



Chair Imeson, State Forester Daugherty, and members of the Board, for the record my name is Seth Barnes, I'm a Forester with the Oregon Forest & Industries Council. I would like to offer comment to you on the Siskiyou review and the information you received today.

I appreciate the work of ODFW and the data they collect and hold across the state regarding fish and wildlife populations. In the context of this conversation, however, it's hard to connect that data with the question at hand. That is to say, what do forests and trees left standing near streams after harvest actually contribute towards fish populations. It's easy to talk about it in the abstract- shade, leaf litter, bank stability, etc- the questions, however, get far more complex as you seek to understand the mechanisms at play and how these different variables affect one another, and ultimately how individual fish and populations of fish respond.

I would offer to you a body of literature that has been generated over time on this subject. I think you will find the research fascinating and informative in terms of some of the questions you're wrestling with in the Siskiyou.

I am not a scientist, but my simple understanding of the findings from the literature are this;

- Fish eat small bugs and organisms that live off of plant material grown in streams.
- That plant material needs a measure of sunlight in order to grow.
- Streams with an over-abundance of shade can actually stymie plant growth and primary productivity to a level where fish populations are detrimentally impacted.
- Research has found that adding pockets of light within the riparian ecosystem actually results in larger, healthier fish, in greater abundance.
- Several researchers continue to uncover information in this arena, and I wanted to make sure you have this science because I think it is completely relevant your conversation.

I recognize that there is more to this story, but so often I hear overly simplified descriptions of riparian interactions with fish populations that don't comport with some of the hard data created by good research. So to that end, I look forward to reading through the literature the department includes within their systematic review.

Kaylor, M.J. and D.R. Warren. 2017. Linking riparian shade and the legacies of forest management to fish and vertebrate biomass in forested streams. *Ecosphere* 8(6):e01845.10.1002/ecs2.1845

Kaylor, M.J. and D.R. Warren. 2017. Long-term effects of riparian forest harvest on light in Pacific Northwest (USA) streams. *Freshwater Science*. 36(1):000-000.

Warren, D.R., W.S. Keeton, P.M. Kiffney, M.J. Kaylor, H.A. Bechtold, and J. Magee. 2016. Changing forests- changing streams: riparian forest stand development and ecosystem function in temperate headwaters. *Ecosphere* 7(8):e01435.10.1002/ecs2.1435

Michael Sievers, Robin Hale, and John Morrongiello. 2017. Do trout respond to riparian change? A meta-analysis with implications for restoration and management. *Freshwater Biology*, 6, 445-457.

Hill, Ryon, and Schilling. 1995. Light limitation in a stream ecosystem: response s by primary producers and consumers. *Ecology*, Vol. 76(4), 1297-1309.

Cross, Benstead, Frost, Thomas. 2005. Ecological stoichiometry in freshwater benthic systems: recent progress and perspectives. *Freshwater Biology*, 50, 1895-1912.

Warren, D.R., S.M. Collins, E.M Purvis*, M.J. Kaylor^u, and H.A. Becthold*. 2016. Spatial variability in light yields co-limitation of primary production by both light and nutrients in a forested stream ecosystem. *Ecosystems*

Warren, D.R., W. S. Keeton, Bechtold, H.A., E.J. Rosi-Marshall. 2013. Comparing streambed light availability and canopy cover in streams with old-growth versus early-mature riparian forests western Oregon. *Aquatic Sciences* 75: 547-558