

United State Department Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Oregon State Office

P.O. Box 2965

Portland, Oregon 97208



In Reply Refer to:
1736PPF (OR-931) P

July 16, 2004

EMS TRANSMISSION 07/20/2004
Information Bulletin No. OR-2004-145

To: All District Managers

From: Deputy State Director for Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Subject: Implementation of Special Status Species Policies for the Former Survey and Manage Species

Background

The Survey and Manage (S&M) Record of Decision (ROD) removed the S&M Standards and Guidelines (S&G) effective April 21, 2004. As a separate action to the removal of the S&M S&Gs, the 296 S&M species were assessed against Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Oregon State Office criteria to determine if species should be added to the BLM Oregon/Washington (OR/WA) Special Status Species (SSS) Program. Based on the documented and suspected status provided by district personnel through May 2004, 61 of these species met the criteria as Bureau Sensitive (BS) or Bureau Assessment (BA) on one or more districts. Another 115 former S&M species met the Bureau Tracking (BT) criteria. The updated SSS list showing these additions was previously transmitted to field units via a separate Instruction Memorandum (IM). Attachment 1 lists, by district, the former S&M species that are now SSS. Attachment 2 summarizes the totals of the former S&M species suspected or documented statewide and by district. Management of these 176 species now follows the Bureau Manual Section 6840 and OR/WA SSS Policy (located at www.or.blm.gov/resources/, under the SSS section). Some of these former S&M species will now require management consideration on field units outside of the Northwest Forest Plan area, and hence this memo is intended as information sharing for those field units.

BLM OR/WA SSS Policy Overview

OR/WA SSS Policy established three different categories for species placement under the SSS Program: BS, BA, and BT. In BLM OR/WA IM No. OR-2003-054, the State Director described these categories and applicable management direction: "OR/WA Districts are responsible for applying the [Bureau Manual Section 6840](#) and the [OR/WA SSS policy](#)... to SSS including: Bureau Sensitive, Bureau Assessment, and Bureau Tracking species that are documented or suspected to occur on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administered lands..."

2

BLM Districts are responsible for documenting the effects of Bureau proposed actions to Bureau Sensitive and Bureau Assessment species through a systematic, interdisciplinary evaluation in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)/decision making process. NEPA decision documents must disclose the effects of proposed actions on Bureau Sensitive and Bureau Assessment species. BLM Districts will document that District decisions would not contribute to the need to list Bureau Sensitive and Bureau Assessment species under the ESA... Bureau Tracking species are not considered as SSS for management purposes."

The ROD removing the S&M S&Gs does not change or clarify either the BLM Manual 6840 or OR/WA SSS Policy. BLM OR/WA actions are expected to be implemented consistent with these SSS Policies. Field units already have extensive experience implementing this policy. It continues to be the role of the line officer to determine the extent of the effort needed to complete pre-project evaluations and whether or how sites will be protected. Field level biologists and botanists make recommendations to the line officer, but the line officer is responsible for the decisions. The line officer and specialist staff are also responsible for ensuring adequate documentation of rationale in support of project specific decisions regarding SSS and their management and compliance with the manual and policy.

Previously Transmitted Direction on 2004 ROD

Information regarding the ROD and the implications to former S&M species management can be found in the previously transmitted document, Information Bulletin (IB) No. OR-2004-121 (<http://web.or.blm.gov/records/ib/2004/ib-or-2004-121.htm>). That IB clearly directs field units that former S&M species not added to the BLM OR/WA SSS Program as BS or BA no longer require site management. This includes the Oregon red tree vole in all portions of its range *EXCEPT* the northern Oregon coast, where the species is now listed as BS. (For the portion in the northern Oregon coast range, the Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center recognizes and ranks this population as a subspecies, *Arborimus longicaudus silvicola*). Site management for the Oregon red tree vole where listed as BS should comply with policy described in the preceding paragraph.

Some language in IB No. OR-2004-121, as it relates to district obligations, needs clarification. On page 9 of the ROD, it states:

"Projects that are in development but have not yet fully complied with survey requirements of the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines may, at the discretion of the line officer responsible for the project decision, continue under those standards and guidelines or comply with the Special Status Species Policies for those Survey and Manage species that were added to the Special Status

*Species Programs.”**“Projects that are initiated after the effective date of this Record of Decision will comply with Special Status Species Policies.”*

As stated in the ROD language above, if S&M S&Gs are met for species added to the OR/WA list, then BLM OR/WA SSS Policies have also been met. No additional analysis would need to be completed. IB No. OR-2004-121 was not intended to conflict with the above direction from the ROD.

FY04/05 SSS Program Tasks and Changes

In an effort to enhance BLM OR/WA ability to implement SSS Policy consistently and effectively, there will be changes to the existing SSS Program structure as well as some new tasks program personnel will be working on. In FY04, the State Office is utilizing personnel already funded by FY04 S&M Program monies to assist in the completion of high priority SSS Program tasks. Some of these tasks will cover all SSS, not just the former S&M species, and are intended as tools covering all BLM OR/WA lands. The State Director and Region 6 Regional Forester reviewed and approved these specific tasks and changes:

- SSS Program staff will query and work with field managers, botanists, and biologists to determine the most pertinent needs and pertinent tools to be developed for field use.
- Initiate development of Conservation Assessments developed for priority species in FY04 which will continue in FY05, with field level input.
- Develop an Inventory Implementation Guide to determine what baseline, large-scale information is needed for each of the SSS. In FY04, the focus will be on top priority SSS.
- Coordinate an extensive policy comparison between BLM OR/WA and Forest Service Region 6 to highlight differences and determine the need to bring policies closer together at the state and regional level.
- Prioritize SSS to determine on which species to focus limited energies and monies. Field units will be asked to help identify needs.
- Hire a Transition Coordinator on a not to exceed one-year detail to help develop work guidelines, processes, and priority tasks for FY05 and beyond.
- Shift Interagency (BLM OR/WA and Forest Service Region 6) personnel to be committed solely to SSS Program management issues (see Attachment 6 for a listing of new personnel/positions).

Additional Guidance

In addition to the species' lists, the Attachments to this IM include detailed information as it relates to SSS Program transition, including specifics on project level evaluations, assumptions used in the Final Environmental Impact Statement to remove S&M S&Gs, tools for use with the former S&M species, specimen identification and vouchering, and additional references and contacts for your use.

For further information about any of the information contained herein, please contact:

- Wildlife Special Status Species Program Manager, Barb Hill, at (503) 808-6052, b2hill@or.blm.gov.
- Botany Program Manager, Joan Seevers, at (503) 808-6048, joan_seevers@blm.gov.
- Interagency Special Status Species Conservation Coordinator, Rob Huff (currently detailed as the Survey and Manage Program Manager until the end of FY04), at (503) 808-6479, rhuff@or.blm.gov. Until the end of FY04, contact Elaine Rybak (acting) at (503) 808-2663, erybak@fs.fed.us.
- Interagency Special Status Species Specialist, Carol Hughes, at (503) 808-2661, cshughes@fs.fed.us.

Districts with Unions are reminded to notify their unions of this IB and satisfy any bargaining obligations before implementation. Your servicing Human Resources Office or Labor Relations Specialist can provide you assistance in this matter.

