Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
Journal canadien des sciences halieutiques et aquatiques

Canopy closure after four decades of post-logging riparian forest regeneration reduces cutthroat trout biomass in headwater streams through bottom-up pathways

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2016-0519.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kaylor, Matthew; Oregon State University, Fisheries and Wildlife Warren, Dana Richard; Oregon State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife; Oregon State University, Forest Ecosystems and Society
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	N/A
Keyword:	Stream Habitat, Light Limitation, Riparian regeneration

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Canopy closure after four decades of post-logging riparian forest regeneration reduces cutthroat trout biomass in headwater streams through bottom-up pathways.

Authors and affiliations:

Matthew J. Kaylor^{1,3*}

Dana R. Warren^{1,2,4}

¹ Oregon State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Corvallis OR 97331

² Oregon State University, Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society, Corvallis OR 97331

³ matthew.kaylor@oregonstate.edu

⁴ dana.warren@oregonstate.edu

*Corresponding Author

Matthew J Kaylor
Oregon State University
Dept. of Fisheries and Wildlife
104 Nash Hall
Email: matthew.kaylor@oregonstate.edu

Abstract

Recovery from timber harvest is widespread across North America but few studies have evaluated long-term stream responses to riparian harvest. We revisit five stream reach pairs where in 1976, periphyton chlorophyll *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass were elevated in reaches where canopies were more open following timber harvest. After four decades of riparian regeneration, mean canopy openness, chlorophyll *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass and cutthroat trout biomass declined in harvested reaches relative to paired old-growth reference reaches. In one reach pair the harvested reach remained more open than the control reach. In accordance with the hypothesis that light exerts strong controls on predator biomass via bottom-up processes in these forested headwaters, trout biomass was also greater in the harvested reach in this pair in 2014. Changes in large wood and pool area over this time interval do not account for chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass, or cutthroat trout biomass responses. These results provide empirical support for conceptual models relating changes in riparian canopy cover to primary production and bottom-up controls on consumer populations.

Introduction

The removal or loss of streamside (riparian) forests have clear acute impacts on associated aquatic environments, particularly headwater streams where interaction between aquatic and terrestrial environments are maximized. Stream responses to riparian harvest have been relatively well studied for the initial years following canopy removal (< 10 years), but few studies have evaluated long-term recovery from this disturbance or its effects on stream biota. Conceptual models based on results from comparative studies evaluating stream abiotic and biotic differences between stream reaches of contrasting forest type (e.g. clear-cut, second growth, old-growth) have been developed to suggest likely trajectories of change in stream biota and stream ecosystem processes over the decadal time scales associated with riparian forest stand development (Sedell and Swanson 1984, Gregory et al. 1987, Mellina and Hinch 2009, Warren et al. 2016). These conceptual trajectories portray increases in primary production, with subsequent bottom-up driven increases in invertebrate production and top consumer (usually salmonids) biomass shortly after riparian canopy removal. Then, following canopy closure that reduces light availability, these conceptual models suggest decreasing primary production with associated declines in consumer biomass. Throughout North America, recovery from 20th century timber harvest is a widespread process that affects riparian zones as well as the upland forest (Pan et al. 2011, Kaylor et al. 2017). Evaluating both short-term and long-term impacts of riparian forest removal and recovery provides a more complete understanding of the impacts of riparian forest harvest on adjacent stream ecosystems.

Studies evaluating stream responses to riparian and upland forest modification have been instrumental in elucidating relationships between forest ecosystems and associated stream environments. Removing riparian forests can impact stream habitat, physio-chemical conditions

of a stream, and the productivity and food web structure of streams (Bilby and Ward 1991, Bilby and Bisson 1992, Wootton 2012). The removal of streamside vegetation reduces allochthonous carbon subsidies (e.g. litter and terrestrial invertebrate inputs), and without any compensatory increases in autochthonous carbon, a reduction in detrital and terrestrial invertebrate inputs can lead to decreased abundances and growth of secondary consumers and predators (Wallace 1997, Nakano et al. 1999, Wallace et al. 1999). But riparian timber harvest also reduces stream shading, which may lead to increases in primary production and autochthonous carbon availability (e.g. stream benthic algal communities) by alleviating light limitation (Bilby and Bisson 1992, Ambrose et al. 2004, Wilzbach et al. 2005). When an increase in autotrophy compensates for loss of litter inputs following riparian canopy loss, the abundances and biomass of food-limited invertebrates and fish can increase (Noel et al. 1986, Bilby and Bisson 1992, Wootton 2012). Decreased shading can also lead to increases in stream temperature (Beschta et al. 1987, Moore et al. 2006, Groom et al. 2011), and this can be a concern in systems dominated by cold-water salmonid fishes. Historic timber harvest operations in the riparian zone and upland forest can also negatively impact the stream shortly after logging by increasing sediment inputs (Kreutzweiser and Capell 2001, Croke and Hairsine 2006), decreasing stream habitat complexity (Murphy et al. 1986, Ralph et al. 1994, Sweeney et al. 2004) and creating chemically stressful stream conditions (e.g pH; Baldigo et al. 2005).

Short-term stream responses to timber harvest have been well studied, particularly the response of salmonid species in the Pacific Northwest region of North America (Hall and Lantz 1969, Murphy and Hall 1981, Bilby and Bisson 1992). However, results from this work have been equivocal, with substantial variation in the magnitude and directionality of fish population responses (reviewed in Mellina and Hinch 2009). The extent of habitat modification (loss)

associated with riparian forest management, particularly the removal of large wood from streams and loss of pool habitat, appears to be a key determinant of whether salmonid populations respond positively or negatively on short time scales (Mellina and Hinch 2009). When habitat is not severely degraded, alleviation of light limitation can lead to gains in primary production, thereby enhancing invertebrate production and ultimately top consumer (fish) biomass and growth due to greater prey availability (Murphy and Hall 1981, Bilby and Bisson 1992). Whether initial population responses to harvest are positive (increased biomass) or negative (decreased biomass), few studies have empirically evaluated long-term responses on the decadal time-scales riparian forests take to regenerate (Bisson et al. 2008).

One of the earliest and most widely cited studies evaluating the influences of riparian harvest on fish populations is Murphy and Hall (1981) which documented greater summertime periphyton stocks, predatory invertebrate biomass, and coastal cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii clarkii*) biomass in stream reaches adjacent to small patch clear-cuts (4-20 ha) relative to upstream reference reaches. This result was observed despite removal of large wood and reduced pool area in harvested reaches. Given an increase in trout biomass concurrent with reduced large wood and percent pool area in harvested reaches, Murphy and Hall (1981) concluded that changes trout biomass were likely attributed to greater primary production leading to increased invertebrate prey availability. These findings along with other Pacific Northwest studies (e.g. Aho 1976, Gregory 1980, Murphy et al. 1981, Hawkins et al. 1983) were used to help develop early conceptual models of the temporal responses of resident salmonids following riparian harvest (Sedell and Swanson 1984, Gregory et al. 1987). These models suggest that fish biomass will be elevated for 10-20 years after harvest, but that biomass will return to pre-harvest conditions within 40 years. The potential for biomass levels to fall below pre-harvest conditions

are included if/when second-growth forests had lower light levels than pre-harvest conditions. Updates of this conceptual framework also ascribe high importance to stream light as a potential driver of long-term trends in salmonid abundance in headwater streams (Mellina and Hinch 2009), but acknowledge the potential for substantial variation in long-term stand development trajectories that may affect changes in canopy cover (Warren et al. 2016). To date, empirical support for the long-term trends is limited, especially on streams where the initial responses to harvest have been quantified.

In this study, we revisited five of the six fish-bearing stream reach pairs originally surveyed by Murphy and Hall (1981) to determine how stream conditions, benthic biofilms, invertebrate predators, and ultimately resident coastal cutthroat trout have responded to nearly four decades of riparian forest regeneration. Using the upstream reference reaches identified by Murphy (1979), which were bordered by old-growth riparian forests, this design is similar to a before-after control-impact study with riparian regeneration as the treatment. Given the conclusions from Murphy and Hall (1981) and the importance of light in both historic and contemporary conceptual models of the relationships between stand regeneration, we hypothesized that canopy closure associated with stand regeneration would correspond with declines in chlorophyll *a* standing stocks, predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass. These long-term responses have important implications for stream function across North America where riparian forest recovery is an ongoing and widespread process (Richardson et al. 2012).

