



ELSEVIER

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)



Forest Ecology and Management xxx (2007) xxx–xxx

Forest Ecology  
and  
Management

[www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco)

# Biodiversity management approaches for stream–riparian areas: Perspectives for Pacific Northwest headwater forests, microclimates, and amphibians

Deanna H. Olson<sup>a,\*</sup>, Paul D. Anderson<sup>a</sup>, Christopher A. Frissell<sup>b</sup>,  
Hartwell H. Welsh Jr.<sup>c</sup>, David F. Bradford<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, 3200 SW Jefferson Way, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

<sup>b</sup> Pacific Rivers Council, PMB 219, 1-2nd Avenue E, Suite C, Polson, MT 59860, USA

<sup>c</sup> USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, 1700 Bayview Dr. Arcata, CA 95521, USA

<sup>d</sup> US Environmental Protection Agency, Landscape Ecology Branch, P.O. Box 93478, Las Vegas, NV 89193, USA

## Abstract

Stream–riparian areas represent a nexus of biodiversity, with disproportionate numbers of species tied to and interacting within this key habitat. New research in Pacific Northwest headwater forests, especially the characterization of microclimates and amphibian distributions, is expanding our perspective of riparian zones, and suggests the need for alternative designs to manage stream–riparian zones and their adjacent uplands. High biodiversity in riparian areas can be attributed to cool moist conditions, high productivity and complex habitat. All 47 northwestern amphibian species have stream–riparian associations, with a third being obligate forms to general stream–riparian areas, and a quarter with life histories reliant on headwater landscapes in particular. Recent recognition that stream-breeding amphibians can disperse hundreds of meters into uplands implies that connectivity among neighboring drainages may be important to their population structures and dynamics. Microclimate studies substantiate a “stream effect” of cool moist conditions permeating upslope into warmer, drier forests. We review forest management approaches relative to headwater riparian areas in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, and we propose scenarios designed to retain all habitats used by amphibians with complex life histories. These include a mix of riparian and upslope management approaches to address the breeding, foraging, overwintering, and dispersal functions of these animals. We speculate that the stream microclimate effect can partly counterbalance edge effects imposed by upslope forest disturbances, hence appropriately sized and managed riparian buffers can protect suitable microclimates at streams and within riparian forests. We propose one approach that focuses habitat conservation in headwater areas – where present management allows extensive logging – on sensitive target species, such as tailed frogs and torrent salamanders that often occur patchily. Assuming both high patchiness and some concordance among the distribution of sensitive species, protecting areas with higher abundances of these animals could justify less protection of currently unoccupied or low-density habitats, where more intensive forest management for timber production could occur. Also, we outline an approach that protects juxtaposed headwater patches, retaining connectivity among sub-drainages using a 6th-field watershed spatial scale for assuring well-distributed protected areas across forested landscapes. However, research is needed to test this approach and to determine whether it is sufficient to buffer downstream water quality and habitat from impacts of headwater management. Offering too-sparse protection everywhere is likely insufficient to conserve headwater habitats and biodiversity, while our alternative targeted protection of selected headwaters does not bind the entire forest landscape into a biodiversity reserve.

© 2007 Published by Elsevier B.V.

**Keywords:** Riparian buffers; Riparian patch reserves; Amphibians; Stream and riparian microclimates; Connectivity; Riparian forest management approaches

## 1. Introduction

The values provided by streams and their riparian zones within forested landscapes continue to be a focus of high

concern and contention. New science has redefined the resources of interest for production, retention or restoration in these areas as well as the scope of threats to these systems. Simultaneously, new management approaches have underscored the diverse priorities among land managers. These issues are especially acute in the Pacific Northwest forests of North America, where neighboring lands have diverse forms of stream–riparian protection, ranging from none to entire

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 541 750 7373; fax: +1 541 750 7329.

E-mail address: [dedeolson@fs.fed.us](mailto:dedeolson@fs.fed.us) (D.H. Olson).

drainages (e.g., Sheridan and Olson, 2003; USDA and USDI, 1994; Sedell et al., 1994). This diversity is reflective of the different resources of importance for management, and land ownership varying from individual private woodlot owners to state and federal resource agencies. Fueling the debate of how to approach riparian management zones, the role of large reserves across the forested landscape as the cornerstone for maintaining forest biodiversity and ecological integrity is being challenged. Coarse-scale reserve networks often fail to capture rare species (Thomas et al., 1993; Lawler et al., 2003; Molina et al., 2006; Olson, 2006). Similarly, ecological processes, both biotic and abiotic, function across all scales (Lowe et al., 2006), and many likely should be retained across entire landscapes, not just inside reserve areas.

The value of riparian management as a finer scale reserve network may have substantial benefits as habitat or dispersal corridors (e.g., Rosenberg et al., 1997) for a suite of northwestern species (USDA and USDI, 1996a,b), especially because some level of riparian protection exists within every subdrainage (Pollock et al., 2005; Sedell et al., 1994). Riparian management, now a pillar of Pacific Northwest forest management (Young, 2000), is integral to balancing resource priorities and retaining biocomplexity at smaller scales (Lindenmayer and Franklin, 2002; Carey, 2006). The value of riparian management may be increased by piggy-backing the protection of terrestrial species upon aquatic–riparian protection strategies. At smaller spatial scales, a variety of species assemblages and ecological processes are relevant to consider, and likely requires a mix of stream–riparian management approaches at the stand-to-drainage scales to tailor management to site and landscape conditions and landowner priorities. We review these species assemblages and ecological factors here, with an eye to synthesizing new information from Pacific Northwest headwater forests and their associated biota, focusing on riparian microclimates and amphibians, taxa uniquely suited for monitoring the health of stream and riparian environments (e.g., Welsh and Ollivier, 1998; Ashton et al., 2006). We also review current management approaches for headwater riparian zones in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, and address alternative management options for maintaining the persistence of headwater riparian-dependent amphibians, using a 2-tiered approach that provides: (1) a more protective design for target species in priority habitats within forested 6th-field watersheds; and (2) fewer species-protection measures where other resources such as timber are a priority.

The Pacific Northwest forested landscape extends continuously from northern California to Alaska, and in a more disjunct pattern from the Pacific Ocean across the interior Columbia River basin to the Rocky Mountains (Omernick et al., 2006). This enormous area, extending over 3,000,000 km<sup>2</sup>, possesses diverse forest types and an equally diverse associated biota; stream–riparian zones across this range and their management approaches mirror this diversity. Naiman et al. (2000) regarded riparian forests of the Pacific Coastal Ecoregion as the most diverse vegetation assemblage in the region, supporting high wildlife diversity, including economically important fishes. These factors have been critical in

focusing regional efforts to provide sound riparian management practices to sustain these systems, and have led to significant research to better understand riparian elements, particularly headwaters, the processes that structure them and the complex interactions among their biota.

New insights from science are redefining stream–riparian zones. Increasing knowledge of the lateral links among stream, riparian and upland biodiversity, and of the longitudinal interactions of biota from headwaters downstream is broadening the scope of our understanding of riparian ecosystem functions and processes (Wiens, 2002). Previously the lateral extent of riparian areas has been defined in terms of the inputs and processes important for fish (Gregory et al., 1991; Naiman and Décamps, 1997; Naiman et al., 2000). For example, distance from streams has been examined relative to contributions of down wood and litter, shading and water temperature retention, and bank stability or rooting strength of bank trees that is related to sedimentation (Fig. 1; from USDA and USDI, 1993; Naiman et al., 2000). Episodic events such as landslides contribute significant down wood to streams from far-upslope areas, whereas more chronic down wood inputs come primarily from within distances equal to 1/2 to 1 site-potential tree height (slope distance) away from streams (see Reeves, 2006).

This fish-centric perspective limits the focus of riparian habitats and their management to fish-bearing streams. However, recent studies have expanded the focus to explicitly consider the influence of upstream headwaters on downstream fish-bearing waters (Lowe and Likens, 2005). This is critical because fishless headwaters typically drain at least 70–80% of a catchment area (e.g., Gomi et al., 2002). Recent research has examined how headwater invertebrate production may provide a substantial prey base for downstream fishes (Wipfli and Gregovich, 2002), and headwater slope failures provide down wood (Reeves et al., 2003; Reeves, 2006) and sediment inputs (Benda and Cundy, 1990; Benda and Dunne, 1997a,b; Rashin et al., 2006) that fundamentally reinitiate streambed substrate “successional” sequences. Moreover, a diverse array of endemic amphibians inhabits headwaters in the Pacific




Fig. 1. Estimated distances upslope of streams of various components contributing to instream habitat conditions. Redrawn from USDA and USDI (1993).

Northwest, and only a nascent understanding exists of their role in stream–riparian systems. Increasing recognition exists that these amphibians have specific associations with instream, bank, and riparian microhabitats (Welsh and Lind, 2002; Olson and Weaver, in press), and some species display habitat associations both longitudinally from ephemeral headwaters and zero-order basins (Sheridan and Olson, 2003) to fish-bearing reaches downstream (Hayes et al., 2006), and also laterally through the riparian zones to uplands (Rundio and Olson, in press). Where they co-occur, these amphibians interact with fishes, potentially as part of cascading trophic networks (e.g., Rundio and Olson, 2003); laterally, similar interactions with terrestrial predators and prey are likely.

Stream amphibians fit well into the recently advancing perspective of “reciprocal subsidies” of stream–riparian zones (Davic and Welsh, 2004; Baxter et al., 2005), wherein stream biota are considered to provide ecologically important resources to streamside terrestrial areas, reciprocal to the terrestrially derived inputs into streams that were previously listed. For example, abundant aquatic diptera (flies) and plecoptera (stoneflies) emerge from the uppermost intermittent headwater channels (e.g., Progar and Moldenke, 2002; Muchow and Richardson, 2000) not only to drift downstream to fishes but to disperse into areas surrounding the riparian zone of headwaters. Welsh et al. (2005a) found higher abundances of coastal giant salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*) and black salamanders (*Aneides flavipunctatus*) along intermittent headwater channels when contrasted with the downstream perennial reaches. Accessing invertebrate-rich intermittent headwater areas may also be one reason that coastal tailed frogs engage in upstream seasonal movements (Hayes et al., 2006). Similar situations may exist for post-metamorphic torrent salamanders (*Rhyacotriton*). Furthermore, diverse taxa such as carabid beetles along stream banks (Hering, 1998), bats along stream flyways (e.g., Swift et al., 1985), and birds (e.g., Gray, 1993) and snakes (Lind and Welsh, 1990, 1994) rely on aquatic prey. Aquatic nutrients are carried away from streams via these upland pathways. High densities and biomasses of stream amphibians imply that they play a significant role in stream–riparian dynamics (Bury, 1988). In streams with anadromous fishes, post-spawning, decaying fish carcasses provide ocean-derived organic matter inputs to uplands (e.g., Naiman et al., 2000). The subsidy these marine-accumulated materials provide to productivity of riparian areas is increasingly recognized. Hence, riparian areas are not simply the zones that directly influence fish habitat, but they constitute a highly concentrated nexus of dynamic and only partly recognized interactions among diverse aquatic and terrestrial biota with complex life histories.

### 1.1. Riparian habitats and microclimates

Scientific understanding of the discrete habitat conditions of headwater stream–riparian areas as well as the transition of conditions from wet stream to dry upslopes is rapidly evolving. Stream banks are recognized as sites of frequent disturbance resulting in relatively heterogeneous and complex microhabitat conditions. Microclimate differences contribute to the distinc-

tion of riparian environments from that of upland forest. However obvious this may seem, only recently has substantial research investment been made to characterizing riparian microclimate in the Pacific Northwest, particularly as it relates to ecological processes, habitat suitability, biodiversity and forest management in headwater forests. Literature on stream temperature is extensive (reviewed by Moore et al., 2005, and see below), but relatively less has been published on riparian microclimate. A few recent studies undertaken in the Pacific Northwest to characterize spatial and temporal variation in microclimate regimes of riparian headwater forests are beginning to provide information about the stream-channel-to-upslope continuum. Table 1 summarizes several of these studies with respect to air temperature and humidity.

Gradients in forest microclimate are common, particularly with respect to forest edges or topographic relief (Matlack, 1993; Chen et al., 1995). In riparian areas, open water surfaces, moist soils, and abundant vegetation contribute to the formation of microclimate gradients extending laterally from streams. Streams create a local environment through influences on air temperature and humidity. Streams directly influence air temperature by acting as either a thermal sink (day, warm season) or source (night, cool season). Near-surface water tables common to riparian areas indirectly influence microclimate by supporting development of vegetation and supplying moisture for transpiration from foliage.

In forest stands, summer daily maximum air temperature tends to increase, and daily minimum relative humidity tends to decrease with distance from headwater streams. These effects appear more pronounced in non-maritime locations (inland from the coast). Trans-riparian microclimate gradients are typically non-linear with greater rates of change near-stream and smaller rates of change with distance upslope. Several studies reveal that the strongest influence of the air temperature gradient is expressed within approximately 10–15 m upslope from the stream (Anderson et al., in press; S. Chan et al., unpublished data [Oregon State University = OSU]; Rykken et al., in press-a; Welsh et al., 2005b). Generally the measured influence of streams on air temperature diminishes by distances of 30–60 m upslope of the stream in unharvested forests (Anderson et al., in press; Brosfoske et al., 1997; S. Chan et al., unpublished data [OSU]; Rykken et al., in press-a; Welsh et al., 2005b). Gradients in relative humidity generally show similar non-linearity, with a sharp near-stream gradient (Anderson et al., in press; Brosfoske et al., 1997; S. Chan et al., unpublished data [OSU]; Rykken et al., in press-a). However, Welsh et al. (2005b) described a more nearly linear trend of decreasing relative humidity with distance from the stream. In general, relative humidity gradients appear to extend further upslope than those of air temperature, but studies have rarely extended upslope microclimate monitoring far enough to make definitive comparisons.

### 1.2. Riparian biodiversity

Cool, moist conditions near streams provide habitat for many riparian-dependent species. Riparian plant assemblages

Table 1  
Microclimate studies characterizing headwater stream riparian zones adjacent to various forest management practices in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere

Microclimate variables measured	Measurement locations	Uncut buffer width (m)	Upslope condition	Stream width (m)	Region	Source
Air temperature, relative humidity, soil/substrate, temperature	Stream center, ~6, ~15, ~25, ~50 m, and at 20 m intervals beyond 50 m up to a maximum of 230 m from stream center	6–70	Unthinned (~540 trees per hectare), thinned (99, 197, or 356 trees per hectare), or patch openings in 35–60-year-old Douglas-fir/western hemlock	0.3–3	Coast Range and western Cascade Range, Oregon, U.S.A.	Anderson et al. (in press)
Air temperature, relative humidity, surface air, temperature, soil temperature	Stream center, at buffer upslope edge, 15, 30, and 60 m upslope of the buffer edge, upland interior forest and in upland clearcut	0–72	Unharvested or clearcut Douglas-fir/western hemlock	2–4	Western Cascade Range, eastern Olympic Range, Washington, U.S.A.	Brosfokske et al. (1997), Dong et al. (1998)
Air temperature, soil/substrate, temperature, relative humidity, soil moisture	Stream center and at 5, 15, 25, and 35 m from stream center		Clearcut, selectively thinned (100–200 residual trees per hectare), and intact second-growth Douglas-fir		Coast Range, Oregon, U.S.A.	Chan et al. (unpublished data [OSU])
Relative humidity	Streamside and at 5, 10, 20, and 30 m from streamside	<30	Selectively harvested ponderosa pine, 5–51 m <sup>2</sup> /ha residual basal area	1.3–5	East-side Cascade Range, Oregon and Washington, U.S.A.	Danehy and Kirpes (2000)
Air temperature	Lateral sampling at streamside, 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 m from stream side; longitudinal sampling at 100 m intervals	25	Closed canopy mixed-wood forest, 80–100-year-old, or clearcut	First-order headwater	Western Maine, U.S.A.	Hagan and Whitman (2000)
Air temperature	Stream center, at centers of 5 and 30 m buffers, and in a clearing 20 m from buffer edge	5, 30	Closed canopy broadleaf forest or clearcut	4	Coromandel Peninsula, New Zealand	Meleason and Quinn (2004)
Air temperature, soil/substrate, temperature, relative humidity	1, 10, 20, and 70 m from stream center	30	Unthinned old-growth Douglas-fir/western hemlock, 5–22-year-old clearcuts with buffer and without buffer	1–5	West-side Cascade Range, Oregon, U.S.A.	Rykken et al. (in press-a)
Air temperature, relative humidity	Streamside and at 10, 20, and 30 m from wetted stream channel	NA	Mixed grassland, second-growth Douglas-fir/hardwood forest and late-seral Douglas-fir/mixed hardwood forest	Intermittent and perennial streams	Mattole Watershed, eastern King Range, northern coastal California, U.S.A.	Welsh et al. (2005)

256 also reflect topographic setting, position within the drainage  
257 network, disturbance history, local propagule sources, and the  
258 larger-scale ecological province. While analyses for other  
259 provinces in the Pacific Northwest region exist, many of the  
260 principal attributes of overstory and understory riparian plant  
261 assemblage structure at reach, basin and landscape scales are  
262 well-illustrated in the body of literature addressing forests of  
263 the Oregon Coast Range. Hence, we use many examples from  
264 this area to illustrate riparian plant biodiversity patterns.