Signed by
Nancy M. Molina
Acting Deputy State Director for Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Authenticated by
Mary O'Leary
Management Assistant

6 Attachments

- 1 - [List of Former S&M Species that are Now OR/WA SSS, by District](#) (18pp)
- 2 - [Numbers of Former S&M Species that are OR/WA BLM SSS Based on the Documented and Suspected Status on OR/WA BLM Units](#) (2pp)
- 3 - [Project Level Evaluations for Former S&M Species](#) (9pp)
- 4 - [Conservation Tools for Former S&M Species](#) (1p)
- 5 - [Project Evaluations for Former S&M Species in which Surveys are Not Feasible](#) (2pp)
- 6 - [Other Information Pertinent to BLM OR/WA SSS Program](#) (6pp)

BLM Distribution

WO-230 (Room 204LS)
CA-330 (Paul Roush)
OR-010 (Lucile Housley)
OR-930 (Anne Boeder, Mike Mottice,
Debbie Pietrzak, Dick Prather)
OR-931 (Nancy Duncan, Mike Haske, Rob Huff)
OR-932 (Janis VanWyhe)

Forest Service

Region 5
Kathy Anderson, Anne Bradley, Paula Crumpton, Kent
Connaughton, Diane McFarlane

Region 6

Alan Christensen, Kathleen Cushman, Judy Harpel, Richard
Helliwell, Russ Holmes, Carol Hughes, Cal Joyner, Peggy Kain,
Sarah Madsen, Pat Ormsbee, Deb Quintana-Coyer, Elaine Rybak,

FWS

Barry Mulder
Laura Finley
Barbara Amidon
Steve Morey
Jay Watson
Wendy Weber

Marty Stein, Roger Sandquist

PNW

Brian Biswell, Randy Molina,
Dede Olson, Nan Vance

Project Evaluations for Former S&M Species in which Surveys are Not Feasible

Species listed as Category B under S&M were determined to be impractical to conduct field level surveys for prior to habitat disturbing activities. These species were placed in that category because they were either difficult to identify and/or their occurrence was sporadic or unpredictable. Most of the species in this Category were fungi, but the following table displays all of the former S&M Category B species that moved to BLM Oregon/Washington Sensitive or Assessment.

TABLE 3 FORMER S&M CATEGORY B SPECIES NOW IN BLM OR/WA SSSP AS SENSITIVE OR ASSESSMENT*	
TAXA, <i>species</i>	TAXA, <i>species</i>
Bryophytes	Fungi, cont.
<i>Diplophyllum plicatum</i>	<i>Destuntzia rubra</i>
<i>Iwatsukiella leuotricha</i>	<i>Gastroboletus imbellus</i>
<i>Kurzia makinoana</i>	<i>Gastroboletus vividus</i>
<i>Marsupella emarginata</i> var. <i>aquatica</i>	<i>Gymnomycetes nondistincta</i>
<i>Rhizomnium nudum</i>	<i>Macowanites mollis</i>
<i>Tritomaria exsectiformis</i>	<i>Martellia fragrans</i>
<i>Tritomaria quinquedentata</i>	<i>Martellia idahoensis</i>
Lichens	<i>Octavianina macrospora</i>
<i>Bryoria subcana</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia californica</i>
<i>Microcalicium arenarium</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia gregaria</i>
<i>Thorluna dissililis</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia oregonensis</i>
Fungi	<i>Ramaria spinulosa</i> var. <i>diminutive</i>
<i>Albatrellus avellaneus</i>	<i>Rhizopogon chamaleontinus</i>
<i>Arcangeliella camphorata</i>	<i>Rhizopogon ellipsosporus</i>
<i>Boletus pulcherrimus</i>	<i>Rhizopogon exiguous</i>
<i>Chroogomphus loculatus</i>	<i>Thaxterogaster pavelekii</i>
<i>Dermocybe huboldtensis</i>	

*Not all of these species are documented or suspected on each of the Districts. It is expected that field units will not conduct field surveys for these species, due to survey impracticality. This was an assumption made in the FSEIS, reflected in the effects analysis for these species. However, it is also recognized that for many of these species,

habitat definitions are very broad or unknown. It is unlikely that other avenues for conducting pre-project evaluations, such as habitat examinations, habitat evaluation, evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat, and the review of existing survey records, inventories, and spatial data would yield sufficient information to make an adequate evaluation at the field level.

The following State Office direction will ensure that BLM OR/WA actions for these species are consistent with SSS policy:

- All known sites (current and future found) for all species identified in Table 3 shall be protected for all projects. Field units will not be expected to conduct pre-project evaluations for these species. Instead, known site protection coupled with ongoing large-scale inventory work to continue through FY04, will provide the measures and means to meet agency policy. This direction will be in place until new information indicates the need for a different strategy.

The majority of these species have very few sites in Oregon and Washington.

In Environmental Assessments or project files, field units should document the protection of all known sites of these species, and the ongoing, larger scale, interagency surveys that will help provide the information needed on how to adequately manage for these rare, but little known species.

List of Former S&M Species that are Now OR/WA SSS, by District

6/18/04

List of Former S&M Species that are OR/WA BLM SSS by District

- Based on:** 1) Documented and Suspected Status Provided by Districts through May 14, 2004
 2) Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center and Washington Natural Heritage Program (Spokane) List Ranks May 2004
 3) January 2004 FSEIS List (Table 2.3) of 296 Former Survey and Manage Species

BS = Bureau Sensitive
BA = Bureau Assessment
BT = Bureau Tracking

D = Documented
S = Suspected

Districts are responsible for applying policy to SSS documented or suspected on their Districts.
 The Districts make the documented and suspected determinations.

Districts should provide any updates to species documented and suspected status via the SSS comment form provided on the SSS list website: <http://web.or.blm.gov/or930/sssd/>
 For questions, contact Carol S Hughes, Intergency SSS Spec. at 503/808-2661 or cshughes@fs.fed.us

BURNS				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Vasc	Botrychium minganense			D
Vert	Strix nebulosa			S
Total D&S		0	0	2

PRINEVILLE				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Vasc	Botrychium minganense			S
Vasc	Botrychium montanum		S	
Vasc	Cypripedium fasciculatum		S	
Vasc	Cypripedium montanum			D
Vert	Strix nebulosa			D
Total D&S		0	2	3
VALE				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Rhizomnium nudum		S	
Vasc	Botrychium minganense			S
Vasc	Botrychium montanum		S	
Vasc	Cypripedium fasciculatum		S	
Vasc	Cypripedium montanum			D
Mollusk	Oreohelix sp.			D
Vert	Strix nebulosa			S
Total D&S		0	3	4
SPOKANE				
BLM Status in Washington State is Determined by WNHP Rankings				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Vasc	Corydalis aquae-gelidae		S	
Vasc	Cypripedium fasciculatum		S	
Vert	Plethodon larselii	S		
Total D&S		1	2	0