Methods

Study System

The five streams evaluated in this study are located within the H.J. Andrews Experimental Forest (hereafter HJA) and the surrounding Willamette National Forest in the western Cascade Mountains of Oregon (Fig. 1). This region is characterized by a Mediterranean climate of wet winters and dry, warm summers. Stream reaches ranged in elevation from 630 meters to 940 meters and were relatively high gradient (4-10%; Table 1) with boulder-dominated substrates. Before forest management began in the HJA in the 1950's and 60's, the area was dominated by a mix of old-growth (dominant trees >400 years of age) and mature (100-150 years old) forests. Today, the HJA remains dominated by late-succession/old-growth forests but patches of younger forest occur regularly in the system reflecting the legacy of past experimental forest management. This patchy forest management within the larger basin created areas where a single stream could have some sections that were heavily impacted by logging and others that were largely unaffected. In this study, we assessed stand regeneration effects on established reach pairs that utilized this patchy management history. Each reach pair in a stream consisted of a stream reach bordered by old-growth riparian forest (hereafter referred to as old-growth reaches) and a reach bordered by previously harvested, and currently regenerating riparian forest (hereafter referred to as previously harvested reaches). Streamside harvesting of the relatively small patch clear-cuts (4-20 ha) evaluated in this study occurred between 1953 and 1965 (Table 1). Harvesting occurred on both stream banks in Mack Creek and Cook Creek, but only on one stream bank at cutblock MR404 on McRae Creek, and cutblocks LO701 and LO703 on Lookout Creek. In all cases trees were removed to the stream edge with no buffers and wood was removed from streams during harvest operations – in accordance with standard forest management practices at that time. Stands were planted with Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) within 5 years of harvest in the management areas, with the exception of Mack Creek,

which was allowed to naturally regenerate. Following harvest or disturbance, red alder (*Alnus rubra*) commonly occupies riparian zones in this region (Summers 1982, Van Pelt et al. 2006, Villarin et al. 2009) and was a dominant canopy species over the stream along the previously harvested reaches of LO701, Cook, and MR404. Very few alder were present at LO703 where dense vine maple (*Acer circinatum*) was instead the dominant hardwood species directly adjacent to the stream. Forests adjacent to old-growth, reference reaches were dominated by Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*) and western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*). In these reaches, alder was present but provided notably less direct over-stream canopy cover.

Detailed explanations of where previous reach pair study sites were established are provided in the appendix of the thesis of M. Murphy (1979), and we were therefore able to identify the locations of both impacted and reference reaches used in the initial surveys. In the initial study (Murphy and Hall 1981), six fish-bearing paired reaches were surveyed. We could no longer access one of these streams due to road closures. The reaches surveyed in Murphy and Hall (1981) were 30 m – 50 m in length except for Mack Creek, which had study reach 200 m in length. We increased reach lengths in the 2014 study to a minimum of 10 times bankfull width (range 90 – 200 m; Table 1) to encompass a wider variety of habitats and account for more spatial variability in fish abundance and biomass. However, lengthening the reaches slightly altered current assessment relative to the initial study. To evaluate whether the use of longer reaches affected the outcome of the stand-regeneration analysis relative to the previous surveys at these sites, we subdivided each individual reach into two sections: (1) a 30-40 m reach that corresponded directly to the reach surveyed in Murphy and Hall (1981), and (2) the additional stream section (ranging from 50 to 70 m). Results from the shorter (30-40 m) reaches were

similar to results from the entire reach which included the shorter reaches. More specifically, the ratios between the harvested reach and the old-growth reach in each reach pair were similar between the shorter reaches and the full reaches, and in every case, the ratio did not affect which reach had greater trout biomass (i.e. if the ratio was greater than one for the longer reach, it was also greater than one for the shorter survey). Because longer reaches encompass more habitat units and align more with contemporary survey methods, we present results from the full survey reaches in this manuscript. The distances between the downstream impacted sites and the upstream reference sites in reach pairs within a stream ranged from 135 m to 325 m.

Resident coastal cutthroat trout (*Onchorhynchus clarkii clarkii*) were the dominant fish species at all sites with sculpin (*Cottus spp.*) present in just one site (MR404). Coastal giant salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*) were present at all surveyed reaches and were a substantial component of total vertebrate biomass (> 50% in some streams).

Field Sampling

We collected data on a suite of abiotic and biotic variables that matched those assessed by Murphy and Hall (1981) to evaluate reach-pair changes over time. All of the initial surveys were conducted in summer during the low-flow period between July and September of 1976 with the exception of Mack Creek fish surveys, which occurred during the summer of 1975.

Hereafter, we refer to the sampling by Murphy and Hall (1981) as “1976 surveys”. In the summer of 2014 sampling also occurred during summer low-flow conditions. Physical habitat variables included canopy cover, bankfull width, wetted width, pool area, large wood abundance and volume, mean daily mean temperature, and stream gradient. Canopy cover was quantified in this study using a spherical densitometer with measurements taken in each cardinal direction (n=4) at 11 locations in each reach. Murphy and Hall (1981) visually assessed canopy openness, and

while there is potential for these methods to yield different estimates, all analyses are based on a comparison of changes in the differences within reach pairs (old-growth vs. harvested) during each sampling period. Thus, methodology is internally consistent within the two periods and we focus on the change in ratios between reference and regenerated sites over time (rather than comparing the change in reference over time to the change in regenerated sites over time). Bankfull and wetted width were measured at regularly spaced intervals, and reach area (for subsequent percent pool area, and per unit area standardization of invertebrate, fish assessments) were calculated as reach length multiplied by mean wetted width. We followed the methods of Murphy and Hall (1981) in identifying and characterizing pools, which were identified during summer-low flow conditions as slow velocity habitat units with minimal turbulence. Pool area was calculated using the length and width of each pool, and percent pool area was calculated as the total pool area divided by total wetted reach area. We counted all large wood pieces – dead wood greater than 10 cm in diameter and one meter in length – within the bankfull channel. For each piece of large wood, we measured the total length within the stream channel and the diameter of the log at both ends. The average of the two diameter measurements was used with length of wood in the bankfull channel to calculate wood volume. Total channel area (mean bankfull width multiplied by reach length) was used to calculate large wood volume per unit area. Temperature loggers (HOBO Pro v2; Onset Computer Corporation, Bourne, MA) were deployed for a two-week period during mid-summer to evaluate relative temperature among streams and differences between paired reaches. Due to a limitation in the number of sensors, temperature data were collected during the same time period (8/8-8/24) for all streams except Cook Creek, where temperature sensors were deployed from 7/20 to 8/3. Temperature data were

not collected in Murphy and Hall (1981) and therefore it was not possible to assess long-term changes in temperature.

Periphyton chlorophyll *a* (here after chl *a*) accrual was quantified in the current study on 15 x 15 cm ceramic tiles (225 cm²) deployed in July and incubated for 6 weeks in riffle sections of the stream (n=10 per reach). Ten tiles were placed in the stream thalweg at regular intervals along each study reach. Tiles were scraped using a wire brush in the field and slurries containing periphyton and stream water for each tile were placed in a cooler and brought back to the lab. Samples were vacuum filtered using Whatman 47 mm GF/F glass fiber filters and filters were frozen for 24 to 48 hours prior to extraction of chl *a* with 15 mL of 90% acetone. Samples were stored in the dark for 2 to 4 hours, brought to room temperature, and shaken twice prior to measurements. Chl *a* concentrations were assessed using fluorometric methods and phaeophytin correction outlined in EPA method 445.0 (Arar and Collins 1997), however samples were not centrifuged prior to analysis (Turner Designs Chlorophyll Application Guide, p. 4). Chl *a* accrual on tiles was also quantified by Murphy and Hall (1981) but they deployed two ceramic tiles for approximately 4 weeks and analyzed chl *a* concentration using methods outlined in Wetzel and Westlake (1969). We increased sample sizes in this study to provide a more rigorous quantification of differences in periphyton accrual on tiles between reaches in a pair that accounts for potential variability in local periphyton standing stocks.

Predatory invertebrates were quantified in the original study by Murphy and Hall (1981) and we therefore evaluated predatory invertebrate biomass in 2014 to evaluate this response over time. Between August and September of 1976, Murphy and Hall (1981) collected three benthic samples from riffle habitats and pooled these into a single sample for each study reach. The 2014 macroinvertebrate sampling was conducted during low flow in late July and both reaches of a

reach pair were always sampled on the same day. In each sampling event, six surber samples (363 μm , 0.0625 m^2) were collected from riffle habitats at regular intervals along each reach. Substrate within the surber sample quadrat was disturbed to a depth of 10 cm for approximately 30 seconds. Samples were stored in 90% alcohol until processing. In the laboratory, the contents of each of the six surber samples from each reach were combined into a single pooled sample. This pooled sample was then subsampled using a plankton splitter until a minimum of 500 individuals were picked from the subsample. Murphy and Hall (1981) picked predatory invertebrates from their samples in the field, which clearly biases the final sample composition toward large bodied individuals. We therefore conducted a 60 second visual search of the remaining sample (less the subsample) to collect large bodied individuals and more effectively match the initial study. Invertebrates were identified to Family or Genus (Merritt et al. 2008) and individually measured using an ocular micrometer mounted on a dissecting microscope. Invertebrate length was converted to biomass using length-weight relationships from published studies (Sample et al. 1993, Sabo et al. 2002) and personal data (M. Wipfli, unpublished data). Subsample abundance and biomass was extrapolated (subsample abundance/biomass divided by subsample proportion multiplied by surber sample area) and combined with the 60 second sample to estimate total abundance and total biomass for each stream reach.

