

Dissertationes Forestales 39

Conservation of polypore diversity
in managed forests of boreal Fennoscandia

Kaisa Junninen
Faculty of Forest Sciences
University of Joensuu

Academic dissertation

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Forest Sciences of the University of Joensuu, for public criticism in auditorium C2 of the University of Joensuu, Yliopistonkatu 4, Joensuu, on 5th May 2007, at 12 o'clock noon.

Title: Conservation of polypore diversity in managed forests of boreal Fennoscandia

Author: Kaisa Junninen

Dissertationes Forestales 39

Supervisors: Prof. Jari Kouki
Faculty of Forest Sciences
University of Joensuu, Finland

Docent Pertti Renvall
Kuopio Natural History Museum
Kuopio, Finland

Pre-examiners: Prof. Bengt Gunnar Jonsson
Department of Natural Sciences
Mid Sweden University
Sundsvall, Sweden

Prof. Jan Stenlid
Department of Forest Mycology and Pathology
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Uppsala, Sweden

Opponent: Docent Anders Dahlberg
ArtDatabanken
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Uppsala, Sweden

ISSN 1795-7389

ISBN 978-951-651-166-8 (PDF)

(2007)

Publishers:

The Finnish Society of Forest Science
Finnish Forest Research Institute
Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Helsinki
Faculty of Forest Sciences of the University of Joensuu

Editorial Office:

The Finnish Society of Forest Science
Unioninkatu 40A, 00170 Helsinki, Finland
<http://www.metla.fi/dissertationes>

Junninen, Kaisa 2007: Conservation of polypore diversity in managed forests of boreal Fennoscandia. University of Joensuu, Faculty of Forest Sciences.

ABSTRACT

In this thesis patterns of polypore assemblages are described along the gradients of forest succession and naturalness, and the effectiveness of some biodiversity-oriented forestry methods for maintaining the diversity of polypores in managed forests is evaluated. The thesis is based on four different data sets collected in eastern Finland 1996-2005. The data include a total of 19 617 records of fungi (based on presence of fruiting bodies) representing 129 species of polypores and 133 species of corticiaceous fungi.

The main findings of the thesis are as follows:

1) For wood-inhabiting fungi, in managed as well as in natural forests, the most species-rich phase of forest succession is the first stage after a major disturbance (wildfire or clear-cutting). The fungal assemblages at the first stage of forest succession are distinctive, particularly in natural forests, compared to the assemblages at later successional stages.

2) After the first stage of succession, the level of forest naturalness is more important than the successional stage in determining the diversity of polypores. Particularly threatened species suffer with increasing levels of management intensity, and in the most intensively managed forests, no threatened species can be found.

3) Fallen retention aspens can be suitable habitats for several polypore species, including many red-listed species.

4) Woodland key habitats, as defined in the Finnish Forest Act, can support several polypore species, but provide little help for red-listed species.

5) The short-term effects on polypores from logging are more dramatic than the effects of fire. On the time scale of four years, logging changes the species composition of polypore assemblages, increases dominance and increases the overall polypore abundance, but decreases the proportion of red-listed and species designated as biodiversity indicators.

The results presented in this thesis underline the fundamental importance of dead wood, its amount and diversity, in maintenance of species diversity in managed forests. Of the current biodiversity-oriented forestry practices, tree retention (at clear-cut sites) can be an effective way of supporting polypore diversity, including red-listed species. However, current retention levels need to be increased to support diversity. The short-term value of “woodland key habitats” and prescribed burning seem to be limited with regards to polypores. The long-term effects, however, may prove to be different. Measures enhancing the diversity of polypores are also likely to improve the living conditions of other taxa dependent on dead trees or large living trees, thus supporting the maintenance of the most threatened part of species diversity in the Fennoscandian boreal forests.

Keywords: Biodiversity, Dead wood, Fire, Forest succession, Fungi, Tree retention, Woodland key habitat

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I can recall swearing countless times in my ‘previous life’ that I would never start working on a PhD thesis, because I had so many more important things to do in my life. Yet, now that it’s time to say goodbye to my status as a PhD student, I find it hard to imagine another job that I’d enjoy as much as being a researcher.

My deepest gratitude goes to Jari Kouki who offered me the opportunity to change my attitude towards PhD studies. Jari has been an excellent supervisor; encouraging and supporting, always finding time to fix my unsolved problems, providing quick comments on manuscripts, and easily engaging in philosophical discussions. My other supervisor, Pertti Renvall, also deserves my warmest thanks. Pertti has been patient with my loads of to-be-identified specimens. He introduced me to the art of microscopy and guided me into the field of mycology, along with correcting the inaccurate mycological terminology of my manuscripts.

Our Biodiversity Research Group has provided me with fruitful discussions on the diversity of topics, not only at our research seminars but also around coffee tables. The feedback from my closest colleagues has helped me forward several times. Particularly Atte Komonen, Petri Martikainen, Esko Hyvärinen, Maarit Similä, Olli-Pekka Tikkanen, Päivi Hokkanen, and Jukka Kettunen – and Harri, of course – many thanks for your enjoyable company.