266 The Oregon Coast Range ecoregion includes two major  
267 vegetation types, the western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*)  
268 and the Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*) associations (Franklin  
269 and Dyrness, 1988). In these forests, the abundance of shade-  
270 intolerant conifers such as Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*)  
271 in the overstory tends to be lower near streams than upslope,  
272 over distances up to approximately 30 m from streams (Pabst  
273 and Spies, 1998, 1999; Minore and Weatherly, 1994;  
274 Nierenberg and Hibbs, 2000). Hardwood species, particularly  
275 red alder (*Alnus rubra*) are more likely to dominate overstory  
276 cover in near-stream areas of high fluvial activity, more recent  
277 disturbance, greater mineral soil exposure, and along wider  
278 streams (Minore and Weatherly, 1994; Pabst and Spies, 1999;  
279 Nierenberg and Hibbs, 2000). Near-stream sites initially  
280 occupied by red alder following disturbance frequently become  
281 dominated by salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), a rhizomatous  
282 shrub and vigorous competitor, as the hardwood stands  
283 degenerate after 90–150 years (Nierenberg and Hibbs, 2000).  
284 These shrub-dominated riparian areas can be highly resistant to  
285 tree regeneration, but after some decades, shade-tolerant  
286 conifers may emerge through the shrub canopy.

287 Distinct understory communities develop for zero-order  
288 basins (i.e., unchanneled headwater swales or “headwalls”),  
289 1st- to 6th-order streams, and upslope forests (Pabst and Spies,  
290 1998; Sheridan and Spies, 2005). Pabst and Spies (1998)  
291 defined 10 understory vegetation types from near-stream herb  
292 and shrub cover data across 1st- to 6th-order stream sites in the  
293 Coast Range of Oregon. They hypothesized that species  
294 composition was driven by valley-bottom to ridge-top  
295 environmental gradients and hillslope processes, particularly  
296 upslope gradients of decreasing soil moisture and relative  
297 humidity. They also identified three species groups that they  
298 considered strongly adapted to hydrological disturbance  
299 (periodic floods, alluvial deposition and erosion) as well as a  
300 separate group adapted to continuously saturated soils. Shade  
301 gradients also appeared to be a driver in the structuring of  
302 understory communities, including both stream-to-upslope  
303 gradients associated with increasing conifer canopy cover, and  
304 gradients along streams arising from a patchy distribution of  
305 canopy composition by conifers, hardwoods, shrubs and gaps.  
306 Sheridan and Spies (2005) found plant assemblages in zero-  
307 order basins tended to have a mix of species associated with  
308 both riparian areas and upslope forests. This likely reflects a  
309 spatial transition in hydrology associated with stream initiation  
310 and the establishment of a fluvial regime in addition to the  
311 topographic and shade gradient drivers that Pabst and Spies  
312 (1998, 1999) identified. Waters et al. (2001) reported a  
313 comparable pattern in a northern California watershed.

314 Diverse faunal groups also have strong stream–riparian  
315 associations. For example, Dunk et al. (2002) found mollusks  
316 occurred more frequently in riparian areas, and Rykken et al. (in  
317 press-b) found a distinct invertebrate community occurring  
318 within 1 m of headwater streams. Naiman et al. (2000) noted  
319 that about 29% of wildlife species, including 34% of bird  
320 species in the Pacific Coast Ecoregion, require riparian areas;  
321 they are “riparian obligates.” In California, 40% of reptiles are  
322 riparian associates (Brode and Bury, 1984). Such habitat  
323 “associates” are typically defined as occurring in that habitat  
324 type more often or in higher abundances compared to  
325 alternative habitats. Riparian associates may or may not be  
326 riparian obligates, but appear to have some dependency on  
327 riparian habitats. Kauffman et al. (2001) reported 319 of 593  
328 (53%) of general wildlife in Oregon and Washington were  
329 riparian associates. Thomas et al. (1979) found the proportion  
330 was higher for vertebrates in the Oregon Blue Mountains (285  
331 of 378 [75%] species) and the Oregon Great Basin (287 of 363  
332 [79%]). In the arid U.S., riparian areas may account for less  
333 than 1% of the landscape, but in northern Colorado, riparian  
334 areas support 82% of breeding birds (Knopf and Samson,  
335 1994). These numbers include species occurring around both  
336 lentic and lotic waters, but it highlights the nature of riparian  
337 zones as an interface of biodiversity, where upland terrestrial  
338 forms use the aquatic–riparian zone incidentally or for some  
339 life history functions, and where riparian- and aquatic-  
340 dependent forms reside.

341 For amphibians, this scenario is echoed and amplified.  
342 While a third of the approximate 265 amphibian species north  
343 of Mexico are stream-associated (Corn et al., 2003), all 47  
344 Pacific Northwest species are either obligate or facultative  
345 stream–riparian associates (Table 2; Jones et al., 2005; Lannoo,  
346 2005). Fifteen (32%) of these species are obligate forms tied to  
347 stream or riparian areas for life history functions, whereas the  
348 remaining 68% are facultative species that display more  
349 incidental use (e.g., if suitable habitat conditions exist along  
350 stream for their life history functions). Twelve of the 15  
351 obligate forms occur primarily in headwater streams. While the  
352 relative use of headwaters versus larger streams is documented  
353 for headwater-associated species, the reasons for this associa-  
354 tion is not well known; however, these animals often have  
355 strong habitat associations with elements of headwaters (e.g.,  
356 steep gradients, coarse substrates) and are proposed to have  
357 predation-structured assemblages (e.g., downstream predators  
358 such as fishes and giant salamanders may displace prey into  
359 headwaters).

360 This suite of 47 species includes stream- and pond-breeding  
361 amphibians and bank dwellers. These species often use riparian  
362 zones upon metamorphosis for foraging or dispersal. Sala-  
363 mander species that breed in upslope terrestrial habitats may  
364 only coincidentally occur along streams if their habitat  
365 transects these areas. Some terrestrial-breeding species shift  
366 from a facultative to a more obligate use of riparian zones as  
367 upland habitat and climate change across their range. For  
368 example, the black salamander, *A. flavipunctatus*, was highly  
369 riparian-associated relative to uplands at interior sites in  
370 northern California (Nauman and Olson, 2004) compared to

Table 2  
Pacific Northwest amphibians occurring in streams and riparian zones

Species	Stream/riparian association	Comments
<b>Frogs and toads</b>		
<i>Ascaphus montanus</i> Rocky Mountain tailed frog, ASMO	Obligate stream breeding, rearing; riparian foraging	Moderate-to-fast flow headwater streams in forests; often step-pools, cold water, coarse substrate
<i>Ascaphus truei</i> Coastal tailed frog, ASTR	Obligate stream breeding, rearing; riparian foraging	Moderate-flow headwater streams in forests; often step-pools, cold water
<i>Bufo boreas</i> Western toad, BUBO	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater breeding in forests, grasslands, meadows, deserts
<i>Bufo woodhousii</i> Woodhouse's toad, BUWO	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in grassland, shrub steppe
<i>Pseudacris maculata</i> Boreal chorus frog, PSMA	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in meadows, swamps and woodlands
<i>Pseudacris regilla</i> Pacific treefrog, PSRE	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests, woodlands, grasslands and other areas; shorter hydroperiod
<i>Rana aurora</i> Northern red-legged frog, RAAU	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging and migration	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests; longer hydroperiod
<i>Rana boylei</i> Foothill yellow-legged frog, RABO	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging, and overwintering; riparian foraging	Typically 3rd order-streams or larger for breeding; also uses smaller tributaries; coarse substrates; in forested foothills
<i>Rana cascadae</i> Cascades frog, RACAS	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in montane forests; longer hydroperiod
<i>Rana catesbeiana</i> Bullfrog, RACAT	Stream breeding if habitat available; riparian foraging	Permanent, warm, stillwater habitat used for breeding; non-native
<i>Rana clamitans</i> Green frog, RACL	Stream breeding if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat for breeding; non-native
<i>Rana draytonii</i> California red-legged frog, RADR	Stream breeding, rearing, foraging if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests, grasslands, agricultural lands; often with emergent vegetation
<i>Rana luteiventris</i> Columbia spotted frog, RALU	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; limited riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests, grasslands and brushlands; longer hydroperiod
<i>Rana pipiens</i> Leopard frog, RAPI	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging and migration	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in grasslands, shrublands or meadows in forests
<i>Rana pretiosa</i> Oregon spotted frog, RAPR	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging and migration	Low-emergent marsh stillwater breeding in grasslands and forests
<i>Rana sylvatica</i> Wood frog, RASY	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging and migration	Diverse stillwater habitats used for breeding in forests
<i>Spea intermontana</i> Great Basin spadefoot, SPIN	Stream breeding if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater breeding habitat in grassland, shrub steppe, woodlands and forests
<b>Woodland salamanders</b>		
<i>Aneides ferreus</i> Clouded salamander, ANFE	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Large decayed wood in or near forests probable breeding requirement, probable plasticity in habitat needs, associated with headwalls of zero-order basins
<i>Aneides flavipunctatus</i> Black salamander, ANFL	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Probable wood-linked or talus breeding site in forests, riparian- and headwater-associate at interior sites
<i>Aneides lugubris</i> Arboreal salamander, ANLU	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Wood-associate, to 30 m above ground in oak woodlands and forests
<i>Aneides vagrans</i> Wandering salamander, ANVA	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Wood associate, to 90 m above ground in forests
<i>Batrachoseps attenuatus</i> California slender salamander, BAAT	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Probable wood-linked breeding site in forests, grasslands, chapparral
<i>Batrachoseps wrighti</i> Oregon slender salamander, BAWR	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Wood associate in forests, also in talus
<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii</i> Ensatina, ENES	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Wood and talus associate in forests
<i>Hydromantes shastae</i> Shasta salamander, HYSH	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Often limestone-associated in forests, also other rock, down wood
<i>Plethodon asupak</i> Scott Bar salamander, PLAS	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Rock-associated in forests

<i>Plethodon dunni</i> Dunn's salamander, PLDU	Obligate riparian breeding, rearing, and foraging	Often rock-associated in forests; may occur in upland forest
<i>Plethodon elongates</i> Del Norte salamander, PLEL	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Rock-associated in forests
<i>Plethodon idahoensis</i> Coeur d'Alene salamander, PLID	Obligate riparian breeding, rearing, and foraging	Often rock-associated in forests
<i>Plethodon larselli</i> Larch Mountain salamander, PLLA	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Often rock-associated in forests
<i>Plethodon stormi</i> Siskiyou Mountains salamander, PLST	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Rock-associated in forests
<i>Plethodon vandykei</i> Van Dyke's salamander, PLVA	Obligate riparian breeding, rearing, and foraging	Rock and wood associated in forests
<i>Plethodon vehiculum</i> Western redback salamander, PLVE	Facultative riparian breeding and foraging	Rock and wood associated in forests, along stream banks
<b>Other salamanders</b>		
<i>Ambystoma gracile</i> Northwestern salamander, AMGR	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests, grasslands and agricultural lands; longer hydroperiod
<i>Ambystoma macrodactylum</i> Long-toed salamander, AMMA	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; V	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in forests, sagebrush and alpine meadows; shorter hydroperiod
<i>Ambystoma tigrinum</i> Tiger salamander, AMTI	Riparian foraging and migration	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in grasslands, savannahs and woodland edges
<i>Dicamptodon aterrimus</i> Idaho giant salamander, DIAT	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Moderate-to-fast flow headwater streams in forests; often step-pools, cold water, some lakes
<i>Dicamptodon copei</i> Cope's giant salamander, DICO	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Moderate-flow headwater streams in forests; often in pools, cold water
<i>Dicamptodon ensatus</i> California giant salamander, DIEN	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Moderate-flow headwater streams in forests; often step-pools, cold water
<i>Dicamptodon tenebrosus</i> Coastal giant salamander, DITE	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Moderate-to-low flow streams in forests; often small streams, in pools, cold water
<i>Rhyacotriton cascadae</i> Cascade torrent salamander, RHCA	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Headwater stream focused in forests; low-flow habitats, cold water
<i>Rhyacotriton kezeri</i> Columbia torrent salamander, RHKE	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Headwater stream focused in forests; low-flow habitats, cold water
<i>Rhyacotriton olympicus</i> Olympic torrent salamander, RHOL	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Headwater stream focused in forests; low-flow habitats, steep slopes, cold water
<i>Rhyacotriton variegates</i> Southern torrent salamander, RHVA	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging	Headwater stream focused in forests; low-flow habitats, cold water
<i>Taricha granulose</i> Roughskin newt, TAGR	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; facultative riparian breeding, foraging and migration	Diverse stillwater habitat breeding in or near forests; longer hydroperiod
<i>Taricha rivularis</i> Red-bellied newt, TARI	Obligate stream breeding, rearing, foraging; riparian foraging and migration	Moderate-to-fast flow streams in redwood forests and oak woodlands; rocky substrates, cold water
<i>Taricha torosa</i> California newt, TATO	Stream breeding, rearing if habitat available; riparian foraging	Diverse stillwater breeding in grasslands, chaparral, forests and oak woodlands

Species acronym represents first letters of genus and species names. Data from Jones et al. (2005) and Lannoo (2005).

370 coastal areas where it does not always appear to be a riparian  
371 associate (except see Welsh et al., 2005a). The relative use of  
372 riparian versus upland habitats across species ranges is poorly  
373 explored for many amphibians with life history stages that  
374 occupy terrestrial habitats.  
375

376 In the Pacific Northwest, most (89% [ $n = 42$ ]) amphibian  
377 species occur in forests. Hence riparian areas in Pacific  
378 Northwest forests are indispensable to this taxonomic group  
379 in the region. Furthermore, salamanders have been proposed to  
380 be ecologically significant due to their: (1) presumed sensitivity  
381 to historic forest practices (e.g., deMaynadier and Hunter, 1995;  
382 Ashton et al., 2006); (2) central location within food webs  
383 because they serve as both dominant predators and prey; (3) high  
384 densities; and (4) sensitivity to microclimate and microhabitat  
385 conditions (e.g., Bury, 1988; Bury and Corn, 1991). They are  
386 proposed to be used as metrics of forest ecosystem health (Davic  
387 and Welsh, 2004; Welsh and Droege, 2001), with stream  
388 amphibians as specific indicators of aquatic ecosystem stress  
389 (Welsh and Ollivier, 1998). Global declines of amphibians were  
390 recognized over a decade ago (Blaustein and Wake, 1990), with  
391 an updated global assessment (Stuart et al., 2004) reviving  
392 concerns worldwide. In Pacific Northwest forests, stream-  
393 riparian breeding amphibians may be particularly indicative of  
394 stressors intersecting aquatic and terrestrial systems (e.g., Welsh  
395 et al., 2005a). Such trends, in tandem with new scientific  
396 information about ecological associations and mechanisms in  
397 headwater streams, indicate that close examination is warranted

of the effectiveness of riparian management in preserving these  
animals and the ecosystems they inhabit.

### 1.3. Use of riparian and upland habitats

Integrating stream, riparian and upland habitat use by  
amphibians for the delineation of riparian boundaries is not  
straightforward. Riparian areas may function as habitat for  
resident species and as corridors for transient species (e.g.,  
Rosenberg et al., 1997). Discrete habitats for breeding, foraging  
and overwintering are now documented for Pacific Northwest  
amphibians such as the Columbia spotted frog (Pilliod et al.,  
2002), which can use select streams for breeding but is  
predominantly a pond-breeder. This reliance on multiple,  
potentially disparate locations within a local area for all life  
history functions is well known for terrestrial vertebrates (e.g.,  
Law and Dickman, 1998) and warrants further study in stream-  
and riparian-associated species.

The lateral spatial extent of habitats used by aquatic- and  
riparian-dependent organisms is becoming better understood,  
although the distance to which aquatic organisms (i.e.,  
“subsidies” in the reciprocal subsidy model) reach upslope  
or from which terrestrial organisms reach the stream (e.g.,  
Nakano and Murakami, 2001) are not well known (Polis et al.,  
2004). Several studies in the PNW have captured northwestern  
stream-breeding or riparian-dependent amphibians away from  
streams (Table 3), suggesting that regular movement overland

Table 3  
Maximum distances away streams into upland forests at which Pacific Northwest amphibians have been found

Species	Distance (m)	Comments	Reference
RHKE/RHVA, ANFE, PLDU, PLVE, ENES, TAGR [ASTR, DITE]	30–40 m [20–30 m]	Time-constrained searches in quadrats 0–10, 10–20, 20–30, and 30–40 m from streams; 5–100+ year old conifer stands, 0 to 40+ m buffers, 1st–3rd order streams, Oregon; DITE, RHKE/RHVA, PLDU and ASTR found primarily at 0–10 m from stream, PLVE found primarily at 0–20 m from stream	Vesely (1996)
AMGR, TAGR, ENES, PLVE	55	Pitfall traps and cover boards spanning 5, 30 and 55 m from stream; 70-year-old conifer stands; British Columbia; more AMGR were captured at 30 m from stream than 5 and 55 m from stream; AMGR and TAGR moved more along streams than up or down slopes	Maxcy and Richardson (2000)
ASTR	65	Pitfall traps at 5, 25, 45, 65 m from stream; <5 and 80+ year old conifer stands; non-fish-bearing streams <3 m wide; British Columbia; no difference in capture frequency across distance from stream	Matsuda and Richardson (2005)
DITE	66, 22, 19	Radiotracking; forested, clearcut with buffer (20–30 m), and clearcut conifer stands; small streams 1–6 m wide; British Columbia; maximum distance from stream was 66 m in intact forested habitat, 22 m in clearcut, 19 m in buffered clearcut	Johnston and Frid (2002)
ASTR	100	Pitfall traps 5, 25, 50 and 100 m from stream; 5- and 250-year-old conifer stands; headwater streams 1–3 m wide and fishless; British Columbia; mean distances from stream reported (adults: 28 m; juveniles: 17 m; males 23 m; females 17 m); frogs captured farther from streams in old growth than in clearcuts	Wahbe et al. (2004)
DITE, TAGR, PLVE, ENES, AMGR, ASTR, RAAU	~135	Pitfall traps, 10 × 10 grid across 135 m × 135 m; 40–50-year-old red alder stands; 2nd order streams, Oregon	McComb et al. (1993a)
ASTR, DITE, BAWR, PLDU, PLVE, RAAU, RHsp, TAGR	200	Pitfall traps at stream and 200 m upslope, 2 trans-riparian pitfall arrays with traps every 25 m; 5–200+ year old conifer stands, deciduous stands; 3rd–4th order streams, Oregon	Gomez and Anthony (1996)
DITE, TAGR, PLDU, PLVE, ENES, ANFE, ASTR, RAAU	400	Pitfall traps <10 and 400 m from streams, 2 trans-riparian arrays with traps every 50 m; 12–140 year conifer stands; 2nd–3rd order streams, Oregon	McComb et al. (1993b)

Species acronyms follow Table 2.

may occur. Several stream obligate species have been detected 100 m or more from streams (e.g., 100 m, Wahbe et al., 2004; 135 m, McComb et al., 1993a; 200 m, Gomez and Anthony, 1996; 400 m, McComb et al., 1993b). Occurrence of stream–riparian obligates 200–400 m away from streams implies they could cross ridgelines where these come in close proximity to stream channels. Wahbe et al. (2004) found geographic variation in upland movements of coastal tailed frogs, *Ascaphus truei*, in that they remained close to streams at inland sites (e.g., 12 m) but some individuals moved farther from streams (>100 m) at coastal sites. This also may be the case with the black salamander mentioned previously, which has riparian associations inland (Nauman and Olson, 2004; Bury, 2005) but is not generally considered a strict riparian associate. More mesic coastal climate conditions may ameliorate surface microclimates, fostering movements. Wahbe et al. (2004) found that forest condition influenced tailed frogs with more animals occurring along streams and fewer in upland sites in clearcuts in comparison to older forests. Johnston and Frid (2002) also found coastal giant salamanders, *D. tenebrosus*, closer to streams in clearcuts than in forested stands. Western redback salamanders were more restricted to riparian zones in second growth compared to old-growth forests (Dupuis, 1997). These patterns may indicate greater site fidelity to water sources and decreased dispersal tendencies for these animals on lands managed for timber (Johnston and Frid, 2002). Alternatively, the results could reflect altered timing of movements. Movements may have been restricted by microclimate in the generally warmer and drier clearcuts, and to rainy times of dry years (Dupuis et al., 1995; Johnston and Frid, 2002). Understanding these altered life history or behavioral attributes may affect population structure and dynamics, and be important to consider for the long-term persistence of animals across managed landscapes.

