine systems (Gamfeldt et al. 2015), species extinctions may further erode the ability of nearshore 40 habitats to provide critical goods and services. Thus, there is strong incentive within the 41 42 conservation movement to protect and manage for high biodiversity in addition to protecting 43 habitat itself, particularly for marine realms (Palumbi et al. 2008; Duffy et al. 2016). 44 More recently, researchers have broadened their definition of biodiversity to incorporate 45 the functional roles of species within an ecosystem, represented by their *functional traits*: 46 measurable characteristics of individual organisms relating to their morphology, physiology, ecology, behavior, and life history (Díaz et al. 2013). Functional diversity, then, captures the 47 breadth of variation in functional traits across all species within an assemblage. The application of 48 functional diversity accounts for the degree of redundancy within an assemblage (Rosenfeld 2002), 49 and thus can be used to refine conservation priorities by identifying areas of particular 50 51 vulnerability (Micheli and Halpern 2005), high productivity (Duffy et al. 2016), or that harbor 52 unique or functionally varied assemblages (Devictor et al. 2010; Stuart-Smith et al. 2013). By specifying how organisms perform and interact with one another, traits can be also used to 53 54 mechanistically link pattern and process (Díaz and Cabido 2001), generating more accurate and 55 generalizable predictions for the ecosystem consequences of species losses (Mouillot, Bellwood, et 56 al. 2013).

57 In addition to conserving current coastal habitats and their biological diversity, there have 58 been increasing efforts to actively restore lost or degraded systems, including seagrasses (Orth et al. 2006), marshes (Zedler 2000), mangroves (Ellison 2000), and oyster and coral reefs (Mumby 59 and Steneck 2008; Beck et al. 2011). A recent meta-analysis revealed that aquatic restorations have, 60 61 on average, recovered 86% of their biodiversity and 80% of their ecosystem services relative to 62 unrestored reference systems (Benavas et al. 2009). These values, however, underscore the general trend that most restored systems have failed to fully recover their pre-disturbance structure and 63 functioning (Lotze et al. 2011; Duarte et al. 2015). Moreover, many assessments of recovery have 64 65 focused on quantifying the cover or abundance of the restored habitat itself (Lotze et al. 2011; Duarte et al. 2015), and not the abundance or diversity of the organisms that use it (but see 66 Fonseca, Meyer & Hall 1996; Coen *et al.* 2007), even though it is these communities that underpin 67 68 many of the services provided by coastal ecosystems (Duffy et al. 2014). Finally, only a handful of studies have integrated functional trait information into their assessment of faunal communities 69 70 associated with restored ecosystems, which may better reflect the recovery of the restored systems 71 by focusing on what constituent organisms are doing, as opposed to replicating some historical – and potentially presently less relevant – community composition (Tullos et al. 2009; Barnes et al. 72 73 2014; Nordström et al. 2015).

One of the most successful examples of coastal restorations has been eelgrass (Zostera 74 75 *marina* L.) in the Delmarva coastal bays (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia) of the mid-western Atlantic, USA (Orth and McGlathery 2012). Eelgrass is a foundational marine angiosperm distributed across 76 77 the northern hemisphere and provides a number of valuable ecosystem services, including nursery habitat, shoreline protection, and carbon storage (Barbier et al. 2011). Eelgrass habitat supports a 78 variety of epifaunal invertebrates, including amphipods, isopods, decapods, and gastropods, which 79 80 have a high secondary production (Fredette et al. 1990) but are an important link between primary producers and secondary consumers (Sobocinski and Latour 2015). The presence and diversity of 81

82 these epifauna has been implicated in the functioning of temperate seagrass ecosystems, with 83 greater abundance and species richness generally leading to increased grazing of fouling epiphytes in numerous experimental mesocosms and field exclusions (Neckles et al. 1993; Duffy et al. 2003; 84 Duffy et al. 2005; Whalen et al. 2013; Reynolds et al. 2014), and more recently, in a synthesis across 85 15 field sites in the northern hemisphere (Duffy et al. 2015). Emerging evidence has also shown 86 87 that variation in the functional traits of these organisms better predict epifaunal biomass, algal consumption, and transfer to higher trophic levels than species richness alone (Best et al. 2013; 88 Lefcheck and Duffy 2015), suggesting that the functioning of eelgrass systems can, in theory, be 89 90 more accurately inferred through the functional trait diversity of the grazer community.

91 Here, we present long-term data from two periods spanning 2001-2013 on the recovery of 92 associated epifaunal invertebrate communities alongside the successful restoration of eelgrass 93 habitat in the southern Delmarva coastal bays. Many of these bays had been unvegetated since the 94 early 1930s, after the pandemic decline of eelgrass due to hurricanes and disease (Orth et al. 2010). 95 In the late 1990s, seed-based restoration efforts began to reestablish eelgrass to the region, which at present now supports over 1800 hectares of restored meadows, with more than half occurring in 96 a single area, South Bay (Orth et al. 2013). Despite the rapid and successful reestablishment of this 97 98 foundational habitat, it remains unclear whether the epifaunal community, which plays a critical role in the maintenance and functioning of these systems, has experienced similar recovery. 99

To address this question, we compared temporal trends in abundance, species, and functional diversity of the epifaunal community in South Bay to a nearby bed in Chincoteague Bay. The Chincoteague bed persisted through the disturbances of the 1930s to the present day, and at the time of the initial restoration, constituted the largest natural bed in the region. It thus served as a useful baseline for assessing restoration success. Drift macroalgae was also collected at each site to understand potential sources of animal recruitment to the newly restored bed. We coupled these survey data with trait, environmental, and water quality data to explore the drivers of various

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Peer Preprints

aspects of community structure in both beds through time. We hypothesized that the epifauna in
South Bay would initially reflect macroalgal assemblages, representing the assumed recruitment
vector, and over time become more like the reference bed as the community matured.

110 Methods

111 Survey Sites

112 Two coastal lagoons were chosen for comparison: a restored bed in South Bay (37.26 N. 113 75.84 W), and a reference bed in Chincoteague Bay (38.04 N, 75.31 W). Eelgrass had been absent in South Bay since 1933 until seed based restoration efforts began in 1997, leading to recovery of 114 115 almost 1,500 hectares on what was until only recently unvegetated bottom (Fig. 1a). While eelgrass has since spread to neighboring bays through both additional seed based restoration and passive 116 recruitment, South Bay remains the focus of that initial, successful restoration effort, and has the 117 largest, densest, and most contiguous restored bed by a large margin (Orth et al. 2013). Because of 118 119 the widespread establishment of eelgrass in South Bay, it was the ideal candidate for assessing the 120 status of animal communities associated with the successful restoration of their habitat. In contrast, eelgrass in Chincoteague Bay recovered naturally after the pandemic decline of the 1930s, and by 121 the late 1990s was dense and extensive. By the early 2000s, when we initiated our sampling 122 program, Chincoteague represented the largest natural eelgrass bed in this region by a factor of 10 123 (Orth et al. 2013), making it the de facto candidate for comparison to the restored site. At the time, 124 125 Chincoteague Bay also appeared to be on a 15-year upswing in terms of total area¹, implying that 126 faunal communities present there would have had time to reach a climax state, and further 127 solidifying its potential as a representative baseline.

¹ <u>http://web.vims.edu/bio/sav/SegmentAreaChart.htm</u>

128 While both South and Chincoteague Bays share generally similar environmental conditions, 129 over the course of the survey, Chincoteague Bay has experienced declining water quality relative to South Bay (Wazniak et al. 2007), and consequently lost a considerable amount of eelgrass by 2013 130 (Fig. 1b). However, this occurred after the initial monitoring period, and thus to maintain 131 consistency through time, we chose to continue sampling in Chincoteague Bay and will continue to 132 133 refer to it as the reference site. We note that, despite a decrease in aerial extent, remaining eelgrass in Chincoteague Bay remained dense and contiguous (Fig. 1a). More importantly for this work, the 134 two bays are expected to harbor identical fauna based on their geographic proximity (<100 km) 135 136 and known ranges of target invertebrates (Pollock 1998).