I’ve also had the great pleasure to work with the skilled gang of Finnish polyporologists. The guru of the gang, Tuomo Niemelä, infected me with his enthusiasm at a polypore course in Lammi in 1994 and the inspiring connection has lasted since then. Besides Pertti and Tuomo, also Reijo Penttilä, Mariko Lindgren, Heikki Kotiranta, Jenni Hottola, Olli Manninen and all the rest of the Finnish ”kääpäjengi” are thanked for shared experiences.

Furthermore, I have to mention some earlier inspirers I had during my MSc studies at the Department of Biology: Jorma Tahvanainen made me an ecologist. Soile Turkulainen, Tiina Laitinen, Outi Isokääntä, Niina Pennanen, Juha Kieksi, and many others – I really had fun with you (& still do whenever we meet). And Heikki Simola has always had exciting ways of looking at the world...

My dear friend Sarah Lloyd checked the English of this thesis.

The Faculty of Forest Sciences has provided me with excellent working facilities, including helpful technical staff. Collaboration with Metsähallitus (Finnish Forest and Park Service) and the North Karelian Forest Centre was pleasant and essential for my work. My studies were funded by the Maj and Tor Nessling Foundation and the Academy of Finland (Centre of Excellence, and Graduate School of Forest Sciences).

To me, life without friends (also non-biologists!) would be only a half-life: Anu & Jaska, Matti & Satu, Kaisa & Ola, Julia, Suonna & Janna, and many others, thank you for being there. And finally, my parents Raija and Risto, my brother Mikko, and Harri & Iitu & Tilhi: thank you for your love and support.

LIST OF ORIGINAL ARTICLES

This thesis is a summary of the following papers referred to in the text by the Roman numerals I-IV:

- I** Junninen, K., Similä, M., Kouki, J. and Kotiranta, H. 2006: Assemblages of wood-inhabiting fungi along the gradients of succession and naturalness in boreal pine-dominated forests in Fennoscandia. *Ecography* 29:75-83.
- II** Junninen, K., Penttilä, R. and Martikainen, P. 2007: Fallen retention aspen trees on clear-cuts can be important habitats for red-listed polypores: a case study in Finland. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 16:475-490.
- III** Junninen, K. and Kouki, J. 2006: Are woodland key habitats in Finland hotspots for polypores (Basidiomycota)? *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 21:32-40.
- IV** Junninen, K., Kouki, J. and Renvall, P. Restoration of natural legacies of fire and conservation of wood-decaying fungi in European boreal forests: large-scale experimental approach. Submitted manuscript.

Articles I-III are reproduced with the kind permission of the publishers: Blackwell Publishing (I), Springer (II), and Taylor & Francis (III).

Contributions of the authors to the articles and to the manuscript.

	I	II	III	IV
Original idea	JK	PM	KJ	JK
Study design	JK, KJ	PM, RP	KJ, JK	JK, KJ
Data collection	MS, KJ, JK	RP, PM	KJ	KJ
Species identification	HK, KJ, PR	RP	KJ, PR	KJ, PR
Data analysis	KJ, JK	KJ, PM	KJ, JK	KJ
Manuscript preparation	KJ, JK	KJ, PM, RP	KJ, JK	KJ, JK, PR

HK, Heikki Kotiranta; JK, Jari Kouki; KJ, Kaisa Junninen; MS, Maarit Similä; PM, Petri Martikainen; PR, Pertti Renvall; RP, Reijo Penttilä. Other contributors are acknowledged in the relevant articles and in the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
LIST OF ORIGINAL ARTICLES	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
1 INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Biodiversity	7
1.2 Polypore fungi – the study organisms	8
1.3 Dead wood in forests – the study habitat.....	8
1.4 Aim of the thesis	10
2 MATERIAL AND METHODS	10
3 MAIN RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	13
3.1 Early successional forests are species-rich and distinctive in polypore species composition.....	13
3.2 Level of naturalness determines polypore diversity in forests at later stages of succession	13
3.3 Fallen retention aspens can host red-listed polypores	14
3.4 Woodland key habitats can support several polypore species but provide little help for red-listed species	14
3.5 Short-term effects of logging on polypores are more dramatic than the effects of fire	15
4 IMPLICATIONS FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION	16
4.1 Dead wood habitats must be promoted	16
4.2 Polypores as surrogates for conservation of other saproxylic species?.....	16
4.3 Long-term considerations.....	17
5 CONCLUDING REMARK.....	18
REFERENCES	20
APPENDIX. Polypore species included in this thesis.....	26

ARTICLES I-IV

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Biodiversity

“Biodiversity” is a fascinating concept embracing “all life on the Earth”. Even before the introduction of the word “biodiversity” (Wilson 1988), the concept existed in the form of “biological diversity”, “ecological diversity” (Magurran 1988) or “species diversity” (Pianka 1966) and attracted many biologists. The Convention on Biological Diversity (negotiated at United Nations Conference on Environment and Development 1992 in Rio de Janeiro) raised the concept into common knowledge and inspired an overwhelming number of studies addressing its different aspects (Haila & Kouki 1994). The main aim of these studies has been to document the diversity of life (other than human) on the Earth and find ways to maintain it. My thesis contributes to this never-ending task of biologists, giving a fraction of understanding of what are the patterns of polypore diversity in boreal forests and what can be done in order to maintain this diversity in our managed forest landscapes.