COOS BAY

		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Diplophyllum plicatum		D	
Bryo	Kurzia makinoana		D	
Bryo	Schistostega pennata		S	
Bryo	Tetraphis geniculata		S	
Fungi	Albatrellus avellaneus	S		
Fungi	Albatrellus caeruleoporus			S
Fungi	Arcangeliella camphorata	D		
Fungi	Arcangeliella crassa			D
Fungi	Catathelasma ventricosa			S
Fungi	Clavulina castaneopes var. lignicola			S
Fungi	Dendrocollybia racemosa			S
Fungi	Cortinarius depauperatus			S
Fungi	Cortinarius valgus			S
Fungi	Cudonia monticola			D
Fungi	Dermocybe humboldtensis	S		
Fungi	Endogone oregonensis			S
Fungi	Gomphus kauffmanii			S
Fungi	Gymnopilus punctifolius			D
Fungi	Helvella elastica			D
Fungi	Hydropus marginellus			D
Fungi	Leucogaster microsporus			S
Fungi	Macowanites chlorinosmus			S
Fungi	Mycena tenax			S
Fungi	Otidea smithii			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia attenuata			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia californica	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia dissiliens			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia gregaria	S		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia olivacea	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia oregonensis	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia piceae			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia pseudofestiva			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia scatesiae			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia sipei			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia spadicea			D

COOS BAY

		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Pholiota albivelata			S
Fungi	Podostroma alutaceum			S
Fungi	Pseudaleuria quinaultiana			S
Fungi	Ramaria aurantiisiccescens			D
Fungi	Ramaria conjunctipes v. sparsiramosa			D
Fungi	Ramaria gelatiniaurantia			D
Fungi	Ramaria largentii			D
Fungi	Ramaria rainierensis			D
Fungi	Ramaria rubribrunnescens			D
Fungi	Rhizopogon exiguus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon flavofrillosus			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon truncatus			S
Fungi	Rickenella swartzii			D
Fungi	Sarcodon fuscoindicus			S
Fungi	Sowerbyella rhenana			D
Fungi	Thaxterogaster pavelekii	S		
Fungi	Tuber asa			S
Fungi	Tuber pacificum			S
Lichen	Bryoria pseudocapillaris	D		
Lichen	Bryoria spiralis	S		
Lichen	Bryoria subcana		D	
Lichen	Buellia oidalea			S
Lichen	Calicium abietinum			D
Lichen	Calicium adpersum		S	
Lichen	Cetrelia cetrarioides			D
Lichen	Hyprotachyna revoluta		S	
Lichen	Leptogium cyanescens			S
Lichen	Leptogium teretiusculum			S
Lichen	Nephroma occultum			D
Lichen	Niebla cephalota		D	
Lichen	Pannaria rubiginosa (=Fuscopannaria r.)		S	
Lichen	Platismatia lacunosa			D
Lichen	Pseudocyphellaria perpetua			D
Lichen	Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis			S
Lichen	Teloschistes flavicans		D	

COOS BAY				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Lichen	Usnea hesperina			S
Lichen	Usnea longissima			D
Vasc	Bensoniella oregana	D		
Vasc	Cypripedium fasciculatum		S	
Vasc	Eucephalus vialis (=Aster vialis)	S		
Vert	Arborimus longicaudus longicaudus			D
Total D&S		13	11	52
EUGENE				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Diplophyllum plicatum		S	
Bryo	Racomitrium aquaticum			S
Bryo	Schistostega pennata		S	
Bryo	Tetraphis geniculata		S	
Fungi	Albatrellus avellaneus	S		
Fungi	Albatrellus caeruleoporus			S
Fungi	Albatrellus ellisii			S
Fungi	Arcangeliella camphorata	D		
Fungi	Balsamia nigrens			S
Fungi	Boletus pulcherrimus	D		
Fungi	Catathelasma ventricosa			S
Fungi	Choiromyces venosus			D
Fungi	Chrysomphalina grossula			S
Fungi	Clavariadelphus sachalinensis			S
Fungi	Clavariadelphus subfastigiatus			S
Fungi	Clavulina castanopes v. lignicola			S
Fungi	Clitocybe senilis			S
Fungi	Dendrocollybia racemosa			S
Fungi	Cordyceps ophioglossoides			S
Fungi	Cortinarius barlowensis			S
Fungi	Cortinarius depauperatus			S
Fungi	Cortinarius magnivelatus			S
Fungi	Cortinarius valgus			S

EUGENE				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Cudonia monticola			S
Fungi	Dermocybe humboldtensis	S		
Fungi	Destuntzia fusca			S
Fungi	Endogone oregonensis			S
Fungi	Gautieria magnicellaris			S
Fungi	Gelatinodiscus flavidus			S
Fungi	Gomphus bonarii			S
Fungi	Gomphus kauffmanii			S
Fungi	Gymnomyces nondistincta	S		
Fungi	Gymnopilus punctifolius			D
Fungi	Gyromitra californica			S
Fungi	Helvella crassitunicata			S
Fungi	Helvella elastica			D
Fungi	Hydropus marginellus			S
Fungi	Hypomyces luteovirens			S
Fungi	Leucogaster citrinus			S
Fungi	Leucogaster microsporus			S
Fungi	Martellia idahoensis	S		
Fungi	Mycena hudsoniana			S
Fungi	Mycena quinaultensis			S
Fungi	Mycena tenax			S
Fungi	Mythicomyces corneipes			S
Fungi	Octavianina macrospora	S		
Fungi	Otidea smithii			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia attenuata			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia californica	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia dissiliens			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia gregaria	S		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia olivacea	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia oregonensis	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia piceae			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia pseudofestiva			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia scatesiae			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia sipei			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia spadicea			D

EUGENE				
		Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
Taxon	S&M Species	BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Pholiota albivelata			S
Fungi	Podostroma alutaceum			S
Fungi	Polyozellus multiplex			S
Fungi	Pseudaleuria quinaultiana			S
Fungi	Ramaria abietina			S
Fungi	Ramaria amyloidea			S
Fungi	Ramaria aurantiisiccescens			D
Fungi	Ramaria botryis v. aurantiisiccescens			S
Fungi	Ramaria concolor f. tsugina			S
Fungi	Ramaria conjunctipes v. sparsiramosa			S
Fungi	Ramaria gelatiniaurantia			S
Fungi	Ramaria gracilis			S
Fungi	Ramaria largentii			S
Fungi	Ramaria maculatipes			S
Fungi	Ramaria rainierensis			S
Fungi	Ramaria rubribrunnescens			S
Fungi	Ramaria suecica			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon atroviolaceus			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon brunneiniger			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon chamaleonitus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon ellipsosporus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon exiguus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon flavofibrillosus			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon inquinatus			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon truncatus			S
Fungi	Rickenella swartzii			S
Fungi	Sarcodon fuscoindicus			S
Fungi	Sowerbyella rhenana			S
Fungi	Tuber asa			S
Fungi	Tuber pacificum			S
Lichen	Bryoria pseudocapillaris	S		
Lichen	Bryoria spiralifera	S		
Lichen	Bryoria subcana		S	
Lichen	Buellia oidalea			D
Lichen	Calicium abietinum			S
Lichen	Calicium adpersum		S	