137 Survey Methods

138 Faunal sampling occurred in two distinct periods: 2001-2003, when eelgrass was initially 139 colonizing South Bay and covered ~15 ha of bottom; and 2010 -2013, after the restored bed had 140 increased to nearly 1500 ha. Sampling was conducted quarterly from May to November each year. In each bay, random samples were collected using suction sampling (Orth and van Montfrans 141 1987). At low tide, a weighted 0.33-m² metal cylinder was placed over a continuous stand of 142 eelgrass. The suction head was then inserted into the top of the sampling frame and the contents in 143 the cylinder were suctioned into a 0.8-mm mesh bag. Sampling continued for two minutes after 144 145 which collection bags were sealed, returned to the laboratory, and frozen. In the laboratory, mobile 146 epifauna were enumerated, identified to lowest possible taxon, and preserved in 90% ethyl alcohol. While the number of samples taken on any given date was dictated by the area of eelgrass available 147 148 for sampling, replication was equivalent for a sampling period.

Additionally, we sampled epifauna of drift macroalgae to investigate potential vectors of recruitment. Macroalgal samples were taken by gently enclosing drift algae in the general vicinity of the sampling location in fine mesh bags, and storing and processing the samples identically to the suction samples. The number of algal samples taken during each sampling date varied, with the

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Peer Preprints

153 exact number dependent on the availability of drift macroalgae within a reasonable vicinity of the

154 suction samples, which declined in beds that were denser and more continuous.

155 Functional Traits

156 We identified nine functional traits based on their relevance to colonization potential, competitive interactions, and effects on ecosystem functioning (Table S1). Traits included 157 indicators of defense and morphology (exoskeleton material and body plan), trophic ecology 158 (trophic group and specific diet), body size (maximum length), habitat use (mobility and position in 159 the water column), and life history (egg retention and development mode). These traits have been 160 161 shown to discriminate among epifaunal invertebrates, and to describe and predict benthic community structure and function (Bremner et al. 2003; Bremner et al. 2006; Best et al. 2013; 162 163 Lefcheck and Duffy 2015). The trait data were collected directly from peer-reviewed literature and 164 verified using expert knowledge of the organisms. The raw trait data and a bibliography of references are found in Supplement 1. 165

166 Environmental Covariates

Water quality data from 2001-2003 for South Bay was sampled monthly by the Virginia 167 Coastal Long-Term Ecological Reserve, and from 2010-2013 by the Virginia Estuarine and Coastal 168 169 Monitoring System program at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. Physical variables were 170 measured using a YSI 6600 EDS sensor array (YSI Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio). Additional water 171 samples were taken at eight separate sampling stations to quantify total suspended solids, chlorophyll-*a*, and phosphate concentrations. Further details can be found in (Orth et al. 2012; 172 McGlathery and Christian 2014). Water quality data from 2001-2013 for Chincoteague Bay was 173 174 collected by the National Park Service at Assateague Island National Seashore (NPS) and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Water Quality Monitoring Programs. Both 175 176 programs recorded on-site water quality parameters, and collected samples to send to laboratories 177 for nutrient and chlorophyll-*a* analyses. Further details can be found in (Wazniak et al. 2007).

178 Eelgrass bed extent and density in both bays were derived from aerial photography 179 acquired annually from 2001 through 2013, except for 2005, when weather conditions prohibited photography. Black and white photography was acquired at a scale of 1:24,000 along two flight 180 lines covering all shorelines and adjacent shoal areas of the two bays. Aerial photography was 181 scanned from negatives, and Z. marina bed boundaries were then directly photo-interpreted on-182 183 screen while maintaining a fixed scale using ESRI ArcMap GIS software (ESRI, Redlands CA). Z. marina beds were categorized as very sparse (1-10% cover), sparse (11-40% cover), moderate (41-184 70% cover) or dense (70-100% cover) based on a visual estimate of the percent cover. Ground 185 186 surveys were conducted in the bays each year to corroborate the occurrence of Z. marina identified in the photography outside the boundaries of the seeded plots. Further details can be found in (Orth 187 188 et al. 2010).

189 Statistical Analysis

To adjust for varying sampling effort through time, we averaged all observations for a 190 particular quarterly sampling period so that each period constituted a single replicate (e.g., 191 192 Dornelas et al. 2014). This choice reduces the power of our analysis, but provides three advantages: it circumvents any potential for pseudoreplication, permits fitting of various correlation structures 193 194 to address temporal autocorrelation, and allows the number of samples taken to be included as a 195 covariate in subsequent analyses. It is well known that sampling effort increases estimates of both 196 abundance and richness (Azovsky 2011), so including sample size as a covariate in any modeling 197 exercise should yield less biased estimates of the predictors of interest.

For each replicate, we calculated a number of community metrics. First, we averaged the number of individuals observed in each replicate to yield a measure of mean total abundance. Next, we calculated species richness (*S*) as the mean number of species observed, and Simpson diversity (*D*), which further incorporates information on species' (mean) relative abundances. For Simpson

202 diversity, we converted the resulting probability values to 'effective numbers' of species using the

203 transformation from (Jost 2006):

$$D_{eff} = \frac{1}{(1-D)} \tag{1}$$

which obey the doubling property, and scales the values comparably with species richness. We used these two indices to construct an index of relative evenness (/), which is calculated as:

$$J = \frac{\ln(D)}{\ln(S)} \tag{2}$$

Unlike other indices of evenness, this index of evenness has been shown to independent of bothrichness and Simpson diversity (Jost 2010), and is bound (0, 1).

For functional diversity (FD) we used the index of Rao's quadratic entropy (Rao 1982). This index has been shown to be independent of species richness (Botta-Dukát 2005), and is calculated using the following equation:

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^{S-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{S} d_{ij} p_i p_j$$
(3)

where d_{ij} is the difference between species *i* and *j* based on their functional traits, p_i is the relative 211 abundance of species *i*, and p_i is the relative abundance of species *j*. The differences d_{ij} are derived 212 from any combination of functional traits using Gower's dissimilarity measure (Gower 1971), which 213 allows both continuous and categorical trait data to be collapsed into a single continuous distance 214 215 measure. Because Rao's Q can be maximized when fewer than all functional types are present when Gower's distances are not ultrametric (Pavoine et al. 2005), we generated ultrametric distances 216 using the procedure described in (Mouchet et al. 2008; Mérigot et al. 2010). In the event where 217 218 species are either the same or different, d_{ii} collapses to 0 or 1 and Q = D, or Simpson diversity. Thus, Rao's *Q* can also be transformed using Equation (1) to yield units that are on the same scale as 219 Simpson diversity. We calculated two separate indices of FD: one weighted by relative abundances, 220

which we interpret as the functional analogue to Simpson diversity, and one based on presence-absence, or the functional analogue to species richness.

Finally, to further account for variable effort, we generated rarefied estimates of species 223 richness and Simpson Diversity using fixed-coverage subsampling (Chao and Jost 2012). This 224 method generates a value of sample coverage (i.e., how complete the sample is) based on the 225 226 number of observed singletons (species for which only 1 individual was observed), and estimates of 227 diversity are then rarefied down to a fixed level of coverage, as opposed to a number of individuals or samples. This method results in less data loss than traditional rarefaction, and more efficiently 228 229 ranks communities based on their true diversities (Chao and Jost 2012). Unfortunately, this method has not yet been extended to indices of functional diversity. Rarefied estimates were calculated 230 231 using the *iNEXT* package in R (Hsieh et al. 2014).