In 2014, fish were collected using a backpack electroshocker (Smith-Root model LR-20B). Block nets were set at the upper and lower ends of each reach to prevent movement and close the system for the duration of the surveys (nets were left in place for the duration of the mark-recapture period). Fish were anesthetized using AQUI-S 20E (AQUI-S, Lower Hutt, New Zealand), weighed, and measured (total length). For mark-recapture surveys, fish were marked with a small caudal clip. Fish were released and each reach was resurveyed after approximately

24 hours. Mark-recapture population estimates were used in four streams (Cook, MR404, LO701, LO703) and abundance was estimated using the Lincoln-Peterson mark-recapture model, modified by Chapman (1951). Mark-recapture reach-scale biomass was estimated by multiplying abundance estimates by mean weight. Juvenile (0+) and adult (1+) cutthroat trout were analyzed separately. In 1976 surveys, mark-recapture methods were used at Cook Creek, MR404, and LO703 but multiple pass depletion methods were used at LO701.

In both 1976 and 2014, multiple pass depletion methods were used to estimate population abundance in Mack Creek. The long-term research project provided the 2014 electrosurvey data used in this study (S.V Gregory, Oregon State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, 104 Nash Hall, Corvallis, OR 07331, USA, unpublished data). However, abiotic and other biotic variables were collected as part of this study and thus, population estimates, which use reach area, may differ from those of S.V. Gregory.

Salamanders were also sampled during both the 1976 and 2014 survey events. Unfortunately, sparse data from the 1976 surveys (see Murphy 1979, Appendix G) limit our ability to rigorously assess differences in salamander biomass within reach pairs over time (e.g. numbers were too low to provide a robust population estimate in most streams). We therefore only quantitatively evaluate salamander biomass in 2014 and compare estimates of biomass in the harvested and old-growth reach of each reach pair to the other variables collected in this study in 2014. Salamanders were surveyed using the same methods as cutthroat trout. However, salamanders were marked with a visual elastomer tag (Northwest Marine Technology, Shaw Island, Washington) for mark-recapture surveys.

Statistical analysis

Our comparisons of 2014 results to those of Murphy and Hall (1981) are similar in design to a before-after-control-impact (BACI) study. This design has been commonly used to assess the short-term impacts of riparian harvest (and other large-scale perturbations) on an ecosystem using a control or reference reach and a treatment reach with data collected before and after a treatment (Stewart-Oaten et al. 1986). In this study, the Murphy and Hall (1981) data represent our pre-treatment condition. Each reach pair ($n=5$) consisted of an old-growth, reference reach and a previously harvested, treatment reach. The treatment, or “impact” in this case, is nearly four decades of recovery from riparian harvesting.

Methodology was consistent within sampling years but differed slightly between 1976 and 2014 for some metrics (e.g. chl *a*). We therefore focus on assessing changes in the ratios between reaches within each pair (previously harvested: old-growth) in 2014 relative to the 1976 surveys. We compare the ratios of response variables between previously harvested and old-growth reaches within years (1976 and 2014), and we evaluate the mean change in the ratios of each response variable between previously harvested and old-growth reaches before (1976) and after (2014) riparian forest stand regeneration. To statistically evaluate potential differences in response metrics within years, we conduct one-way Welch’s t-tests of the natural-log transformed ratios (previously harvested: old-growth) within each year. A mean of 0 in this analysis would indicate no difference in the response variable between paired previously harvested and old-growth reaches during that period (1976 or 2014). Because ratios are more easily interpreted, we provide back-transformed estimates of the mean ratio (previously harvested: old-growth), associated 95% confidence intervals, t-statistics and p-values. To evaluate whether the mean ratios previously harvested and old-growth reaches differed between

sampling periods (1976 versus 2014), we conduct paired t-tests of the difference in log-ratios from 1976 to 2014.

Results

In 1976, Murphy and Hall (1981) compared stream sections by recent patch clear-cuts to paired old-growth reference sections on the same stream. During these initial surveys, percent pool area and large wood volume were lower in the harvested reach compared to the old-growth reach for all five reach pairs (Fig. 2A & 2B, respectively). In contrast, canopy openness, periphyton chl *a* (with one exception), predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass were greater in the harvested reach of each reach pair (Fig. 2C-2F). After nearly four decades of riparian regeneration, the ratios (previously harvested: old-growth) of percent pool area and large wood volume largely persisted while the ratios of canopy openness, chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass and cutthroat trout biomass decreased, indicating a relative decline of the latter metrics in previously harvested reaches relative to paired old-growth reaches (Fig. 3).

In 1976, percent pool area in harvested reaches averaged 0.71 times (95% CI: 0.50-1.00; back-transformed from log ratio estimates) that of associated upstream old-growth reaches (one-way t-test of natural log ratios; $T(df = 4) = -2.79$; $p = 0.049$). In 2014, percent pool area was still lower in previously harvested reaches and averaged 0.85 times (95% CI: 0.54 – 1.33) that of old-growth reaches, although these differences were no longer significant ($T(4) = -1.02$, $p = 0.363$). In 1976, large wood, which had been removed during harvesting operations, was substantially lower in the harvested reach of each pair and averaged only 6% (95% CI: 1% – 81%) of wood volume in old-growth reaches ($T(3) = -3.44$; $p = 0.041$). Large wood volume in one previously

harvested reach was reported as zero (versus $0.9 \text{ m}^3/100 \text{ m}^2$ in the paired old-growth reach) and therefore the ratio of this reach pair could not be evaluated. Four decades later, large wood volume was still substantially lower in previously harvested reaches, averaging 16% (95% CI: 5% - 54%) of wood volume in paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = -4.17$; $p = 0.014$). In contrast to percent pool area and large wood volume, changes in the ratio of canopy cover between paired previously harvested and old-growth reaches changed substantially over the four decade time interval. In 1976, canopy openness was on average 2.46 times (95% CI: 1.62 – 3.72) greater in the harvested reach compared to paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = 6.02$; $p = 0.004$). However, in 2014, canopy openness in previously harvested reaches was on average 0.76 times (95% CI: 0.26 – 2.20) the canopy openness in paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = -0.72$; $p = 0.510$).

Mean ratios of chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass between previously harvested reaches and paired old-growth reaches generally reflected canopy openness results from 1976 and 2014. In 1976, chl *a* was on average 1.86 times (95% CI: = 1.21 – 2.86) greater in the harvested reach of each pair ($T(4) = 2.15$; $p = 0.098$) relative to the old-growth reach. In 2014, chl *a* in previously harvested reaches was on average 0.81 times (95% CI: 0.59 – 1.09) that of paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = -1.96$; $p = 0.121$). Predatory invertebrate biomass was quantified in four reach pairs in 1976 but was not collected in LO703. Predatory invertebrate biomass was on average 2.27 times (1.06 – 4.87) greater in previously harvested reaches compared to paired old-growth reaches during this initial survey period ($T(3) = 3.41$; $p = 0.042$). In 2014, predatory invertebrate biomass was quantified at all five reach pairs and predatory invertebrate biomass in previously harvested reaches averaged 0.72 times (95% CI: 0.44- 1.17) the biomass of paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = -1.88$; $p = 0.134$). Lastly, in 1976, cutthroat trout biomass was on average 1.86 times (95% CI: 1.21 – 2.85) greater in previously harvested

reaches compared to paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = 4.00$; $p = 0.016$). Four decades later, cutthroat trout biomass in previously harvested reaches was on average 0.96 times (95% CI: 0.64 - 1.45) that of paired old-growth reaches ($T(4) = -0.26$; $p = 0.809$).

Differences in ratios of paired previously harvested and old-growth reaches between 1976 and 2014 were evaluated using log-ratios (Fig. 3). The mean log-ratios of percent pool area (95% CI: -0.62 – 0.28; $T(4) = -1.07$; $p = 0.344$) and large wood volume (95% CI: -4.01 – 1.33; $T(3) = -1.60$; $p = 0.209$) were not significantly different between 1976 and 2014. However, the mean difference of log-ratios between 1976 and 2014 were significantly different for canopy openness (95% CI: 0.15 – 2.20; $T(4) = 3.19$; $p = 0.033$), chl *a* (95% CI: 0.18 – 1.46; $T(4) = 3.47$; $p = 0.023$), and predatory invertebrate biomass (95% CI: 0.70 – 1.78; $T(3) = 7.28$; $p = 0.005$). While the mean log-ratio of cutthroat trout biomass was substantially lower in 2014 compared to 1976, the mean difference in log-ratios was not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (95% CI: -0.04 – 1.36; $T(4) = 2.62$; $p = 0.059$).