EUGENE

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Lichen	<i>Cetrelia cetrarioides</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Chaenotheca ferruginea</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Chaenothecopsis pusilla</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Dermatocarpon luridum</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Hypogymnia duplicata</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Hypotrachyna revoluta</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Leptogium cyanescens</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Leptogium rivale</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Leptogium teretiusculum</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Lobaria linita</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Microcalicium arenarium</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Nephroma occultum</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Niebla cephalota</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Pannaria rubiginosa</i>		D	
Lichen	<i>Platismatia lacunosa</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Pseudocyphellaria perpetua</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Tholurna dissimilis</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Usnea hesperina</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Usnea longissima</i>			D
Mollusk	<i>Pristiloma articum crateris</i>	S		
Vasc	<i>Botrychium minganense</i>			D
Vasc	<i>Botrychium montanum</i>		S	
Vasc	<i>Corydalis aquae-gelidae</i>	S		
Vasc	<i>Cyripedium montanum</i>			D
Vasc	<i>Eucephalus vialis</i>	D		
Vert	<i>Arborimus longicaudus silvicola</i>	S		
Vert	<i>Arborimus longicaudus longicaudus</i>			D
Vert	<i>Strix nebulosa</i>			D
Total D&S		20	12	91

**LAKEVIEW
KLAMATH RESOURCE AREA**

Lakeview, outside of Klamath Falls RA, reported no documented or suspected former S&M species

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Tritomaria exsectiformis		S	
Fungi	Albatrellus ellisii			D
Fungi	Boletus pulcherrimus	D		
Fungi	Clavariadelphus sachalinensis			D
Fungi	Dendrocollybia racemosa			S
Fungi	Cortinarius verrucisporus			S
Fungi	Gomphus kauffmanii			S
Fungi	Gyromitra californica			D
Fungi	Helvella elastica			S
Fungi	Otidea smithii			S
Fungi	Rhizopogon ellipsosporus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon truncatus			S
Fungi	Sowerbyella rhenana			S
Mollusk	Deroceras hesperium	D		

**LAKEVIEW
KLAMATH RESOURCE AREA**

Lakeview, outside of Klamath Falls RA, reported no documented or suspected former S&M species

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Mollusk	Fluminicola n. sp. 3	D		
Mollusk	Fluminicola n. sp. 11	S		
Mollusk	Monadenia chaceana	S		
Mollusk	Pristiloma articum crateris	S		
Vasc	Cyripedium fasciculatum		S	
Vasc	Cyripedium montanum			D
Vasc	Eucephalus vialis	S		
Vert	Strix nebulosa			D
Total D&S		8	2	12

MEDFORD

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	<i>Albatrellus ellisii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Alpova olivaceotinctus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Balsamia nigrens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Boletus pulcherrimus</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Clavariadelphus sachalinensis</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Clavariadelphus subfastigiatus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Dendrocollybia racemosa</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Dermocybe humboldtensis</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Gautieria otthii</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Gelatinodiscus flavidus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Gomphus kauffmanii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Gymnopilus punctifolius</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Helvella crassitunicata</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Helvella elastica</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Leucogaster citrinus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Mycena quinaultensis</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia californica</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia olivacea</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia oregonensis</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia piceae</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia pseudofestiva</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Polyzellus multiplex</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria abietina</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria aurantiisiccescens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria coulterae</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria largentii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria rubribrunnescens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria spinulosa v. diminutiva</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Ramaria thiersii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon brunneiniger</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon chamalelotinus</i>	S		

MEDFORD

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Rhizopogon ellipsosporus	D		
Fungi	Rhizopogon exiguus	S		
Fungi	Rhizopogon truncatus			D
Fungi	Sowerbyella rhenana			D
Lichen	Bryoria subcana		D	
Lichen	Buellia oidalea			D
Lichen	Chaenotheca ferruginea			D
Lichen	Leptogium cyanescens			D
Lichen	Leptogium rivale			D
Lichen	Leptogium teretiusculum			D
Lichen	Nephroma occultum			S
Lichen	Pannaria rubiginosa		D	
Lichen	Platismatia lacunosa			D
Lichen	Usnea hesperina			S
Lichen	Usnea longissima			S
Mollusk	Deroceras hesperium	D		
Mollusk	Megomphix hemphilli			D
Mollusk	Fluminicola n. sp. 11	D		
Mollusk	Monadenia chaceana	D		
Vasc	Bensoniella oregana	D		
Vasc	Cypripedium fasciculatum		D	
Vasc	Cypripedium montanum			D
Vasc	Eucephalus vialis	D		
Vert	Arborimus longicaudus longicaudus			D
Vert	Plethodon stormii ssp.	D		
Vert	Strix nebulosa			D
Total D&S		15	3	39

ROSEBURG

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Schistostega pennata		S	
Fungi	Albatrellus ellisii			D
Fungi	Arcangeliella camphorata	S		
Fungi	Bridgeoporus nobilissimus	S		
Fungi	Choiromyces alveolatus			S
Fungi	Clavariadelphus sachalinensis			S
Fungi	Clavariadelphus subfastigiatus			D
Fungi	Cudonia monticola			D
Fungi	Dermocybe humboldtensis	D		
Fungi	Endogone oregonensis			D
Fungi	Gomphus bonarii			D
Fungi	Gomphus kauffmanii			D
Fungi	Gyromitra californica			S
Fungi	Helvella crassitunicata			S
Fungi	Helvella elastica			D
Fungi	Leucogaster citrinus			D
Fungi	Mycena quinaultensis			S
Fungi	Otidea smithii			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia attenuata			D
Fungi	Phaeocollybia californica	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia dissiliens			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia gregaria	S		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia olivacea	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia oregonensis	D		
Fungi	Phaeocollybia piceae			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia pseudofestiva			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia scatesiae			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia sipei			S
Fungi	Phaeocollybia spadicea			D
Fungi	Ramaria abietina			D
Fungi	Ramaria amyloidea			S
Fungi	Ramaria aurantiisiccescens			S
Fungi	Ramaria botyris v. aurantiiramosa			S
Fungi	Ramaria concolor f. tsugina			S
Fungi	Ramaria conjunctipes v. sparsiramosa			S
Fungi	Ramaria coulterae			S

ROSEBURG

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	<i>Ramaria gelatinaurantia</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria largentii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria rubribrunnescens</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria spinulosa</i> v. <i>diminutiva</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Ramaria suecica</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria thiersii</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon brunneiniger</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon chamaleontinus</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon exiguus</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon flavofibrillosus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon truncatus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Sarcodon fuscoindicus</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Sowerbyella rhenana</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Bryoria spiralifera</i>	S		
Lichen	<i>Bryoria subcana</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Buellia oidalea</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Calicium abietinum</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Calicium adpersum</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Cetrelia cetrarioides</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Chaenotheca ferruginea</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Chaenothecopsis pusilla</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Dermatocarpon luridum</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Hypogymnia duplicata</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Leptogium cyanescens</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Leptogium rivale</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Leptogium teretiusculum</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Microcalicium arenarium</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Nephroma occultum</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Pannaria rubiginosa</i>		S	
Lichen	<i>Platismatia lacunosa</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Pseudocyphellaria perpetua</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis</i>			D
Lichen	<i>Usnea hesperina</i>			S
Lichen	<i>Usnea longissima</i>			D
Mollusk	<i>Monadenia chaceana</i>	D		
Mollusk	<i>Pristiloma articum crateris</i>	D		