The concept of biodiversity can be defined more explicitly by recognizing three hierarchical elements in it. These are often referred to as genetic diversity, organismal (or species) diversity and ecological (or ecosystem and habitat) diversity (Heywood & Watson 1995). Although all these levels can be considered equally important, one measure of biodiversity has arisen above the others: the species diversity. Species diversity is most often described simply as the number of species, or species richness (e.g. Gaston 1996; Tokeshi 1999). Although species richness covers only a part of the broader concept of species diversity, there are several good reasons why it deserves to be so widely applied (Gaston & Spicer 2004): species richness is a relatively unambiguous measure and relatively easy to measure; a lot of information on species already exists and this information is applied in practice, e.g. in management of natural resources or in legislation. Also, global patterns of species diversity are rather well known for some taxa, particularly for terrestrial vertebrates.

Besides climate change, the loss of biodiversity is clearly the most urgent and alarming human-induced global trend. After the Convention on Biological Diversity, international concern has been further manifested by the Biodiversity Target 2010 (agreed on at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg 2002) and by EU action plan to halt biodiversity loss by 2010 (“Message from Malahide” 2004). Yet, in international assessments it has been estimated that today we are losing species at the rate that is up to 1000 times higher than the rate that has been detected in fossil records during the geological history (Heywood & Watson 1995; Millenium Ecosystems Assessment 2005). This rate of extinctions is expected to further increase, and the current period has been described as the sixth major extinction era on the Earth. The most important reason for loss of species is loss of their habitats due to human exploitation (Heywood & Watson 1995).

Conservation of biodiversity or species richness is not a simple task, even from purely ecological perspective. Global hotspots of species richness do not necessarily capture the hotspots of rare or endemic species (Prendergast et al. 1993; Orme et al. 2005), and despite recent conservation efforts, some critical threshold levels for existence of many species may have already been passed (Brooks et al. 1999; Cowlshaw 1999; Helm et al. 2006; Vellend et al. 2006). Furthermore, we do not know the functional importance of the lost species, or the way ecosystems will respond to reductions in diversity (McCann 2000;

Loreau et al. 2001; McCann 2007). And there is no restoration method that would bring extinct species back.

On a global scale, the greatest species richness is known to exist in the tropics, with the number of species decreasing towards higher latitudes (e.g. Rohde 1992). Some groups of species, however, show an opposite biogeographical pattern (Kouki 1999), thus emphasizing the importance of complementary approach in species conservation also on the global scale. Boreal forests, for example, although not as species-rich as tropical forests, contain some special features and conditions not met elsewhere. One feature of special importance for boreal species diversity is dead wood that decomposes at a relatively slow rate due to cold climate and, thus, provides a diversity of habitats for a diversity of species (Hanski & Hammond 1995; Renvall 1995). This diversity includes wood-decomposing fungi, the main actors of my thesis.

1.2 Polypore fungi – the study organisms

Polypores (poroid Basidiomycota) are a polyphyletic group of basidiomycetous fungi the spores of which develop in pores; excluding boleti, and including some lamellate species with hard fruiting bodies. Although phylogenetically diverse, functionally polypores are a more or less homogeneous group, with a great majority being decomposers of woody material (e.g. Rayner & Boddy 1988). A functionally closely related group of species is the corticiaceous fungi that are separated from polypores by different appearance of fruiting bodies (non-poroid hymenial surface). The total number of polypore species on the Earth has been estimated to be around 1500 (Leif Ryvarden, pers. comm.), and for Finland a recent revision of the check-list revealed a total of 230 species (Niemelä 2005).

In boreal coniferous forests, polypores are the most important decomposers of dead trees (Renvall 1995). Many of the conifer-decaying polypores are brown-rot fungi, particularly in dry pine forests. Brown-rot fungi decompose only carbohydrate components of wood, leaving most of the lignin unaltered, and produce residues that may remain stable in forest soils; contrary to white-rot fungi that decompose all major components of wood equally and eventually decay the wood completely. Brown-rot logs are known to provide favorable microsites for the establishment of conifer seedlings in boreal forests (McCullough 1948; Harmon & Franklin 1989; Hofgaard 1993). This may be related to the quality of the decay: brown-rot residues improve soil conditions including water holding capacity, pH and soil temperature (e.g. Ryvarden & Gilbertson 1993 and references therein). Furthermore, decayed wood provides important substrate for ectomycorrhizal development (e.g. Harvey et al. 1979). Thus, it is not only that trees facilitate the existence of polypores, but to some extent also the trees depend on polypores, particularly in northern regions.

1.3 Dead wood in forests – the study habitat

Decomposition of a tree is a process that inevitably leads to disappearance of the decomposer's habitat. To persist, the decomposer species must be able to disperse to a new habitat patch (dead wood unit of suitable quality) within a finite time-scale. In forests under natural disturbance dynamics without human exploitation of wood, the input of dead wood is – although stochastic locally – more or less constant in relation to the life-spans and dispersal abilities of decomposer species (Kuuluvainen 1994; Renvall 1995; Jonsson 2000; Stokland 2001; Rouvinen & Kouki 2002). This relative predictability and abundance of

dead-wood habitats has provided good possibilities for evolution of diverse decomposer communities through resource partitioning and niche specialization (*sensu* MacArthur & MacArthur 1961).