Differences among the community metrics for each bay and sampling period were assessed 232 using general linear mixed effects models with an autoregressive 1 (AR1) correlation structure 233 corresponding to each sampling period. We additionally modeled the random variance associated 234 with being in a particular sampling period. As mentioned previously, the number of samples 235 collected on each date was included as a covariate to account for influence of variable effort on the 236 237 community response. Both the response and sample size were log₁₀-transformed, as the species-238 sampling effort relationship is known to follow a power law (Azovsky 2011). Assumptions of 239 normality of errors and homogeneity of variance were assessed visually. Pseudo-R² values were 240 calculated using the variance of both the fixed and random effects (conditional R², sensu Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2012). Models were constructing using the *nlme* package in R (Pinheiro et al. 2015), 241 242 and evaluated using the *piecewiseSEM* package (Lefcheck 2016).

The role of environmental covariates in driving the observed patterns was then estimated using random forests (Breiman 2001). We built an ensemble of 50 trees, after which we observed no appreciable decrease in mean squared error, with 'out-of-bag' (OOB) permutation to estimate

246 importance partitioned based on Pearson correlation threshold ≥ 0.5 . Each community metric 247 (abundance, richness, etc.) was regressed against the following variables that had near complete coverage across all sampling locations and periods: year, bed location, area, and density, 248 temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen, pH, and water column chl-*a* and phosphates (as a proxy for 249 suspended organic material). We then evaluated the importance of each predictor by quantifying 250 251 the mean percent decrease in accuracy, derived from the increase in mean error across all trees in the ensemble when a given variable is randomly permuted and then challenged with the OOB data. 252 Model parameters were optimized using the *caret* package (Kuhn 2015), and RFs were constructed 253 254 using the *randomForest* package in R (Liaw and Wiener 2002). For the top predictors, we plotted bivariate correlations and tested whether the observed correlation was significantly different from 255 256 zero by comparing values to a *t*-distribution with n - 2 degrees of freedom.

257 We used non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) to visualize differences in 258 multivariate community structure across bays, algal vs. eelgrass samples, and through time. 259 Because algal samples were collected differently than eelgrass samples, we used a sample-byspecies incidence matrix to downplay the influence of the amount of habitat or area sampled. We 260 also ran a separate NMDS for each habitat type using relative abundances, applying a Wisconsin 261 262 square-root transformation to reduce the impact of highly abundant species. To statistically test for differences among species composition through time, we conducted PERMANOVA, which 263 partitioned variance in the community dissimilarity matrix as a function of sampling period, and 264 265 used random permutations of the data to assess significance (McArdle and Anderson 2001). 266 Separate PERMANOVAs were conducted for each bay. We performed all multivariate analyses using the vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2013). 267

All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 3.1.2 (R Development Core Team 2015), and we held a study-wide $\alpha = 0.05$ for assessing statistical significance. All data and R scripts used to conduct the analyses are provided in Supplement 1.

271 Results

272 In contrast to our expectations that the restored bed would appear more like the reference 273 bed through time, the two were not significantly different in terms of most community metrics after 274 only one year (Fig. 2, P > 0.05 based on output from general linear mixed effects models). The two 275 exceptions were average abundance, which was significantly lower in South Bay during the period from 2001-2003 (Fig. 2a, P = 0.017), and functional diversity based on presence-absence, which 276 was, on average, significantly higher (Fig. 2f, P = 0.034). The number of samples taken did not 277 significantly influence any response during this time (P > 0.05 in all cases). Conditional R² values 278 279 ranged from 0.21–0.62, implying relatively high accuracy of these predictions, particularly for ecological data. 280

281 By the early 2010s, most community metrics were actually significantly higher in the 282 restored bed, particularly functional diversity (Fig. 2b, *P* = 0.031; Fig. 2c, *P* = 0.032; Fig. 2e-f, *P* < 283 (0.001). Average abundance was still significantly lower in South Bay during the later period (P =0.045), although we note the expected difference between the two was approximately 50% less 284 285 than in the earlier period based on coefficients from the mixed models ($\beta = 0.54$ cf. $\beta = 1.10$). Evenness was the only index that was not significantly different between the two bays (Fig. 2d, P = 286 0.132). Instead, this was the only variable that was more strongly predicted by sample size (P =287 288 0.007). Conditional R² values ranged from 0.23–0.71, reinforcing once again that these models 289 explained a substantial proportion of variance in the responses.

Random forests consistently identified bed location (restored vs. unrestored), total area and
mean eelgrass density to be the top three most important predictors across all community metrics
(Fig. S1). Bivariate plots revealed strong and highly significant positive correlations between area
and density for almost all metrics of diversity in South Bay (Fig. 3), particularly estimated richness
and Simpson diversity (Fig. 3b, c) and functional diversity weighted by relative abundance (Fig. 3f).

295 Chincoteague Bay showed generally weaker or sometimes opposite trends in these bivariate 296 correlations. However, it is important to recall that random forests account for collinearity and 297 interactions among variables, and thus the ranking reflects the importance independent of other 298 confounding factors, while the bivariate plots in Figure 3 do not.

299 Exploration of individual trait values revealed that assemblages in the South Bay bed generally exhibited greater variation in traits related to habitat use, life history, and morphology, 300 301 particularly during the later stages of restoration (Fig. S2). Specifically, South Bay had proportionally more benthic-dwelling crawlers, with calcium carbonate exoskeletons, and external 302 303 release of eggs with subsequent planktonic dispersal (Figs. S3-7). Thus, it appears that gastropods are responsible for a large proportion of the difference in functional diversity between the restored 304 305 and reference beds. Even within this taxonomic group, however, richness, Simpson, and functional 306 diversity weighted by relative abundance were all higher in South Bay during the late period (Fig. S8). 307

Analysis of multivariate community data using non-metric multidimensional scaling and 308 PERMANOVA revealed that the composition of the restored bed changed significantly from the 309 early period of restoration to the late period (Fig. 4), particularly when factoring in relative 310 abundances and re-analyzing the community data separately by habitat type (P < 0.001 based on 311 312 9,999 random permutations of the data, Fig. S9b). Shifts in community composition were 313 principally driven by declines in the relative abundances of the amphipod *Batea catharinensis*, the snail *Astyris lunata*, and the shrimp *Hippolyte pleuracanthus*, and by the appearance of the snail 314 315 *Costoanachis avara*. In contrast, there were no significant changes in community structure across 316 years in Chincoteague Bay based on relative abundances (P > 0.05, Fig. 4, Fig. S9b). Further, the 317 changes in community structure through time did not appear to be a consequence of recruitment 318 via drift macroalgae, with the macroalgal communities in each bay being significantly distinct from the corresponding grass beds (P < 0.001, Fig. 4, Fig. S9a). 319

While the full NMDS had a borderline acceptable value of stress, implying somewhat poor reproducibility of the multivariate data in two dimensions (0.26, Fig. 4), identical patterns emerged after repeated runs using different start values, and separate analyses by habitat type using relative abundances returned more acceptable values of stress (0.17 for eelgrass, Fig. S9b). Thus, the trends in Figure 4 appear to be robust to further explorations of these data, despite the higher stress value, and reinforce conclusions from independent analyses using PERMANOVA.

Of the 42 species captured over the entire survey, five were found exclusively in South Bay, 326 including three gastropod species in the genus Costoanachis, as well as the grazing snail 327 328 *Marshallora nigrocincta*, and the detritivorous amphipod *Photis macrocoxa* (although this species was found only on drift macroalgae). All five of these species occupied unique parts of functional 329 330 trait space, based on principal coordinates analysis of their trait values (Fig. S10). Only two species 331 - the grazing isopod *Paracerceis caudata* and the detritivorous amphipod *Lysianopsis alba* - were 332 found exclusively in Chincoteague Bay, and they were nearly functionally equivalent with other 333 species (Fig. S10).