Although on average across the five reach pairs, forest regeneration resulted in a decline in canopy openness, chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass and ultimately cutthroat trout biomass, this result was not universal. In 2014, canopy openness was still substantially greater in the previously harvested reach of LO703 relative to the old-growth reach (54% vs 34%) despite four decades of stand regeneration. While the canopy did not close over this time interval as we expected, the lack of canopy closure at this site was fortuitous in that it allowed us to more explicitly evaluate the role of light regulating bottom-up controls on stream biota. In 1976, canopy openness, chl *a*, and cutthroat trout biomass in L703 were greater in the harvested reach (predatory invertebrates were not collected at this site during initial surveys). In 2014, contrary to expectations, mean chl *a* and predatory invertebrate biomass were relatively similar between the

previously harvested and old-growth reaches. However, consistent with expectations, cutthroat trout biomass remained greater in the previously harvested reach relative to the more shaded old-growth reach (8.01 vs 5.13 g/m²).

We were not able to rigorously compare estimates of salamander biomass between 1976 and 2014. However, results from 2014 alone are consistent with those observed for cutthroat trout biomass (Appendix Fig. A1). Estimates of salamander biomass were similar between the harvested reach and the old-growth reach for MR404, Mack Creek and LO701. In Cook Creek, where estimates of canopy openness and cutthroat trout biomass were lower in the harvested reach, salamander biomass was just over half the estimated biomass in the old-growth reach (4.41 vs 8.1 g·m⁻²). In LO703, estimated salamander biomass was substantially greater in the harvested reach compared to the old-growth reach (14.95 vs 9.82 g·m⁻²) – a result that is also consistent with canopy openness and trout biomass.

Discussion

After nearly four decades of riparian regeneration, mean canopy openness, chlorophyll *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass and cutthroat trout biomass declined in harvested reaches relative to paired old-growth reference reaches, which provides empirical data supporting conceptual models of stream abiotic and biotic responses to riparian stand regeneration over time in forested ecosystems. In the sites evaluated in this study, mean chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass were initially greater in harvested reaches where canopies were more open relative to paired, old-growth reaches 5-23 years after riparian harvest occurred (Murphy and Hall 1981). These results were observed despite the removal of large wood and lower percent pool area in harvested reaches compared to paired old-growth reaches. In 2014, large

wood volume was still substantially lower in previously harvested reaches but percent pool area was similar between paired previously harvested and old-growth reaches. Consistent with the hypothesis that stream light availability can be an important bottom-up driver of the biomass of periphyton and biota in headwater streams, declines in canopy openness in previously harvested reaches relative to paired old-growth reaches over this time interval were accompanied by similar declines in periphyton chl *a*, predatory invertebrate biomass, and cutthroat trout biomass in four of five streams. Overall results from four of the five sites were consistent with trajectories of change portrayed in conceptual models where bottom-up processes strongly influence top predator biomass (usually salmonids) – with increases in predator biomass shortly after riparian forest harvest, and declines in the biomass of stream predators following stand regeneration when canopies close back over the stream (Sedell and Swanson 1984, Gregory et al. 1987, Mellina and Hinch 2009, Warren et al. 2016).

In contrast to our expectations, trout biomass remained substantially greater in the previously harvested reach relative to the reference, old-growth reach at site LO703. While the trend at this site did not fit the classic hypothesized trajectory of biomass over time (e.g. reduced biomass), this result ultimately provides support for the importance of light as a driver of trout biomass in these forested headwater streams. The LO703 site experienced little change in canopy cover from 1976 to 2014 with greater canopy openness in the previously harvested reach during both survey periods. Therefore, the absence of a relative decline in trout biomass following stand regeneration from 1976 to 2014 is consistent with the hypothesized mechanism of changes in canopy cover exerting controls on consumers through bottom-up processes. However, in 2014, chl *a* and the biomass of predatory invertebrates were similar between reaches within this pair despite differences in canopy cover. We speculate that the similarity in chl *a* may be attributed to

greater grazing pressure in the previously harvested reach because total invertebrate biomass (not just predatory invertebrates) was approximately 40% greater in the previously harvested reach in 2014 compared to the old-growth reach (MJ Kaylor; unpublished data) and other studies have found that the effects of changing light on periphyton standing stocks can be missed when macroinvertebrate consumption is high (Kiffney et al. 2004). Additionally, salamander biomass at this site was 1.5 times greater in the previously harvested reach in 2014. The previously harvested reach of LO703 was the only previously harvested reach in which vine maple (rather than alder) dominated the riparian tree community. The results from this reach pair therefore also highlight the importance of considering multiple riparian development trajectories when assessing and projecting forest recovery influences on streams and the biota therein (Warren et al. 2016).

While changes in light over time appear to be the dominant driver of the trout biomass in our study streams, variables not quantified in this study may have also influence trout biomass over time. Nutrient inputs to streams, particularly nitrogen, often increase in response to riparian harvest (Feller 2005, Kreutzweiser et al. 2008) and increased nutrient inputs have been linked to increased predator production through bottom-up pathways (Johnston et al. 1990, Deegan and Peterson 1992, Peterson et al. 1993, Cross et al. 2006). However, stream nutrient responses to riparian harvest typically depend on the amount of the basin harvested (Tiedemann et al. 1988, Feller 2005), and the size of harvest units in this study were small (<20 ha) within a surrounding basin of unharvested forest. Similarly, temperature may have increased following riparian harvest, which could have altered stream productivity and fish growth rates. In the 1970s, temperature was only monitored at one of the five sites, Mack Creek, and mean weekly temperatures did not exceed 1.0°C greater in the harvested reach compared to the upstream

reference reach (Aho 1976). Given the small sizes of the harvest units and the cool background temperatures of the streams in this study, we do not invoke temperature changes as a major driver of the response in predatory invertebrate or trout biomass. Lastly, because fish are visual feeders, changes in light may have led to changes in fish biomass by altering fish feeding efficiency (Wilzbach and Hall 1985). While decreasing light could lead to reduced feeding efficiency, we do not believe that it was a dominant driver of the responses observed here because it would not account for the changes in chl *a* or predatory invertebrates that we observed.

A limited number of studies have empirically evaluated resident fish responses to timber harvest on the same streams over timescales greater than 10 years (Bisson et al. 2008). These studies reveal the potential for drastically different short- and long-term trajectories from those observed in this study. In the Alsea Watershed study (AWS) located in the Oregon Coast Range, clear-cut harvesting of the entire 71 hectare Needle Branch watershed resulted in a short-term reduction in resident cutthroat trout biomass and abundance (Hall and Lantz 1969). In 25-30 years after harvest, cutthroat trout biomass had not recovered and remained below pre-harvest levels (Gregory et al. 2008). Short-term effects of increased temperature, longer-term effects of habitat degradation, and interactions with other salmonid species were identified as possible explanations of continued suppression (Gregory et al. 2008). In East Creek, British Columbia, cutthroat biomass was lower relative to a reference reach following clear-cut harvesting and stream wood removal (Young et al. 1999). Temperatures exceeded 30°C shortly after harvesting, which likely resulted in high short-term mortality. Approximately a decade later, temperature in the harvested reach had substantially decreased, pool area had increased, and trout abundance was similar to that of the reference reach. Pool area increased again over the next decade, and

trout abundance in the previously impacted reach was nearly double that of the reference reach. While this initially appears to contrast with hypothesized trajectories associated with stand recovery and canopy closure, both riparian thinning and habitat restoration occurred in this stream between the second and third sampling events, which confound interpretation of habitat changes alone as the mechanism driving long-term recovery trends (Young et al. 1999).

Our current study along with the two earlier long-term studies and the studies quantifying responses over shorter timeframes highlight the potential for fish recovery to progress along multiple alternative trajectories that are affected directly and indirectly by trajectories of change in the riparian forest (Hall and Lantz 1969, Young et al. 1999, Gregory et al. 2008, Mellina and Hinch 2009). Long-term recovery from forest management is also a result of how stream habitat and food webs are initially affected by management. In the short-term, resident salmonid biomass may substantially decrease when increases in temperature exceed thermal limits, or when habitat, particularly loss of pools, is substantially degraded (reviewed in Mellina and Hinch 2009). Populations may recover relatively quickly (<10 years) as temperature recovers or when restoration efforts can enhance the recovery of key habitat elements such as pool structure (Young et al. 1999). However, natural recovery of pool forming large wood operates on decadal and centennial time scales (Benda et al. 2003, Gregory et al. 2003, Warren et al. 2009), and it is likely that fish populations affected by the loss of large wood structure will remain suppressed for a long period of time (Connolly and Hall 1999). In high gradient boulder-dominated systems where large rocks are functioning as key pool-forming agents during summer, changes or differences in large wood volume may be more likely to yield equivocal results since habitat is not limiting (Warren and Kraft 2003). In these systems, changes in light availability and primary production are likely to be the dominant drivers of consumer biomass over time. To illustrate

how trajectories of change over time for resident salmonids following riparian harvest can vary depending on the type and degree impact and on the trajectories of recovery in the riparian forest we suggest six dominant alternative trajectories a resident trout population may follow after riparian harvest (Fig. 4). The set of six alternative trajectories is not exhaustive but demonstrates the complexity of potential resident salmonid responses based on food web and habitat impacts associated with riparian harvest. Greater detail on each trajectory is provided in Appendix B.