ROSEBURG				
Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Vasc	Bensoniella oregana	D		
Vasc	Cypripedium montanum			D
Vasc	Eucephalus vialis	D		
Vert	Arborimus longicaudus longicaudus			D
Vert	Strix nebulosa			D
Total D&S		15	5	57

SALEM				
Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Bryo	Diplophyllum plicatum		S	
Bryo	Herbertus aduncus		S	
Bryo	Iwatsukiella leucotricha		S	
Bryo	Kurzia makinoana		S	
Bryo	Marsupella emarginata var. aquatica		S	
Bryo	Racomitrium aquaticum			D
Bryo	Rhizomnium nudum		S	
Bryo	Schistostega pennata		D	
Bryo	Tetraphis geniculata		D	
Bryo	Tritomaria exsectiformis		S	
Bryo	Tritomaria quinquedentata		S	
Fungi	Albatrellus avellaneus	S		
Fungi	Albatrellus caeruleoporus			S
Fungi	Albatrellus ellisii			S
Fungi	Arcangeliella camphorata	D		
Fungi	Balsamia nigrens			S
Fungi	Boletus pulcherrimus	S		
Fungi	Bridgeoporus nobilissimus	D		
Fungi	Catathelasma ventricosa			S
Fungi	Chamonixia caespitosa			S
Fungi	Choiromyces alveolatus			S
Fungi	Choiromyces venosus			S
Fungi	Chroogomphus loculatus	S		
Fungi	Chrysomphalina grossula			S
Fungi	Clavariadelphus sachalinensis			D

SALEM

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Clavariadelphus subfastigiatus			D
Fungi	Clavulina castanopes v. lignicola			S
Fungi	Clitocybe senilis			D
Fungi	Clitocybe subditopoda			S
Fungi	Dendrocollybia racemosa			S
Fungi	Cordyceps ophioglossoides			S
Fungi	Cortinarius barlowensis			S
Fungi	Cortinarius cyanites			D
Fungi	Cortinarius depauperatus			D
Fungi	Cortinarius wiebeae			S
Fungi	Cudonia monticola			D
Fungi	Cyphellostereum laeve			D
Fungi	Destuntzia fusca			S
Fungi	Endogone oregonensis			S
Fungi	Fevansia aurantiaca			S
Fungi	Gastroboletus imbellus	S		
Fungi	Gastroboletus ruber			D
Fungi	Gastroboletus vividus	S		
Fungi	Gelatinodiscus flavidus			S
Fungi	Gomphus bonarii			S
Fungi	Gomphus kauffmanii			D
Fungi	Gymnomyces nondistincta	S		
Fungi	Gymnopilus punctifolius			D
Fungi	Gyromitra californica			S
Fungi	Helvella crassitunicata			S
Fungi	Helvella elastica			S
Fungi	Hydnotrya inordinata			S
Fungi	Hydropus marginellus			D
Fungi	Hygrophorus caeruleus			S
Fungi	Hypomyces luteovirens			D
Fungi	Leucogaster citrinus			D
Fungi	Leucogaster microsporus			S
Fungi	Macowanites chlorinosmus			S
Fungi	Macowanites mollis	S		
Fungi	Martellia fragrans	S		
Fungi	Martellia idahoensis	S		
Fungi	Mycena hudsoniana			S
Fungi	Mycena quinaultensis			S

SALEM

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	<i>Mycena tenax</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Mythicomyces corneipes</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Octavianina macrospora</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Otidea smithii</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia attenuata</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia californica</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia dissiliens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia gregaria</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia olivacea</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia oregonensis</i>	D		
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia piceae</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia pseudofestiva</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia scatesiae</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia sipei</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Phaeocollybia spadicea</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Pholiota albivelata</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Podostroma alutaceum</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Polyozellus multiplex</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria abietina</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria amyloidea</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria aurantiisiccescens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria botryis</i> v. <i>aurantiiramosa</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria concolor</i> f. <i>tsugina</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria conjunctipes</i> v. <i>sparsiramosa</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria gelatiniaurantia</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria gracilis</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria largentii</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria maculatipes</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria rainierensis</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria rubella</i> v. <i>blanda</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Ramaria rubribrunnescens</i>			D
Fungi	<i>Ramaria spinulosa</i> v. <i>diminutiva</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Ramaria suecica</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon brunneiniger</i>			S
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon exiguus</i>	S		
Fungi	<i>Rhizopogon inquinatus</i>			S

SALEM

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Fungi	Rickenella swartzii			S
Fungi	Sarcodon fuscoindicus			D
Fungi	Sowerbyella rhenana			D
Fungi	Stagnicola perplexa			S
Fungi	Thaxterogaster pavelekii	S		
Fungi	Tricholomopsis fulvescens			S
Fungi	Tuber asa			S
Fungi	Tuber pacificum			S
Lichen	Bryoria pseudocapillaris	S		
Lichen	Bryoria spiralifera	S		
Lichen	Bryoria subcana		S	
Lichen	Buellia oidalea			S
Lichen	Calicium abietinum			D
Lichen	Calicium adpersum		S	
Lichen	Cetrelia cetrarioides			D
Lichen	Chaenotheca ferruginea			D
Lichen	Dermatocarpon luridum			D
Lichen	Heterodermia sitchensis		S	
Lichen	Hypogymnia duplicata			D
Lichen	Hypotrachyna revoluta		S	
Lichen	Leptogium cyanescens			S
Lichen	Leptogium rivale			S
Lichen	Lobaria linita		D	
Lichen	Nephroma occultum			S
Lichen	Niebla cephalota		S	
Lichen	Pannaria rubiginosa		D	
Lichen	Platismatia lacunosa			D
Lichen	Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis			D
Lichen	Teloschistes flavicans		D	
Lichen	Tholurna dissimilis		D	
Lichen	Usnea hesperina			S
Lichen	Usnea longissima			D
Mollusk	Cryptomastix devia	D		
Mollusk	Deroceras hesperium	S		
Mollusk	Hemphillia glandulosa			D
Mollusk	Hemphillia malonei			D

SALEM

Taxon	S&M Species	Category -(D)ocumented or (S)uspected		
		BS	BA	BT
Mollusk	Lyogyrus n. sp. 1	S		
	Pristiloma arcticum crateris	S		
Mollusk	Botrychium minganense			S
Vasc	Botrychium montanum		S	
Vasc	Coptis trifolia		S	
Vasc	Corydalis aquae-gelidae	D		
Vasc	Cypripedium montanum			S
Vasc	Eucephalus vialis	S		
Vert	Arborimus longicaudus silvicola	S		
Vert	Arborimus longicaudus longicaudus			D
Vert	Plethodon larselli		S	
Total D&S		28	22	96

Numbers of Former S&M Species that are OR/WA BLM SSS Species Based on the Documented and Suspected Status on OR/WA BLM Units

As part of the SEIS, the former S&M species were assessed against FS R6, FS R5, BLM OR/WA and BLM CA criteria for listing as a SSS. Of the 296 former S&M species, 152 species met the criteria as FS Sensitive or Bureau Sensitive (BS) or Assessment (BA) in one or more of the above four agency areas. Based on OR/WA BLM 6840 SSS Policy, 61 of these species were determined to be BS or BA on one or more Districts.