334 Discussion

In this study, we found that the diversity of epifaunal invertebrates and their functional 335 traits in a newly restored eelgrass bed matched, and then exceeded, values exhibited by a nearby 336 337 reference bed in less than a decade (Fig. 1). Further, the rapid recovery of the epifaunal community was shown to be a direct consequence of restoration actions that encouraged the growth and 338 expansion of the restored bed, represented by bed area and density (Fig. 3). These findings may be 339 of particular consequence as eelgrass cover has generally declined in the region over the past two 340 341 decades (Orth et al. 2013), and is likely to continue this downward trajectory without further 342 restorative measures. The area of the reference bed, for example, declined 49% over the 12 years of 343 the survey (Fig. 1a), as a consequence of decreasing water quality and thermal stress known to

344 drive eelgrass decline in the nearby Chesapeake Bay (Wazniak et al. 2007; Moore et al. 2012). In 345 contrast, the area of the restored bed increased by 910% over the same time period (Fig. 1b), owing to better water quality, persistent restoration, and natural recruitment from the restored beds. 346 Thus, assuming these trends continue, restored beds in an environment not challenged by poor 347 water quality may play an increasingly vital role in providing habitat for a variety of taxa and 348 functional forms present in the region. Indeed, restored beds now make up roughly one-third of 349 total seagrass cover in the Delmarva coastal bays (Orth et al. 2013), They may one day even set 350 targets for both restoration efforts in South Bay and elsewhere, and, in an ironic reversal, natural 351 352 sites experiencing eelgrass loss due to declining water quality, such as Chincoteague Bay.

If many aquatic restorations fail to achieve pre-disturbance levels of diversity (Benayas et 353 354 al. 2009), then why has this particular effort been so successful? Low human impacts in this region 355 are undoubtedly a major factor. Long-term monitoring by the Virginia Coastal LTER has shown that 356 nutrient loading and water column chlorophyll-*a* have been low and relatively stable across all of 357 Virginia's coastal bays over the past two decades (Orth and McGlathery 2012) but, as noted earlier, not in Maryland's Chincoteague Bay (Wazniak et al. 2007). South Bay also experiences regular 358 flushing with cooler ocean water, alleviating temperature stress that is a major driver of eelgrass 359 360 die-backs in nearby regions, such as the Chesapeake Bay (Moore et al. 2012). Moreover, as the 361 restored bed has increased in size and density, it has more effectively captured particulates, leading to increased water clarity and greater light availability for photosynthesis (Moore et al. 2012; Orth 362 363 et al. 2012). This self-facilitation has been identified as a key predictor of the persistence of 364 restored seagrass ecosystems (van Katwijk et al. 2009).

Altogether, the factors that promote the growth and expansion of the restored bed should, in theory, facilitate the recruitment and survival of epifaunal invertebrates, principally by increasing the availability of habitat and substrate for algal resources. While the positive relationship between habitat and area sampled and species richness has been established generally,

there are few examples from seagrass systems (Boström, Jackson & Simenstad 2006). Our study is 369 370 also unique in the sense that increasing area does not simply represent a shift in geographic focus, but a product of ongoing efforts to actively increase the total habitat in the same location, 371 supplemented by the natural spread of eelgrass from the initial effort to restore this habitat. Indeed, 372 it is the recurring annual restoration efforts combined with natural recruitment from these 373 374 restored beds over the past two decades that has led to the impressive recovery of eelgrass in the region, and undoubtedly this reliable influx of habitat-forming seeds has played a key role in 375 promoting the diverse epifaunal assemblage observed in our study, and may distinguish this 376 377 success from other restoration attempts.

There is also potential for an interesting and hitherto unrecognized positive feedback 378 379 involving epifauna and eelgrass contributing to restoration success. Numerous mesocosm and 380 caging studies have demonstrated that the presence and diversity of these grazers has been shown 381 to promote the growth and productivity of eelgrass through the removal of fouling epiphytes 382 (Neckles et al. 1993; Duffy et al. 2003; Duffy et al. 2005; Douglass et al. 2007; Whalen et al. 2013; Reynolds et al. 2014; Duffy et al. 2015). This action releases eelgrass blades from competition for 383 light and nutrients, which in turn increases productivity and ultimately the amount of habitat. We 384 385 show here that habitat directly enhances diversity (Fig. 4), leading to more habitat, more animals, and so on. While this link is tenuous in the absence of robust data on epiphyte fouling, it is a 386 foundational concept in temperate seagrass ecology (van Montfrans et al. 1984; Duffy et al. 2014). 387 388 and in light of considerable empirical verification in other systems, it is likely to play a role in the 389 persistence and rapid expansion of the bed in South Bay. The degree to which animals and their diversity promote eelgrass versus the annual sowing of seeds and natural expansion is probably 390 small, but parsing these effects is certainly deserving of further attention. 391

392 The reproductive biology and dispersal abilities of the focal organisms may have also played 393 a pivotal role in the rapid recovery of the epifaunal community in the restored bed. Recent reviews

394 have suggested that 'successful restorations' – those that have achieved similar levels of 395 biodiversity as before a disturbance – have concerned communities of fast-reproducing organisms with high dispersal ability (Jones and Schmitz 2009; Duarte et al. 2015). While there did not appear 396 397 to be a change in the proportion of individuals belonging to high vs. low dispersal species throughout the course of restoration – those that brooded or released their eggs, and those with 398 399 planktonic vs. non-planktonic larval forms (Figs. S6-7) – most of the organisms in this system have generation times on the scale of weeks to months. The amphipod *Gammarus mucronatus*, for 400 401 instance, can reach reproductive maturity in as few as three weeks during summer months 402 (Fredette and Diaz 1986). The quick generation and turnover of populations certainly contributed to the ability of these small invertebrates to reach and exploit this new habitat. 403

404 A complementary hypothesis is that, as the bed expanded, it also recruited mesopredators 405 of epifauna, including various fishes and crabs, which also utilize the eelgrass as habitat. Predator 406 trawls conducted in South Bay the early 2010s revealed a diverse and abundant predator 407 community (Schmitt et al. 2016). A recent meta-analysis produced strong evidence supporting the long-standing hypothesis that predation enhances prey diversity by relieving competition among 408 prey species (Katano et al. 2015), a trend which has been seen in mesocosm experiments using 409 several of the species observed in our surveys (Duffy et al. 2005; Douglass et al. 2008). Consistent 410 with an active and increasingly abundant predator community, epifaunal abundance actually had 411 an inverse relationship with bed area and density in South Bay (Fig. 3a). An alternative explanation 412 413 is that epifauna are resource-limited, as suggested by their remarkably invariant mean abundances 414 observed in the later stages of restored bed (Fig. 1a). Thus, increasing the density of habitat but not resources could have diluted the average abundance per unit sampling area. 415

416 One of the more striking differences between the restored and reference beds was the
417 higher functional diversity in South Bay compared to Chincoteague Bay (Fig. 1e-f). Habitat

418 complexity and resource availability – proxied by mean density and total phosphates in our random

forest analysis - may have played a role here as well (Fig. 3e-f, Fig. S1). Increasing both should 419 420 theoretically open niche space and facilitate coexistence, leading to a wider variety of observed functional morphologies, behaviors, and life histories. Classical successional theory would predict 421 that this would be especially true during the later stages of restoration, as biotic as opposed to 422 abiotic filters play an increasingly larger role and functionally similar species are weeded out as 423 424 consequence of competitive interactions (Connell and Slatver 1977). Given these predictions, it is surprising that we observed significantly higher functional diversity in the restored bed compared 425 to the reference bed even in the early stages of restoration. Once again, the relatively fast 426 427 recruitment and generation times of the organisms may provide explanation, allowing such interactions to play out on much shorter time scales than might be expected in other systems in 428 429 which this phenomenon has been investigated, such as terrestrial plants (Purschke et al. 2013).