In light-limited systems that exhibit trajectories similar to those observed in this study (Fig. 4 - trajectory 1), the timing of canopy closure and duration of a closed canopy will ultimately influence long-term responses to timber harvest and subsequent regeneration. If canopies close quickly (<20 years) and are followed by a long period (>50 years) of low light associated with stands in the mid-seral stages of stand development, harvesting may result in a net reduction in benthic biofilms, aquatic macroinvertebrates and total trout biomass over decadal time scales, even if an initial increase in biomass was observed in the years shortly after canopy removal. In Douglas-fir dominated regions of the Pacific Northwest, canopy closure over headwater streams typically occurs within 30 years after riparian harvest and canopies remain more closed than pre-harvest, old-growth conditions from 30-100 years (Kaylor et al. 2017). This has important implications considering riparian harvest has been advocated as a potential tool for increasing fish productivity in Pacific Northwest streams (Newton and Ice 2015) with relatively little consideration of long-term responses and alternative trajectories.

Broadly, this study highlights that changes in stream light availability over time, whether associated with forest recovery or in response to other riparian forest changes, can influence consumers through bottom-up pathways in forested headwater streams. Riparian forest recovery from historic harvest is a widespread process that affects light availability in forested streams

across North America (Keeton et al. 2007, Kaylor et al. 2017). Results from this study provide support for the hypothesis that decreasing light availability associated with canopy closure is likely to be accompanied by reductions in consumer biomass in light limited streams (when habitat degradation has been minimal). However, many forest recovery trajectories exist, and these stand development processes will interact with stream conditions and the physiological constraints of stream biota to allow for multiple trajectories of change over time. Understanding long-term responses of stream habitat, productivity and consumer populations to riparian harvest and recovery will improve our ability to contextualize and project ongoing changes stream ecosystem function and stream biota in the future .

Acknowledgements

We thank Brian VerWey, Kate Pospisil, Emily Heaston, Chris Kopet, and Emily Purvis for their work in the field and the HJ Andrews staff for logistical support. Stanley Gregory and Randy Wildman provided unpublished 2014 fish and salamander survey data from Mack Creek. Judy Li and William Gerth provided lab space to sort and subsample invertebrates and Dave Lytle and Rich Van Driesche provided lab space and a microscope for identifying and measuring invertebrates. Rich Van Driesche and William Gerth also generously provided invertebrate identification expertise that was invaluable to this study. Matthew Sloat provided feedback and suggestions on alternative trajectories salmonid populations may take following riparian harvest. Additional conversation and support was provided by Joey “T” Lemanski. Project funding was provided by Oregon’s Fish and Wildlife Habitat in Managed Forests Research Program. Graduate student funding was supported by the HJ Andrews Experimental Forest LTER (Grant DEB 1440409) and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program.

537 All surveying efforts were in compliance with Oregon State University's Animal Care and Use
538 Committee (Permit #4439).

Draft

References

- Aho, R.S. 1976. A population study of the cutthroat trout in an unshaded and shaded section of stream. Oregon State University. Available from <https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/21777>.
- Ambrose, H.E., Wilzbach, M.A., and Cummins, K.W. 2004. Periphyton response to increased light and salmon carcass introduction in northern California streams. *North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **23**(4): 701–712. doi:doi/10.1899/0887-3593(2004)023<0701:PRTILA>2.0.CO;2.
- Arar, E.J., and Collins, G.B. 1997. In vitro determination of chlorophyll a and pheophytin a in marine and freshwater algae by fluorescence. *In* US Environmental Protection Agency Method 445.0 Revision 1.2. Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Baldigo, B.P., Murdoch, P.S., and Burns, D.A. 2005. Stream acidification and mortality of brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) in response to timber harvest in Catskill Mountain watersheds, New York, USA. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **62**: 1168–1183. doi:10.1139/F05-022.
- Benda, L., Miller, D., Sias, J., Martin, D., Bilby, R., Veldhuisen, C., and Dunne, T. 2003. Wood recruitment processes and wood budgeting. *Am. Fish. Soc. Symp.* **37**: 49–73.
- Beschta, R.L., Bilby, R.E., Brown, G.W., Holtby, L.B., and Hofstra, T.D. 1987. Stream temperature and aquatic habitat: Fisheries and forestry interactions. *In* Streamside management: Forestry and fishery interactions, vol. 57. *Edited by* E.O. Salo and T.W. Cundy. University of Washington, Institute of Forest Resources, Seattle, Washington. pp. 191–232.
- Bilby, R.E., and Bisson, P.A. 1992. Allochthonous versus autochthonous organic matter contributions to the trophic support of fish populations in clear-cut and old-growth forested streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **49**: 540–551. doi:10.1139/f92-064.
- Bilby, R.E., and Ward, J.W. 1991. Characteristics and function of large woody debris in streams draining old-growth, clear-cut, and second-growth forests in southwestern Washington. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **48**: 2499–2508. doi:10.1139/f91-291.
- Bisson, P.A., Gregory, S. V., Nickelson, T.E., and Hall, J.D. 2008. The Alsea Watershed Study: A comparison with other multi-year investigations in the Pacific Northwest. *In* Hydrological and Biological Responses to Forest Practices. *Edited by* J.D. Stednick. Springer. pp. 259–289.
- Chapman, D.G. 1951. Some properties of the hypergeometric distribution, with applications to zoological sample censuses. *Univ. Calif. Publ. Stat.* **1**: 131–160.
- Connolly, P.J., and Hall, J.D. 1999. Biomass of Coastal Cutthroat Trout in unlogged and previously clear-cut basins in the central Coast Range of Oregon. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **128**: 890–899. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1999)128<0890.
- Croke, J.C., and Hairsine, P.B. 2006. Sediment delivery in managed forests: a review. *Environ. Rev.* **14**: 59–87. doi:10.1139/A05-016.
- Cross, W.F., Wallace, J.B., Rosemond, A.D., and Eggert, S.L. 2006. Whole-system nutrient enrichment increases secondary production in a detrital-based ecosystem. *Ecology* **87**(6):

- 578 1556–1565. doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[1556:WNEISP]2.0.CO;2.
- 579 Deegan, L. a, and Peterson, B.J. 1992. Whole-river fertilization stimulates fish production in an
580 arctic tundra river. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **49**: 1890–1901.
- 581 Feller, M.C. 2005. Forest harvesting and streamwater inorganic chemistry in western North
582 America: A review. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* **41**(4): 785–811. doi:10.1111/j.1752-
583 1688.2005.tb03771.x.
- 584 Gregory, S., Meleason, M., and Sobota, D. 2003. Modeling the dynamics of wood in streams and
585 rivers. *Am. Fish. Soc. Symp.* **37**: 315–335.
- 586 Gregory, S. V. 1980. Effects of light, nutrients, and grazers on periphyton communities in
587 streams. Oregon State University. Available from
588 <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/17914>.
- 589 Gregory, S. V., Lamberti, G.A., Erman, D.C., Koski, K. V., Murphy, M.L., and Sedell, J.R.
590 1987. Influences of forest practices on aquatic production. *In* *Streamside Management:*
591 *Forestry and Fishery Interactions. Edited by E.O. Salo and T.W. Cundy.* University of
592 Washington, Institute of Forest Resources, Seattle, Washington. pp. 233–255.
- 593 Gregory, S. V, Schwartz, J.S., Hall, J.D., Wildman, R.C., and Bisson, P.A. 2008. Long-term
594 trends in habitat and fish populations in the Alsea Basin. *In* *Hydrological and Biological*
595 *Responses to Forest Practices. Edited by J.D. Stednick.* Springer. pp. 237–257. Available
596 from <http://www.springerlink.com/index/G011704122L53704.pdf>.
- 597 Groom, J.D., Dent, L., Madsen, L.J., and Fleuret, J. 2011. Response of western Oregon (USA)
598 stream temperatures to contemporary forest management. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **262**(8): 1618–
599 1629. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2011.07.012.
- 600 Hall, J.D., and Lantz, R.L. 1969. Effects of Logging on the habitat of coho salmon and cutthroat
601 trout in coastal streams. *In* *Symposium on Salmon and trout in streams. Edited by T.G.*
602 *Northcote. H.R. MacMillan Lectures in Fisheries, University of British Columbia.* pp. 355–
603 375.
- 604 Hawkins, C.P., Murphy, M.L., Anderson, N., and Wilzbach, M.A. 1983. Density of fish and
605 salamanders in relation to riparian canopy and physical habitat in streams of the
606 northwestern United States. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **40**(8): 1173–1185. doi:10.1139/f83-
607 134.
- 608 Johnston, N.T., Perrin, C.J., Slaney, P.A., and Ward, B.R. 1990. Increased juvenile salmonid
609 growth by whole-river fertilization. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **47**: 862–872. doi:10.1139/f90-
610 099.
- 611 Kaylor, M.J., Warren, D.R., and Kiffney, P.M. 2017. Long-term effects of riparian forest harvest
612 on light in Pacific Northwest (USA) streams. *Freshw. Sci.* **36**(1). doi:10.1086/690624.
- 613 Keeton, W.S., Kraft, C.E., and Warren, D.R. 2007. Mature and old-growth riparian forests:
614 structure, dynamics, and effects on Adirondack stream habitats. *Ecol. Appl.* **17**(3): 852–68.
615 Available from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17494402>.
- 616 Kiffney, P.M., Richardson, J.S., and Bull, J.P. 2004. Establishing light as a causal mechanism