Some degree of mobility also is known for other northwestern amphibians, but mobility may be coupled with site specificity at other life stages or seasons. The red-bellied newt, *Taricha rivularis*, a stream breeder at the southern extent of our area of consideration, appears to have high site fidelity and also high mobility, returning to natal streams for breeding even if displaced several kilometers (Kuchta, 2005). Maxcy and Richardson (2000) found the closely related roughskin newt, *Taricha granulosa*, and the northwestern salamander, *Ambystoma gracile* traveled more often along streams than up or down slopes. This may result from directional movement toward or away from their lentic breeding sites (Maxcy and Richardson, 2000), suitable conditions for surface movements along streams (e.g., cool, moist conditions), or if streams serve as full or partial barriers to movement, diverting travel along them and hence resulting in higher animal abundances. A seasonal upstream movement has been documented for the coastal tailed frog that likely represents a seasonal cycling between breeding habitat in the perennial portion of the headwater stream and foraging habitat near the upstream origin (Hayes et al., 2006). Thus, while spatial extent of a “population” is still a mystery for most stream–riparian associated amphibians in this region, evidence of their use of uplands and movements along riparian

corridors is accumulating. Both longitudinal and lateral connectivity of habitats is likely important for long-term persistence of aquatic–riparian species and assemblages. Wahbe et al. (2004) suggested that a tailed frog population may extend across multiple streams in a watershed, a suggestion that agrees with the recent finding that the genetic neighborhood for coastal tailed frog is around 10 km (A. Storfer, personal communication). Johnston and Frid (2002) estimated the home range of a single coastal giant salamander was 935 m<sup>2</sup> in intact forests, so that a population could cover a much more extensive area, and potentially cover multiple streams. Terrestrial-breeding salamanders appear less mobile. For example, mark-recapture studies have reported that ensatina (*Ensatina eschscholtzii*), the Del Norte salamander (*Plethodon elongatus*), California slender salamander (*Batrachoseps attenuatus*), and the western redback salamander appear to move over spatial scales <10 m (Hendrickson, 1954; Ovaska, 1988; Karraker and Welsh, 2006). At these smaller spatial scales, riparian forest may serve as important habitat for these species. However, these species may be abundant upslope, and loss or degradation of upland forest habitat could disrupt population dynamics or affect persistence.

Conceptually, disrupted habitat connectivity, or habitat fragmentation, can affect populations through either within-fragment processes (e.g., demographic, genetic, and stochastic effects) or between-fragment processes (e.g., source–sink or metapopulation dynamics; Davies et al., 2001; Pullin, 2002). Several studies have demonstrated fragmentation effects on amphibians (Cushman, 2006), although the research on these topics is sparse for amphibians in contrast to other animal groups (Lidicker and Koenig, 1996; McGarigal and Cushman, 2002). Moreover, most information on habitat and population isolation, metapopulation dynamics, and dispersal or movement among amphibians comes primarily from pond-breeding rather than stream- or terrestrial-breeding species (e.g., Smith and Green, 2005; Cushman, 2006). Many studies reveal pronounced decreases in the ability of amphibians to disperse as human alteration of landscapes increases, and survival of juveniles in such fragmented landscapes is often substantially reduced (see Cushman, 2006). These findings imply dramatic effects on immigration because dispersal in amphibians is thought to be primarily effected by juveniles rather than adults (e.g., Funk et al., 2005; Cushman, 2006). For Pacific Northwest forest amphibians occurring in headwaters, there is some indirect support that reduced population connectivity might be associated with timber harvest; for example, the previously described patterns of restricted distribution to streams of tailed frogs and coastal giant salamanders in clearcut areas might reduce connectivity at larger scales (Wahbe et al., 2004; Johnston and Frid, 2002). However, the relative effects on population persistence of site-specific habitat alteration for the various life history stages of headwater species and altered between-site connectivity are unknown.

Finally, amphibians can have a metapopulation dynamic in which local populations occasionally become extirpated but the site is eventually recolonized by individuals from nearby populations (Alford and Richards, 1999; Sjögren Gulve, 1994).

536  
537 In theory, a stable metapopulation relies on longer-term  
538 interactions among such sites. Although the generality of this  
539 concept has been challenged for some amphibians (Smith and  
540 Green, 2005), ample evidence exists of a meta-structure in  
541 many amphibian populations. A metapopulation structure may  
542 place a population at greater risk (Heinz et al., 2006) because it  
543 relies on the long-term dynamics among organisms at many  
544 localities in an area. Hence, it may take a more thoughtful or  
545 complex forest management strategy to maintain the popula-  
546 tion. In particular, in forested landscapes, the extent, pattern and  
547 duration of disrupted connectivity are important considerations.  
548 For example, timber harvest may be a disturbance with a  
549 relatively short duration because many forest conditions (e.g.,  
550 canopy cover, microclimate regimes) become re-established  
551 within years-to-decades as trees regenerate. The effects of  
552 episodic disturbances are not well known for most species.

553 A few studies address these concepts with headwater stream-  
554 breeding amphibians, both in the Pacific Northwest and in the  
555 eastern U.S. For example, in North Carolina, Willson and  
556 Dorcas (2003) found the relative abundance of headwater  
557 salamanders was inversely proportional to the percentage of  
558 disturbed habitat in the sub-watershed of the stream. They  
559 concluded that protection of headwater stream populations  
560 should consider watershed-scale land use. In New Hampshire,  
561 Lowe and Bolger (2002) found the abundance of spring  
562 salamanders in isolated headwater streams was less than in  
563 paired streams, having a downstream tributary junction linking  
564 the streams. They suggested that landscape connectivity  
565 confers resilience to habitat disturbance. In the U.S. Pacific  
566 Northwest, both Stoddard and Hayes (2005) and Raphael et al.  
567 (2002) detected larger spatial scale effects on stream animal  
568 abundances. At drainage scales, Stoddard and Hayes (2005)  
569 found coastal tailed frog and coastal giant salamander  
570 abundances were associated with the proportion of stream  
571 lengths having forested bands >46 m wide. Torrent salaman-  
572 ders lacked a drainage-scale association, but were associated  
573 with these stream buffer widths at a smaller spatial scale. Welsh  
574 et al. (2005a,b) linked changes in abundances and species  
575 composition of stream-associated amphibian assemblages in  
576 the Mattole watershed of northwestern California to changes in  
577 stream temperature regimes resulting from landscape-level  
578 fragmentation due to the harvesting of late-seral forests, and the  
579 conversion of forests to small homesteads and rangeland. Most  
580 recently, identification of whether coastal tailed frogs use  
581 headwater basins for reproduction in southwestern Washington  
582 appears to be related to the extent of non-fish-bearing stream  
583 habitat in particular basins (Hayes et al., 2006).

584 Fragmentation of Pacific Northwest forests from timber  
585 harvest practices can be expected to affect stream–riparian  
586 amphibians with both long- and short-distance dispersing  
587 capabilities (Heinz et al., 2006). Cushman (2006) concluded  
588 from a number of studies that the short-term impact of habitat  
589 loss and fragmentation is greater for long-distance than short-  
590 distance dispersing amphibians, apparently because of high  
591 mortality rates for dispersing individuals in the matrix of  
592 altered habitat. However, short-distance dispersers have greater  
593 likelihood for isolation than long-distance dispersers, which

594 greatly increases their risk of local extirpation. Too few data  
595 exist to definitively evaluate the relative risk of general long-  
596 versus short-distance dispersal categories. Frequent extirpation  
597 and turnover may represent a typical background phenomenon  
598 among populations of a number of amphibian species,  
599 indicating that “population connectivity is ultimately important  
600 even for populations of species that are not directly impacted by  
601 habitat loss or elevated mortality risks in dispersing” (Cush-  
602 man, 2006).

603 Genetic studies are increasingly used to frame conservation  
604 decisions (Hedrick, 2001; Frankham, 2003), and can provide  
605 insights about the scale of historical connectivity among  
606 populations. Molecular genetics represents a tool that provides  
607 critical population data that are, at best, difficult to obtain with  
608 even the most sophisticated demographic methods. Recently,  
609 genetic data were used to evaluate the population structure of  
610 coastal giant salamanders in managed landscapes in British  
611 Columbia (Curtis and Taylor, 2003). That analysis identified  
612 decreased genetic variability with an increase in area over  
613 which forestry practices had been applied. While demographic  
614 data are used to assess the immediate health of a population,  
615 only genetic data can identify genetic variability. Reduced  
616 genetic variability (e.g., from reductions in population size or  
617 inbreeding) is thought to have negative consequences for  
618 population function and ultimately, species survival (Schrader-  
619 Frechette and McCoy, 1993; Frankham, 2003). Hence,  
620 estimating genetic diversity, in addition to demographic  
621 population size estimates, gives a more rigorous basis for  
622 making predictions about short and long-term survival of  
623 species in response to land use changes. However, a current  
624 challenge is to understand of how genetic diversity, or  
625 specifically a reduction in genetic variation, might predictably  
626 affect population stability; in particular, a risk analysis for loss  
627 of genetic diversity for headwater amphibians has not been  
628 conducted.

629 Ultimately, populations are defined both demographically  
630 and genetically, but genetic data can most-precisely identify the  
631 scales over which gene flow occurs among populations  
632 (Frankham, 2003). Empirically defined “genetic neighbor-  
633 hoods” or inferred spatial patterns of gene flow are basic  
634 yardsticks for not only identifying the spatial footprint of  
635 populations, but also for providing insights into how landscape  
636 features or land management practices may constrain popula-  
637 tions. Genetic population structure data are currently unavail-  
638 able for most amphibian species in the Pacific Northwest, but a  
639 few data are beginning to emerge. For example, the spatial scale  
640 of the genetic neighborhood of the stillwater-breeding  
641 Cascades frog (*Rana cascadae*), sampled across a broad range  
642 of populations, was about 10 km (Monsen and Blouin, 2004).  
643 As previously mentioned, a similar figure was recently obtained  
644 from preliminary data on coastal tailed frogs (A. Storfer,  
645 personal communication). Such genetic neighborhood data take  
646 on particular importance because they define a spatial scale at  
647 which management should be addressed (Frankham, 2003).

648 Genetics also can contribute two other important pieces of  
649 data on population structure unobtainable by other means. First,  
650 they shed light on whether local populations are autonomous or

represent elements linked in some kind of meta-structure (Smith and Green, 2005), and second, for those populations that display some kind of meta-structure, they can indicate which of the member populations represent recent “sources” or “sinks” in that structure (Frankham, 2003). With the appropriate reference populations, basic data on genetic structure allows identification of distinctive genetic patterns that provide clues to genetic health (e.g., inbreeding levels) or potential legacy effects that may have either anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic origins. Assuming the observed dynamics are somewhat stable over time, the ability to identify the populations that donate migrants (“sources”) would aid management decisions to maintain viable meta-populations. Currently, genetic analyses identifying meta-populations and their source–sink relationships have not been conducted for Pacific Northwest amphibians. Until such studies are available for stream-associated amphibians or other taxa, our delineation of “riparian” based on biotic use patterns will need to rely on inference from less powerful observations, such as captures away from streams (e.g., Table 3). These types of data could have a large impact on the landscape designs; managers could more efficiently target the best areas for protection, and yield greater success in species management for long-term persistence. This approach might be considered for those headwater taxa of greatest concern.

## 2. Management approaches

### 2.1. Current management systems

Current management approaches for forested stream–riparian zones in the Pacific Northwest constitute a variable mix of land management jurisdictions and natural resource priorities (Fig. 2; Table 4). Key elements of current approaches include delineation of management zones in which timber harvest is not allowed (no-cut, Fig. 2) or where harvest is allowed with limitations of equipment use or levels of tree removal (management zone, Fig. 2; Table 4; Young, 2000). Rationale for riparian management zone delineations can typically be traced back to recommendations for: (1) retaining stream bank stability (~10 m) to reduce sedimentation; (2) maintaining instream habitat attributes such as water temperature, litter and wood inputs (~15–30 m); and (3) a more conservative approach to provision of instream habitat conditions with benefits to riparian-dependent species (~40–100 m). In many regards, these measures have not been well tested, and hence represent application of our best available science relative to diverse stream–riparian priorities. Implementation of diverse measures may represent opportunities for monitoring their effects. For example, one recent study (Rashin et al., 2006) examined Washington State management practices and found that 94% of erosion factors associated with sediment delivery to headwater streams were located within 10 m of streams, supporting the value of a near-stream buffer to reduce sedimentation impacts.

Comparing riparian management rules among different plans and jurisdictions (Fig. 2; Table 4) is not simple because management rules vary among multiple spatial and practical

dimensions. Perhaps the foremost consideration, however, is categorical: most policies have different rules for streams with and without fish, and with perennial or ephemeral flows. The second major dimension of interest is the width of the overall zone that is targeted for some kind of “special” management. The simplest way to characterize this zone is by reference to its width relative to stream axis or the water’s edge. With this information coupled to mapping of waterways for a given locale, it is possible to map and estimate the overall area managed for riparian-specific purposes (e.g., Fig. 2). The third critical dimension can be summarized as the set of practices allowed within the designated area, including the guiding objectives that determine in particular cases whether specific practices are allowed or prohibited. The importance of overarching objectives is exemplified in the Northwest Forest Plan Aquatic Conservation Strategy (USDA and USDI, 1994). Because the dictum of management within the designated riparian area is of ecological benefit to habitat and water quality values, and because any management within this area is complicated by both diverse and frequent natural disturbance processes and severely constrained by pervasive past human alteration that greatly depleted large woody debris, “active management” such as timber harvest needs careful consideration, and in some cases may be difficult to justify.

The various approaches to riparian forest management in headwater areas (Fig. 2; Table 4) reflect legal mandates and political influences that vary according to land ownership and have been in flux in recent years. On U.S. National Forests, for example, the National Forest Management Act of 1976 imposed a mandate to protect biological diversity, maintain or improve water quality, and in particular, prevent harmful delivery of sediment to streams. Although the U.S.D.A. Forest Service has interpreted the biological diversity requirement as the need to maintain viable populations or a reasonably secure regional distribution of native species, the implications of the policy with respect to headwater stream biota, including amphibians, remains poorly understood. In 2005, a new planning rule was instituted for the National Forest System (US 36 CFR Part 219; Federal Register, 2005) that addresses biological diversity protections using ecosystem approaches first, with additional provisions for threatened or endangered species, species-of-concern and species-of-interest. Under this new rule, some headwater stream species are likely candidates to be considered species-of-concern or interest, but species in this assemblage are only recently gaining recognition as themselves constituting natural values that warrant recognition in forest management.

Federal, state and private forestry initiatives have long focused on fish because many stream-rearing fish are highly valued for recreational and commercial purposes. As a result, a considerable body of science has developed linking specific categories of forest practices to impacts on fish habitat. However, the logic of focusing only on fish-bearing reaches for designing management prescriptions to protect fish has been challenged (Welsh, 2000) on the grounds that instream fish habitat quality is more influenced by upstream conditions and processes in the non-fish-bearing reaches than by those at the




Fig. 2. Management systems in the U.S. Pacific Northwest delineating riparian forest management zones. Table 4 provides additional information for each system.

