

TABLE 3. FEATURES OF VALLEY RIPARIAN SITES WITH AND WITHOUT POPULATIONS OF *I. HUMILIS*

Site	Distance to nearest urban area (km)	Stream flow*	Encroachment by nonnative trees†	Overall disturbance (0-8 scale)
<i>I. humilis</i> present				
1	0.0	1	+	2
5	3.1	1	-	3
6	0.1	1	+	4
7	1.5	1	+	2
9	6.9	1	+	4
10	2.8	1	+	4
12	0.0	0	+	5
15	2.0	1	-	4
16	9.0	1	-	3
20	21.9	1	-	3
<i>I. humilis</i> absent				
2	5.5	0	-	2
3	5.0	1	-	1
4	4.5	1	-	1
8	3.6	1	-	2
11	2.0	0	+	4
13	1.7	0	+	3
14	4.4	1	-	2
17	17.8	1	-	4
18	4.5	0	-	4
19	6.0	0	-	3
21	27.5	0	-	1
22	38.1	0	-	2

\*1 = permanent; 0 = intermittent

†Presence is indicated by plus (+) sign; absence is indicated by minus (-) sign.

nonindependent occurrence of *I. humilis* in the two environments (table 4) suggests that one might serve as a reservoir for populations to invade the other.

(4) Spot samples also indicate that indigenous species of ants are conspicuous in *I. humilis*-free patches and are underrepresented at sites occupied by *I. humilis*. Because ants were incompletely surveyed in spot samples, this pattern is analyzed in further detail below, using data from the 22 valley riparian sites that were intensively sampled with the full ensemble of collecting methods.

TABLE 4. PATTERN OF OCCURRENCE OF *I. HUMILIS* AT PAIRED SITES, ONE IN RIPARIAN WOODLAND AND THE OTHER IN ADJACENT AGRICULTURAL LAND\*

		Riparian woodland sites			
		Present	Absent	Total	
Adjacent agricultural land	Present	9	0	9	$G = 12.79$
	Absent	3	7	10	$p < .001$
	Total	12	7	19	

\*Based on spot samples taken at 19 pairs of sites along Putah Creek.