



parameters.¹

- The Committee for Family Forestlands provided opinions about the “general approach to collecting appropriate data to inform” the streamside protections review. We believe that that adding a fish population study would be costly, time consuming, highly unlikely to be scientifically informative as proposed, and irrelevant to the already extant policy and legal context, which has already been considered at length and integrates known effects on fish.
- Regarding the EOAC’s endorsement of the 2003 “ERFAC” report, the Board should recognize that this report reflected only landowner views: the sole conservation-oriented member of that committee actually wrote a letter attached to the report that expressed the view that conservation interests were not adequately represented. With respect to the EOAC’s opinion on the extreme complexity of Eastern Oregon ecosystems, we must respectfully disagree. *Eastern Oregon streams are no more complex than any other streams. In terms of temperature and shade relations specifically, they are the same.*
- The EOAC does make some astute observations on Idaho rules and how they lay down on the ground, and we urge ODF to explore this further, in addition to both CA and WA rules. In Idaho, it is our understanding that the common outcome of no-cut 50-foot buffers being required to achieve shade and stocking objectives simply reflects the biophysical reality of the riparian forest situation in the interior west.
- We are further concerned about the EOAC’s implication that that fish use streams that are dry or have intermittent dry reaches in the summer should not be equally considered as other fish streams purposes of riparian protection. This implication bears further scrutiny for its ecological basis. *In Oregon, a stream or lake has fish use if it is occupied—at any time of year—by fish that are anadromous, game species, or listed as threatened or endangered under the state or federal endangered species acts, unless fish are present due only to introduction.* There is currently no regulatory or other reason of which we are aware to treat periodically dry reaches of perennial fish use streams differently than other fish use reaches.

¹The protection goal for water quality, per ORS 527.765 is to ensure through the described forest practices that, to the maximum extent practicable, non-point source discharges of pollutants resulting from forest operations do not impair the achievement and maintenance of the water quality standards.