761  
762 streamside of fish-bearing reaches (see Montgomery, 1999).  
763 Additionally, fish distributions may have been altered by human  
764 disturbances, such that fish-bearing reaches identified today  
765 may be a limited view of the historic condition, with some  
766 species suffering diminished distribution in headwater streams.  
767 For example, only recently has biological passage through  
768 road-crossing culverts become a concern. On U.S. Forest  
769 Service and Bureau of Land Management roads in Oregon and  
770 Washington, over half of ~10,000 culverts on fish-bearing  
771 streams were determined to be barriers to salmonids (US GAO,

2001); hence some fishless headwater reaches may result from  
772 artificial barriers of downstream road crossings. Welsh et al.  
773 (2000) concluded that sedimentation from unprotected  
774 upstream reaches pushed fish distributions to downstream  
775 reaches in California. Others, such as Jackson et al. (2001) and  
776 Rashin et al. (2006) in Washington, have reported that  
777 sedimentation of unbuffered headwater streams altered stream  
778 habitats. They considered sedimentation in headwater streams  
779 to have particularly adverse consequences for stream amphi-  
780 bians.  
781

Table 4  
Riparian buffer widths delineated by various management systems in U.S. Pacific Northwest forests

Management system	No cut buffer (m)	Management zone (m) with timber harvest allowed	Comments	References
<b>Perennial fish-bearing streams</b>				
Washington Forest and Fish Report, West of Cascades WA FFR W	15	3–30: inner zone; 9–20: outer zone		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-021(1)]
Washington Forest and Fish Report, East of Cascades WA FFR E	9	14–21: inner zone; 0–17: outer zone		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(1)]
Washington Department Natural Resources, West of Cascades WA DNR W	8	23: inner zone; 0–66: outer zone		Washington State Department of Natural Resources (1997)
Washington Dept. Natural Resources, East of Cascades WA DNR E	9	14–21: inner zone; 0–17: outer zone		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(1)]
Oregon Private lands	6	9–24		Oregon Administrative Rules (2006) [OAR 629-640-100 (2)(b); OAR 629-635-0310 (1)(a)]
Oregon NW/SW State lands	8	23: inner zone; 21: outer zone		Oregon Department of Forestry (2001)
California Forest Practice Rules CA FPR	None	23–45	Class I streams. Varies with steepness of side-slope; 50% minimum canopy cover for both overstory and understory	Young (2000)
Federal Northwest Forest Plan, East of Cascades NWFP E	91	None	Interim riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)
Federal Northwest Forest Plan, West of Cascades NWFP W	91–152	None	“Interim” but prevailing riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage exceptions	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)
<b>Perennial non-fish-bearing streams</b>				
WA FFR W	0–15	0–15		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-021(2)]
WA FFR E	0–15	0–15		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(2)]
WA DNR W	8	23		Washington State Department of Natural Resources (1997)
WA DNR E	0–15	0–15		Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(2)]
OR Private small streams	0	0–3	Small streams have average annual water flow < 2 ft <sup>3</sup> /s (cfs, ~57 l/s) or have drainage area < 81 ha	Oregon Administrative Rules (2006) [OAR 629-640-200 (6); OAR 629-635-0200]
OR Private medium to large streams	6	9–15	Streams with average annual water flow > 2 cfs (~57 l/s)	Oregon Administrative Rules (2006) [OAR 629-640-200 (2)(b); OAR 629-635-0310(1)(a); OAR 629-635-0200]
OR NW/SW State lands	8	23: inner zone; 21: outer zone	Applied to at least 75% of reach on small streams	Oregon Department of Forestry (2001)
CA FPR	None	15–30	Class II streams. Side slope dependent; Minimum 50% total canopy retention (overstory and understory combined)	Young (2000)
NWFP E	46	None	Interim riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)
NWFP W	46–76	None	Interim riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)
<b>Seasonal non-fish-bearing streams</b>				
WA FFR W	0	9	Equipment limitation zone only	Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-021(2)(a)]
WA FFR E	0	9	Equipment limitation zone only	Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(2)(a)]
WA DNR W	0	None	RMZ protection provided where necessary for aquatic system and in unstable areas (interim strategy)	Washington State Department of Natural Resources (1997)
WA DNR E	0	9	Equipment limitation zone only	Washington Administrative Code (2006) [WAC 222-30-022(2)(a)]

Table 4 (Continued)

Management system	No cut buffer (m)	Management zone (m) with timber harvest allowed	Comments	References
OR Private medium to large streams	6	9–15	Streams with average annual water flow > 2 cfs (~57 l/s)	Oregon Administrative Rules (2006) [OAR 629-640-200 (2)(b); OAR 629-635-0310(1)(a); OAR 629-635-0200]
OR NW/SW State lands Small streams	0–8	23–30: inner zone; 21: outer zone	Applied to at least 75% of reach; small streams have average annual water flow $\leq 2$ ft <sup>3</sup> /s (cfs, ~57 l/s) or have drainage area < 81 ha	Oregon Department of Forestry (2001), Oregon Administrative Rules (2006) [OAR 629-635-0200]
OR NW/SW State lands medium to large streams	8	23: inner zone; 21: outer zone	Applied to at least 75% of reach; Streams with average annual water flow > 2 cfs (~57 l/s)	Oregon Department of Forestry (2001)
CA FPR	None	None	Class III streams. Side-slope dependent; Minimum 50% understory cover retention	Young (2000)
NWFP E	30–34	None	Interim riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)
NWFP W	30–76	None	Interim riparian reserve; occasional density management, salvage	USDA and USDI (1993, 1994)

NA = not applicable. Conversion from English units in original literature to metric units are shown to nearest m. Management zones indicate widths of managed areas, not distances from stream (as shown in Fig. 2).

781  
782 Other federal land management agencies, in particular the  
783 U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), have operated under  
784 less explicit mandates for biological conservation than the U.S.  
785 Forest Service. In recent decades, however, the potential  
786 consequences of endangered species listing for wide-ranging  
787 terrestrial and freshwater taxa (some amphibians are candidate  
788 species for federal protection) prompted the unification of once-  
789 varied standards and practices under the umbrella of regional  
790 management frameworks. The Northwest Forest Plan, covering  
791 federal forest lands and waters within the range of the northern  
792 spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis*) is the most important of these  
793 (USDA and USDI, 1994). Its importance stems from the  
794 unprecedented convening of a multidisciplinary scientific team,  
795 known as the “Forest Ecosystem Management Science  
796 Assessment Team” (FEMAT) that developed science-based  
797 recommendations for uniform conservation measures for  
798 national forests and BLM lands within the range of the  
799 northern spotted owl (USDA and USDI, 1993). The FEMAT  
800 process, conducted by large and focused multidisciplinary team  
801 of scientists, resulted in the consideration and integration of a  
802 far broader scope of values, processes, and mechanisms of  
803 impact when riparian management rules were adopted in the  
804 Northwest Forest Plan than had previously been considered in  
805 federal management plans and project assessments. FEMAT  
806 stream protection guidelines extend beyond shade retention and  
807 filtration of sediment and nutrients, to the explicit consideration  
808 of long-term recruitment of coarse down wood to channels and  
809 soil surfaces, downstream transport of both wood and sediment  
810 to off-site areas, trophic sources from riparian habitats to  
811 aquatic food webs, and the effects of vegetation and vegetation  
812 management on riparian microclimate. Spence et al. (1996) lent  
813 further scientific support for the FEMAT approach and  
814 recommended the National Marine Fisheries Service adopt it

814 in the development of Habitat Conservation Plans and other  
815 biological restoration and recovery measures. 816

817 The ecosystem approach embodied in the Northwest Forest  
818 Plan Standards and Guidelines established a benchmark for  
819 riparian conservation rules that no other agencies or industrial  
820 landowners have yet approached (Fig. 2). Riparian reserves, the  
821 areas of restricted harvest adjacent to waterways and stream  
822 channels, extend from ~30 m (100 ft) to more than 90 m  
823 (>300 ft) lateral to the stream channel on both sides of the  
824 stream. Reserve widths are framed in terms of site-potential tree  
825 height, the height a dominant mature tree would attain on a  
826 given site. Fish-bearing streams are given the widest reserves –  
827 the greater of 2 site-potential-tree heights or ~90 m (Fig. 2a),  
828 while seasonally flowing non-fish-bearing streams have the  
829 narrowest widths – the greater of 1 site-potential-tree height or  
830 ~30 m (Fig. 2c). Accounting for inherent differences in tree  
831 growth potential, prescribed riparian reserve widths are wider  
832 for more mesic forests west of the Cascade crest than for east-  
833 side, more xeric forests. While some forest management  
834 activities including tree harvest for density control or salvage  
835 are not absolutely prohibited in riparian reserves, they can only  
836 occur following an extensive assessment of their potential  
837 impacts with respect to a list of Aquatic Conservation Strategy  
838 objectives (USDA and USDI, 1994). Objective nine states:  
839 “Maintain and restore habitat to support well-distributed  
840 populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate  
841 riparian-dependent species”.

842 State and private forest managers are less clearly mandated  
843 than federal agencies to observe biological conservation  
844 objectives, but they are obligated to ensure that permitted or  
845 recommended practices meet the intent of the Clean Water Act,  
846 and under various treaties with Native American tribes, ensure  
847 the natural resource conditions necessary to sustain fishing, and

847 hunting, and other uses or values practiced by indigenous  
848 peoples. Federal listings of salmon, bull trout (*Salvelinus*  
849 *confluentus*), and other fishes under the Endangered Species  
850 Act have in the past decade increased scrutiny of state-enforced  
851 forest practices laws, the authority under which most private  
852 forest management is conducted. Hence, more recent attempts  
853 to reform state and private forest practices rules, such as the  
854 Washington Department of Natural Resources' Forest Practices  
855 Habitat Conservation Plan (Washington State Department of  
856 Natural Resources, 1997; Bigley and Deisenhofer, 2006), have  
857 moved closer to the biologically based standards set by  
858 FEMAT.  
859

860 Under this Habitat Conservation Plan in Washington,  
861 riparian management zones associated with fish-bearing  
862 streams are delineated into three sub-zones aligned as adjacent  
863 bands along streams: the near-stream core; the transitional  
864 inner; the upslope outer zones (Fig. 2; Table 4). Conceptually,  
865 each zone provides different levels of riparian resources and  
866 functionality. The core zone is of fixed width and management  
867 activity with tree harvest limited to road construction for stream  
868 crossings and the creation and use of yarding corridors. Cut  
869 trees can only be removed from the core zone if coarse down  
870 wood targets are already met (a rare condition because of past  
871 management practices). The widths of inner and outer zones  
872 vary by stream width, site productivity class, and the type of  
873 management selected by the landowner. Harvest activities in  
874 the inner zone are limited to a set of specified silvicultural  
875 options and can be undertaken only if projected stand  
876 development meets threshold desired future conditions for  
877 tree density, basal area per acre and proportion of conifer  
878 species. Timber harvest in the outer zone is generally allowed  
879 subject to the retention of a specified minimum density of  
880 riparian trees.

881 In contrast, California Forest Practice Rules do not stipulate  
882 a mandatory no harvest zone adjacent to fish-bearing or non-  
883 fish-bearing streams typical of headwater forests. Instead,  
884 Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones are defined based on  
885 stream width and near-stream topography, with steeper slopes  
886 requiring wider protection zones (Young, 2000). Harvesting  
887 within these zones of streams supporting fish or providing  
888 habitat for non-fish aquatic species (Class I and II streams) is  
889 restricted to the retention of a specified percentage of overstory  
890 and understory canopy cover rather than a minimum residual  
891 tree density or basal area, with the additional requirement of  
892 retention of a minimum density of large trees within 15 m of the  
893 channel. In small streams lacking evidence of aquatic life  
894 (Class III), the minimum canopy cover restriction can be met by  
895 understory vegetation alone. Furthermore, debate exists over  
896 what constitutes aquatic life (currently aquatic invertebrates are  
897 not recognized as such in California) which results in many  
898 likely Class II channels being mis-classified and receiving only  
899 Class III protections (H. Welsh, personal observation). A  
900 second problem involves the timing of efforts to establish the  
901 presence of vertebrate life in headwater channels. This often is  
902 done in the dry season when tributary flows go subsurface, and  
903 aquatic amphibians disappear into the substrates of the  
904 hyporheic zone (Feral et al., 2005) to await fall rains. This

unfortunate timing results in the misclassification of streams  
which erroneously puts their fauna at risk.

Misclassification of stream types also was documented in  
Washington due to an over-reliance on maps derived from  
Geographic Information Systems and remote sensing: 23% of  
fish-bearing streams were misclassified as having no fish; 39%  
of non-fish-bearing streams were not identified on maps  
(Rashin et al., 2006). While this has led to adaptive  
management of the stream identification process, Rashin  
et al. (2006) suggested ground truthing would be needed to  
ensure accuracy.

Consistent across the riparian protection schemes outlined  
are (1) a greater width of protection zone for larger streams and  
fish-bearing streams; (2) decreasing intensity of management  
activity allowed with increased proximity to the stream; and (3)  
vegetation retention designed to provide near-stream shade,  
sediment filtration, and bank stability. However, examination of  
Fig. 2 and Table 4 clearly reveals that differences among  
management jurisdictions are largest when it comes to  
headwater streams that are not fish occupied. These streams  
are afforded narrower protective buffers than are large, fish-  
bearing streams regardless of whether their dry season flows are  
permanent or intermittent. Kondolf et al. (1996) and Welsh  
et al. (2000) have assailed the logic of narrower buffers given  
that steeper, headwater streams occupy the position in the  
stream network where the majority of sediment and nutrient  
transfer from land to water occurs. Forman (1995) also  
considered wider buffers in headwater streams a more prudent  
approach due to the significant downstream benefits they  
contributed. Nevertheless, narrow “buffers” within which  
extensive logging can occur remains the current standard on  
private forest lands throughout the region (see Fig. 2, Table 4).  
Questions persist about whether narrow buffers provide  
sufficient moderation of microclimate, habitat diversity, and  
transfers of energy and matter to support non-fish aquatic and  
riparian biota, particularly sensitive frogs and salamanders,  
whose abundance is often greatest upstream of fish-bearing  
waters and whose adult stages sometimes forage hundreds of  
meters upland from the immediate stream margin.

## 2.2. Riparian management, stream temperature, and microclimate

Harvesting of riparian vegetation has been repeatedly shown  
to result in alterations of stream temperature regime including  
increased average and maximum temperatures and increased  
diurnal variation (Johnson and Jones, 2000; Herunter et al.,  
2004; Wilkerson et al., 2006). Furthermore, removal of stream  
shade can lead to an earlier seasonal occurrence of stream  
temperature extremes, possibly as a result of changes in the  
relative influences of incident solar radiation and seasonal low  
flow in determining maximum stream temperature (Johnson  
and Jones, 2000; Wilkerson et al., 2006).

The magnitude of stream temperature response to harvest  
will vary with the amount of stream shade retained, the intensity  
of upslope harvest, and time since harvest. Complete removal  
of stream shade from headwater streams may result in

temperature increases of as much as 5–13 °C (Johnson and Jones, 2000; Macdonald et al., 2003; Moore et al., 2005). Retention of buffers along headwater streams may result in negligible increase or as much as 5 °C increase in maximum stream temperature, depending on buffer widths and buffer density (Wilkerson et al., 2006; Jackson et al., 2001; Moore et al., 2005). Evaluating the effects of clearcutting adjacent to intact buffers of 10 or 30 m width in British Columbia, Kiffney et al. (2003) observed increased stream temperatures of nearly 5 °C for the narrow buffers and increases less than 1.6 °C for 30 m buffers. In contrast, for headwater streams in Maine, Wilkerson et al. (2006) observed negligible increases in headwater stream temperature when buffers of 11 m width and >60% canopy cover were retained adjacent to clearcuts. In central British Columbia, partially harvested buffers (20–30 m wide) were less effective in stream temperature mitigation, with high and low retention buffers associated with 1–3 and 2–4 °C increases, respectively (Herunter et al., 2004; Macdonald et al., 2003). Dense deposits of logging slash over the stream channel has been observed to prevent a stream temperature increase following clearcutting (Jackson et al., 2001) further emphasizing the importance of shade in regulating stream temperature response. Increased stream temperatures following harvest have been observed to persist for 5 years (Macdonald et al., 2003) and in excess of 15 years (Johnson and Jones, 2000). Stream temperature recovery following harvest is likely driven by development of riparian vegetation with rates of recovery being potentially greater in mesic forests such as the Coast Range of Oregon and Washington than more xeric forests such as those of the east-side Cascade Range or the Siskiyou Mountains of southern Oregon. Even with buffering, stream temperature recovery may be delayed if the buffers undergo post-harvest density reductions due to windthrow (Macdonald et al., 2003) or other disturbances.

While incident solar radiation may be the primary driver of stream temperature response to harvest of riparian vegetation (Brown and Krygier, 1970), hydrological influences can be strong, particularly in headwater streams having seasonal low flows and low depth to surface-area ratios. At the catchment scale, harvest may decrease transpiration and result in a transitory period of higher summer minimum flows lasting a few years to more than a decade (Moore and Wondzell, 2005). While increased minimum flows may tend to mitigate stream heat loading, there has been some suggestion that upslope harvests, particularly clearcutting, may increase the temperature of sub-surface flows entering headwater stream channels (Brosofske et al., 1997) leading to increased stream temperature. Furthermore, changes in vegetation composition following harvest may alter flow patterns relative to pre-harvest; conversion from conifer to hardwood riparian vegetation may result in lower summer minimum flows (Moore and Wondzell, 2005).

There is substantial interest in the potential for downstream “relaxation” (Ice, 2001) of stream temperature responses to harvest. While increases in stream temperature can be cumulative, thermal pollution is not conserved and stream temperature is constantly moving toward equilibrium with the surrounding environment (Ice, 2001). Thus, streams passing

through harvest units may cool if they subsequently pass through shaded, cooler conditions. Zwieniecki and Newton (1999) reported a 2 °C stream temperature decline within 300 m downstream of harvest units in western Oregon. Wilkerson et al. (2006) observed complete temperature recovery within 100 m of the harvest unit boundary on headwater streams in Maine. Story et al. (2003) concluded that thermal recovery of headwater streams in central British Columbia was due predominantly to ground water inflow. While stream temperature relaxation may be a common phenomenon, Ice (2001) concluded that it is more ecologically efficient to use shade to protect stream water from temperature increases than it is to cool water that has been warmed.