- 617 structuring stream communities in response to experimental manipulation of riparian buffer
618 width. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **23**(3): 542–555.
- 619 Kreutzweiser, D.P., and Capell, S.S. 2001. Fine sediment deposition in streams after selective
620 forest harvesting without riparian buffers. *Can. J. For. Res.* **31**: 2134–2142.
621 doi:10.1139/cjfr-31-12-2134.
- 622 Kreutzweiser, D.P., Hazlett, P.W., and Gunn, J.M. 2008. Logging impacts on the
623 biogeochemistry of boreal forest soils and nutrient export to aquatic systems: A review.
624 *Environ. Rev.* **16**(NA): 157–179. doi:10.1139/A08-006.
- 625 Mellina, E., and Hinch, S.G. 2009. Influences of riparian logging and in-stream large wood
626 removal on pool habitat and salmonid density and biomass: a meta-analysis. *Can. J. For.*
627 *Res.* **39**(7): 1280–1301. doi:10.1139/X09-037.
- 628 Merritt, R.W., Cummins, K.W., and Berg, M.B. (*Editors*). 2008. An introduction to the aquatic
629 insects of North America. Kendell Hunt Publishing Company.
- 630 Moore, R.D., Spittlehouse, D.L., and Story, A. 2006. Riparian microclimate and stream
631 temperature response to forest harvesting: A review. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* **41**(4):
632 813–834. doi:10.1111/j.1752-1688.2005.tb03772.x.
- 633 Murphy, M.L. 1979. Predator assemblages in old-growth and logged sections of small cascade
634 streams. Oregon State University. Available from
635 <http://andrewsforest.oregonstate.edu/pubs/pdf/pub1933.pdf>.
- 636 Murphy, M.L., and Hall, J.D. 1981. Vaired effects of clear-cut logging on predators and their
637 habitat in small streams of the Cascade Mountains, Oregon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **38**:
638 137–145. doi:10.1139/f81-018.
- 639 Murphy, M.L., Hawkins, C.P., and Anderson, N.H. 1981. Effects of canopy modification and
640 accumulated sediment on stream communities. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **110**(4): 469–478.
641 doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1981)110<469.
- 642 Murphy, M.L., Heifetz, J., Johnson, S.W., Koski, K. V, and Thedinga, J.F. 1986. Effects of
643 clear-cut logging with and without buffer strips on juvenile salmonids in Alaskan streams.
644 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **43**: 1521–1533. doi:10.1139/f86-190.
- 645 Nakano, S., Miyasaka, H., and Naotoshi, K. 1999. Terrestrial-aquatic linkages: riparian
646 arthropod inputs alter trophic cascades in a stream food web. *Ecology* **80**(7): 2435–2441.
647 doi:10.2307/176923.
- 648 Newton, M., and Ice, G. 2015. Regulating riparian forests for aquatic productivity in the Pacific
649 Northwest, USA: addressing a paradox. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*: 1–9.
650 doi:10.1007/s11356-015-5814-7.
- 651 Noel, Di.S., Martin, C.W., and Federer, C.A. 1986. Effects of forest clearcutting in New England
652 on stream macroinvertebrates and periphyton. *Environ. Manage.* **10**(5): 661–670.
653 doi:10.1007/BF01866770.
- 654 Pan, Y., Chen, J.M., Birdsey, R., McCullough, K., He, L., and Deng, F. 2011. Age structure and
655 disturbance legacy of North American forests. *Biogeosciences* **8**(3): 715–732.

- doi:10.5194/bg-8-715-2011.
- Van Pelt, R., O'Keefe, T.C., Latterell, J.J., and Naiman, R.J. 2006. Riparian forest stand development along the Queets River in Olympic National Park, Washington. *Ecol. Monogr.* **76**(2): 277–298. Available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27646041>.
- Peterson, B.J., Deegan, L., Helfrich, J., Hobbie, J.E., Hullar, M., Moller, B., Ford, T.E., Hershey, A., Hiltner, A., Kipphut, G., Lock, M.A., Fiebig, D.M., Mckinley, V., Miller, M.C., Vestal, J.R., Ventullo, R., Ecology, S., and Apr, N. 1993. Biological responses of a tundra river to fertilization. *Ecology* **74**(3): 653–672. Available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1940794>.
- Ralph, S.C., Poole, G.C., Conquest, L.L., and Naiman, R.J. 1994. Stream channel morphology and woody debris in logged and unlogged basins of western Washington. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **51**: 37–51. doi:10.1139/f94-006.
- Richardson, J.S., Naiman, R.J., and Bisson, P.A. 2012. How did fixed-width buffers become standard practice for protecting freshwaters and their riparian areas from forest harvest practices? *Freshw. Sci.* **31**(1): 232–238. doi:10.1899/11-031.1.
- Sabo, J.L., Bastow, J.L., and Power, M.E. 2002. Length–mass relationships for adult aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates in a California watershed. *North Am. Benthological Soc.* **21**(2): 336–343. doi:10.2307/1468420.
- Sample, B.E., Cooper, R.J., Greer, R.D., and Whitmore, R.C. 1993. Estimation of insect biomass by length and width. *Am. Midl. Nat.* **129**(2): 234–240. doi:10.2307/2426503.
- Sedell, J.R., and Swanson, F.J. 1984. Ecological characteristics of streams in old-growth forests of the Pacific Northwest. In *Fish and Wwldlife relationships in old-growth forests. Edited by W.R. Meehan, T.R. Merrell, and T.A. Hanley.* Juneau, Alaska. pp. 9–16.
- Stewart-Oaten, A., Murdoch, W.W., and Parker, K.R. 1986. Environmental impact assessment: “pseudoreplication” in time? *Ecology* **67**(4): 929–940. doi:10.2307/1939815.
- Summers, R.P. 1982. Trends in riparian vegetation regrowth following timber harvesting in western Oregon watersheds. Oregon State University. Available from <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/9877>.
- Sweeney, B.W., Bott, T.L., Jackson, J.K., Kaplan, L.A., Newbold, J.D., Standley, L.J., Hession, W.C., and Horwitz, R.J. 2004. Riparian deforestation, stream narrowing, and loss of stream ecosystem services. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **101**(39): 14132–14137. doi:10.1073/pnas.0405895101.
- Tiedemann, A.R., Quigley, T.M., and Anderson, T.D. 1988. Effects of timber harvest on stream chemistry and dissolved nutrient losses in northeast Oregon. *For. Sci.* **34**(2): 344–358.
- Villarin, L.A., Chapin, D.M., and Jones, J.E. 2009. Riparian forest structure and succession in second-growth stands of the central Cascade Mountains, Washington, USA. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **257**(5): 1375–1385. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.12.007.
- Wallace, J.B. 1997. Multiple trophic levels of a forest stream linked to terrestrial litter inputs. *Science* (80-.). **277**(5322): 102–104. doi:10.1126/science.277.5322.102.