Intensive commercial forest management has caused a dramatic decline in the amount of dead wood in forests during the last few decades, particularly in Fennoscandian countries (Kalliola 1966; Esseen et al. 1992; Linder & Östlund 1998; Fridman & Walheim 2000; Siitonen 2001). This, in turn, has resulted in decline in decomposers and other species dependent on dead wood, the “saproxylic” species (*sensu* Speight 1989). Today many of them are included in national red lists of threatened species (Bendiksen et al. 1998; Gärdenfors 2000; Rassi et al. 2001); in Finland, for example, 35% of the polypores known for the country are red-listed (Rassi et al. 2001). Improving the situation of these species is one of the biggest challenges for the Fennoscandian countries in trying to fulfill the objectives of international initiatives of biodiversity conservation (Hawksworth 1997).

The patchy and ephemeral nature of dead wood imposes particular challenges to conservation of species dependent on it (Siitonen 2001; Jonsson et al. 2005). Furthermore, “dead wood” is not a homogeneous habitat type but rather a collective term – similar to “forests” – for a range of habitats. These habitat types, or microhabitats, include, for example, different tree species of different trunk diameters at different stages of decay (e.g. Harmon et al. 1986; Renvall 1995). During the decomposition process, the decomposers further alter the structure, moisture and chemistry of the decaying trees and thus create new niches for other saproxylic species. Also, the variety of decomposition pathways involves successions of different fungal species, and this also contributes to the variety of microhabitats in the trunks at advanced stages of decay (Renvall 1995). Maintaining all saproxylic species requires maintaining the full ranges of different types of dead wood habitats, in sufficient quantities and without breaks in continuity.

Maintaining continuity of some dead wood types may be challenging even in national parks and other large forest reserves (Kouki et al. 2004), but it can be even more difficult in forests managed for wood-production. Yet, because of the uneven distribution of reserves and the relatively small area covered by them, the role of the matrix (i.e. the managed forest landscape surrounding the reserves) in maintaining the biodiversity of Fennoscandian forests is important and involves consideration of spatial scales of the focal species’ habitats. (Mönkkönen & Reunanen 1999; Kouki et al. 2001). For example, for many saproxylic species, this scale is the occurrence of individual dead trees of suitable quality within the species’ dispersal distance, instead of the occurrence of old-growth forest patches, which might be the relevant scale for some other species.

So far, the efforts in increasing dead wood in managed forests have concentrated in increasing the overall amount of dead wood without paying much attention to its different types (except from the economic point of view). The efforts include tree retention and creation of high stumps in clear-cut areas (Halpern & McKenzie 2001; Vanha-Majamaa & Jalonen 2001; Lindhe et al. 2004), introduction of controlled burning as a restoration method in reserves (Kuuluvainen et al. 2002; Hyvärinen et al. 2006), and protection of small-scale forest patches via ecological landscape planning and legislation (Nitare & Norén 1992; Aasaaren & Sverdrup-Thygeson 1994; Meriluoto & Soinen 1998). At the same time, however, there is an increasing demand for biofuels, including harvesting of logging residues and even cut stumps for energy use – a practice that at least partly counteracts the efforts of increasing the amount of dead wood in Fennoscandian managed forests (Rudolphi & Gustafsson 2005).

1.4 Aim of the thesis

Despite the recent efforts to maintain diversity of polypores and other saproxylic species also in forests managed for wood production, intensive management still poses serious challenges for survival of viable polypore populations in Fennoscandian forests (Spence 2001). Obviously, there are still several research questions that need to be rigorously addressed to develop and implement ecologically sound management and conservation principles. To meet these challenges, this thesis provides basic information on community ecology of polypores and connects this information with practical forest management methods currently applied in Finnish forests.

This thesis explores the structure of polypore assemblages at different successional stages of forest and at different levels of forest naturalness, and evaluates some new, more biodiversity-oriented forestry methods in their effectiveness towards protecting the diversity of polypores. The thesis also aims at addressing the practical implications for biodiversity conservation in managed forests.

More specifically, the questions addressed in the thesis are

- 1) How do, if at all, assemblages of wood-decaying fungi change along the gradients of forest succession and naturalness? How can these results be applied towards biodiversity conservation?
- 2) What is the importance of retention of aspen trees in protecting the diversity of polypores?
- 3) What is the importance of woodland key habitats, as defined in the Finnish Forest Act, in protecting the diversity of polypores?
- 4) What is the importance of fire in promoting the diversity of polypores?

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

This thesis is based on four different data sets (Table 1) collected in eastern Finland, southern boreal zone (II, III) or in transition between southern and middle boreal zones (I, IV) (*sensu* Ahti et al. 1968) (Fig.1). The landscape of the study area is dominated by managed forests fragmented by lakes, open mires, cultivated land and sparse settlements. The main tree species are Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.), Norway spruce (*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.) and birches (*Betula pendula* Roth. and *B. pubescens* Ehrh.). The history of commercial forest utilization in eastern Finland is relatively short, because of the location of the areas beyond the limit of economically profitable logging until the late 20th century (Lihtonen 1949; Kalliola 1966). Because of this, particularly in areas close to the eastern (Russian) border, several old-growth patches and reserves are located within the managed forest landscape. Thus, the continuity of structural characteristics of natural forests and the continuity of species dependent on those structures are still relatively well preserved in the study region compared to other parts of southern boreal zone in Finland. This makes it possible to study not only the common forest-dwelling species but also the red-listed and other species dependent on characteristics typical of natural forests.