430 A recent publication also suggested that it is not competitive interactions, but continued 431 colonization, that drives the functional trait structure of successional communities (Li et al. 2015). 432 We observed significant differences in community composition through time, particularly in the restored bed (Fig. 4), which was a consequence of the arrival of new species or shifts in dominance. 433 Along similar lines, the demography of these epifaunal invertebrates is notoriously unpredictable. 434 435 In nearby systems in the Chesapeake Bay, which have been well studied for decades, species appear and then disappear regularly, generally in response to loss of habitat (Douglass et al. 2010). Similar 436 stochastic processes may also be at play here, with high trait diversity in the early years simply an 437 438 outcome of chance processes that favored recruitment of functionally varied individuals to the 439 sudden appearance of uncolonized habitat. Interestingly, our analysis showed little role of rafting macroalgae in providing a recruitment vector for new species (Fig. 4). Where these animals are 440 coming from, and how they are arriving at the bed, remains a frontier in seagrass ecology. 441

442 Finally, we must acknowledge the possibility that we are still observing some transitional443 state, and that the restored bed is still progressing towards the stable state exhibited by the

444 reference bed (Fig. 4). Several lines of evidence suggest this is not the case. First, inter- and intraannual variability was similar between both bays (Fig. 1), suggesting that the reference bed had not 445 achieved a more stable, and potentially more mature, state than the restored bed. In fact, the errors 446 around most means of community properties in the restored bed are actually lower than in the 447 reference bed (Fig. 1). Second, we observed significant compositional differences between the beds, 448 449 suggesting potentially different avenues for colonization (Fig. 4). Finally, given the contrasting trajectories of the two beds (Fig. 1), it may be unreasonable to suspect these two communities to 450 451 ever converge.

Aggregating at broad temporal scales emphasizes overall trajectories of these beds, but 452 ignores some of the finer scale variation. One particularly notable instance occurred in June 2012, 453 454 with the recruitment of juvenile pinfish (Lagodon rhomboides) to these coastal bays. During early 455 life history stages, pinfish are known to be voracious predators of epifaunal invertebrates 456 (Luczkovich and Stellwag 1993), and were indisputably responsible for the steep declines in 457 epifaunal abundance and diversity during this month (Fig. S11). Generally, pinfish do not range this far north, but with increasing temperatures, we may be witness to a northward range expansion. 458 Such a shift may have drastic consequence for the eelgrass: first, by removing the critical top-down 459 460 control provided by epifaunal grazers, and second, by directly consuming eelgrass, particularly later during their ontogeny (Luczkovich and Stellwag 1993). Thus, while local conditions over the 461 last decade have favored the growth and expansion of eelgrass in Virginia's coastal bays, climate 462 463 change may introduce a new variable in the form of pinfish with uncertain consequences for the 464 maintenance of eelgrass diversity and function in South Bay.

Within the larger context of restoration ecology, our study stands out in that it documents
the transition from a near complete lack of vegetation to dense, contiguous beds (Fig. 1, Orth &
McGlathery 2012). This state-shift stands in contrast to many other restoration projects, which
have focused on recovery of degraded, but not totally absent, systems. The drastic transition from

469 an unvegetated to a vegetated state may explain some of our results by widening the scope for 470 detectable effects. We note, however, that the greatest differences occurred during the later stages of restoration, when the restored and reference beds were comparable in terms of their total 471 coverage (Fig. 1). Further, even in degraded eelgrass beds, remediation of environmental stressors 472 has been show to enhance the functional trait diversity of epifaunal invertebrates (Dolbeth et al. 473 474 2013). As with our results (Fig. 1e), functional recovery was partly a consequence of the redistribution of biomass among different functional types (Dolbeth et al. 2013). Similarly rapid 475 recovery of functional diversity has been observed in other invertebrate communities, such as 476 477 beetles in restored wetlands (Watts and Mason 2015). These studies, along with ours, suggest that functional traits can be a powerful tool for assessing the response and subsequent recovery of 478 479 communities to disturbance (Mouillot, Graham, et al. 2013).

It is worth noting the limitations of this study. First, we are comparing two bays, even 480 481 though these bays combined account for 88% of the submersed aquatic vegetation in the Delmarva 482 coastal bays. While our results may not be representative of eelgrass systems in general, we do demonstrate that restored ecosystems on a comparatively large scale at least have the potential to 483 greatly exceed the diversity of reference or pre-disturbance systems, which is a rare outcome in 484 485 restoration ecology (Benayas et al. 2009). Second, we had variable sampling effort through time, largely as a consequence of available habitat to sample, which could have biased our summary 486 statistics. However, incorporation of sample size as a covariate in our analyses revealed that it has 487 488 no significant effect in the vast majority of cases (with the sole exception of evenness in the latter 489 period, Fig. 1d). Finally, we did not have robust and consistent estimates of the local density of the habitat to use in our analysis. Future monitoring efforts should focus on a method that is not only 490 standard to the area of bottom sampled, but also yields some value of habitat availability (biomass, 491 492 etc.).

493 In this study, we show that epifaunal community diversity in a restored eelgrass bed was 494 significantly higher than an unrestored bed in the region, particularly when considering the breadth of organismal functional traits. Given the wealth of evidence linking both epifaunal species 495 and trait diversity to enhanced ecosystem functioning (Best et al. 2013; Duffy et al. 2015; Lefcheck 496 and Duffy 2015), it is reasonable to infer that the restored bed may also experience higher levels 497 498 and greater stability in ecosystem functioning than unrestored beds. Indeed, sediment organic content and ammonium exchange have been shown to be higher during the later stages of 499 restoration (McGlathery et al. 2012). While these functions were attributed to the recovery of the 500 501 eelgrass itself, previous mesocosm experiments have shown that epifaunal richness also impacts these properties as well, irrespective of eelgrass biomass (Duffy et al. 2003; Spivak et al. 2007). 502 503 Future work, however, will have to directly quantify processes related to these grazers, such as 504 secondary production or biogeochemical processes, to demonstrate their independent contributions to the eelgrass ecosystem function. In the interim, the restored systems in Virginia's 505 coastal bays may serve an important role in conserving regional biological diversity in the face of 506 507 large-scale declines in existing beds.

508 Acknowledgements

We foremost thank the past and current members of the VIMS SAV lab for the collection and 509 510 sampling of the hundreds of benthic samples taken over the course of this survey, but especially C. 511 Holbert, S. Sumoski, A. Johnson, and P. Trivett. We are also indebted to B. Lusk and B. Truitt of the Nature Conservancy for their assistance for the duration of the project. Funding for all faunal work 512 513 and later water quality data in South Bay was provided by the grants from numerous agencies 514 notably: the Coastal Programs of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality funded by 515 Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, administered by NOAA's Office of Ocean and 516 Coastal Resource Management, the Virginia Recreational Fishing License Fund, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act with funding to NOAA, Grant NA09NMF4630308, The Nature 517

- 518 Conservancy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as well as private grants from the Allied-Signal
- 519 Foundation, Norfolk-Southern, and the Keith Campbell Foundation for the Environment. Early
- 520 South Bay water quality data were provided J. Porter and K. McGlathery at Virginia Coast Reserve
- 521 Long-Term Ecological Research project, supported by the National Science Foundation under
- 522 Grants No. BSR-8702333-06, DEB-9211772, DEB-9411974, DEB-0080381, DEB-0621014 and DEB-
- 523 1237733. Chincoteague Bay water quality data were provided by C. Wazniak at the Maryland
- 524 Department of Natural Resources Tidewater Ecosystem Assessment Division, funded by the State of
- 525 Maryland. We thank C. Patrick for comments on a previous version of this manuscript. This is
- 526 contribution no. **####** of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science.

