

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest Service  
R-5 CA  
R-6 OR/WA

Bureau of Land  
Management

United States  
Department of  
Interior

---

**Reply Refer To:** 1920/2600 (FS); 1630/1736-PFP (BLM-OR931)P **Date:** November 23, 1999

**FS-Memorandum** **EMS TRANSMISSION 12/02/99**  
**BLM-Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-015**  
**Expires: 09/30/2001**

**To:** USDI Bureau of Land Management District Managers (Coos Bay, Eugene, Lakeview, Medford, Roseburg, Salem) and Field Managers (OR: Klamath Falls; CA: Arcata, Redding, and Ukiah) and USDA Forest Service Forest Supervisors within the area of the Northwest Forest Plan

**Subject:** Survey and Manage Management Recommendations for Four Terrestrial Mollusks:  
*Cryptomastix devia*, *Megomphix hemphilli*, *Prophysaon coeruleum*, and *P. dubium*

### **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, fung lichens, and arthropods). The Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs) require identification, mapping, and management of known sites of Component 1 and 2 Survey and Manage (S&M) species listed in Table C 3 (pp. C-4 to C-6 and C-49 to C-61).

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. Management Recommendations for 23 other Terrestrial Mollusks were transmitted via Forest Service (FS) Memorandum 1920/2600 /Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2000-003 on October 15, 1999. The Management Recommendations for the four remaining terrestrial mollusks listed in Table C-3 and on page C-6 (Protect from Grazing) have been completed. The Management Recommendations for *Cryptomastix devia*, *Megomphix hemphilli*, *Prophysaon coeruleum*, and *P. dubium* are enclosed.

### **Effective Date of S&M Management Recommendations - Terrestrial Mollusks**

This memorandum transmits four terrestrial mollusk MRs to field officials. These MRs should be utilized for all projects without a signed decision document. When MRs are not available, use professional judgment and Appendix J-2 to guide management actions (2620-3/2670(FS)1736-PFP(BLM-OR931)P, BLM-Information Bulletin No. OR-97-337, June 18, 1997).

It is the intent of these MRs that they be used by biological staff to reduce the risk to the species. The application of the recommendations, along with professional biological judgment based on local site conditions, will provide site management of these species in the context of NFP goals. Please follow the

guidance (Enclosure 1) regarding use of these MRs.

### **Review of S&M Management Recommendations - Terrestrial Mollusks**

The MRs will undergo formal peer review in 1999 and 2000 by selected scientists, managers, and agency staff knowledgeable about the species. In addition, all field offices are encouraged to provide comments. Comments are due before September 2000.

If you have questions or comments concerning the enclosed MRs or guidance, please address any questions to Cheryl McCaffrey (BLM), Sarah Madsen (FS R-6), or Paula Crumpton (FS R-5). They can be reached at:

- Cheryl - 503-952-6050; E-mail: [cmccaffr@or.blm.gov](mailto:cmccaffr@or.blm.gov)
- Sarah - 503-808-2673; E-mail: [smadsen/r6pnw@fs.fed.us](mailto:smadsen/r6pnw@fs.fed.us)
- Paula - 530-242-2242; E-mail: [pcrumpton/r5\\_shastatrinity@fs.fed.us](mailto:pcrumpton/r5_shastatrinity@fs.fed.us)

/signed/,

NANCY GRAYBEAL  
Acting Regional Forester, Region 6  
USDA Forest Service

/signed/,

BRADLEY E. POWELL  
Regional Forester, Region 5  
USDA Forest Service

Enclosures (4):

1. [General Guidance for use of S&M Management Recommendations \(1 p\)](#) (see below)
2. [MRs for Terrestrial Mollusk Species \*Cryptomastix devia\*, the Puget Oregonian V. 2.0 \(35 pp\)](#)
3. [MRs for Terrestrial Mollusk Species \*Megomphix hemphilli\*, The Oregon Megomphix Version 2.0 \(40 pp\)](#);
4. [MRs for Terrestrial Mollusk Species \*Prophysaon coeruleum\*, Blue-Gray Taildropper & \*Prophysaon dubium\*, Papillose Taildropper V. 2.0 \(48 pp\)](#)

/signed/,

ELAINE Y. ZIELINSKI  
State Director, OR/WA  
USDI Bureau of Land Management

/signed/,

ALFRED W. WRIGHT  
Acting State Director, CA  
USDI Bureau of Land Management

<b>BLM</b>		<b>Forest Service</b>	
District Managers Oregon	Field Managers	Forest Supervisors Region 6	Forest Supervisors Region 5
Coos Bay Eugene Lakeview Medford Roseburg Salem	Arcata Klamath Falls Redding Ukiah	Deschutes Gifford Pinchot Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Mt. Hood Okanogan Olympic Rogue River Siskiyou Siuslaw Umpqua Wenatchee Willamette Winema	Klamath Lassen Mendocino Modoc Shasta Trinity Six Rivers
<u>BLM Distribution:</u>  WO-230 (Room 204LS)-1 CA-330 (P.Roush)-1 CA-930-1 OR-912 (A.Agnew)-1 OR-931 (C.McCaffrey)-1 OR-934 (P. Teensma)-1			<u>FS Distribution:</u>  R5: Shasta Trinity, Paula Crumpton Orleans RD, John Larson R6: NR, Sarah Madsen R6-SP - 1
<u>REO Distribution:</u>  Belisle -1 Mohoric -1 Sims -1 Watson -1		<u>Research Units:</u>  PNW - 1 PSW - 1	

^

## 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 and 2 Survey and Manage (S&M) species and Protection Buffer species and Protect From Grazing species: Terrestrial Mollusks.

#### 1. Introduction

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

MRs have been developed for use at field offices of the BLM and FS. Other agencies may find them useful as well.

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 these MRs to maintain a level of flexibility that allows for creativity of interdisciplinary (ID) teams in providing for management of the species in the context of other Northwest Forest Plan (NFP) goals. Where there are few known sites, it is especially important for these MRs to be followed in order to reduce any possible high risk to species survival in the NFP area.

## **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 use 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 in concert 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 pp. 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.

## **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.

Enclosure 1