While buffers have been demonstrated as having the potential to mitigate harvest effects on headwater stream temperatures, it is important to consider the potential biological consequences of even small changes in thermal regime. Thermal tolerances of some fish and amphibian species have been determined. For example, Huff et al. (2005) determined the thermal tolerances for 16 aquatic vertebrates in four ecoregions of Oregon. Stream temperature minima and maxima differed not only among species, but also varied among sub-populations of a species occurring in different ecoregions (Huff et al., 2005). Beyond the general impacts of increased stream temperature, seasonal shifts in stream temperature extremes may negatively impact organisms at sensitive stages of development (e.g., larval development), or may negatively alter behaviors, such as triggering an early migration of anadromous fishes (Macdonald et al., 2003). While Kiffney et al. (2003) found 30-m buffers adequate to mitigate stream temperature effects, they observed significant changes in periphyton communities, and thus primary productivity, in buffered streams. Breakdown of leaf litter by microbes and invertebrates in headwater streams was little influenced by temperature variation, but rather was more strongly influenced by water chemistry (Rowe et al., 1996). Welsh et al. (2005b) demonstrated that changes in water temperatures, sufficient to change the composition of the in-stream vertebrate assemblage (including the loss of coho salmon [*Oncorhynchus kisutch*]), resulted from the removal of more than 15% of the forest cover in small tributary basins in northern California.

Recent riparian microclimate research has addressed the question of how forest management practices influence riparian microclimate. Alteration of stream temperature has been a primary concern, however retention of interior forest conditions along streams, including streamside and riparian zone microclimates, is gaining recognition as a riparian management objective. The question is often framed as “what measures must be taken to prevent disturbance of stream and riparian microclimates considered critical to ecosystem function?” With our new knowledge of trans-riparian stream effects, this could be rephrased to ask how edge effects from forest management interact with stream effects? The studies in Table 1, with the exception of Welsh et al. (2005b), examined combinations of forest harvest and riparian buffering on microclimate. In all cases, some degree of microclimate moderation was derived from streamside vegetation.

1073  
1074 The degree of microclimate moderation afforded by buffers  
1075 can depend on the reference condition against which impacts  
1076 are assessed. Meleason and Quinn (2004) assessed buffer width  
1077 effectiveness as the extent to which air temperature in the buffer  
1078 was decreased relative to the upslope clearcut forest. Hence,  
1079 this does not address change from a pre-harvest condition,  
1080 potentially highly relevant to forest biota. Anderson et al. (in  
1081 press), S. Chan et al. (unpublished data [OSU]), and Hagan and  
1082 Whitman (2000) evaluated stream-center and riparian-buffer  
1083 microclimates in harvested stands (clearcut or thinned) relative  
1084 to similar locations in unharvested stands. Brosofske et al.  
1085 (1997) and Dong et al. (1998) assessed alteration of stream  
1086 center microclimate relative to pre-harvest stream-center  
1087 conditions and to upslope microclimates of nearby intact  
1088 late-seral forests and clearcut openings.

1089 Clearcut harvesting clearly alters microclimates in the  
1090 harvested area, but its influence on buffered riparian areas is  
1091 not straightforward. Meleason and Quinn (2004) found that  
1092 while air temperatures at the center of buffers were clearly  
1093 lower ( $\sim 3^\circ\text{C}$ ) than those of adjacent forest openings, buffer  
1094 maximum daily temperatures differed only marginally  
1095 ( $\sim 0.3^\circ\text{C}$ ) for buffers of 5- and 30-m widths. Rykken et al.  
1096 (in press-b) examined buffers of approximately 30-m width  
1097 and found that summer maximum daily temperatures within  
1098 the buffers averaged about 35% lower than in adjacent  
1099 clearcuts and about 10% higher than those in intact late-seral  
1100 forests. Brosofske et al. (1997) and Dong et al. (1998)  
1101 observed up to a  $4^\circ\text{C}$  increase in stream-center air  
1102 temperature, with clearcutting adjacent to buffers ranging  
1103 from 0 to 72 m wide; they did not collect microclimate data  
1104 within the buffers.

1105 Increasingly, thinning of young, second-growth stands is  
1106 being prescribed on federal lands in the Pacific Northwest to meet  
1107 compatible objectives for watershed restoration and economic  
1108 revenue. Evaluating a range of buffer widths from approximately  
1109 6–70 m, Anderson et al. (in press) found that summer mean daily  
1110 maximum air temperature at the stream center was minimally  
1111 affected by upslope thinning ( $\sim 1^\circ\text{C}$  increase relative to  
1112 unthinned reaches) when unthinned buffers of at least 15 m  
1113 width were retained. For narrower, streamside retention buffers  
1114 ( $\sim 6$  m average width) prescribed primarily for streambank  
1115 stabilization, stream-center air temperatures increased  $\sim 4^\circ\text{C}$ ,  
1116 reflecting a breakdown of the near-stream air temperature  
1117 gradient. In thinned stands, stream-center relative humidity  
1118 decreased an average of 18% with narrow, streamside retention  
1119 buffers and only about 5% when buffers 15 m or wider were  
1120 retained. No discernable differences existed for either air  
1121 temperature or relative humidity measured at stream center  
1122 among buffers 15 m and greater in width. Within buffers,  
1123 maximum air temperatures averaged 0– $2.5^\circ\text{C}$  higher and  
1124 relative humidity averaged from 1% higher to 27% lower than  
1125 at stream center, depending on buffer width and thinning  
1126 intensity. These findings illustrate that less intensive thinning  
1127 harvests that retain a substantial proportion of the pre-harvest  
1128 stand density and canopy cover have less impact on stream and  
1129 riparian microclimates than do more intensive regeneration  
1130 harvests.

1131 The predominant mechanism by which buffers influence  
1132 stream and riparian microclimate is presumed to be shading—the  
1133 blocking of solar radiation from reaching the stream channel or  
1134 forest understory. However, other factors also influence riparian  
1135 microclimates, including local topography, hydrology and  
1136 macroclimate. Many of the studies summarized here were  
1137 conducted at multiple sites having different local site character-  
1138 istics. Interestingly, in general these studies have not explicitly  
1139 addressed the influence of site variation in their analyses (but see  
1140 Welsh et al., 2005b). Danehy and Kirpes (2000), observing wide  
1141 variation among sites in the strength of correlation between  
1142 percent canopy cover and relative humidity gradient, concluded  
1143 that local topography could override shade effects on relative  
1144 humidity. They attributed some of this among-site variation to the  
1145 steepness of near-stream topography—stronger microclimate  
1146 gradients were associated with streams having steep side slopes  
1147 and weak gradients were associated with streams having shallow  
1148 valley cross sections. Furthermore, Danehy and Kirpes (2000)  
1149 suggested that in the drier areas east-side of the Cascade Range  
1150 crest, seasonal limitations in moisture may result in narrower  
1151 zones of stream-influenced microclimate, although the zone of  
1152 stream influence as represented by relative humidity seemed to  
1153 be very similar to that reported by Anderson et al. (in press), S.  
1154 Chan et al. (unpublished data [OSU]) and Rykken et al. (in press-  
1155 b) for western Oregon.

1156 At this time, given the studies that have been conducted and  
1157 site-specific contexts of the results, it is difficult to make  
1158 prescriptive buffer width recommendations to retain riparian  
1159 microclimates. A 300-m buffer was considered by Brosofske  
1160 et al. (1997) as sufficient to maintain relative humidity gradients  
1161 typical of uncut forests. However, following harvest, they did not  
1162 sample microclimate within the buffer and therefore could not  
1163 detect either the extent of a near-stream steep gradient (stream  
1164 effect) or the distance from stream at which gradients depart from  
1165 those of the typical uncut condition. In contrast, for retention of  
1166 streamside riparian microclimate and invertebrates, Rykken et al.  
1167 (in press-a,b) proposed a narrower 30 m buffer when clearcut  
1168 harvest occurs upslope because they found a microclimate  
1169 “stream effect” counterbalanced the edge effect from the cut  
1170 boundary at this closer distance to the stream (Rykken, 2004).  
1171 Due to the stream effect, again evident by the steep near-stream  
1172 temperature and relative humidity gradients, this narrower buffer  
1173 zone was concluded to be sufficient to preserve microclimate  
1174 conditions within 5 m of streams. However they did not address  
1175 alternative buffer widths nor sample intensively across the trans-  
1176 riparian gradient to show how stream and edge effects interacted.  
1177 With upland forest thinning rather than clearcutting, it is possible  
1178 that a narrow buffer width might preserve microclimates at  
1179 streams, but this is uncertain and may be variable. Anderson et al.  
1180 (in press) suggested that a 15 m-wide buffer may retain stream  
1181 center conditions (see above), but the distribution and replication  
1182 of microclimate data-loggers used in the study was not designed  
1183 to characterize the spatial patterns of microclimate about the  
1184 buffer-upslope edge, and therefore the study does not fully  
1185 address the spatial extent to which stream effects counterbalance  
1186 edge effects. Given limitations of the sampling designs in the  
1187 studies reviewed, we can conclude that relatively narrow buffers

(relative to those of the Northwest Forest Plan, in particular) can be effective in maintaining stream center microclimate conditions and therefore the steep near-stream microclimate gradients that may extend 10–20 m from streams in intact stands (Anderson et al., in press; see above microclimate discussion). However, we have few data for predicting the countervailing spatial extent of upslope harvest influences on microclimates within buffers. In general, our understanding of trans-buffer microclimate gradients must be improved by sampling at a higher spatial resolution with spacing among sensors sufficient to quantify non-linear trends across ecotones associated with both stream-buffer and buffer-upslope edges. Such potential research is further complicated by the likelihood of context-specific results on riparian microclimates from both site conditions and silvicultural practices. Additionally, to address our uncertainty of species-specific effects across trans-riparian zones, it would be valuable to track species responses simultaneously.

### 2.3. Riparian management and biodiversity

Management to consider the ecological needs of stream-riparian dependent biota is not a new concept. However, for flora, impacts of forest management on riparian vegetation community structure are not well documented (Pabst and Spies, 1998). Hibbs and Bower (2001) found little evidence of vegetation community differences between buffer strips adjacent to clearcuts and similar near-stream zones in unharvested reaches. The buffer configuration evaluated was limited to a single strip of trees adjacent to the stream. Additional efforts will be needed to evaluate the effectiveness of buffer areas as riparian habitat (i.e., considering within-buffer vegetation responses) to varying intensities of harvest and for various widths of buffer, especially considering the diversity of assemblages identified by Pabst and Spies (1998) and Sheridan and Spies (2005). For animals and the physical habitat attributes on which they depend, numerous studies have investigated riparian associations and called for

protection of riparian habitat from logging and other management disturbances (e.g., Table 5). Headwater streams that constitute habitat for endemic amphibians such as tailed frogs and torrent salamanders have been recognized as receiving insufficient protection for almost two decades (e.g., Bury, 1988; Bury and Corn, 1988; Corn and Bury, 1989; Dupuis and Steventon, 1999; Welsh et al., 2000; Welsh and Lind, 2002; Ashton et al., 2006).

To retain riparian fauna, recommendations for buffer widths have spanned 6 to >90 m, depending upon the upslope management scenario and site-specific conditions (Table 5). The narrower 6-m estimate stems from moderate thinning of young (~40–50 year) managed stands conducted outside of small headwater streams, where instream fauna were not negatively affected in years 1 and 2 post-harvest (Olson and Rugger, in press). The researchers cautioned that lag effects may occur in subsequent years, and to hedge uncertainties, suggested a mix of buffer widths be used within a planning area. Additionally, this 6-m buffer resulted in a 4 °C increase in summer daily maximum air temperature at streams, hence microclimate was not retained by this small no-cut buffer with thinning upslope (Anderson et al., in press), although during this timeframe (summer, ~4 pm) amphibians are not surface active. The larger estimate, >90 m, was derived by examining distances from streams used by aquatic salamanders and adding an additional 50 m to buffer edge effects to the complex of aquatic and terrestrial habitats they require (Crawford and Semlitsch, in press). Wider buffers likely would be needed for retention of trans-riparian conditions relative to those occurring in unmanaged stands, and for riparian biota that venture farther upslope (Table 3). Several studies recommend buffers of 30 to >45 m for riparian obligate birds and amphibians (Table 5). Movements of stream-breeding amphibians to 100, 200, and 400 m upslope suggest increased distances and inter-stream connectivity need consideration. Hence, both a stream buffer approach to retain aquatic connectivity and an upland inter-

Table 5  
Stream riparian buffer width recommendations to retain various species or conditions (primary focus on PNW forests)

Width (m)	Rationale	Reference
6–76	Retains stream and bank amphibians (small streams with thinning)	Olson and Rugger (in press)
20	Contained 80% of <i>Rhyacotriton</i> , <i>Plethodon dunni</i> and <i>Dicamptodon tenebrosus</i>	Vesely and McComb (2002)
27	Retains 95% amphibian assemblage in	Crawford and Semlitsch (in press)
42.5	Needed for 1 species	
92.6	Additional 50 m to buffer edge effects.	
30	Retains frogs—Australia	Lemckert and Brassil (2000)
30	Retains riparian invertebrates; retains riparian microclimates (small streams with clearcuts)	Rykken et al. (in press-b)
30	Primary activity of aquatic trichoptera (may go as far as 200 m upslope)	Collier and Smith (1998)
30–40	Retains most riparian-associated amphibians, unlikely to retain upland species or vagile pond breeders such as northern red-legged frogs and roughskin newts	Vesely (1996)
30	Most riparian birds	Pearson and Manuwal (2001)
>45	Black-throated gray warbler	
>40	Forest-associated bird species in Oregon Coast Range headwaters	Hagar (1999)
45–300	Retains riparian microclimates (with clearcuts)	Brososke et al. (1997)
≥45	Retains birds with low species turnover	Pearson and Manuwal (2001)
>46	Retains stream amphibians (small streams with clearcuts)	Stoddard and Hayes (2005)
70–90	Full complement of riparian-stream linkages, such as down wood, litter, bank stability, microclimate (one site-potential tree height)	Young (2000)

stream approach for terrestrial connectivity could be considered simultaneously. It is largely unknown how these animals might respond to different zones of riparian buffer management; alternative buffer management designs require further investigation relative to the different species.

The extent, pattern, and duration of connectivity between stream-riparian patches needed to minimize fragmentation effects in Pacific Northwest forests are unknown, but these features undoubtedly vary among species. Given the affinity of stream-riparian amphibians for habitat above the fish-inhabited reaches of the stream network, it would seem likely that connectivity between stream-riparian habitat fragments would be more ecologically effective for amphibians above the fish-bearing zone (i.e., across headwaters) than connectivity along interconnecting higher-order stream reaches that are inhabited by fish. Hence, with the sum of what we know about the biology of headwater stream and riparian species, a precautionary approach might be warranted to maintaining connectivity at multiple spatial and temporal scales, such as within and between subdrainages, and between larger basins (e.g., Richards et al., 2002), and over short and long timeframes across juxtaposed lands.

#### 2.4. Spatial pattern of headwater reserves

Key management actions or design elements to minimize fragmentation effects on Pacific Northwest stream-riparian amphibians are to keep fragments as large as possible, and to maintain connectivity of habitat fragments by retaining some contiguous unlogged habitat between them (e.g., Richards et al., 2002). These two actions correspond to two of the “critical elements of effective and biologically based management plans for amphibians that consider both population and landscape processes,” namely protection of terrestrial buffers around wetlands and protection of the integrity of ecological connectivity (Semlitsch, 2000). Specific buffer distances have been proposed for wetland-breeding amphibians (Semlitsch and Bodie, 2003) and stream-riparian associates (Table 5), whereas specific guidelines for maintaining connectivity have not. Given the penchant for some stream-dwelling amphibians to move longitudinally within a stream network (e.g., Hayes et al., 2006), one design for maintaining connectivity would be to extend some of the buffers protecting adjacent headwater streams up to the ridgeline where they would join (Sheridan and Olson, 2003) (Fig. 3c and d). Bury (1988) similarly proposed




Fig. 3. Riparian management considerations for retention of headwater amphibians (“spaghetti and meatballs” approach): (a) narrow buffer zone might be used to protect water quality and some instream habitat components where headwater amphibian occurrences or habitat quality are low; (b) wider buffer zone contributes to retention of instream and riparian habitat conditions and some biota; (c) patch reserves at headwaters to protect endemic species and functions contributing to downstream habitats, and to provide connectivity between joined headwater channels; (d and f) patch reserves can provide connectivity across ridgelines to adjacent drainages, and can be placed downstream to provide enhanced riparian habitat protection such as at tributary junctions; (e and g) partial harvest (shaded area) and/or leave islands (circles) may be used to provide connectivity functions between watersheds.

such a patch reserve at headwaters for amphibians, and also considered patches along streams to be a valuable approach. Patches or discontinuous patches along streams also were proposed by Bury and Corn (1988). Cissel et al. (1998) designed headwater reserves for this purpose, and included patch reserves downstream at tributary junctions for combined biodiversity and habitat functions. Another approach would be to protect the entire upper portion of adjacent stream watersheds on both sides of a ridgeline (Fig. 3f). The dimensions to make such connections effective are not known; however, in principle, a corridor between patches is anticipated to reduce fragmentation, facilitate dispersal and increase the effective size of populations. While no-cut connections could provide optimum habitat, partial harvest (dispersed or aggregated trees) across ridgelines might provide habitat conditions for dispersal of many species (Fig. 3e and g).