- 694 Wallace, J.B., Eggert, S.L., Meyer, J.L., and Webster, J.R. 1999. Effects of resource limitation
695 on a detrital-based ecosystem. *Ecol. Monogr.* **69**(4): 409–442. doi:10.2307/2657224.
- 696 Warren, D.R., Keeton, W.S., Kiffney, P.M., Kaylor, M.J., Bechtold, H.A., and Magee, J. 2016.
697 Changing forests - changing streams: riparian forest stand development and ecosystem
698 function in temperate headwaters. *Ecosphere* **7**(8): e01435. doi:10.1002/ecs2.1435.
- 699 Warren, D.R., and Kraft, C.E. 2003. Brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) response to wood
700 removal from high-gradient streams of the Adirondack Mountains (N. Y., U. S. A.). *Can. J.*
701 *Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**: 379–389. doi:10.1139/F03-031.
- 702 Warren, D.R., Kraft, C.E., Keeton, W.S., Nunery, J.S., and Likens, G.E. 2009. Dynamics of
703 wood recruitment in streams of the northeastern US. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **258**(5): 804–813.
704 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2009.05.020.
- 705 Wetzel, R.G., and Westlake, D.F. 1969. Estimating quantity and quality of biomass - periphyton.
706 *In* A manual on methods for measuring primary production in the aquatic environment.
707 *Edited by* R.A. Voflenweider. Davis Co, Philadelphia. pp. 33–40.
- 708 Wilzbach, M.A., and Hall, J.D. 1985. Prey availability and foraging behavior of cutthroat trout in
709 an open and forested section of stream. *Verhandlungen Int. Verein Limnol.* **22**: 2516–2522.
- 710 Wilzbach, M.A., Harvey, B.C., White, J.L., and Nakamoto, R.J. 2005. Effects of riparian canopy
711 opening and salmon carcass addition on the abundance and growth of resident salmonids.
712 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **62**: 58–67. doi:10.1139/F04-177.
- 713 Wootton, J.T. 2012. River food web response to large-scale riparian zone manipulations. *PLoS*
714 *One* **7**(12): 1–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0051839.
- 715 Young, K.A., Hinch, S.G., and Northcote, T.G. 1999. Status of resident Coastal Cutthroat Trout
716 and their habitat twenty-five years after riparian logging. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **19**:
717 901–911. doi:10.1577/1548-8675(1999)019<0901:SORCCT>2.0.CO;2.
- 718

Tables and Figure Legends

Table 1: Physical attributes of stream reach pairs in summer 2014. OG = old-growth riparian forest and PH = previously harvested riparian forest on at least one stream bank. Temperature is the mean daily mean temperature for a two-week period in July, 2014.

Fig. 1: Blue River drainage, a tributary of the McKenzie River, and sampling sites. Filled circles indicate upstream old-growth, reference reaches and open circles indicate previously harvested reaches of each reach pair.

Fig. 2: Ratios of previously harvested to old-growth values for percent pool area (A; %), large wood volume (B; $\text{m}^3 \cdot 100 \text{ m}^{-2}$), canopy openness (C; %), chl *a* (D; $\mu\text{g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$), predatory invertebrate biomass (E; $\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$) and cutthroat trout biomass (F; $\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$) in five reach pairs in the 1970s (open shapes) and in 2014 (filled shapes) after four decades of riparian regeneration.

Fig. 3: Mean log-ratios (previously harvested: old-growth; $\pm 1\text{SE}$) of five reach pairs for the suite of abiotic and biotic variables in the 1970s (open bars) and in 2014 (filled bars) after four decades of riparian regeneration. A value of zero indicates no difference between reaches within a reach pair.

Fig. 4: A suite of potential long-term responses of a resident trout population to riparian timber harvest: 1) Changes in canopy cover drive primary and secondary production; 2) Smaller changes in canopy cover such as those from thinning with a riparian buffer promote smaller magnitude and shorter duration changes in primary and secondary production; 3) Harvesting results in minimal changes in habitat and production; 4) Short-term negative response (e.g. temperature) that quickly recovers; 5) Long-term negative response associated with habitat degradation from the loss of large wood; 6) Alternative steady state in which both habitat and

742 populations do not recover on these time scales (e.g. historic splash dams scouring stream
743 substrate to bedrock). See Appendix B for more detailed explanations of trajectories.

744

Draft

Table 1: Physical attributes of stream reach pairs in summer 2014. OG =bordered by old-growth riparian forest and PH = bordered by previously harvested riparian forest on at least one stream bank. Temperature is the mean daily mean temperature for a two-week period in July, 2014.

Site	Riparian type	Harvest Year	Area Harvested (ha)	Bankfull Width (m)	Canopy Openness (%)	Gradient (%)	Wood Volume (m ³ 100 m ⁻²)	Pool Area (%)	Elevation (m)	Temp (°C)
LO703	OG	-	-	7.8	34.0	6.4	2.0	16.8	940	9.1
	PH	1960	7	7.4	53.8	6.4	0.7	15.4	900	9.3
Mack	OG	-	-	9.8	23.9	9.5	6.0	27.0	800	12.4
	PH	1965	4	9.3	32.2	9.9	1.5	21.4	750	12.7
LO701	OG	-	-	9.9	20.2	7.1	2.7	40.2	810	9.9
	PH	1959	12	9.0	10.5	6.0	0.9	42.4	750	10.3
Cook	OG	-	-	10.55	23.8	4.6	6.6	17.5	700	13.8
	PH	1971	7	8.6	4.8	4	0.6	21.2	650	13.9
MR404	OG	-	-	10.4	29.0	7.6	6.8	41.0	660	13.7
	PH	1953	20	8.6	32.7	4.0	0.3	19.2	630	13.6

751 **Fig. 1:** Blue River drainage, a tributary of the McKenzie River, and sampling sites. Filled circles
752 indicate upstream old-growth, reference reaches and open circles indicate previously harvested
753 reaches of each reach pair.

Fig. 2: Ratios of previously harvested to old-growth values for percent pool area (A; %), large wood volume (B; $\text{m}^3 \cdot 100 \text{ m}^{-2}$), canopy openness (C; %), chl *a* (D; $\mu\text{g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2}$), predatory invertebrate biomass (E; $\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$) and cutthroat trout biomass (F; $\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$) in five reach pairs in the 1970s (open shapes) and in 2014 (filled shapes) after four decades of riparian regeneration.

* No macroinvertebrate sampling in 1976.

† For MR404, the ratio in 2014 is 1.13 when sculpin are included.

763 **Fig. 3:** Mean log-ratios (previously harvested: old-growth; ± 1 SE) of five reach pairs for the suite
 764 of abiotic and biotic variables in the 1970s (open bars) and in 2014 (filled bars) after four
 765 decades of riparian regeneration. A value of zero indicates no difference between reaches within
 766 a reach pair.

Fig. 4: A suite of potential long-term responses of a resident trout population to riparian timber harvest: 1) Changes in canopy cover drive primary and secondary production; 2) Smaller changes in canopy cover such as those from thinning with a riparian buffer promote smaller magnitude and shorter duration changes in primary and secondary production; 3) Harvesting results in minimal changes in habitat and production; 4) Short-term negative response (e.g. temperature or sedimentation) that quickly recovers; 5) Long-term negative response associated with habitat degradation from the loss of large wood; 6) Alternative steady state in which both habitat and populations do not recover on these time scales (e.g. historic splash dams scouring stream substrate to bedrock). See Appendix B for more detailed explanations of trajectories.

Appendix A

Table A1: Salamander biomass and canopy openness in previously harvested and old-growth reaches in 2014. Salamander biomass includes 95% confidence intervals on population estimates in parentheses.

Site	Riparian type	Salamander biomass (g • m ⁻²)	Canopy openness (%)
LO703	OG	9.82 (5.79-13.96)	34.0
	PH	14.95 (7.41-22.48)	53.8
Mack	OG	6.91 (6.22-7.59)	23.9
	PH	7.95 (7.06-8.84)	32.2
LO701	OG	10.58 (1.46-19.70)	20.2
	PH	12.86 (3.95-21.78)	10.5
Cook	OG	8.09 (5.14-11.05)	23.8
	PH	4.41 (2.81-6.02)	4.8
MR404	OG	5.87 (2.04-9.71)	29.0
	PH	6.69 (3.55-9.83)	32.7

Table A2: Description of reach locations.

Site	Riparian type	Site Location Description
LO703	OG	Upstream end 10 m downstream of cold creek and downstream end 70 m upstream of L703 cut break.
	PH	Upstream end 90 m downstream of L703 cut break. Downstream end located 5 m upstream of channel braid.
Mack	OG	Contact S.V. Gregory for reach information.
	PH	Contact S.V. Gregory for reach information.
LO701	OG	Downstream end of reach located 75 m upstream of L701 cut break.
	PH	Upstream end of reach located 175 m downstream of L701 cut break.
Cook	OG	Downstream end of reach approximately 200 m upstream of cut break.
	PH	Upstream end of reach located approximately 100 m downstream of cut break.
MR404	OG	Downstream end of reach located approximately 80 m upstream of L404 cut break.
	PH	Upstream end of reach located approximately 110 m downstream of L404 cut break.

Figure A1: Percent pool area, large wood volume and canopy openness in 1976 (left) and 2014 (right). Unshaded bars represent reaches within harvested riparian forest and shaded bars are within the upstream old-growth reference. 2014 canopy openness is shown with 95% confidence intervals of the estimated mean.

Figure A2: Percent pool area, large wood volume and canopy openness in 1976 (left) and 2014 (right). Unshaded bars represent reaches within harvested riparian forest and shaded bars are within the upstream old-growth reference. Error bars for chl *a*, and trout biomass are 95% confidence intervals.