115 of the former S&M species became Bureau Tracking (BT). BT species are not considered SSS for management purposes per Agency policy, but counts of these species are also provided in the following.

The data in this summary is based on:

- Total number of S&M species analyzed in January FSEIS (Table 2.3) = **296²**
²Seven of these have 2 ecological range breakouts, therefore they may be counted twice if district reported the species as Documented (D) or Suspected (S) in both parts of the range breakouts.
- D/S Status provided through 5/14/04 by districts
- ONHP analysis and List ranks as of 5/03/03 (as posted on their website):

BS = Bureau Sensitive Status D = Documented Occurrence in the District
 BA = Bureau Assessment Status S = Suspected Occurrence in the District
 BT = Bureau Tracking Status

	Total Final No. of All D or S Species	Total No. of D or S Plants	Total No. of D or S Animal	Total No. of D or S Fungi
BS	37	5	9	23
BA	24	23	1	0
Total	61	28	10	23
BT	115	19	5	91
Total	176	47	15	114

	Total No. of Eastside D or S Species	Total No. of Westside D or S Species
BS	1	37
BA	4	24
Total	5	61
BT	4	115
Total	9	176

Westside

- Coos Bay District (CB)
- Eugene District (EU)
- Klamath Falls Resource Area (KF)
- Medford District (MD)
- Roseburg District (RO)
- Salem District (SA)

Eastside

- Burns District (BU)
- Lakeview District (LV)
- Prineville District (PV)
- Spokane District (SP – in WA)
- Vale District (VA – in OR & WA)

Number of Former S&M Species that are D or S by District											
Status	BU	SP	PV	VA	LV	KF	EU	CB	MD	RO	SA
BS	0	1	0	0	0	8	20	13	15	15	28
BA	0	2	2	3	0	2	12	11	3	5	22
Total	0	3	2	3	0	10	32	24	18	20	50
BT	2	0	3	4	0	12	91	52	39	57	96
Total	2	3	5	7	0	22	123	76	57	77	146

Of the 296 total S&M Species, some were BLM SSS prior to the 4/20/04 ROD.

Of these there were (excluding duplicates between OR and WA):

- 11** Bureau Sensitive
- 16** Bureau Assessment
- 78** Bureau Tracking

Total number of species for OR and WA:

- 10** Bureau Sensitive in Oregon
- 15** Bureau Assessment in Oregon
- 58** Bureau Tracking in Oregon
- 2** Bureau Sensitive in Washington
- 1** Bureau Assessment in Washington
- 32** Bureau Tracking in Washington

Project Level Evaluations for Former S&M Species

Overview

The State Director formally updated the SSS list for Oregon and Washington BLM lands in early July. That update will be included in the SSS database on the BLM intranet site at web.or.blm.gov/or930/ssbdb. The list was developed by District and Resource Area personnel working with the State Office. Overall, 61 species were identified as additions as BS or BA to one or more District. The list will change as field units update species' documented and suspected status.

The ROD removing the S&M S&Gs does not change any of the BLM policy regarding SSS management. BLM policy states that BLM actions should not contribute towards federal listing of a species under the Endangered Species Act. To ensure this, BLM policies address project level evaluations and line officer responsibility. Project level evaluations are conducted to provide line officers the decision space to provide adequate conservation for a species and to meet policy requirements while implementing program activities.

Pre-project evaluations

Per policy the BLM must conduct pre-project evaluations for all actions and determine the relative impacts to BS and BA species. Conclusions regarding this determination are to be documented in the Environmental Assessment or other NEPA document. Tracking species are not addressed in any of the discussions below, since project evaluations and management are not required per policy for the Bureau Tracking category.

Examples of various types of pre-project evaluations include, but are not limited to the following:

- Evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat
- Review of existing survey records, inventories and spatial data
- Utilization of professional research, literature, and other technology transfer sources
- Use of expertise, both internal and external, that is based on documented, substantiated professional rationale.
- Pre-project field survey, monitoring, and inventory for species that are based on technically sound and logistically feasible methods

It is expected that field level biologists and botanists will utilize these above tools as appropriate in conducting their evaluation. Biologists and botanists should make recommendations to their line officer as to the appropriateness and need of each of these potential tools; the line officer should determine what level of effort is needed to make a supportable evaluation.

FSEIS Assumptions and implications

In the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) on the removal of the S&M S&Gs, assumptions were used regarding the most likely method for completing pre-project evaluations and site management for the former S&M species added to and managed under SSS Program Policies. The assumptions in the FSEIS as to how the former S&M species would be managed under SSSP were based on the Category in which the species was listed in S&M. Under S&M, species were placed in one of 6

different S&M Management Categories (A, B, C, D, E, and F) depending upon their relative rarity, whether surveys were considered practical or not, and whether enough information was known about the species to know the appropriate management needed. It is important to briefly understand these categories in order to understand the background behind some of the FSEIS assumptions. Table 1 summarizes management direction for species under the S&M S&Gs.

TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF S&M SPECIES CATEGORIES			
Relative Rarity	Pre-disturbance surveys practical	Pre-disturbance surveys not practical	Status undetermined
Rare	Category A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage all known sites • Conduct pre-disturbance surveys 	Category B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage all known sites • No pre-disturbance surveys required 	Category E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage all known sites • Practicality of pre-disturbance surveys undetermined
Uncommon	Category C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage “high-priority” sites • Conduct pre-disturbance surveys 	Category D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage “high-priority” sites • Pre-disturbance surveys not practical OR not required to provide a reasonable assurance of species persistence; no pre-disturbance surveys required 	Category F <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No site management • Practicality of pre-disturbance surveys undetermined

Field surveys

Field surveys most likely used as a tool

The following information is from page 6 of the ROD.

“If pre-disturbance surveys are practical under the Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines, then clearance surveys, field clearances, field reconnaissance, inventories, and/or habitat examinations are most likely to be used for Special Status Species.

Field surveys are one likely tool to utilize for the former Survey and Manage species that were in Categories A or C, and 2 mollusk species in Category B. Survey protocols transmitted previously under the S&M Program for these species may be used for conducting field surveys, but are not required. Field managers will determine the need for field surveys, considering such items as species habitat associations, presence of suitable habitat, existing inventory data, and the likelihood that the project would cause an impact on the species should the species be present.

Field surveys not likely to be used as a tool

On page 6 of the ROD, there is further information about the assumptions used in the SEIS regarding field level surveys:

If pre-disturbance surveys are not practical under the Survey and Manage Standards and Guidelines (most Category B and D species) or a species status is undetermined (Categories E and F species), then field surveys are not likely to occur for Special Status Species either. Instead, the other components of pre-project clearances such as habitat examinations; habitat evaluation; evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat; review of existing survey records, inventories, and spatial data; or utilization of professional research, literature, and other technology transfer sources are most likely to be used.”

Category B species in Survey and Manage were those species in which field surveys were considered impractical. Therefore, under SSSP, field surveys are likely not a tool for those former S&M species that were within Category B (except for two mollusk species mentioned above, and identified in Table 2).

Only one Category D species moves into the SSS Program, *Plethodon stormi* (the Siskiyou Mountain salamander). Surveys are feasible for this species. However surveys were determined under S&M to not be a necessary tool needed to provide for a reasonable assurance of species persistence, as enough sites for this species were previously located.