Carey (2006) provided a list of tools to manage upland forests for biocomplexity objectives, retaining structural forest features and softening the impact of harvest activities. Thinning may not reduce occupancy or abundance of numerous taxa (e.g., plants, arthropods, mollusks, amphibians: Wessell, 2005), but Karraker and Welsh (2006) found body condition of terrestrial salamanders was significantly reduced on thinned stands. Knapp et al. (2003) cautioned against implementation of low-intensity harvest everywhere, and to minimize effects on salamanders they proposed concentrating high intensity harvest in small areas, and leaving uncut areas as likely optimum habitat (the considerable impact of an extensive road network necessary to implement landscape-extensive thinning regimes must also be considered). Patch reserves or leave islands in such a logged matrix could serve as habitat refugia or “stepping stones” between drainages (Fig. 3g). Leave islands may retain some species, provide wood and structure (Matveinen-Huju et al., 2006) including species associated with late-successional forest conditions (Wessell, 2005). Furthermore, interior forest microclimates were preserved in 0.4-ha circular leave islands within young managed stands in western Oregon (Wessell, 2005). Similar to Olson and Rugger (in press) suggesting a mix of buffer widths to be applied across drainages, Lowe and Bolger (2002) proposed a mosaic of conditions be implemented upslope. These are conceptual designs at present, and research is needed to understand the population-level implications of connectivity designs in addition to combined buffer-and-connectivity designs at subdrainage and basin scales. This “spaghetti and meatball” approach of linear stream buffers (spaghetti reserves) and patch reserves (meatballs), either along streams or upslope, warrants testing.

### 2.5. Target species management

While maintaining riparian forest biodiversity is of paramount concern, it is well recognized that forest resources such as timber result in conflicting land management priorities for managers. How can we sustain biota and commodities? We suggest an approach including target-species management in headwaters, where key taxa and their priority habitats are identified and managed for species persistence. This type of

prioritization of areas for management focused on the needs of a set of target species is gaining broader use in other systems. The concept acknowledges that to maintain a sensitive species well-distributed across its range, all areas may not need a conservative approach ensuring a low risk to species extirpation. For example, under the federal Survey and Manage program (USDA and USDI, 2001), all known sites may not warrant species-focused management for those with sufficient distribution to be considered “uncommon” rather than “rare.” For uncommon species, sites could be prioritized for management. For headwater amphibians, this notion has been expressed by several researchers. In British Columbia, Dupuis and Steventon (1999) suggested priority management areas be identified for tailed frogs along creeks with higher frog abundances and coarse, stable substrates, a habitat attribute associated with their occurrences. Similarly, larger-order non-fish-bearing basins could be regarded as higher priority watersheds for coastal tailed frogs (Hayes et al., 2006). For many stream amphibians in the Pacific Northwest, physical habitat features of streams such as substrate composition and gradient are strong predictors of occurrence or abundance (e.g., torrent salamanders [*Rhyacotriton*] and tailed frogs [*Ascaphus*]: Wilkins and Peterson, 2000; Adams and Bury, 2002; Russell et al., 2004), and should be considered if management areas are prioritized. Coastal tailed frogs have patchy distributions with optimal habitat conditions in late-seral forests (e.g., Welsh and Lind, 2002), and may need species-specific consideration for management across their range, which is broadly subject to timber harvest activities. Also, southern torrent salamanders, *R. variegatus*, have been found more frequently in older forest sites and may rely on microhabitat and microclimate protection (Welsh, 1990; Welsh and Lind, 1996). Bury and Corn (1988) and Bury et al. (1991) suggested that if tailed frogs or torrent salamanders were present, then protection measures should be implemented, although Bury and Corn (1988) felt the entire stream length might not need protection for the purpose of maintaining these species. Across the Pacific Northwest, these two taxa, tailed frogs and torrent salamanders, have gained concern among researchers, and are prime candidates to be considered in our target-species headwater protection scheme. At local scales, other species may be identified as targets for management, such as those with restricted distributions like the Van Dyke’s or Coeur d’Alene salamanders (*P. vandykei* and *P. idahoensis*, respectively).

While our focus in this analysis has been on headwater amphibians, this approach may be suitable for other species or habitat areas. For example, the stream-riparian dependent western pond turtle, *Clemmys marmorata*, nests in uplands, sometimes hundreds of meters away from water (Reese and Welsh, 1997; Blaustein et al., 1995). Nesting sites may be aggregated and the same area used every year, so a priority management area could be designated for this species’ habitat.

If not every stream reach or stream is managed for these endemic headwater species, how many priority management areas are needed? A larger scale than the stream reach or stream needs consideration. We suggest that it might be practical and

effective for species distributions to be managed for persistence at the scale of 6th-field watersheds (i.e., 6th code hydrologic units; catchment areas defined by an integrated stream network and typically ranging from ~4000 to 16,000 ha in the Oregon Coast Range; K. Burnett, personal communication [U.S. Forest Service]), as management designs at this scale can incorporate approaches along and between streams. Ideally, multiple areas within a 6th-field watershed could be identified to anchor headwater species and processes. As 6th-field watersheds are aggregated, larger basin connectivity can be addressed. Moreover, as genetic information becomes available for headwater species, the effectiveness of this approach can be tested.

This approach requires knowledge of species' distributions, to focus management to areas of high species abundances and/or high habitat quality, or both. This requires inventories for targeted species preceding development of priority species management areas. The costs of screening an area for a target species would be offset by the benefit to the land manager of the likely lifting of timber harvest restrictions over a portion of the watershed, while ensuring provision of within- and among-site protections to result in well-distributed populations of target species across the landscape. Across watersheds, the "spaghetti and meatball" toolbox can be implemented, potentially including narrow stream buffers to retain bank stability and stream habitat attributes (Fig. 3a), wider buffers for additional stream habitat and slope stability attributes and some riparian refugia (Fig. 3b), patch reserves at headwaters or along streams (Fig. 3c and d), and connections by full or partial forest retention across ridgelines of neighboring basins (Fig. 3e–g).

## 2.6. Balancing conflicting management priorities

In conjunction with a target-species approach, riparian and landscape design tools can be ordered by those that provide more conservative management approaches for aquatic–riparian dependent species, and those that are more geared to balancing conflicting forest management priorities. This dichotomy of designs has been suggested by the U.S. national Partners for Amphibian and Reptile Conservation, in their Habitat Management Guides for the southeastern U.S. (Bailey et al., 2006). A 2-tiered management design reiterates the idea that not all species-sites have to be conservatively managed. However, if designs can be developed at larger spatial scales, well-distributed populations and connectivity of managed sites can be addressed, perhaps by a mix of approaches. These guides are developed to assist private, industrial, state, federal or other land owners in managing for herpetological species across diverse habitats nationwide. Similar guidelines are in development for the rest of the country, and the northwest Habitat Management Guides (D. Pilliod and E. Wind, unpublished data) are expected to be available in 2007.

Conservative and forestry-compatible considerations for stream–riparian dependent species in the Pacific Northwest forests are included in Table 6. Conservative approaches are geared to protect the stream and riparian habitats used by obligate species and incidentally used by facultative species.

Hence a wider riparian buffer width is listed, 40–150 m, to retain riparian and upland habitats used by stream–riparian dependent fauna. These wider buffer areas might also take the form of "bulges" or patch reserves placed along streams, perhaps located at headwaters or tributary junctions, used in a forestry-compatible approach. These forested buffers might be management zones rather than no-entry reserves, if habitat conditions such as forest structural elements or stream hydrology can be shown to warrant some form of restoration management, or if there is thought to be limited risk to key taxa or conditions from the proposed management activities. Long-term large down wood recruitment is a particular concern for second-growth stands in these buffers. Included in Table 6 is a recommendation for avoidance of chemical applications and road building in riparian areas, due to their various adverse effects on amphibians, including direct mortality (e.g., deMaynadier and Hunter, 1995). Stream road crossings may disrupt movements of animals over the road and along the stream or riparian area; for example, Sagar et al. (in press) found larval coastal giant salamander movements instream were affected by culverts.

Approaches to balance conflicting species and timber production priorities may be a mix of buffers widths, patch reserves of different sizes, and dispersed tree retention (Table 6). However, as larger spatial scales are considered, retaining species distributions can be an overarching objective, so an integration of approaches is likely needed, with target-species approaches helping to focus protective efforts in key locations for species of interest or concern. The benefit of this 2-tiered management approach to forest landowners would be reduced harvest restrictions on some lands while other areas would function to retain headwater taxa and likely other ecological services; specifically, this approach would be geared towards precluding downward population trends towards species-listing under the Endangered Species Act. This approach requires testing for its benefits to headwater target species as well as for its efficacy in retaining other forest ecological services, including other headwater species and functions.

Headwaters are not the only area in a forested landscape warranting concern for forest-dependent species. Biodiversity management areas could be consolidated as multiple species' distributions overlap. For example, as targeted headwater species' distributions overlap owl nest sites, botanical set-asides or other upland rare-species protection areas, these areas could be considered to serve multiple biological functions. Again, we suggest consideration of 6th-field watershed designs for multiple species management areas to anchor populations across landscapes. Central to this notion is that many species could also occur in the intervening matrix at some spatial or temporal scales, but the anchor areas would provide more optimal habitat conditions and likely source populations. A 6th-field watershed scale of habitat anchors could address many species connectivity issues, except those with extremely limited dispersal abilities, and could hedge uncertainties of natural or anthropogenic disturbances affecting local anchor sites.

Table 6  
Stream riparian management considerations for biodiversity

Approach	Consideration	Example
Conservative	Maintain and restore the aquatic, riparian and upland systems simultaneously	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain connectivity longitudinally and laterally from stream channels, into headwaters and across ridgelines.</li> <li>2. Consider species with life histories transecting perennial-to-ephemeral channels, stream-to-riparian and riparian-to-upland systems</li> </ol>
	Identify high priority areas for protection or restoration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unique habitats</li> <li>2. Areas with high disturbance potential</li> <li>3. Areas outside the range of natural variation</li> <li>4. Areas with unique species or species of concern</li> </ol>
	Provide aquatic–riparian protection via delineation of entire subdrainage reserves, patch reserves and/or riparian buffers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 40–150 m (~130–500 ft) buffers for aquatic and riparian habitat and species</li> <li>2. Species specific considerations, e.g., turtle nesting sites may be &gt;150 m from water</li> <li>3. A mix of subdrainage reserves, patch reserves, and buffer widths may integrate local knowledge of habitats, or to hedge uncertainties</li> </ol>
	Maintain or restore microhabitats	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Large down wood</li> <li>2. Interstitial spaces in substrates</li> <li>3. Vegetation</li> <li>4. Microclimates</li> </ol>
	Maintain or restore natural hydrological conditions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peak flow timing and extent</li> <li>2. Flow duration</li> </ol>
	Avoid chemical applications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fertilizers</li> <li>2. Herbicides and pesticides</li> <li>3. Fire retardants</li> </ol>
Forestry-compatible considerations	Maintain stream continuity at road crossings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoid new road construction in riparian areas</li> <li>2. Avoid pipe culverts with perched outlets at stream crossings</li> </ol>
	At the landscape scale, consider connectivity of aquatic and terrestrial habitats in management plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stream channels to uplands</li> <li>2. Headwaters to ridgelines</li> <li>3. Corridors linking areas</li> </ol>
	Consider applying a mix of riparian protections, such as different buffer widths or combined linear buffers with patch reserves in polygon shapes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 10 m (~30 ft) for bank stability</li> <li>2. 15–30 m (~50–100 ft) for some water quality and aquatic habitat attributes</li> <li>3. 40–100 m (~130–330 ft) for aquatic/riparian-dependent species</li> <li>4. Tiered and/or interspersed larger and smaller zones.</li> </ol>
	Consider seasonal restrictions on management activities and ground disturbances in or near riparian areas	Timing to reflect the annual life cycle of activities of the resident species of concern (e.g., spring and fall amphibian activities)

Conservative approaches may be used when benefiting biodiversity is a primary objective. Forestry-compatible considerations include approaches to balance conflicting resource objectives, and may be used when biodiversity retention is secondary to other land use objectives.

2.7. Monitoring

Refinement of these management designs requires experimental manipulation or monitoring. For endemic headwater species, such as tailed frogs and torrent salamanders, it may be argued that conservative management approaches should be used until designs have empirical support for success in sustaining populations. Unfortunately, a call for research on these species has been made for two decades (Bury, 1983; Corn and Bury, 1989), and while significant new information is available on habitat associations, and many ideas have been forwarded as to how management might proceed, we have relatively little experimental or empirical knowledge about the efficacies of alternative management scenarios. Deployment of an experimental approach in a landscape-level test of the effectiveness of alternative prescriptions in headwater streams is currently underway in Washington State, with monitoring planned over several years post-implementation, but the result

of this work will not be available for several years (M. Hayes, unpublished data). Measures of success for headwater amphibian species include validation that species occupancy persists or is increased across stream reaches within basins, relative abundances similarly do not show decreasing trends, and habitat attributes associated with these species are not showing patterns of degradation (sedimentation, water temperature, water flow, down wood recruitment). Field studies and genetic tools could be used to assess connectivity and population metrics in basins subject to different management regimes. It would also be important to determine that this approach does not result in additional risk to other species of concern or to key ecological functions of headwaters.

3. Conclusions

A new understanding of forest management designs to retain stream–riparian habitats and biodiversity is developing. We

synthesize emerging data on riparian microclimates, efficacy of buffer widths for microclimate retention and species retention, spatial distributions of riparian-dependent fauna, and the need for upland connections between streams. The amphibians of the forested landscape of the Pacific Northwest are a particular concern, with declining population issues becoming more apparent regionally and globally. All 47 species occur in riparian areas over at least a portion of their range, 90% occur in forested habitats, about a third are stream–riparian obligate species, and a quarter are tied to headwaters. A new conservation approach outlined here targets selected species-of-interest for management designs along and among headwater stream reaches. A conservation approach for species persistence incorporates wider riparian management zones (40–150 m) and patch reserves along headwater streams to accommodate terrestrial life history functions of stream–riparian associated fauna, and habitat management in upslope forests to promote connectivity among drainages. A mix of buffer widths, 6–100 m, is suggested when timber management in forestlands is the dominant priority. Developing headwater habitat anchors at the spatial scale of 6th-field watersheds offers a design for connectivity of populations across forest landscapes. Piggy-backing protections of other forest species with headwater designs can consolidate biodiversity management areas.

#### Uncited reference

Ovaska and Davis (2005).

#### Acknowledgements

Special thanks to M. Hayes for extensive feedback on earlier drafts of our manuscript, and to D. Ashton, R.B. Bury and W. Lowe who helped develop ideas in this paper. We thank K. Ronnenberg for editorial assistance and graphic design, and B. Wright and M. Scurlock for compiling information for Fig. 2 and Table 4. Comments provided by G. Benson, K. Ronnenberg, S. Chan, R. Pabst and anonymous reviewers substantially improved our paper. The Pacific Rivers Council and the U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station provided support.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), through its Office of Research and Development, collaborated in the research described herein. This manuscript has been approved for publication by the EPA.

#### References

- Adams, M.J., Bury, R.B., 2002. The endemic headwater stream amphibians of the American Northwest: associations with environmental gradients in a large forested preserve. *Global Ecol. Biogeog.* 11, 169–178.
- Alford, R.A., Richards, S.J., 1999. Global amphibian declines: a problem in applied ecology. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. System.* 30, 133–165.
- Anderson, P.D., Larson, D.J., Chan, S.S. Riparian buffer and density management influences on microclimate of young headwater forests of western Oregon. *For. Sci.*, in press.
- Ashton, D.T., Marks, S.B., Welsh Jr., H.H., 2006. Evidence of continued effects from timber harvesting on lotic amphibians in redwood forests of north-western California. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 221, 183–193.

- Bailey, M.A., Holmes, J.N., Buhlmann, K.A., Mitchell, J.C., 2006. Habitat Management Guidelines for Amphibians and Reptiles of the Southeastern United States. Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Technical Publication HMG-2, Montgomery, Alabama, p. 88.
- Baxter, C.V., Fausch, K.D., Saunders, C., 2005. Tangled webs: reciprocal flows of invertebrate prey link streams and riparian zones. *Freshwater Biol.* 50, 2001–2220.
- Benda, L.E., Cundy, T.W., 1990. Predicting deposition of debris flows in mountain channels. *Can. Geotech. J.* 27, 409–417.
- Benda, L.E., Dunne, T., 1997a. Stochastic forcing of sediment supply to channel networks from landsliding and debris flows. *Water Resour. Res.* 33, 2849–2863.
- Benda, L.E., Dunne, T., 1997b. Stochastic forcing of sediment routing and storage in channel networks. *Water Resour. Res.* 33, 2865–2880.
- Bigley, R.E., Deisenhofer, F.U., 2006. Implementation procedures for the Habitat Conservation Plan Riparian Forest Restoration Strategy. Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Scientific Support Section, Olympia, Washington.
- Blaustein, A.R., Wake, D.B., 1990. Declining amphibian populations: a global phenomenon? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 5, 203–204.
- Blaustein, A.R., Beatty, J.J., Olson, D.H., Storm, R.M., 1995. The biology of amphibians and reptiles in old-growth forests in the Pacific Northwest. *Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-337*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, p. 98.
- Brode, J.M., Bury, R.B., 1984. The importance of riparian systems to amphibians and reptiles. In: Warner, R.E., Hendrix, K.E. (Eds.), *California Riparian Systems: Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, pp. 30–36.
- Brosofske, K.D., Chen, J., Naiman, R.J., Franklin, J.F., 1997. Harvesting effects on microclimatic gradients from small streams to uplands in western Washington. *Ecol. Appl.* 7, 1188–1200.
- Brown, G.W., Krygier, J.T., 1970. Effects of clearcutting on stream temperature. *Water Resour. Res.* 6 (4), 1133–1140.
- Bury, R.B., 1983. Differences in amphibian populations in logged and old growth redwood forest. *Northwest Sci.* 57 (3), 167–178.
- Bury, R.B., 1988. Habitat relationships and ecological importance of amphibians and reptiles. In: Raedeke, K.J. (Ed.), *Streamside Management: Riparian Wildlife and Forestry Interactions*. Institute of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, pp. 61–76.
- Bury, R.B., 2005. Black salamander, *Aneides flavipunctatus*. In: Jones, L.C.C., Leonard, W.P., Olson, D.H. (Eds.), *Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, WA, pp. 90–93.
- Bury, R.B., Corn, P.S., 1988. Responses of aquatic and streamside amphibians to timber harvest: a review. In: Raedeke, K.J. (Ed.), *Streamside Management: Riparian Wildlife and Forestry Interactions*. Institute of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, pp. 165–181.
- Bury, R.B., Corn, P.S., 1991. Sampling methods for amphibians in streams in the Pacific Northwest. *Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-275*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, p. 29.
- Bury, R.B., Corn, P.S., Aubry, K.B., Gilbert, F.F., Jones, L.L.C., 1991. Aquatic amphibian communities in Oregon and Washington. In: Ruggiero, L.F., Aubry, K.B., Carey, A.B., Huff, M.H. (Tech. Coords.), *Wildlife, Vegetation of Unmanaged Douglas-fir Forests*, *Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-285*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, pp. 353–362.
- Carey, A.B., 2006. Active and passive forest management for multiple values. In: Olson, D.H. (Ed.), *Symposium Issue: Biodiversity*, vol. 87. *Northwestern Naturalist*, pp. 18–30.
- Chen, J.J., Franklin, J.F., Spies, T.A., 1995. Growing season microclimate gradients from clearcut edges into old-growth Douglas-fir forests. *Ecol. Appl.* 5, 74–86.
- Cissel, J.H., Swanson, F.J., Grant, G.E., Olson, D.H., Gregory, S.V., Garman, K.L., Ashkenas, L.R., Hunter, M.G., Kertis, J.A., Mayo, J.H., McSwain, M.D., Swetland, S.G., Swindle, K.A., Wallin, D.O., 1998. A landscape plan based on historical fire regimes for a managed forest ecosystem: the Augusta Creek study. *Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-422*. U.S. Department

