

**United States  
Department of  
Agriculture**

**Forest  
Service  
R-5/6**

**United States  
Department of  
Interior**

**Bureau of Land  
Management  
OR/WA/CA**

---

**Reply to:** FS: 2600(FS)  
BLM: 1736-PFP (BLM-OR931)

**Date:** October 20, 1997

EMS TRANSMISSION 10/22/97  
BLM-Instruction Memorandum No. OR-  
98-003  
Expires: 9-30-99

**Subject:** Survey and Manage Management Recommendations - Fungi

**To:** USDI Bureau of Land Management District Managers and Area  
Managers; and USDA Forest Service Forest Supervisors within the Area  
of the Northwest Forest Plan (See Distribution List)

### **OPTIONAL REPLY DUE OCTOBER 17, 1998**

#### **Background**

The Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) includes measures to protect a variety of species associated with late-successional and old-growth forests (amphibians, mammals, bryophytes, mollusks, vascular plants, fungi, lichens, and arthropods). The Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs) require identification, mapping, and management of known sites of Component 1 Survey and Manage (S&M) species listed in Table C-3 (S&Gs, pages C-4 to C-6, C-48 to C-61). In addition, development of species or area management plans is recommended for certain Protection Buffer species (pages C-20 and C-27).

To implement these provisions of the NFP, the Regional Interagency Executive Committee agreed in January 1995 to have the (S&M) Work Group coordinate preparation of management recommendations (MRs) for known sites. The MRs (Enclosure 1) for 151 fungi listed in Table C-3 or as Protection Buffer species have been completed.

#### **Implementation of S&M Management Recommendations - Fungi**

This memorandum transmits 151 fungi MRs to field officials for immediate implementation. Please follow the guidance (Enclosure 2) regarding use of the MRs.

#### **Review of S&M Management Recommendations - Fungi**

The MRs will undergo formal peer review in 1997 and 1998 by selected scientists, managers, and agency staff knowledgeable about the species. In addition, we would appreciate response and comments from field offices based on implementation experience. This response is optional and we would like to have it by October 17, 1998. Please provide your comments to the two

contacts listed below. The peer review and field comments will be assembled and provided to the authors for revisions.

If you have questions concerning the enclosed MRs or guidance, please contact [Cheryl McCaffrey](#), Bureau of Land Management (503-952-6050), or Sarah Madsen, Forest Service (503-808-2673).

ELAINE Y. ZIELINSKI ROBERT W. WILLIAMS  
State Director, OR/WA Regional Forester, Region 6

ED HASTEY G. LYNN SPRAGUE  
State Director, CA Regional Forester, Region 5

Authenticated by  
Maggie Weaver  
Management Asst.

Enclosures:

1 - [Management Recommendations - Fungi](#)  
<http://stg.or.blm.gov/or/plans/surveyandmanage/MR/Fungi/default.htm>

2 - [General Guidance for Use of S&M Management Recommendations \(2 pp.\)](#)  
1005/ly (see below)

---

Date: October 20, 1997  
Subject: Survey and Manage Management Recommendations - Fungi

Northwest Forest Plan Distribution:

BLM		Forest Service	
District Managers Oregon	Area Managers California	Forest Supervisors Region 6	Forest Supervisors Region 5
Coos Bay Eugene Lakeview	Arcata Redding Clear Lake	Deschutes Gifford Pinchot	Klamath Lassen Mendocino

Medford Roseburg Salem		Mt. Baker- Snoqualmie Mt. Hood Okanogan Olympic Rogue River Siskiyou Siuslaw Umpqua Wenachee Willamette Winema	Modoc Shasta Trinity Six Rivers
<u>BLM SO Distribution:</u>  WO-230 (Room 204LS)-1 OR-930-1 CA-930-1 OR-931 (C.McCaffrey)-2			<u>RO Distribution:</u>  NR Sarah Madsen

---

## GENERAL GUIDANCE for use of SURVEY AND MANAGE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The following guidance was developed to assist field units in implementing management recommendations (MRs) for Component 1 Survey and Manage (S&M) species and Protection Buffer species.

### 1. Introduction

All MRs will be transmitted by joint Bureau of Land Management (BLM) / Forest Service (FS) memos.

The MRs are intended for implementation on FS and BLM lands within the range of the northern spotted owl although they may be used at sites outside of this range as well.

The MRs were written for implementation by the BLM and FS. However, there are sites of these species on lands of the States, other Federal agencies and other entities. These land managers may be interested in the MRs in case they want to voluntarily manage for these species.

MRs were developed primarily in response to the Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs) for Component 1 Survey and Manage species and Protection Buffer species.

It is the intent of the MRs to maintain a level of flexibility that allows for creativity of interdisciplinary (ID) teams in providing for protection of the species in the context of other Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) goals. Where there are few known sites, it is especially important for the MRs to be followed.

### 2. Application of the MRs

The Executive Summary can be scanned for highlights about species. For example, look at range information and determine where a species is likely to be, get an idea of the species' habitat, and review what management options might be useful.

MRs were written primarily for implementation by botanists or biologists, but they also may be useful to others involved in project planning and design.

The enclosed MRs are effective as of the date of the transmittal memorandum, and replace the species management information contained in Appendix J-2 of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The MRs apply to the species as they occur throughout the range of the northern spotted owl (or limited areas as noted in Table C-3 of the NFP S&Gs). The known site database (KSDB) and other credible locational data available to the field office should be used as appropriate to determine if a particular taxon is known within the project area. Use the MRs with the most recently distributed version of the KSDB to aid in determining the range of each species relative to the project area.

Component 1 provisions for the protection of known sites apply to all activities (including, but not limited to timber sales) that may have adverse or beneficial effects.

For Protection Buffer species, these MRs serve as the management plans recommended by the NFP S&Gs on pages C-20 and C-27.

Some MRs may suggest proactive management, such as prescribed fire, needed for species viability. Where such opportunities exist, managers are encouraged to implement these proactive recommendations.

The MRs are based on what little habitat and locational information is presently known about the species, typically from few sites. As sites are revisited and additional sites found, we will learn more about species range, and its habitat and microclimate needs. Under the concept of adaptive management, this new knowledge will be factored into actual management prescriptions implemented for the species.

### **3. Follow-up Actions**

Field office staff who have expertise regarding these species may be asked to participate in revision of the MRs, in peer reviews, or on teams developing recommendations to change the status of certain species.

Field offices will likely be asked to provide information regarding their implementation of these MRs. Therefore, field office staff are asked to note pertinent aspects of the MRs, such as feasibility of implementation, appropriateness of the level of intensity, magnitude of implementation costs, and the accuracy of biological information.