Unknown whether field surveys are a likely tool

The assumption used in the FSEIS was that species formerly in S&M Category E and F would not have field surveys conducted under SSSP. The standards for determining whether field surveys were necessary or feasible under S&M are much different than SSSP. Under S&M, a determination on the practicality of surveys was not made for Category E and F species. Instead, species were placed in these two Categories as not enough information was known about them in order to determine whether the S&M S&Gs were appropriate management direction for these species. Since SSSP uses different management direction and objectives than S&M, field surveys may or may not be a tool that field units utilize.

Summary

A species-specific summary table describing the assumptions for each of the 61 species added to BLM OR/WA SSS Program is located in Table 2.

Site management

Whether or how to protect a SSS site is dependent upon the site and project specific needs to meet BLM policy. Many variables come into play in making this determination. Per BLM OR/WA Instruction Memo OR-2003-054, conservation of a species may include but is not limited to: modifying a project (timing, placement, intensity, or dropping); using buffers to protect sites; and implementing habitat restoration actions (i.e., to benefit a species).

The FSEIS and ROD relied on some assumptions regarding the need to provide protection for known sites of former S&M species added to and now managed under SSS Program Policies. The following information comes directly from page 6 of the ROD, and is relevant to the NWFP area:

“The assumption used in the Final SEIS for managing known sites under the Special Status Species Programs was that sites needed to prevent a listing under the Endangered Species Act would be managed. For species currently included in Survey and Manage Categories A, B, and E (which require management of all known sites), it is anticipated that only in rare cases would a site not be needed to prevent a listing. For species currently included in Survey and Manage Categories C and D (which require management of only high-priority sites), it is anticipated that loss of some sites would not contribute to a need to list. Authority to disturb special status species sites lies with the agency official who is responsible for authorizing the proposed habitat-disturbing activity.”

The FSEIS glossary (page 256) defines a known site as “Historic and current location of a species reported by a credible source, available to field offices, and that does not require additional species verification or survey by the Agency to locate the species...as well as sites located in the future.”

Managing all known sites

Species formerly listed in Categories A, B, and E under Survey and Manage were considered to be “rare”, with management under that Program requiring all known sites to be managed to provide for species conservation needs. Under the assumptions used in the FSEIS/ROD, species formerly in these 3 Categories were assumed to have all sites managed to meet SSS policy objectives. Line officers can make determinations on when sites are not needed, but according to the assumptions in the FSEIS and ROD, this is expected to be rare. These assumptions apply to both current and future found sites of these species.

Not managing all known sites

Former Category C and D species were determined to be “uncommon”, with not all sites requiring protection everywhere in order to provide a reasonable assurance of species persistence. Local biologists and botanists will need to make recommendations as to which sites are likely needed or not to ensure consistency with BLM policy. Although the FSEIS/ROD does not mention the assumptions about site management for former S&M Category F species, under the S&M S&Gs these species received no site management.

In S&M, species were placed in Category D because “there are a sufficient number of sites known to meet species objectives”. Additional sites were considered to not be needed and all currently known sites did not need protection. For BLM OR/WA, there is only one Bureau Sensitive or Assessment species in this category: *Plethodon stormi*, the Siskiyou Mountain salamander.

For BLM OR/WA, there is one former S&M Category F species that is now Bureau Sensitive: the fungi *Phaeocollybia olivacea* in Oregon.

Species specific summary

The following table summarizes field survey likelihood and site management assumptions for species moving from Survey and Manage to Bureau Sensitive or Assessment:

TABLE 2 SURVEY AND SITE MANAGEMENT OF FORMER S&M SPECIES UNDER SSSP, AS ASSUMED UNDER THE 2004 ROD					
	FIELD SURVEYS AS A TOOL FOR USE BY FIELD UNITS			SITE MANAGEMENT UNDER SSSP FOR FORMER S&M SPECIES	
TAXA, <i>species</i> *	Field surveys most likely used	Field surveys not likely to occur	Unknown if surveys are feasible/likely	All known sites likely managed	All known sites not likely managed
Lichens					
<i>Bryoria pseudocapillaris</i>	X			X	
<i>Bryoria spiralifera</i>	X			X	
<i>Bryoria subcana</i>		X		X	
<i>Calicium adpersum</i>			X	X	
<i>Heterodermia sitchensis</i>			X	X	
<i>Hypotrachyna revoluta</i>			X	X	
<i>Lobaria linita</i>	X			X	

TAXA, species	Field surveys most likely used	Field surveys not likely to occur	Unknown if surveys are feasible/likely	All known sites likely managed	All known sites not likely managed
Lichens, cont.					
<i>Microcalicium arenarium</i>		X		X	
<i>Niebla cephalota</i>	X			X	
<i>Pannaria rubiginosa</i>			X	X	
<i>Teloschistes flavicans</i>	X			X	
<i>Thorluna dissimilis</i>		X		X	
Mollusks					
<i>Cryptomastix devia</i>	X			X	
<i>Deroceras hesperium</i> **	X			X	
<i>Fluminicola</i> n. sp. 3	X			X	
<i>Fluminicola</i> n. sp. 11	X			X	
<i>Lyogyrus</i> n. sp. 1	X			X	
<i>Monadenia chaceana</i> **	X			X	
<i>Pristoloma arcticum crateris</i>	X			X	
Bryophytes					
<i>Diplophyllum plicatum</i>		X		X	
<i>Herbertus aduncus</i>			X	X	
<i>Iwatsukiella leuotricha</i>		X		X	
<i>Kurzia makinoana</i>		X		X	
<i>Marsupella emarginata</i> var. <i>aquatica</i>		X		X	
<i>Rhizomnium nudum</i>		X		X	

TAXA, species	Field surveys most likely used	Field surveys not likely to occur	Unknown if surveys are feasible/likely	All known sites likely managed	All known sites not likely managed
Bryophytes, cont.					
<i>Schistostega pennata</i>	X			X	
<i>Tetraphis geniculata</i>	X			X	
<i>Tritomaria exsectiformis</i>		X		X	
<i>Tritomaria quinquedentata</i>		X		X	
Vascular Plants					
<i>Bensoniella oregana</i>	X			X	
<i>Botrychium montanum</i>	X			X	
<i>Coptis trifolia</i>	X			X	
<i>Corydalis aquae-gelidae</i>	X			X	
<i>Cypripedium fasciculatum</i>	X				X
<i>Eucephalis vialis</i>	X			X	
Vertebrates					
<i>Arborimus longicaudus silvicola</i> ***	X				X
<i>Plethodon larselli</i>	X			X	
<i>Plethodon stormi</i>	X				X
Fungi					
<i>Albatrellus avellaneus</i>		X		X	
<i>Arcangeliella camphorata</i>		X		X	
<i>Boletus pulcherrimus</i>		X		X	
<i>Bridgeoporus nobilissimus</i>	X			X	

TAXA, species	Field surveys most likely used	Field surveys not likely to occur	Unknown if surveys are feasible/likely	All known sites likely managed	All known sites not likely managed
Fungi, cont.					
<i>Chroogomphus loculatus</i>		X		X	
<i>Dermocybe huboldtensis</i>		X		X	
<i>Destuntzia rubra</i>		X		X	
<i>Gastroboletus imbellus</i>		X		X	
<i>Gastroboletus vividus</i>		X		X	
<i>Gymnomyces nondistincta</i>		X		X	
<i>Macowanites mollis</i>		X		X	
<i>Martellia fragrans</i>		X		X	
<i>Martellia idahoensis</i>		X		X	
<i>Octavianina macrospora</i>		X		X	
<i>Phaeocollybia californica</i>		X		X	
<i>Phaeocollybia gregaria</i>		X		X	
<i>Phaeocollybia olivacea</i>			X		X
<i>Phaeocollybia oregonensis</i>		X		X	
<i>Ramaria spinulosa</i> var. <i>diminutiva</i>		X		X	
<i>Rhizopogon chamaleontinus</i>		X		X	
<i>Rhizopogon ellipsosporus</i>		X		X	
<i>Rhizopogon exiguus</i>		X		X	
<i>Thaxterogaster pavelekii</i>		X		X	

*Not all of these species are documented or suspected on each of the Districts. Districts are required to only apply policy for those suspected or documented on their lands.