Appendix B

Explanations of alternative trajectories of resident salmonid populations

Scenario 1) A short-term positive response (increased biomass) to harvesting associated with greater light and primary production. In this scenario, habitat is minimally effected, temperature increases are minimal or temperature remains relatively low, primary producers are light limited (at least for part of the year), and invertebrates and resident salmonids are food limited. Biomass decreases as canopies close and biomass eventually reaches levels below reference conditions because canopy openness (and understory light) is at a minimum in regenerated, secondary growth forests (Donato et al. 2012; Kaylor et al. 2017). As stands age and canopy gaps form, biomass slightly increases back to reference (old-growth) levels. This is based on results from this study (Fig. 2), previous studies which document positive resident salmonid responses to harvest (Aho 1976; Murphy and Hall 1981; Hawkins et al. 1983; Bilby and Bisson 1992; Wootton 2012), and previous conceptual diagrams predicting this trend (Sedell and Swanson 1984; Gregory et al. 1987; Mellina and Hinch 2009).

Scenario 2) A short-term positive response that is smaller in magnitude and shorter in duration than that of Scenario 1. This could reflect the effect of increased light associated with harvesting outside of riparian buffers (Kiffney et al. 2003). Because changes in light are relatively small compared to historic clear-cutting, the potential effect size smaller. Increased stream light may be shorter in duration due to regrowth outside the riparian buffer or due to increased branch and understory shrub growth

within riparian buffers due to increased light. The same conditions apply as in Scenario 1 – minimal habitat effects and light limitation of primary production.

Scenario 3) The resident salmonid response to harvest is minimal with no clear directionality or long-term population trend (inter-annual variation excluded). Relatively small, short-term responses were observed in Deer Creek in the Alsea Watershed in which only partial harvest occurred (Gregory et al. 2008) and in a section of East Creek (section B), British Columbia where clear-cut harvesting occurred but large wood and logging debris were left in the stream (Young et al. 1999). Conditions leading to this scenario may include streams where primary production is limited by other factors (e.g. nutrients), increases in light and primary production are too small to result in an observable invertebrate response, or where increased primary production is accumulated by inedible herbivores which prevent energy flow to higher trophic levels (Power and Dietrich 2002; Power et al. 2013). There are numerous examples of light limitation within heavily forested streams (Gregory 1980; Bilby and Bisson 1992; Ambrose et al. 2004; Warren et al. 2016) but in nutrient poor, oligotrophic streams, limitation of primary production may only occur at very low light levels. For example, Warren et al. (2016) found that in a stream with low summer nutrient concentrations ($\sim 5 \mu\text{g/L}$) the light threshold at which limitation switched from light to nutrient limitation was estimated just 8% of full-sun values.

Scenario 4) There is a short-term negative response (decreased biomass) but a relatively quick recovery. In this scenario, short-term negative responses could be attributed to temperatures exceeding thermal maximums but then recovering as shrubs and trees

shade the stream, excess sedimentation that is reduced after vegetative regrowth, altered habitat conditions that are modified by habitat improvement projects, or a combination of these (potentially East Creek section A; Young et al. 1999). In these streams, major changes to structural habitat (large wood, pools, pool complexity) remain minimally affected. When temperatures or sedimentation rates reduce to pre-harvest levels, or substantially reduce, resident salmonid biomass may return to pre-harvest levels if light has minimal influence on stream production. Alternatively, but not shown, resident salmonids may increase to levels greater than pre-harvest if increased light promotes increased primary production after temperatures or sedimentation rates are restored.

Scenario 5) There is a negative response that is sustained long-term with slow recovery in the absence of management actions. Negative responses are attributed to habitat degradation associated with loss of large wood and pool habitat. Wood inputs to streams, especially large diameter wood, are extremely low following riparian removal and recover slowly as riparian stands develop (Gregory et al. 2003). Full recovery in this scenario could take centuries and would be a high priority for habitat enhancement projects such as large wood addition. In these systems, resident salmonid populations are more strongly habitat limited and increased prey availability, if any, is outweighed by the effects of habitat degradation.

Scenario 6) Lastly, in Scenario 6, harvesting operations, loss of wood and intensified debris flows may result in the loss of stream substrates that would take centuries or millennia to recover. In this “state change” habitat may remain highly degraded and show little sign of recovery over the time frame portrayed in Fig. 4. Scour and the

loss of substrates associated with historic splash dams my result in this trajectory. As with Scenario 5, these streams would be high priorities for habitat enhancement projects.

Draft

Appendix B References

- Aho, R.S. 1976. A population study of the cutthroat trout in an unshaded and shaded section of stream. Oregon State University. Available from <https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/21777>.
- Ambrose, H.E., Wilzbach, M.A., and Cummins, K.W. 2004. Periphyton response to increased light and salmon carcass introduction in northern California streams. *North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **23**(4): 701–712. doi:doi/10.1899/0887-3593(2004)023<0701:PRTILA>2.0.CO;2.
- Bilby, R.E., and Bisson, P.A. 1992. Allochthonous versus autochthonous organic matter contributions to the trophic support of fish populations in clear-cut and old-growth forested streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **49**: 540–551. doi:10.1139/f92-064.
- Donato, D.C., Campbell, J.L., and Franklin, J.F. 2012. Multiple successional pathways and precocity in forest development: Can some forests be born complex? *J. Veg. Sci.* **23**(3): 576–584. doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2011.01362.x.
- Gregory, S., Meleason, M., and Sobota, D. 2003. Modeling the dynamics of wood in streams and rivers. *Am. Fish. Soc. Symp.* **37**: 315–335.
- Gregory, S. V. 1980. Effects of light, nutrients, and grazers on periphyton communities in streams. Oregon State University. Available from <http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/17914>.
- Gregory, S. V., Lamberti, G.A., Erman, D.C., Koski, K. V., Murphy, M.L., and Sedell, J.R. 1987. Influences of forest practices on aquatic production. *In* *Streamside Management: Forestry and Fishery Interactions*. Edited by E.O. Salo and T.W. Cundy. University of Washington, Institute of Forest Resources, Seattle, Washington. pp. 233–255.
- Gregory, S. V., Schwartz, J.S., Hall, J.D., Wildman, R.C., and Bisson, P.A. 2008. Long-term trends in habitat and fish populations in the Alsea Basin. *In* *Hydrological and Biological Responses to Forest Practices*. Edited by J.D. Stednick. Springer. pp. 237–257. Available from <http://www.springerlink.com/index/G011704122L53704.pdf>.
- Hawkins, C.P., Murphy, M.L., Anderson, N., and Wilzbach, M.A. 1983. Density of fish and salamanders in relation to riparian canopy and physical habitat in streams of the northwestern United States. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **40**(8): 1173–1185. doi:10.1139/f83-134.
- Kaylor, M.J., Warren, D.R., and Kiffney, P.M. 2017. Long-term effects of riparian forest harvest on light in Pacific Northwest (USA) streams. *Freshw. Sci.* **36**(1). doi:10.1086/690624.
- Kiffney, P.M., Richardson, J.S., and Bull, J.P. 2003. Responses of periphyton and insects to experimental manipulation of riparian buffer width along forest streams. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **40**(6): 1060–1076. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2003.00855.x.
- Mellina, E., and Hinch, S.G. 2009. Influences of riparian logging and in-stream large wood removal on pool habitat and salmonid density and biomass: a meta-analysis. *Can. J. For. Res.* **39**(7): 1280–1301. doi:10.1139/X09-037.
- Murphy, M.L., and Hall, J.D. 1981. Vaired effects of clear-cut logging on predators and their habitat in small streams of the Cascade Mountains, Oregon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **38**: 137–145. doi:10.1139/f81-018.
- Power, M.E., and Dietrich, W.E. 2002. Food webs in river networks. *Ecol. Res.* **17**: 451–471.
- Power, M.E., Holomuzki, J.R., and Lowe, R.L. 2013. Food webs in Mediterranean rivers. *Hydrobiologia* **719**(1): 119–136. doi:10.1007/s10750-013-1510-0.
- Sedell, J.R., and Swanson, F.J. 1984. Ecological characteristics of streams in old-growth forests

- of the Pacific Northwest. *In* Fish and Wildlife relationships in old-growth forests. *Edited by* W.R. Meehan, T.R. Merrell, and T.A. Hanley. Juneau, Alaska. pp. 9–16.
- Warren, D.R., Collins, S.M., Purvis, E.M., Kaylor, M.J., and Bechtold, H.A. 2016. Spatial variability in light yields co-limitation of primary production by both light and nutrients in a forested stream ecosystem. *Ecosystems*. Springer US. doi:10.1007/s10021-016-0024-9.
- Wootton, J.T. 2012. River food web response to large-scale riparian zone manipulations. *PLoS One* **7**(12): 1–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0051839.
- Young, K.A., Hinch, S.G., and Northcote, T.G. 1999. Status of resident Coastal Cutthroat Trout and their habitat twenty-five years after riparian logging. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **19**: 901–911. doi:10.1577/1548-8675(1999)019<0901:SORCCT>2.0.CO;2.

Draft