527 References

- Azovsky, Andrey I. 2011. Species-area and species-sampling effort relationships: disentangling the
 effects. *Ecography* 34: 18–30. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2010.06288.x.
- Barbier, Edward B., Sally D. Hacker, Chris Kennedy, Evamaria W. Koch, Adrian C. Stier, and Brian R.
 Silliman. 2011. The value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecological Monographs* 81: 169–193. doi:10.1890/10-1510.1.
- Barnes, Andrew D., Rowan M. Emberson, and Frank-thorsten Krell. 2014. The Role of Species Traits
 in Mediating Functional Recovery during Matrix Restoration. *PLoS ONE*: 1–19.
 doi:10.5061/dryad.62512.
- Beck, Michael W., Robert D. Brumbaugh, Laura Airoldi, Alvar Carranza, Loren D. Coen, Christine
 Crawford, Omar Defeo, et al. 2011. Oyster Reefs at Risk and Recommendations for
 Conservation, Restoration, and Management. *BioScience* 61: 107–116.
 doi:10.1525/bio.2011.61.2.5.
- Benayas, José M. Rey, Adrian C. Newton, Anita Diaz, and James M. Bullock. 2009. Enhancement of
 Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services by Ecological Restoration: A Meta-Analysis. *Science* 325:
 1121–1124.
- Best, R. J., N. C. Caulk, and J. J. Stachowicz. 2013. Trait vs. phylogenetic diversity as predictors of
 competition and community composition in herbivorous marine amphipods. *Ecology Letters* 16: 72–80. doi:10.1111/ele.12016.
- Boström, Christoffer, Emma L. Jackson, and Charles A. Simenstad. 2006. Seagrass landscapes and
 their effects on associated fauna: A review. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 68: 383–403.
 doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2006.01.026.
- Botta-Dukát, Zoltán. 2005. Rao's quadratic entropy as a measure of functional diversity based on multiple traits. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 16: 533–540.
- 551 Breiman, Leo. 2001. Random forests. *Machine Learning* 45: 5–32.
- 552 Bremner, J., O. A. L. Paramor, and C. L. J. Frid. 2006. Developing a methodology for incorporating

553

the 0-12 nautical mile zone: 1-158. 554 555 Bremner, J., S. I. Rogers, and C. L. J. Frid. 2003. Assessing functional diversity in marine benthic ecosystems: a comparison of approaches. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 254: 11–25. 556 557 doi:10.3354/meps254011. Chao, Anne, and Lou Jost. 2012. Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: standardizing 558 559 samples by completeness rather than size. *Ecology* 93: 2533–2547. 560 Coen, Loren D., Robert D. Brumbaugh, David Bushek, Ray Grizzle, Mark W. Luckenbach, Martin H. Posey, Sean P. Powers, and S. Gregory Tolley. 2007. Ecosystem services related to oyster 561 restoration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 341: 303–307. doi:10.3354/meps341299. 562 Connell, Joseph H., and Ralph O. Slatver. 1977. Mechanisms of succession in natural communities 563 564 and their role in community stability and organization. The American Naturalist 111: 1119– 565 1144. Devictor, Vincent, David Mouillot, Christine Meynard, Frédéric Jiguet, Wilfried Thuiller, and Nicolas 566 Mouquet. 2010. Spatial mismatch and congruence between taxonomic, phylogenetic and 567 functional diversity: the need for integrative conservation strategies in a changing world. 568 569 *Ecology Letters* 13: 1030–1040. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01493.x. Díaz, Sandra, and Marcelo Cabido. 2001. Vive la difference: plant functional diversity matters to 570 ecosystem processes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16: 646–655. 571 Díaz, Sandra, Andy Purvis, Johannes H. C. Cornelissen, Georgina M. Mace, Michael J. Donoghue, 572 Robert M. Ewers, Pedro. Jordano, and William D. Pearse. 2013. Functional traits, the phylogeny 573 of function, and ecosystem service vulnerability. *Ecology and Evolution* 3: 2958–2975. 574 575 doi:10.1002/ece3.601. 576 Dolbeth, Marina, Patrícia Cardoso, Tiago Grilo, Dave Raffaelli, and Miguel Ângelo Pardal. 2013. Drivers of estuarine benthic species distribution patterns following a restoration of a seagrass 577 bed: A functional trait analyses. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 72: 47–54. 578 579 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.05.001. 580 Dornelas, Maria, Nicholas J. Gotelli, Brian McGill, Hideyasu Shimadzu, Faye Moyes, Caya Sievers, and Anne E. Magurran. 2014. Assemblage time series reveal biodiversity change but not systematic 581 loss. Science 344: 296-299. doi:10.1126/science.1248484. 582 583 Douglass, James G., J. Emmett Duffy, and John F. Bruno. 2008. Herbivore and predator diversity 584 interactively affect ecosystem properties in an experimental marine community. *Ecology* Letters 11: 598-608. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01175.x. 585 586 Douglass, James G., J. Emmett Duffy, Aamanda C. Spivak, and John P. Richardson. 2007. Nutrient versus consumer control of community structure in a Chesapeake Bay eelgrass habitat. Marine 587 *Ecology Progress Series* 348: 71–83. doi:10.3354/meps07091. 588 589 Douglass, James G., Kristin E. France, J. Paul Richardson, and J. Emmett Duffy. 2010. Seasonal and 590 interannual changes in a Chesapeake Bay eelgrass community: Insights into biotic and abiotic control of community structure. *Limnology and Oceanography* 55: 1499–1520. 591 doi:10.4319/lo.2010.55.4.1499. 592 593 Duarte, Carlos M., Angel Borja, Jacob Carstensen, Michael Elliott, Dorte Krause-Jensen, and Núria Marbà, 2015, Paradigms in the Recovery of Estuarine and Coastal Ecosystems, Estuaries and 594 595 *Coasts* 38: 1202–1212. doi:10.1007/s12237-013-9750-9. 596 Duffy, J. Emmett, A Randall Hughes, and Per-Olav Moksnes. 2014. Ecology of Seagrass Communities.

ecological structure and functioning into designation of Special Areas of Conservation (SAD) in

- In *Marine Community Ecology and Conservation*, ed. Mark D. Bertness, Brian R. Silliman, John F.
 Bruno, and John J. Stachowicz, 271–297. Sunderland, MA: Sinaeuer.
- 599 Duffy, J. Emmett, Jonathan S. Lefcheck, Rick D. Stuart-Smith, Sergio A. Navarrete, and Graham J.
 600 Edgar. 2016. Biodiversity enhances reef fish biomass and resistance to climate change. *PNAS*:
 601 In press.
- Duffy, J. Emmett, Pamela L. Reynolds, Christoffer Boström, James A. Coyer, Mathieu Cusson, Serena
 Donadi, James G. Douglass, et al. 2015. Biodiversity mediates top-down control in eelgrass
 ecosystems: a global comparative-experimental approach. *Ecology Letters* 18: 696–705.
 doi:10.1111/ele.12448.
- Duffy, J. Emmett, J. Paul Richardson, and Elizabeth A. Canuel. 2003. Grazer diversity effects on
 ecosystem functioning in seagrass beds. *Ecology Letters* 6: 637–645. doi:10.1046/j.1461 0248.2003.00474.x.
- Duffy, J. Emmett, J. Paul Richardson, and Kristin E. France. 2005. Ecosystem consequences of
 diversity depend on food chain length in estuarine vegetation. *Ecology Letters* 8: 301–309.
 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00725.x.
- Ellison, Aaron M. 2000. Mangrove restoration: Do we know enough? *Restoration Ecology* 8: 219–
 229. doi:10.1046/j.1526-100X.2000.80033.x.
- Fonseca, Mark S., David L. Meyer, and Margret O. Hall. 1996. Development of planted seagrass beds
 in Tampa Bay, Florida, USA. II. Faunal components. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 132: 141–
 156. doi:10.3354/meps132141.
- 617 Fredette, Thomas J., and Robert J. Diaz. 1986. Life history of Gammarus mucronatus Say
 618 (Amphipoda: Gammaridae) in warm temperate estuarine habitats, York River, Virginia.
 619 Journal of Crustacean Biology 6: 57–78.
- Gamfeldt, Lars, Jonathan S. Lefcheck, Jarrett E. K. Byrnes, Bradley J. Cardinale, J. Emmett Duffy, and
 John N. Griffin. 2015. Marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: what's known and
 what's next. *Oikos* 124: 252–265. doi:10.1111/oik.01549.
- Gower, J. C. 1971. A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties. *Biometrics* 27: 857–
 874.
- Halpern, Benjamin S., Shaun Walbridge, Kimberly A. Selkoe, Carrie V. Kappel, Fiorenza Micheli,
 Caterina D'Agrosa, John F. Bruno, et al. 2008. A Global Map of Human Impact on Marine
 Ecosystems. *Science* 319: 948–952. doi:10.1126/science.1149345.
- Hsieh, T. C., K. H. Ma, and Anne Chao. 2014. iNEXT: iNterpolation and EXTrapolation for species
 diversity.
- Jones, Holly P., and Oswald J. Schmitz. 2009. Rapid recovery of damaged ecosystems. *PLoS ONE* 4.
 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005653.
- 632 Jost, Lou. 2006. Entropy and diversity. *Oikos* 113: 363–375. doi:10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.14714.x.
- Jost, Lou. 2010. The relation between evenness and diversity. *Diversity* 2: 207–232.
 doi:10.3390/d2020207.
- Katano, Izumi, Hideyuki Doi, Britas Klemens Eriksson, and Helmut Hillebrand. 2015. A cross-system
 meta-analysis reveals coupled predation effects on prey biomass and diversity. *Oikos* 124:
 1427–1435.
- 638 Kuhn, Max. 2015. caret: Classification and Regression Training.
- 639 Lefcheck, Jonathan S. 2016. piecewiseSEM : Piecewise structural equation modeling in R for