The data include a total of 19 617 records of 262 species of fungi (of which 129 species of polypores) (Appendix). The data are records of fungal fruiting bodies (sporocarps) of polypores on wood (in paper I, corticiaceous fungi were also included). The fruiting bodies were recorded on sampling plots of fixed area (I, III, IV) or on a fixed number of trunks (II)

(Table 1). For large-scale ecological field studies documenting the presence of fruiting bodies is in practice the only method that has been and can be used, although it omits the species and individuals not fruiting at the time of the inventory. To alleviate this problem, all data were collected during the best fruiting season of polypores in late August–October. Also, comparisons between data sets collected in different years were avoided or analyzed with care, because variation in weather conditions may cause variation in fruiting body production. Yearly fruiting body production of wood-living polypores, however, has been found to be relatively stable compared to that of soil-inhabiting or corticiaceous fungi (Hintikka 1993; Berglund et al. 2005) and, thus, the yearly variation within the present data sets (I, II, IV) should not have been a major problem.



Figure 1. Location of the study areas. Roman numerals I-IV refer to the original research articles included in the thesis. Although I and IV are denoted with the same location, the data for the two articles originate from different forest stands.

Table 1. Sampling years, sampling efforts and polypore data used for papers I-IV.

	I	II	III	IV
Sampling years	1999, 2002	1996, 1997	2003	2000, 2002, 2005
Total area sampled (ha)	12.9	-	13.8	24.0 ^a
Area of one sampling plot (ha)	0.314	-	0.04 - 0.2	1.0
Number of trunks sampled	-	110	-	-
Number of records	5328 ^b	499	2345	11445
Number of species	195 ^c	46	98	104

^a the same sites were sampled three times (different years)

^b 1391 records of polypores and 3937 records of corticiaceous fungi

^c 62 species of polypores and 133 species of corticiaceous fungi

In paper I, assemblages of polypores and corticiaceous fungi along the gradients of forest naturalness and succession were studied by establishing replicated series of study plots at three levels of forest naturalness – or management intensity – and at five stages of forest succession in pine-dominated forests. Polypores were found to reflect the effects of forest management more clearly than the corticiaceous fungi, and, on the other hand, corticiaceous fungi were found to be very laborious to collect and identify. Thus, polypores were identified as more ‘cost-efficient’ for the further large-scale field studies. Based on this study, the general patterns of polypore species diversity and of composition of polypore assemblages could be detected. This background information is essential when assessing the effects of new forest management methods that aim at decreasing the impacts of forestry on biodiversity.

In papers II, III and IV, the importance of new forest management measures were studied in relation to polypore diversity. The measures studied include retention trees at clear-cuts (II), protection of woodland key habitats as defined in the Finnish Forest Act (III), and use of controlled burning of logging areas as a silvicultural method and, of unlogged forests as a restoration method (IV).

In all studies included in this thesis, three main aspects were analyzed to describe the patterns of polypore assemblages, or polypore diversity: (1) the total number of species and records of polypores, (2) the number of species and records of threatened or red-listed species (as defined in Rassi et al. 2001) and (3) the composition (similarity) of species assemblages. The differences between groups were detected by using ANOVA and non-parametric statistical tests, and relative similarities within and between groups were examined with detrended correspondence analysis (DCA ordination) and with diversity indices.

3 MAIN RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Early successional forests are species-rich and distinctive in polypore species composition

An unexpected pattern of polypore species-richness was found in the study presented in paper I: The earliest stage of forest succession following a major disturbance was the most species-rich of all successional stages. This pattern was found in the most natural-like forests regenerating after a wildfire, as well as in intensively managed forests after clear-cutting, and the pattern was even more clear when corticiaceous fungi were also taken into account. A likely explanation for the finding lies in the evolutionary history of polypores as wood-decaying fungi: polypore species richness would be expected to be highest when the amount (and diversity) of dead wood is highest and, in natural forests, this is the period of early succession following a major disturbance like a wildfire or a windstorm (Lee et al. 1997; Uotila et al. 2001; Pedlar et al. 2002). Furthermore, the composition of polypore assemblages of early successional forests was found to be very different from those at later stages of succession, particularly in natural forests (I, IV). This clearly reflects the unique conditions in forests at early stage of succession: abundance of fresh dead wood available in extreme microclimatic conditions – a situation never present at later stages of succession. Of these two factors, the resources (abundance of fresh dead wood) is probably of much greater importance than the environment (microclimatic conditions) since the fruiting body production of most polypore species seems to be more or less indifferent to the general microclimatic conditions of the habitat (Martikainen et al. 2000; Lindhe et al. 2004; Penttilä 2004; Heilmann-Clausen et al. 2005, I, II).