- of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon, p. 82.
- Collier, K.J., Smith, B.S., 1998. Dispersal of adult caddisflies (Trichoptera) in forests alongside three New Zealand streams. *Hydrobiologia* 361, 53–65.
- Corn, P.S., Bury, R.B., 1989. Logging in western Oregon: responses of headwater habitats and stream amphibians. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 29, 39–57.
- Corn, P.S., Bury, R.B., Hyde, E.J., 2003. Conservation of North American stream amphibians. In: Semlitsch, R.D. (Ed.), *Amphibian Conservation*. Smithsonian Books, Washington, DC, pp. 24–36.
- Crawford, J.A., Semlitsch, R.D. Estimation of core terrestrial habitat for stream-breeding salamanders and delineation of riparian buffers for protection of biodiversity in the southern Appalachian Mountains. *Cons. Biol.*, in press.
- Curtis, J.M.R., Taylor, E.B., 2003. The genetic structure of coastal giant salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*) in a managed forest. *Biol. Cons.* 115, 45–54.
- Cushman, S.A., 2006. Effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on amphibians: a review and prospectus. *Biol. Cons.* 128, 231–240.
- Danehy, R.J., Kirpes, B.J., 2000. Relative humidity gradients across riparian areas in eastern Oregon and Washington forests. *Northwest Sci.* 74 (3), 224–233.
- Davic, R.D., Welsh Jr., H.H., 2004. On the ecological roles of salamanders. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 35, 405–434.
- Davies, K.F., Gascon, C., Margules, C.R., 2001. Habitat fragmentation; consequences, management, and future research priorities. In: Soule, M.E., Orians, G.H. (Eds.), *Conservation Biology*. Island Press, Washington, DC, pp. 81–97.
- deMaynadier, P.G., Hunter Jr., M.L., 1995. The relationship between forest management and amphibian ecology: a review of the North American literature. *Environ. Rev.* 3, 230–261.
- Dong, J., Chen, J., Borofsky, K.D., Naiman, R.J., 1998. Modeling air temperature gradients across managed small streams in western Washington. *J. Environ. Manage.* 53, 309–321.
- Dunk, J.R., Zielinski, W.J., West, K., Schmidt, K., Baldwin, J., Perrochet, J., Schlick, K., Ford, J., 2002. Distributions of rare mollusks relative to reserved lands in northern California. *Northwest Sci.* 76 (3), 249–256.
- Dupuis, L., 1997. Effects of logging on terrestrial-breeding amphibians on Vancouver Island. In: Green, D.M. (Ed.), *Amphibians in Decline: Canadian Studies of a Global Problem*. Herpetological Conservation, vol. 1. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, St. Louis, MO, pp. 258–270.
- Dupuis, L., Steventon, D., 1999. Riparian management and the tailed frog in northern coastal forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 124, 35–43.
- Dupuis, L.A., Smith, J.N.M., Bunnell, F., 1995. Relation of terrestrial-breeding amphibian abundance to tree-stand age. *Cons. Biol.* 9, 645–653.
- Federal Register, 2005. National forest system land management planning, US 36 CFR Part 219. *Federal Register* 70 (3), 1023–1061.
- Forman, R.T.T., 1995. *Land Mosaics: The Ecology of Landscapes and Regions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, p. 632.
- Frankham, R., 2003. Genetics and conservation biology. *C. R. Biol.* 326, S22–S29.
- Franklin, J.F., Dyrness, C.T., 1988. *Natural Vegetation of Oregon and Washington*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR, p. 452.
- Funk, W.C., Greene, A.E., Corn, P.S., Allendorf, F.W., 2005. High dispersal in a frog species suggests that it is vulnerable to habitat fragmentation. *Biol. Lett.* 1, 13–16.
- Gomez, D.M., Anthony, R.G., 1996. Amphibian and reptile abundance in riparian and upslope areas of five forest types in western Oregon. *Northwest Sci.* 70, 109–119.
- Gomi, T., Sidle, R.C., Richardson, J.S., 2002. Understanding processes and downstream linkages of headwater streams. *BioScience* 52 (10), 905–916.
- Gray, L.J., 1993. Response of insectivorous birds to emerging aquatic insects in riparian habitats of a tallgrass prairie stream. *Am. Midland Nat.* 129, 288–300.
- Gregory, S.V., Swanson, F.J., McKee, W.A., Cummins, K.W., 1991. An ecosystem perspective of riparian zones. *BioScience* 41 (8), 540–551.
- Hagan, J.M., Whitman, A.A., 2000. Microclimate Changes Across Upland and Riparian Clearcut Forest Boundaries in Maine. *Mosaic Science Notes* 2000–4. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, Brunswick, ME, p. 6.
- Hagar, J.C., 1999. Influence of riparian buffer width on bird assemblages in western Oregon. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 63 (2), 484–496.
- Hayes, M.P., Quinn, T., Dugger, D.J., Hicks, T.L., Melchior, M.A., Runde, D.E., 2006. Dispersion of coastal tailed frog (*Ascaphus truei*): a hypothesis relating occurrence of frogs in non-fishbearing headwater basins to their seasonal movements. *J. Herpetol.* 40 (4), 533–545.
- Hedrick, P.W., 2001. Conservation genetics: Where are we now? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 16, 629–636.
- Heinz, S.K., Wissel, C., Frank, K., 2006. The viability of metapopulations: individual dispersal behaviour matters. *Landscape Ecol.* 21, 77–89.
- Hendrickson, J.R., 1954. Ecology and systematics of salamanders of the genus *Batrachoseps*. *Zoology* 54, 1–46.
- Hering, D., 1998. Riparian beetles (Coleoptera) along a small stream in the Oregon Coast Range and their interactions with the aquatic environment. *Coleopterists Bull.* 52 (2), 161–170.
- Herunter, H.E., MacDonald, J.S., MacIsaac, E.A., 2004. Effectiveness of variable-retention riparian buffers for maintaining thermal regimes, water chemistry, and benthic invertebrate communities of small headwater streams in central British Columbia. In: Scrimgeour, G.J., Eisler, G., McCulloch, B., Silins, U., Monita, M. (Eds.), *Forest Land-fish Conference II—Ecosystem Stewardship through Collaboration*, Proc. Forest-Land-Fish Conf. II, April 26–28, 2004, Edmonton, Alberta, pp. 105–113.
- Hibbs, D.E., Bower, A.L., 2001. Riparian forests in the Oregon Coast Range. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 154, 201–213.
- Huff, D.D., Hubler, S.L., Borisenko, A.N., 2005. Using field data to estimate the realized thermal niche of aquatic vertebrates. *N. Am. J. Fish. Manage.* 25, 346–360.
- Ice, G., 2001. How direct solar radiation and shade influences temperature in forest streams and relaxation of changes in stream temperature. In: (Anon.) Proceedings of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, Research (CMER) Workshop: Heat Transfer Processes in Forested Watersheds, their Effects on Surface Temperature, Lacey, Washington, February 2001.
- Jackson, C.R., Sturm, C.A., Ward, J.M., 2001. Timber harvest impacts on small headwater stream channels in the coast ranges of Washington. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 37, 1533–1549.
- Johnson, S.L., Jones, J.A., 2000. Stream temperature responses to forest harvest and debris flows in western Cascades, Oregon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 57 (Suppl. 2), 30–39.
- Johnston, B., Frid, L., 2002. Clearcut logging restricts the movements of terrestrial Pacific giant salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus* Good). *Can. J. Zool.* 80, 2170–2177.
- Jones, L.L.C., Leonard, W.P., Olson, D.H. (Eds.), 2005. *Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, WA, p. 227.
- Karraker, N.E., Welsh Jr., H.H., 2006. Long-term impacts of even-aged timber management on abundance and body condition of terrestrial amphibians in Northwestern California. *Biol. Cons.* 131, 132–140.
- Kauffman, J.B., Mahrt, M., Mahrt, L.A., Edge, W.D., 2001. Wildlife of riparian habitats. In: Johnson, D.H., O’Neil, T.A. (Manage. Dirs.), *Wildlife-habitat Relationships in Oregon and Washington*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, Oregon, pp. 361–388.
- Kiffney, P.M., Richardson, J.S., Bull, J.P., 2003. Responses of periphyton and insects to manipulation of riparian buffer width along forest streams. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 40, 1060–1076.
- Knapp, S.M., Haas, C.A., Harpole, D.N., Kirkpatrick, R.L., 2003. Initial effects of clearcutting and alternative silvicultural practices on terrestrial salamander abundance. *Cons. Biol.* 17 (3), 752–762.
- Knopf, F.L., Samson, F.B., 1994. Scale perspectives on avian diversity in western riparian ecosystems. *Cons. Biol.* 8, 669–676.
- Kondolf, G.M., Kattelman, R., Embury, M., Erman, D.C., 1996. Status of riparian habitats, Chapter 36. In: *Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final Report to Congress, vol. II, Assessments, Scientific Basis for Management Options*, Wildland Resources Center Report No. 37, University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources, Davis, CA, pp. 1009–1030.
- Kuchta, S.R., 2005. Red-bellied newt, *Taricha rivularis*. In: Jones, L.C.C., Leonard, W.P., Olson, D.H. (Eds.), *Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, WA, pp. 78–81.

1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813

- 1813 Lannoo, M. (Ed.), 2005. Amphibian Declines. The Conservation Status of  
1814 United States Species. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, p. 1094.  
1815 Law, B.S., Dickman, C.R., 1998. The use of habitat mosaics by terrestrial  
1816 vertebrate fauna: implications for conservation and management. *Biodivers.*  
1817 *Conserv.* 7, 323–333.  
1818 Lawler, J.J., White, D., Sifneos, J.C., Master, L.O., 2003. Rare species and the  
1819 use of indicator groups for conservation planning. *Cons. Biol.* 17, 875–882.  
1820 Lemckert, F., Brassil, T., 2000. Movements and habitat use of the endangered  
1821 giant barred river frog (*Mixophyes iteratus*) and the implications for its  
1822 conservation in timber production forests. *Biol. Cons.* 96 (2), 177–184.  
1823 Lidicker Jr., W.Z., Koenig, W.D., 1996. Responses of terrestrial vertebrates to  
1824 habitat edges and corridors. In: McCullough, D.R. (Ed.), *Metapopulations*  
1825 and *Wildlife Conservation*. Island Press, Washington, DC, pp. 85–109.  
1826 Lind, A.J., Welsh Jr., H.H., 1990. Predation by *Thamnophis couchi* on  
1827 *Dicamptodon ensatus*. *J. Herpetol.* 24, 104–106.  
1828 Lindenmayer, D.B., Franklin, J.F., 2002. *Managing Forest Biodiversity: A*  
1829 *Comprehensive Multiscaled Approach*. Island Press, Washington, DC, p. 351.  
1830 Lowe, W.H., Bolger, D.T., 2002. Local and landscape-scale predictors of  
1831 salamander abundance in New Hampshire headwater streams. *Cons. Biol.*  
1832 16 (1), 183–193.  
1833 Lowe, W.H., Likens, G.E., 2005. Moving headwater streams to the head of the  
1834 class. *BioScience* 55, 196–197.  
1835 Lowe, W.H., Likens, G.E., Power, M.E., 2006. Linking scales in stream ecology.  
1836 *BioScience* 56, 591–597.  
1837 Macdonald, J.S., MacIsaac, E.A., Herunter, H.E., 2003. The effect of variable-  
1838 retention riparian buffer zones on water temperatures in small headwater  
1839 streams in sub-boreal forest ecosystems of British Columbia. *Can. J. For.*  
1840 *Res.* 33, 1371–1382.  
1841 Matlack, G.R., 1993. Microenvironment variation within and among forest edge  
1842 sites in the eastern United States. *Biol. Cons.* 66, 185–194.  
1843 Matsuda, B.M., Richardson, J.S., 2005. Movement patterns and relative abun-  
1844 dance of coastal tailed frogs in clearcuts and mature forest stands. *Can. J.*  
1845 *For. Res.* 35, 1131–1138.  
1846 Matveinen-Huju, K., Niemelä, J., Rita, H., O'Hara, R.B., 2006. Retention-tree  
1847 groups in clear-cuts: Do they constitute 'life-boats' for spiders and carabids?  
1848 *For. Ecol. Manage.* 230, 119–135.  
1849 Maxcy, K.A., Richardson, J., 2000. Abundance and movements of terrestrial  
1850 salamanders in second-growth forests of southwestern British Columbia. In:  
1851 Darling, L.M. (Ed.), *Proceedings of a Conference on the Biology and*  
1852 *Management of Species and Habitats at Risk*, Kamloops, BC, 15–19  
1853 February 1999, vol. 1. BC Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks,  
1854 Victoria, BC, and University College of the Cariboo, Kamloops, BC, pp.  
1855 295–301.  
1856 McComb, W.G., Chambers, C.L., Newton, M., 1993a. Small mammal and  
1857 amphibian communities and habitat associations in red alder stands, central  
1858 Oregon Coast Range. *Northwest Sci.* 67 (3), 181–188.  
1859 McComb, W.G., McGarigal, K., Anthony, R.G., 1993b. Small mammal and  
1860 amphibian abundance in streamside and upslope habitats of mature Dou-  
1861 glas-fir stands, western Oregon. *Northwest Sci.* 67 (1), 7–15.  
1862 McGarigal, K., Cushman, S.A., 2002. Comparative evaluation of experimental  
1863 approaches to the study of habitat fragmentation effects. *Ecol. Appl.* 12 (2),  
1864 335–345.  
1865 Meleason, M.A., Quinn, J.M., 2004. Influence of riparian buffer width on air  
1866 temperature at Whangapoua Forest, Coromandel Peninsula, New Zealand.  
1867 *For. Ecol. Manage.* 191, 365–371.  
1868 Minore, D., Weatherly, H.G., 1994. Riparian trees, shrubs, and forest regenera-  
1869 tion in the coastal mountains of Oregon. *New For.* 8, 249–263.  
1870 Molina, R., Marcot, B.G., Leshner, R., 2006. Protecting rare, old-growth, forest-  
1871 associated species under the Survey and Manage Program guidelines of the  
1872 Northwest Forest Plan. *Cons. Biol.* 20 (2), 306–318.  
1873 Monsen, K., Blouin, M., 2004. Extreme isolation by distance in a montane frog  
1874 *Rana cascadae*. *Conserv. Genet.* 5, 827–835.  
1875 Moore, R.D., Spittlehouse, D.L., Story, A., 2005. Riparian microclimate and  
1876 stream temperature response to forest harvesting. *J. Am. Water Resour.*  
1877 *Assoc.* 41, 813–834.  
1878 Moore, R.D., Wondzell, S.M., 2005. Physical hydrology and the effects of forest  
1879 harvesting in the Pacific Northwest: a review. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.*  
1880 41 (4), 763–784.  
1881 Muchow, C., Richardson, J.S., 2000. Unexplored diversity: macroinvertebrates  
1882 in coastal B.C. zero-order headwater streams. In: Darling, L.M. (Ed.), *Proc.*  
1883 *Biology and Management of Species and Habitats At Risk*, Kamloops, BC,  
1884 15–19 February 1999, vol.2. BC Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks,  
1885 Victoria, BC and University College of the Cariboo, Kamloops, BC, pp.  
1886 503–506.  
1887 Naiman, R.J., Décamps, H., 1997. The ecology of interfaces: riparian zones.  
1888 *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 28, 621–658.  
1889 Naiman, R.J., Bilby, R.E., Bisson, P.A., 2000. Riparian ecology and manage-  
1890 ment in the Pacific Coastal Rain Forest. *BioScience* 50 (11), 996–1011.  
1891 Nakano, S., Murakami, M., 2001. Reciprocal subsidies: dynamic interdepen-  
1892 dence between terrestrial and aquatic food webs. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*  
1893 U.S.A. 98, 166–170.  
1894 Nauman, R.S., Olson, D.H., 2004. Surveys for terrestrial amphibians in Shasta  
1895 County, California with notes on the distribution of Shasta salamanders  
1896 (*Hydromantes shastae*). *Northwestern Nat.* 85, 29–32.  
1897 Nierenberg, T.R., Hibbs, D.E., 2000. A characterization of unmanaged riparian  
1898 areas in the central Coast Range of western Oregon. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 129,  
1899 195–206.  
1900 Olson, D.H., 2006. Biodiversity conservation—a place holder: introduction to  
1901 papers in this issue. In: Olson, D.H. (Ed.), *Symposium Issue: Biodiversity*,  
1902 87. *Northwestern Naturalist*, pp. 1–9.  
1903 Olson, D.H., Rugger, C. Initial effects of headwater riparian reserves with  
1904 upslope thinning on stream habitats and amphibians. *For. Sci.*, in press.  
1905 Olson, D.H., Weaver, G. Vertebrate assemblages associated with headwater  
1906 hydrology in western Oregon managed forests. *For. Sci.*, in press.  
1907 Omernick, J.M., Bryce, S.A., Chapman, S.S., Moran, B.C., Griffith, G.E.,  
1908 Woods, A.J., Paulsen, S.G., 2006. Ecoregion Maps and GIS Resources.  
1909 Western Ecology Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis,  
1910 OR Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/wed/pages/ecoregions/ecoregions.htm>. Accessed 26 July 2006.  
1911 Oregon Administrative Rules, 2006. Title 629, Department of Forestry. Avail-  
1912 able at: [http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS\\_600/OAR\\_629/629\\_tofc.html](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_600/OAR_629/629_tofc.html). Accessed 4 August 2006.  
1913 Oregon Department of Forestry, 2001. Final Oregon State Forests Management  
1914 Plan [Northwest and Southwest]. Available at: [http://governor.oregon.gov/ODF/STATE\\_FORESTS/planning.shtml](http://governor.oregon.gov/ODF/STATE_FORESTS/planning.shtml). Accessed 4 August 2006.  
1915 Ovaska, K., 1988. Spacing and movements of the salamander *Plethodon*  
1916 *vehiculum*. *Herpetologica* 44, 377–386.  
1917 Ovaska, K., Davis, T.M., 2005. Western red-backed salamander, *Plethodon*  
1918 *vehiculum*. In: Jones, L.C.C., Leonard, W.P., Olson, D.H. (Eds.), *Amphi-*  
1919 *bians of the Pacific Northwest*. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, WA, pp.  
1920 144–147.  
1921 Pabst, R.J., Spies, T.A., 1998. Distribution of herbs and shrubs in relation to  
1922 landform and canopy cover in riparian forests of coastal Oregon. *Can. J. Bot.*  
1923 76, 298–315.  
1924 Pabst, R.J., Spies, T.A., 1999. Structure and composition of unmanaged riparian  
1925 forests in the coastal mountains of Oregon, U.S.A. *Can. J. For. Res.* 29,  
1926 1557–1573.  
1927 Pearson, S.F., Manuwal, D.A., 2001. Breeding bird response to riparian buffer  
1928 width in managed Pacific Northwest Douglas-fir forests. *Ecol. Appl.* 11 (3),  
1929 840–853.  
1930 Pilliod, D.S., Peterson, C.R., Ritson, P.I., 2002. Seasonal migration of Columbia  
1931 spotted frogs (*Rana luteiventris*) among complementary resources in a high  
1932 mountain basin. *Can. J. Zool.* 80, 1849–1862.  
1933 Polis, G.A., Power, M.E., Huxel, G. (Eds.), 2004. *Food Webs and Landscapes*.  
1934 Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.  
1935 Pollock, M.M., Beechie, T.J., Chan, S.S., Bigley, R., 2005. Monitoring restora-  
1936 tion of riparian forests. In: Roni, P. (Ed.), *Methods for Monitoring Stream*  
1937 *and Watershed Restoration*. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda,  
1938 Maryland, pp. 67–96.  
1939 Progar, R.A., Moldenke, A.R., 2002. Insect production from temporary and  
1940 perennially flowing headwater streams in western Oregon. *J. Freshwater*  
1941 *Ecol.* 17 (3), 391–407.  
1942 Pullin, A.S., 2002. *Conservation Biology*. Cambridge University Press, Cam-  
1943 bridge, UK.  
1944 Raphael, M.G., Bisson, P.A., Jones, L.L.C., Foster, A.D., 2002. Effects of  
1945 streamside forest management on the composition and abundance of stream  
1946