640 641	ecology, evolution, and systematics. <i>Methods in Ecology and Evolution</i> 7: 573–579. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12512.
642 643 644	Lefcheck, Jonathan S., and J. Emmett Duffy. 2015. Multitrophic functional diversity predicts ecosystem functioning in experimental assemblages of estuarine consumers. <i>Ecology</i> 96: 2973–2983. doi:10.1890/14-1977.1.
645 646 647	Li, Shao-peng, Marc W. Cadotte, Scott J. Meiners, Zheng-shuang Hua, Lin Jiang, and Wen-sheng Shu. 2015. Species colonisation, not competitive exclusion, drives community overdispersion over long-term succession. <i>Ecology Letters</i> 18: 964–973. doi:10.1111/ele.12476.
648 649	Liaw, Andy, and Matthew Wiener. 2002. Classification and Regression by randomForest. <i>R News</i> 2: 18–22.
650 651 652	Lotze, Heike K., Marta Coll, Anna M. Magera, Christine Ward-Paige, and Laura Airoldi. 2011. Recovery of marine animal populations and ecosystems. <i>Trends in Ecology and Evolution</i> 26. Elsevier Ltd: 595–605. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.07.008.
653 654 655	Luczkovich, J. J., and E. J. Stellwag. 1993. Isolation of cellulolytic microbes from the intestinal tract of the pinfish, Lagodon rhomboides: size-related changes in diet and microbial abundance. <i>Marine Biology</i> . doi:10.1007/BF00350054.
656 657	McArdle, Brian H., and Marti J. Anderson. 2001. Fitting multivariate models to community data: a comment on distance-based redundancy analysis. <i>Ecology</i> 82: 290–297.
658 659 660	McCauley, Douglas J., Malin L. Pinsky, Stephen R. Palumbi, James A. Estes, Francis H. Joyce, and Robert R. Warner. 2015. Marine defaunation: Animal loss in the global ocean. <i>Science</i> 347: 1255641. doi:10.1126/science.1255641.
661 662	McGlathery, Karen J., and Robert R. Christian. 2014. Water Quality Sampling - integrated measurements for the Virginia Coast, 2004-2014. <i>Virginia Coast Reserve Dataset VCR15243</i> .
663 664 665	McGlathery, Karen J., Laura K. Reynolds, Luke W. Cole, Robert J. Orth, Scott R. Marion, and Arthur Schwarzschild. 2012. Recovery trajectories during state change from bare sediment to eelgrass dominance. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 448: 209–221. doi:10.3354/meps09574.
666 667	Mérigot, Bastien, Jean-Pierre Durbec, and Jean-Claude Gaertner. 2010. On goodness-of-fit measure for dendrogram-based analyses. <i>Ecology</i> 91: 1850–1859.
668 669	Micheli, Fiorenza, and Benjamin S. Halpern. 2005. Low functional redundancy in coastal marine assemblages. <i>Ecology Letters</i> 8: 391–400. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00731.x.
670 671	van Montfrans, J., R. L. Wetzel, and R. J. Orth. 1984. Epiphyte-grazer relationships in seagrass meadows: consequences for seagras growth and production 7, No. 4A: 289–309.
672 673 674	Moore, Kenneth A., Erin C. Shields, David B. Parrish, and Robert J. Orth. 2012. Eelgrass survival in two contrasting systems: Role of turbidity and summer water temperatures. <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> 448: 247–258. doi:10.3354/meps09578.
675 676 677	Mouchet, Maud, François Guilhaumon, Sébastien Villéger, Norman W. H. Mason, Jean-Antoine Tomasini, and David Mouillot. 2008. Towards a consensus for calculating dendrogram-based functional diversity indices. <i>Oikos</i> 117: 794–800. doi:10.1111/j.2008.0030-1299.16594.x.
678 679 680	Mouillot, David, David R. Bellwood, Christopher Baraloto, Jerome Chave, Rene Galzin, Mireille Harmelin-Vivien, Michel Kulbicki, et al. 2013. Rare species support vulnerable functions in high-diversity ecosystems. <i>PLoS Biology</i> 11: e1001569. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001569.
681 682 683	Mouillot, David, Nicholas A. J. Graham, Sébastien Villéger, Norman W. H. Mason, and David R. Bellwood. 2013. A functional approach reveals community responses to disturbances. <i>Trends</i> <i>in Ecology & Evolution</i> 28: 167–177. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.004.
	20