3.2 Level of naturalness determines polypore diversity in forests at later stages of succession

In the forest succession following the first, open stage, forest naturalness was found to be more important than the successional stage in determining the diversity of polypores (I). Particularly threatened species suffered with increasing level of management intensity, and in most intensively managed forests, no threatened species were found. This trend is obviously related to dead wood, its amount, quality and/or continuity (Bader et al. 1995; Renvall 1995; Ohlson et al. 1997; Lindblad 1998; Sippola & Renvall 1999; Humphrey et al. 2000; Nordén & Paltto 2001; Sippola et al. 2001; Groven et al. 2002; Heilmann-Clausen & Christensen 2004; Penttilä et al. 2004). For the amount of dead wood, it has been estimated that 20 m³ of dead wood per hectare may represent an approximate threshold value below which the persistence of threatened polypores becomes unlikely (Penttilä et al. 2004). In intensively managed forests, the amount of dead wood is largest after the pre-commercial thinning of young forest, provided that the cut trees are left on the forest floor, but even then the total amount stays below 5 m³ ha⁻¹ (I), i.e. clearly below the suggested threshold value for threatened polypores. The diversity of dead wood qualities (e.g. tree species, diameter, decay stage) usually correlates to the amount of dead wood (Penttilä et al. 2004) and thus further supports the diversity of polypores.

3.3 Fallen retention aspens can host red-listed polypores

Retention trees left at clear-cut areas are supposed to alleviate the negative effects of logging on biodiversity by ‘lifeboating’ species over the regeneration phase of the forest and by enriching the structure of the reestablished forest stand (Franklin et al. 1997). Most polypore species can utilize retention trees (for sexual reproduction) only after the trees have fallen and started to decay; but to what extent this actually happens has remained largely unstudied (but see Siitonen et al. 2006). According to paper II, large fallen retention aspens can be important habitats for several polypore species, including many red-listed species, at least when the volume of retention trees is around $60 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ and there are good dispersal sources of polypores near the logging areas.

Thus, retention of large trees in sufficient numbers seems to be an ecologically effective way of supporting several polypore species in managed forests. Apparently retention trees not only ‘lifeboat’ the species over the period of little or no dead wood available but actually provide habitat for species that have evolved to utilize the conditions of the first stage of succession in natural forest ecosystems. Without logging (or other disturbance such as fire or windstorm) no habitat would be available for species that produce fruiting bodies in open, sunny conditions rather than within shaded forests. It is important to note, however, that the number and quality of retention trees are of crucial importance and the continuity of dead wood within the dispersal distance of species must be ensured. If the aim is to support not only common species but also the threatened polypores the goal for retention levels should be more than $20 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ (i.e. the suggested threshold value for occurrence of threatened polypores; Penttilä et al. 2004) to maintain the resources over a time period of several decades. The current levels of tree retention ($5 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ in state forests; Heinonen 2006) are clearly not enough to reach this goal. Also, care should be taken not to destroy retained trees in future management practices (Hautala et al. 2004).

3.4 Woodland key habitats can support several polypore species but provide little help for red-listed species

Protection of small-scale habitat types “of special importance for biological diversity” as defined in the Finnish Forest Act aims at saving the ecologically most valuable forest patches within managed forest landscapes. This is believed to be economically cost-efficient because instead of protecting large areas (quantity) as in traditional conservation programs the focus is now in the strictly defined quality of very small areas (mean 0.6 ha; Yrjönen 2004). This quality, however, is defined only by some suggested surrogates of biodiversity – e.g. topographical features, vicinity of water bodies, rich soils – and not by the actual number of species, or presence of red-listed species within the forest patch. Thus, the real biodiversity value of these “woodland key habitats” is poorly known. Furthermore, in the Finnish legislation, natural or old-growth forest as such is not included in the list of key habitat types, which is a clear difference compared to the situation in Sweden and Norway where natural forest is among the most important types of woodland key habitats (e.g. Gustafsson et al. 1999; Sverdrup-Thygeson 2002).

In paper III, the value of woodland key habitats (as defined in the Finnish Forest Act) in maintaining diversity of polypores was recognized: on average, key habitats hosted more species than managed control forests. Of the different habitat types, however, only herb-rich forests were significantly more species-rich than the control forests. Furthermore, although the total number of polypore species at key habitat sites was very high, only few

red-listed species were found. This case study of woodland key habitats demonstrates how the total species richness – that can be nicely predicted or explained by habitat heterogeneity (woodland key habitats were very heterogeneous in their tree species composition), or productivity (the most species-rich habitat type was herb-rich forest) – does not necessarily mean richness of rare species (see also Prendergast et al. 1993; Orme et al. 2005). On the other hand, explanation for the absence of rare species can be found by changing the scale of what is a habitat for a polypore: If the habitat is a forest patch (key habitat site), then the diversity or heterogeneity of key habitat sites can be used to explain the total species richness. But if we define the habitat as a dead tree, we realize that these habitats were very homogeneous at least in one respect, the diameter of the dead trees. Most of the dead wood units at the key habitat sites were less than 10 cm in diameter and only few dead trees with a diameter over 30 cm were available. Large dead trees, however, have been found to be essential substrates for many red-listed polypores (Renvall 1995; Berg et al. 2002; Tikkanen et al. 2006) and lack of these substrates, or habitats, means absence of the species dependent on them.