**Although these two mollusk species were Category B under S&M, “equivalent effort” surveys were directed to be conducted under the S&M S&Gs, and covered in species survey protocols.

***Located only in north Oregon coast range; portions of EUG and SAL

Potential questions to ask when evaluating a project

The following is just one tool field units can use when assessing if a proposed project may contribute to the need to list a species or not. This represents a simplistic assessment that could be conducted for a project and could be used for single species or species groups.

1. Is the proposed project within the range of the species? If yes, go to 3.
If not, then project will not contribute to the need to list. Document.
2. Is the proposed project located within habitat of the species? If yes, go to 5.
If not, then project will not contribute to the need to list. Document.
3. Will the proposed project negatively impact the species or species habitat? If yes, go to 7.
If not, then project will not contribute to the need to list. Document.
4. Is the negative impact to the species/habitat detrimental to overall conservation needs of the species? (Need to look at the larger scale when addressing this. Utilize resources available to you such as habitat associations, number and distribution of sites, other expertise, and surveys (if feasible) to determine likelihood of species presence and degree of project impact). If yes, go to 9.
If not, then project will not contribute to the need to list. Document.
5. Can the site/habitat be protected, or the project modified to eliminate or reduce the impact such that the impact is no longer detrimental to overall conservation needs? If not, then go to 11.
If yes, then project will not contribute to the need to list. Document.
6. If project design for site protection is infeasible, consult with line officer and appropriate State Office Special Status Species Program Manager.

Additional tools to assist field units in performing project level evaluations are forthcoming.

Conservation Tools for Former S&M Species

For many of the species that moved from S&M to the BLM OR/WA SSS Program, Survey Protocols and/or Management Recommendations had been developed in accordance with the S&M S&Gs. The Survey Protocols and Management Recommendations were completed in order to meet certain S&M objectives and direction. With the effective date of the new S&M ROD conservation of these rare and little known species will be accomplished through the Bureau's SSS Program.

Under the SSS Program, the Survey Protocols and Management Recommendations are not required to be used by field personnel. Field units may use these documents to help in their assessments and evaluations. Line managers should consider the assumptions utilized to complete the 2004 Record of Decision when determining their potential use. In particular, these documents contain information on species identification, range, habitat, threats, and ecology. That information may be valuable as a resource for determining if a proposed project might affect the species or its habitat, and can help provide rationale as to why a project is consistent with BLM SSS policy.

Oregon State Office specialists are reviewing and modifying these existing Management Recommendations and Survey Protocols to assure consistency with Bureau-wide SSS policy. Revisions will be made available for field consideration starting later this summer. In addition, for former S&M species that are now SSS and do not have previously transmitted Management Recommendations, Conservation Assessments are being developed. Conservation Assessments include key information on species habitat, range, ecology, and threats. While Conservation Assessments are helpful tools for field use, they are not mandatory products for field documentation of a projects compliance with SSS policy. Based upon priority and available funding, Conservation Assessments for these species will start being available to the field later this summer.

Project Evaluations for Former S&M Species in which Surveys are Not Feasible

Species listed as Category B under S&M were determined to be impractical to conduct field level surveys for prior to habitat disturbing activities. These species were placed in that category because they were either difficult to identify and/or their occurrence was sporadic or unpredictable. Most of the species in this Category were fungi, but the following table displays all of the former S&M Category B species that moved to BLM Oregon/Washington Sensitive or Assessment.

TABLE 3 FORMER S&M CATEGORY B SPECIES NOW IN BLM OR/WA SSSP AS SENSITIVE OR ASSESSMENT*	
TAXA, <i>species</i>	TAXA, <i>species</i>
Bryophytes	Fungi, cont.
<i>Diplophyllum plicatum</i>	<i>Destuntzia rubra</i>
<i>Iwatsukiella leuotricha</i>	<i>Gastroboletus imbellus</i>
<i>Kurzia makinoana</i>	<i>Gastroboletus vividus</i>
<i>Marsupella emarginata</i> var. <i>aquatica</i>	<i>Gymnomycetes nondistincta</i>
<i>Rhizomnium nudum</i>	<i>Macowanites mollis</i>
<i>Tritomaria exsectiformis</i>	<i>Martellia fragrans</i>
<i>Tritomaria quinquedentata</i>	<i>Martellia idahoensis</i>
Lichens	<i>Octavianina macrospora</i>
<i>Bryoria subcana</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia californica</i>
<i>Microcalicium arenarium</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia gregaria</i>
<i>Thorluna dissililis</i>	<i>Phaeocollybia oregonensis</i>
Fungi	<i>Ramaria spinulosa</i> var. <i>diminutive</i>
<i>Albatrellus avellaneus</i>	<i>Rhizopogon chamaleontinus</i>
<i>Arcangeliella camphorata</i>	<i>Rhizopogon ellipsosporus</i>
<i>Boletus pulcherrimus</i>	<i>Rhizopogon exiguous</i>
<i>Chroogomphus loculatus</i>	<i>Thaxterogaster pavelekii</i>
<i>Dermocybe huboldtensis</i>	

*Not all of these species are documented or suspected on each of the Districts. It is expected that field units will not conduct field surveys for these species, due to survey impracticality. This was an assumption made in the FSEIS, reflected in the effects analysis for these species. However, it is also recognized that for many of these species,

habitat definitions are very broad or unknown. It is unlikely that other avenues for conducting pre-project evaluations, such as habitat examinations, habitat evaluation, evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat, and the review of existing survey records, inventories, and spatial data would yield sufficient information to make an adequate evaluation at the field level.

The following State Office direction will ensure that BLM OR/WA actions for these species are consistent with SSS policy:

- All known sites (current and future found) for all species identified in Table 3 shall be protected for all projects. Field units will not be expected to conduct pre-project evaluations for these species. Instead, known site protection coupled with ongoing large-scale inventory work to continue through FY04, will provide the measures and means to meet agency policy. This direction will be in place until new information indicates the need for a different strategy.

The majority of these species have very few sites in Oregon and Washington.

In Environmental Assessments or project files, field units should document the protection of all known sites of these species, and the ongoing, larger scale, interagency surveys that will help provide the information needed on how to adequately manage for these rare, but little known species.