- 1949 and riparian fauna of the Olympic Peninsula. In: Johnson, A.C., Haynes,  
1950 R.W., Monserud, R.A. (Eds.), *Congruent Management of Multiple*  
1951 *Resources: Proceedings from the Wood Compatibility Initiative Workshop.*  
1952 PNW-GTR-563. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific  
1953 Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, pp. 27–40.
- 1954 Rashin, E.B., Clishe, C.J., Loch, A.T., Bell, J.M., 2006. Effectiveness of timber  
1955 harvest practices for controlling sediment related water quality impacts. *J.*  
1956 *Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 42, 1307–1327.
- 1957 Reeves, G.H., Burnett, K.M., McGarry, E.V., 2003. Sources of large wood  
1958 in a pristine watershed in coastal Oregon. *Can. J. For. Res.* 33, 1363–  
1959 1370.
- 1960 Reeves, G.H., 2006. The aquatic conservation strategy of the Northwest  
1961 Forest Plan: and assessment after ten years. In: Haynes, R.W., Bormann,  
1962 B.T., Lee, D.C., Martin, J.R. (Tech. Eds.), *Northwest Forest Plan—the first*  
1963 *10 years (1994–2003) synthesis of monitoring and research results.* Gen.  
1964 Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-651. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Ser-  
1965 vice, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR, pp. 181–217  
1966 (Chapter 9).
- 1967 Rosenberg, D.K., Noon, B.R., Meslow, E.C., 1997. Biological corridors: form,  
1968 function, and efficacy. *BioScience* 47 (10), 677–687.
- 1969 Rowe, J.M., Meegan, S.K., Engstrom, E.S., Perry, S.A., Perry, W.B., 1996.  
1970 Comparison of leaf processing rates under different temperature regimes in  
1971 three headwater streams. *Freshwater Biol.* 36, 277–288.
- 1972 Rundio, D.E., Olson, D.H., 2003. Antipredator defenses of larval Pacific giant  
1973 salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*) against cutthroat trout (*Oncor-*  
1974 *hynchus clarki*). *Copeia* 2003 (2), 392–397.
- 1975 Rundio, D.E., Olson, D.H. Influence of headwater site conditions and riparian  
1976 buffers on terrestrial salamander response to forest thinning. *For. Sci.*, in  
1977 press.
- 1978 Russell, K.R., Mabee, T.J., Cole, M.B., 2004. Distribution and habitat of  
1979 Columbia torrent salamanders at multiple spatial scales in managed forests  
1980 of northwestern Oregon. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 68 (2), 403–415.
- 1981 Rykken, J., 2004. Relationships between forest-floor invertebrate distribution,  
1982 movement, and microclimate under alternative riparian management prac-  
1983 tices in the western Cascade Range, Oregon. Ph.D., Department of Botany,  
1984 Oregon State University.
- 1985 Rykken, J., Chan, S.S., Moldenke, A.R. Headwater riparian microclimate  
1986 patterns under alternative forest management treatments. *For. Sci.*, in press.
- 1987 Rykken, J., Moldenke, A., Olson, D. Headwater riparian invertebrates and their  
1988 responses to alternative forest management practices. *Ecol. Appl.*, in press.
- 1989 Sagar, J.P., Olson, D.H., Schmitz, R.A. Survival and growth of larval Coastal  
1990 Giant Salamanders (*Dicamptodon tenebrosus*) in streams in the Oregon  
1991 Coast Range. *Copeia*, in press.
- 1992 Schrader-Frechette, K.S., McCoy, D.C., 1993. *Methods in Ecology: Strategies*  
1993 *for Conservation.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United King-  
1994 dom.
- 1995 Sedell, J.R., Reeves, G.H., Burnett, K.M., 1994. Development and evaluation of  
1996 aquatic conservation strategies. *J. Forestry* 92 (4), 28–31.
- 1997 Semlitsch, R.D., 2000. Principles for management of aquatic-breeding amphi-  
1998 bians. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 64, 615–631.
- 1999 Semlitsch, R.D., Bodie, J.R., 2003. Biological criteria for buffer zones around  
2000 wetlands and riparian habitats for amphibians and reptiles. *Cons. Biol.* 17,  
2001 1219–1228.
- 2002 Sheridan, C.D., Olson, D.H., 2003. Amphibian assemblages in zero-  
2003 order basins in the Oregon Coast Range. *Can. J. For. Resour.* 33, 1452–  
2004 1477.
- 2005 Sheridan, C.D., Spies, T.A., 2005. Vegetation-environment relationships in  
2006 zero-order basins in coastal Oregon. *Can. J. For. Res.* 35, 340–355.
- 2007 Sjögren Gulve, P., 1994. Distribution and extinction patterns within a  
2008 northern metapopulation of the pool frog, *Rana lessonae*. *Ecology* 75,  
2009 1357–2136.
- 2010 Smith, M.A., Green, D.M., 2005. Dispersal and the metapopulation paradigm in  
2011 amphibian ecology and conservation: are all amphibian populations  
2012 metapopulations? *Ecography* 28, 110–128.
- 2013 Spence, B.C., Lomnický, G.A., Hughes, R.M., Novitzki, R.P., 1996. An  
2014 ecosystem approach to salmonid conservation. Funded jointly by  
2015 the U.S. EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine  
2016 Fisheries Service. TR-4501-96-6057. Man Tech Environmental Research  
2017 Services Corp., Corvallis, OR. <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/1habcon/habweb/ManTech/front.htm#TOC>.
- 2018 Stoddard, M.A., Hayes, J.P., 2005. The influence of forest management on  
2019 headwater stream amphibians at multiple spatial scales. *Ecol. Appl.* 15 (3),  
2020 811–823.
- 2021 Story, A., Moore, R.D., Macdonald, J.S., 2003. Stream temperatures in two  
2022 shaded reaches below cutblocks and logging roads: downstream cooling  
2023 linked to subsurface hydrology. *Can. J. For. Res.* 33, 1383–1396.
- 2024 Stuart, S.N., Chanson, J.S., Cox, N.A., Young, B.E., Rodrigues, A.S.L., Fisch-  
2025 man, D.L., Waller, R.W., 2004. Status and trends of amphibian declines and  
2026 extinctions worldwide. *Science* 306, 1783–1785.
- 2027 Swift, S.M., Racey, P.A., Avery, M.I., 1985. Feeding ecology of *Pipistrellus*  
2028 *pipistrellus* (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae) during pregnancy and lactation.  
2029 II. *Diet. J. Anim. Ecol.* 54, 217–225.
- 2030 Thomas, J.W., Maser, C., Rodiek, J.E., 1979. Riparian zones. In: Thomas,  
2031 J.W. (Ed.), *Wildlife Habitats in Managed Forests: The Blue Mountains*  
2032 *of Washington and Oregon.* U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest  
2033 Service, Washington, DC, Agriculture Handbook Number 553, pp. 40–  
2034 47.
- 2035 Thomas, J.W., Raphael, M.G., Anthony, R.G., et al., 1993. Viability assessments  
2036 and management considerations for species associated with late-succes-  
2037 sional and old-growth forests of the Pacific Northwest. The Report of the  
2038 Scientific Analysis Team, U.S. Department of Agriculture, p. 530.
- 2039 [USDA USDI] US Department of Agriculture and US Department of Interior,  
2040 1993. Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team (FEMAT): An  
2041 Ecological, Economic, and Social Assessment. US Department of Agri-  
2042 culture and US Department of Interior, Portland, OR.
- 2043 [USDA USDI] US Department of Agriculture and US Department of Interior,  
2044 1994. Record of Decision on Management of Habitat for Late-successional  
2045 and Old-growth Forest Related Species within the Range of the Northern  
2046 Spotted Owl [Northwest Forest Plan]. US Department of Agriculture and  
2047 US Department of Interior, Portland, OR.
- 2048 [USDA USDI] US Department of Agriculture and US Department of Interior,  
2049 1996a. Riparian Reserve Evaluation Techniques and Synthesis. Module  
2050 of the Guide to Watershed Analysis. Riparian Reserve Technical  
2051 Team, Regional Ecosystem Office, Portland, OR, p. 42, Interagency Publi-  
2052 cation.
- 2053 [USDA USDI] US Department of Agriculture and US Department of Interior,  
2054 1996b. Species Information: Addendum to Appendix B, Riparian Reserve  
2055 Evaluation Techniques and Synthesis. Module of the Guide to Watershed  
2056 Analysis. Riparian Reserve Technical Team, Regional Ecosystem Office,  
2057 Portland, OR, p. 342, Interagency Publication.
- 2058 [USDA and USDI] US Department of Agriculture and US Department of  
2059 Interior, 2001. Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for  
2060 Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other  
2061 Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines. Portland, OR.
- 2062 [US GAO] General Accounting US Office, 2001. Restoring Fish Passage  
2063 through Culverts on Forest Service and BLM Lands in Oregon and  
2064 Washington could take Decades. United States General Accounting Office  
2065 Publication BTS01-01, Washington, DC, p. 29.
- 2066 Vesely, D.G., 1996. Terrestrial amphibian abundance and species richness in  
2067 headwater riparian buffer strips, Oregon Coast Range. M.Sc. Thesis. Oregon  
2068 State University, Corvallis, OR, p. 48.
- 2069 Vesely, D.G., McComb, W.C., 2002. Salamander abundance and amphibian  
2070 species richness in riparian buffer strips in the Oregon Coast Range. *For. Sci.*  
2071 48 (2), 291–297.
- 2072 Wahbe, T.R., Bunnell, F.L., Bury, R.B., 2004. Terrestrial movements in juvenile  
2073 and adult tailed frogs in relation to timber harvest in coastal British  
2074 Columbia. *Can. J. For. Res.* 34, 2455–2466.
- 2075 Washington Administrative Code, 2006. Title 222 Forest Practices Board.  
2076 Available at: <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC>. Accessed 4 August 2006.
- 2077 Washington State Department of Natural Resources, 1997. Final Habitat  
2078 Conservation Plan. Washington State Department of Natural Resources,  
2079 Olympia, Washington.
- 2080 Welsh Jr., H.H., 1990. Relictual amphibians and old-growth forests. *Cons. Biol.*  
2081 4 (3), 309–319.
- 2082 Welsh Jr., H.H., 2000. California forest management and aquatic/riparian  
2083 ecosystems in the redwoods. In: Noss, R. (Ed.), *The Redwood Forest:*  
2084  
2085

- 2086 History, Ecology, and Management of the Coast Redwoods. Island Press, 2107  
2087 Covelo, CA, pp. 255–261. 2108
- 2088 Welsh Jr., H.H., Ollivier, L.M., 1998. Stream amphibians as indicators of 2109  
2089 ecosystem stress: a case study from California's redwoods. *Ecol. Appl.* 8 2110  
2090 (4), 1118–1132. 2111
- 2091 Welsh Jr., H.H., Droege, S., 2001. A case for using plethodontid salamanders for 2112  
2092 monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem integrity of North American forests. 2113  
2093 *Cons. Biol.* 15 (3), 558–569. 2114
- 2094 Welsh Jr., H.H., Lind, A.J., 2002. Multiscale habitat relationships of stream 2115  
2095 amphibians in the Klamath-Siskiyou Region of California and Oregon. *J.* 2116  
2096 *Wildl. Manage.* 66 (3), 581–602. 2117
- 2097 Welsh Jr., H.H., Roelofs, T.D., Frissell, C.A., 2000. Aquatic ecosystems of the 2118  
2098 redwood region. In: Noss, R.F. (Ed.), *The Redwood Forest: History,* 2119  
2099 *Ecology, and Conservation of the Coast Redwoods.* Island Press, Covelo, 2120  
2100 CA, pp. 165–199. 2121
- 2101 Welsh Jr., H.H., Hodgson, G.R., Lind, A.J., 2005a. Ecogeography of the 2122  
2102 herpetofauna of a northern California watershed: linking species patterns 2123  
2103 to landscape processes. *Ecography* 28, 521–536. 2124
- 2104 Welsh Jr., H.H., Hodgson, G.R., Karraker, N.E., 2005b. Influences of the 2125  
2105 vegetation mosaic on riparian and stream environments in a mixed for- 2126  
2106 est-grassland landscape in "Mediterranean" northwestern California. *Eco-* 2127  
2107 *graphy* 28, 537–551. 2128
- Wessell, S.J., 2005. Biodiversity in managed forests of western Oregon: species 2129  
assemblages in leave islands, thinned, and unthinned forests. M.Sc. Thesis, 2108  
Oregon State Univ., Corvallis, Oregon, U.S.A., p. 161. 2109
- Wiens, J.A., 2002. Riverine landscapes: talking landscape ecology into the 2111  
water. *Freshwater Biol.* 47, 501–515. 2112
- Wilkerson, E., Hagan, J.M., Siegel, D., Whitman, A.A., 2006. The effectiveness 2113  
of different buffer widths for protecting headwater stream temperature 2114  
effects. *For. Sci.* 52 (3), 221–231. 2115
- Wilkins, R.N., Peterson, N.P., 2000. Factors related to amphibian occurrence and 2116  
abundance in headwater streams draining second-growth Douglas-fir forests 2117  
in southwestern Washington. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 139, 79–91. 2118
- Willson, J.D., Dorcas, M.E., 2003. Effects of habitat disturbance on stream 2119  
salamanders: implications for buffer zones and watershed management. 2120  
*Cons. Biol.* 17 (3), 763–771. 2121
- Wipfli, M.S., Gregovich, D.P., 2002. Export of invertebrates and detritus from 2122  
fishless headwater streams in southeast Alaska: implications for down- 2123  
stream salmonid production. *Freshwater Ecol.* 47, 957–969. 2124
- Young, K.A., 2000. Riparian zone management in the Pacific Northwest: who's 2125  
cutting what? *Environ. Manage.* 26 (2), 131–144. 2126
- Zwieniecki, M.A., Newton, M., 1999. Influence of streamside cover and stream 2127  
features on temperature trends in forested streams of western Oregon. 2128  
*Western J. Appl. For.* 14, 106–113. 2129