3.5 Short-term effects of logging on polypores are more dramatic than the effects of fire

Almost all differences between natural and managed forests in the boreal can be explained by differences in their disturbance dynamics. In most cases, management for wood production means, for instance, elimination of wildfires, shortened rotation times, lack of dead wood and large deteriorated trees, and homogeneous stand structures (Lindenmayer & McCarthy 2002), and these differences, in turn, are reflected in species composition of the forests. Awareness of these differences has led to adoption of controlled burning as a forest restoration method in Fennoscandian countries, mimicking the most important disturbance of natural forests, wildfires (Christensen 1988; Kouki et al. 2001; Kuuluvainen et al. 2002). The effects of controlled burning on biodiversity, however, have not been comprehensively evaluated (but see Penttilä & Kotiranta 1996; Penttilä 2004; Hyvärinen et al. 2005; Hyvärinen et al. 2006). Furthermore, little is known about the effects of prescribed burning of logged areas on biodiversity.

The short-term effects of fire on polypores depend strongly on whether or not the forest has been logged before the burning (IV). On the time scale of four years, logging – whether followed by prescribed burning or not – changed the species composition of polypore assemblages, increased dominance in assemblages, and increased the overall abundance of polypores but decreased the proportion of red-listed and biodiversity indicator species. None of these changes occurred in the burnt unlogged forests. These results underline the fundamental differences between clear-cutting and wildfire. It is clearly not the fire itself but rather the structural legacies created by fire – amount of dead wood – that largely determines the polypore species composition of a burnt forest site.

4 IMPLICATIONS FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT AND SPECIES CONSERVATION

4.1 Dead wood habitats must be promoted

One cannot get around the general fact that dead wood – its amount and diversity – is the most important factor affecting the species richness and composition of wood-decaying polypore assemblages (Bader et al. 1995; Renvall 1995; Ohlson et al. 1997; Lindblad 1998; Sippola & Renvall 1999; Humphrey et al. 2000; Norden & Paltto 2001; Sippola et al. 2001; Groven et al. 2002; Heilmann-Clausen & Christensen 2004; Penttilä et al. 2004). To gain or maintain diverse local assemblages of polypores, also sources of polypore dispersal are needed (Hallenberg & Küffer 2001; Edman et al. 2004a) in addition to variety of dead wood habitats. Availability of dispersal sources, in turn, is affected by the past continuity of dead wood (Heilmann-Clausen & Christensen 2005) and spatial configuration (including size, fragmentation and isolation) of habitat patches in the landscape (Berglund & Jonsson 2003; Edman et al. 2004b; Berglund & Jonsson 2005; Penttilä et al. 2006).

Thus, in order to maintain or increase the diversity of polypores in managed forests the amount and diversity of dead wood must be promoted. Particularly large dead trees of different tree species and at different decay stages are needed in much larger quantities than they are available in today's managed forests. In addition to old-growth forests, also young successional forests with abundant dead wood should be available (I, II). In fact, a considerable number of threatened polypore species may have become threatened, not only because of the loss of old-growth forests, but rather because natural young forests with very large amounts of dead wood have disappeared. Increasing the number of retention trees at clear-cut areas (II) would mimic the situation in young natural forest, provided that the oldest and largest trees (representing all tree species) are selected for retention and the total volumes are many times what is seen as a result of current management practises. Controlled burning of the logged area would kill retention trees and accelerate the formation of dead wood, and this practice can be recommended particularly in places where the continuity of dead wood is under threat (IV). Furthermore, the efficiency of woodland key habitats (III) in protection of dead-wood-dependent organisms could be improved by adding a new habitat type in the definition: aggregations of dead trees. These aggregations could be created by any natural disturbance – fire, snow, wind, insect outbreak, pathogens – or by natural senescence of trees, and be located in any type of forest. Leaving these natural legacies in managed forests could be at least as effective as artificial restoration of former managed forests in reserves as a way of promoting the diversity of polypores.

4.2 Polypores as surrogates for conservation of other saproxylic species?

Polypores constitute only a fraction of biodiversity or species richness in forests, and thus, it is clear that the recommendations for protecting (or managing!) the diversity of polypores cannot be applied as such for all other forest-dwelling species. Promoting the diversity of polypores would probably directly promote the diversity of other wood-decomposers as well. In addition, also many others of the estimated number of 5000-7000 saproxylic species in Fennoscandia would benefit, irrespective of their functional groups (Siitonen 2001; Dahlberg & Stokland 2004). There are some obvious differences, however, in the habitat requirements of different species groups utilizing dead wood. Most bark beetles and

cavity-nesting birds, for example, favor standing dead trees that have died recently (e.g. Mikusinski & Angelstam 1994; Hyvärinen et al. 2005), contrary to most polypores that are confined (based on the production of fruiting bodies) to fallen trees in advanced stages of decay. Also lichens grow mainly on standing trees, whereas saproxylic bryophytes utilize dead-wood habitats very similar to those of polypores (Söderström 1988; Andersson & Hytteborn 1991; Thor 1998; Johansson & Gustafsson 2001).

The role of polypores at the end part of the wood decomposition process, however, means that where there are suitable habitats available for diverse polypore assemblages, those habitats have already served other species groups that favor earlier decay stages of dead trees. Furthermore, all measures promoting the amount of large dead trees support not only polypores but also most other species associated with dead trees (Kruys et al. 1999; Dahlberg & Stokland 2004) and those species that require large living trees (e.g. nesting sites for birds of prey). Presence of fungi in dead trees also directly facilitates the existence of species dependent on fungal mycelia or fruiting bodies, including other fungi (Niemelä et al. 1995) and many insects and their parasites (Komonen et al. 2000; Komonen 2003; Jonsell & Nordlander 2004). Thus, the measures that promote the diversity of polypores are likely to support also the majority of other species dependent on dead trees or on other structural characteristics typical of old-growth forests. It should be kept in mind, on the other hand, that the measures that are not effective in protection of polypores may still benefit some other groups of species.