- Mumby, Peter J., and Robert S. Steneck. 2008. Coral reef management and conservation in light of
 rapidly evolving ecological paradigms. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23: 555–563.
 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.06.011.
- Nakagawa, Shinichi, and Holger Schielzeth. 2012. A general and simple method for obtaining R2
 from generalized linear mixed-• effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4: 133–142.
 doi:10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x.
- Neckles, Hilary A., Richard L. Wetzel, and Robert J. Orth. 1993. Relative effects of nutrient
 enrichment and grazing on epiphyte-macrophyte (Zostera marina L.) dynamics. *Oecologia* 93: 285–295.
- Nordström, Marie C., Amanda W. J. Demopoulos, Christine R. Whitcraft, Andrea Rismondo, Patricia
 McMillan, Jennifer P. Gonzalez, and Lisa A. Levin. 2015. *Food web heterogeneity and succession in created saltmarshes. Journal of Applied Ecology*. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12473.
- 696 Oksanen, Jari, F. Guillaume Blanchet, Roeland Kindt, Pierre Legendre, Peter R. Minchin, R. B. O'Hara,
 697 Gavin L. Simpson, Peter Solymos, M. Henry H. Stevens, and Helene Wagner. 2013. vegan:
 698 Community Ecology Package.
- Orth, Robert J., Tim J. B. Carruthers, William C. Dennison, Carlos M. Duarte, W. James, Kenneth L.
 Heck Jr., A. Randall Hughes, et al. 2006. A global crisis for seagrass ecosystems. *Bioscience* 56: 987–996.
- Orth, Robert J., Scott R. Marion, Kenneth A. Moore, and David J. Wilcox. 2010. Eelgrass (Zostera marina L.) in the Chesapeake Bay region of mid-Atlantic coast of the USA: Challenges in conservation and restoration. *Estuaries and Coasts* 33: 139–150. doi:10.1007/s12237-009-9234-0.
- Orth, Robert J., and Karen J. McGlathery. 2012. Eelgrass recovery in the coastal bays of the Virginia
 Coast Reserve, USA. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 448: 173–176. doi:10.3354/meps09596.
- Orth, Robert J., and J. van Montfrans. 1987. Ultilization of a seagrass meadow and tidal marsh creek
 by blue crabs Callinectes sapidus. I. Seasonal and annual variations in abundance with
 emphasis on post-settlement juveniles. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 41: 283–294.
 doi:10.3354/meps041283.
- Orth, Robert J., Kenneth A. Moore, Scott R. Marion, David J. Wilcox, and David B. Parrish. 2012. Seed
 addition facilitates eelgrass recovery in a coastal bay system. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 448: 177–195. doi:10.3354/meps09522.
- Orth, Robert J., D. J. Wilcox, J. R. Whiting, L. Nagey, A. K. Kenne, and E. R. Smith. 2013. 2013
 Distribution of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation in the Chesapeake Bay and Coastal Bays. In *VIMS Special Scientific Report Number 155. Final report to EPA, Chesapeake Bay Program,*Annapolis.
- Palumbi, Stephen R., Paul A. Sandifer, J. David Allan, Michael W. Beck, Daphne G. Fautin, M. J.
 Fogarty, Benjamin S. Halpern, et al. 2008. Managing for ocean biodiversity to sustain marine
 ecosystem services. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 7: 204–211.
 doi:10.1890/070135.
- Pavoine, S., S. Ollier, and D. Pontier. 2005. Measuring diversity from dissimilarities with Rao's
 quadratic entropy: Are any dissimilarities suitable? *Theoretical Population Biology* 67: 231–
 239. doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2005.01.004.
- Pinheiro, Jose, Douglas Bates, Saikat DebRoy, Deepayan Sarkar, and R Core Team. 2015. nlme:
 Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models.

728

729 New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 730 Purschke, Oliver, Barbara C. Schmid, Martin T. Sykes, Peter Poschlod, Stefan G. Michalski, Walter Durka, Ingolf Kühn, Marten Winter, and Honor C. Prentice, 2013. Contrasting changes in 731 732 taxonomic, phylogenetic and functional diversity during a long-term succession: insights into assembly processes. Edited by Jason Fridley. *Journal of Ecology* 101: 857–866. 733 734 doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12098. R Development Core Team. 2015. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. 735 736 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. 737 Rao, C. Radhakrishna. 1982. Diversity and dissimilarity coefficients: A unified approach. *Theoretical* Population Biology 21: 24-43. doi:10.1016/0040-5809(82)90004-1. 738 739 Reynolds, Pamela L., J. Paul Richardson, J. Emmett Duffy, J Paul Richardson, J Emmett Duffy, J. Paul Richardson, and J. Emmett Duffy. 2014. Field experimental evidence that grazers mediate 740 transition between microalgal and seagrass dominance. *Limnology and Oceanography* 59: 741 1053-1064. doi:10.4319/lo.2014.59.3.0000. 742 Rosenfeld, Jordan S. 2002. Functional redundancy in ecology and conservation. *Oikos* 98. 743 Munksgaard International Publishers: 156–162. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980116.x. 744 Schmitt, Erika L., Mark W. Luckenbach, Jonathan S. Lefcheck, and Robert J. Orth. 2016. Predator-745 746 prey interactions in a restored eelgrass ecosystem: strategies for maximizing success of reintroduced bay scallops (Argopecten irradians). Restoration Ecology: In press. 747 doi:10.1111/rec.12353. 748 Sobocinski, Kathryn L., and Robert J. Latour. 2015. Trophic transfer in seagrass systems : estimating 749 750 seasonal production of an abundant seagrass fish, Bairdiella chrysoura, in lower Chesapeake 751 Bay. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 523: 157–174. doi:10.3354/meps11163. Spivak, Amanda C., Elizabeth A. Canuel, J. Emmett Duffy, and J. Paul Richardson. 2007. Top-down 752 and bottom-up controls on sediment organic matter composition in an experimental seagrass 753 ecosystem. Limnology and Oceanography 52: 2595-2607. 754 755 Stuart-Smith, Rick D., Amanda E. Bates, Jonathan S. Lefcheck, J. Emmett Duffy, Susan C. Baker, 756 Russell J. Thomson, Jemina F. Stuart-Smith, et al. 2013. Integrating abundance and functional traits reveals new global hotspots of fish diversity. *Nature* 501. Nature Publishing Group: 539– 757 758 542. doi:10.1038/nature12529. 759 Tullos, Desiree D., David L. Penrose, Gregory D. Jennings, and W. Gregory Cope. 2009. Analysis of 760 functional traits in reconfigured channels: implications for the bioassessment and disturbance 761 of river restoration. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 28: 80–92. 762 doi:10.1899/07-122.1. 763 van Katwijk, M. M., a. R. Bos, V. N. de Jonge, L. S a M Hanssen, D. C R Hermus, and D. J. de Jong. 2009. Guidelines for seagrass restoration: Importance of habitat selection and donor population, 764 spreading of risks, and ecosystem engineering effects. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 58, 765 doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.09.028. 766 767 Watts, Corinne H., and Norman W. H. Mason. 2015. If we build - they mostly come: partial functional 768 recovery but persistent compositional differences in wetland beetle community restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 23: 555–565. doi:10.1111/rec.12227. 769 770 Wazniak, Catherine E., Matthew R. Hall, Tim J. B. Carruthers, Brian Sturgis, William C. Dennison, and Robert J. Orth. 2007. Linking water quality to living resources in a mid-Atlantic lagoon system, 771 USA. Ecological Applications 17: S64–S68. 772

Pollock. Leland W. 1998. A Practical Guide to the Marine Animals of Northeastern North America.

- Whalen, Matthew A., J. Emmett Duffy, and James B. Grace. 2013. Temporal shifts in top-down vs.
 bottom-up control of epiphytic algae in a seagrass ecosystem. *Ecology* 94: 510–520.
- Zedler, Joy B. 2000. Progress in wetland restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 15: 402–
 407. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01959-5.

777 Figure Captions

Figure 1: Total area (in hectares) of eelgrass beds in (a) Chincoteague Bay and (b) South Bay
through time. Bars are divided into estimated density bins (% cover) based on comparison of aerial
footage to a crown density scale. Note: aerial photography could not be conducted in 2005 due to
poor weather conditions.

Figure 2: Time series plotting the annual mean ± 1 SE for various faunal community properties.
Light grey circles represent the mature bed in Chincoteague Bay. Black triangles represent the
restored bed in South Bay. FD = functional diversity, calculated as Rao's quadratic entropy from all
nine functional traits.

Figure 3: Plots of total bed area (in hectares, left column) and mean density (as the average density bin based on comparison of aerial footage against a crown density scale, ranging from 0 for no cover to 1 for full cover) for South Bay. Points represent each year and month of the survey. The black line represents a simple linear regression between the two variables. The Pearson correlation (*r*) from this regression is given in the bottom of each panel along with the following indicator of statistical significance: * *P* = 0.05, ** *P* = 0.01, *** *P* = 0.001.

Figure 4: Non-metric multidimensional scaling conducted on relative abundance data for both
eelgrass (green) and drift macroalgal (brown) communities. Small open points represent each year
and month of the survey. Large points represent the centroid for each year, graded from early years
(dark grey) to later years (light grey). Arrows represent the trajectories from one year to the next.
Stress – a measure of concordance between the multivariate data and this two-dimensional
representation – is given in the lower right.



798

Figure 1

800



Figure 2

801

NOT PEER-REVIEWED



803

Figure 3



805

Figure 4