4.3 Long-term considerations

All studies assessing the ecological value of the new forestry methods in this thesis (II, III, IV) consider only short time spans. This is understandable given that the forest management methods aimed at enhancing biodiversity are relatively recent in application and their long-term ecological effectiveness is to be seen only as decades pass. This future is difficult to predict because there are several, often conflicting forces acting and interacting simultaneously. The value of woodland key habitats in protecting the diversity of polypores, for example, may increase in future as the trees grow larger and eventually form large-diameter dead wood that is currently lacking from these key habitats (III). On the other hand, the small size of the key habitat sites and their location in fragmented landscape may override this positive development and cause extinction debts (*sensu* Hanski 2000) that will be realized in the future, and the diversity of polypores will actually decrease.

The value of retention trees as well is difficult to predict over more than one rotation period. Although retention trees seem to be suitable habitats even for red-listed species (II), the situation may change if all of the surrounding landscape is subjected to silvicultural management with normal rotation periods. At some point the fruiting bodies growing on retention trees may become the only dispersal sources of polypores within that location, and the small populations face the risk of local extinctions similar to that of polypores in woodland key habitats. Furthermore, if polypore populations are already locally extinct – e.g. many pine-dependent species in southwestern Finland – leaving retention trees of whatever quantity and quality may not bring the species back, simply because there are no dispersal sources. The dispersal ecology of polypores, however, is poorly known (but see Edman et al. 2004a) and this gap in knowledge makes predictions of the future particularly challenging.

Long-term effects of controlled burning of a forest on polypores are also likely to be different from the short-term effects (IV). At clear-cut areas, as soon as the logging residues and cut stumps are completely decomposed, polypores will face a shortage of habitat substrates and their numbers will decline. By that time, on the other hand, some of the retention trees (if there are any) have probably died, particularly if the harvested site has been burnt. Dead, fallen retention trees can provide continuity of dead wood and habitats for polypores as discussed earlier. In unlogged forest, response to controlled burning is much slower than at logged sites (IV), particularly if the fire was not severe. Gradual mortality of trees injured by fire may take several years or even decades and provide an exceptionally good continuity of dead wood which, in turn, will probably result in future increase of polypore diversity (see Penttilä 2004).

Consideration of the temporal dimension can also be extended backwards. One can argue that the results obtained in eastern Finland, particularly those concerning red-listed species, cannot be generalized over areas with longer and more intensive forest utilization history. The differences in the continuity of dead pine trees in my study area compared with areas in the more southern and western parts of Finland, for example, could be seen already in the 1930's (Kalliola 1966) and this inevitably has affected the local species pools of saproxylics. Thus, it is possible that if the studies had been conducted in more southern parts of Finland, the clear differences in polypore diversity detected between natural and managed forests (I), or between logged and unlogged forests (IV), would not have been so pronounced; but the lack of dispersal sources (caused by breaks in the continuity of large-diameter dead wood and isolation of forest patches) would have confounded the local effects of stand characteristics. Also, the large number of red-listed polypores found on retention aspens (II) is probably related to the exceptionally good continuity of large living and dead aspens in the study area. If the aim, however, is to study stand-level factors that influence red-listed and other rare species and their responses to management treatments, such a study has to take place within the current range of these species; otherwise no differences could be detected. My study areas are among the southernmost of the regions in Finland still supporting populations of most red-listed polypore species with boreal distributions (Kotiranta & Niemelä 1996). Thus, the results of my studies describe the potential effects of different treatments rather than the absolute outcomes that could be expected everywhere. Spatial and temporal factors interact over varying scales in nature and these interactions still require researchers' attention.

5 CONCLUDING REMARK

In the conservation ecology of saproxylic species, a paradigm shift from emphasizing the importance of old-growth forests into recognizing the role of early successional stages of natural forests as equally important is taking place (Kouki et al. 2001; Martikainen 2001; this thesis). This, however, does not mean that clear-cutting could be regarded as a forestry method that mimics the effects of natural disturbances, but rather that conservation of the remaining patches of old-growth forests or small-scale "woodland key habitats" only is not enough to maintain the diversity of saproxylic species. Instead, focus should be on creating reserves with areas large enough to allow natural disturbances to operate in spatial and temporal scales characteristic of boreal forest ecosystems (Syrjänen et al. 1994; Kuuluvainen 2002; Angelstam & Kuuluvainen 2004). This approach can be complemented

by matrix management (Mönkkönen & Reunanen 1999), employing the new biodiversity-oriented forestry methods. But it must be noted, as discussed in this thesis, that the effectiveness of this kind of management as the only method of forest biodiversity conservation is limited. Thus, a shift in a scientific paradigm is not enough but it has to be accompanied by shifts in practical forest management and conservation, if the goal is to fulfill the objectives of the Rio Convention and maintain the full spectrum of biodiversity in our forests.

REFERENCES

- Aasaaren, O. & Sverdrup-Thygeson, A. 1994. Nokkelbiotoper i skogen. *Norskog*. 24 p.
- Ahti, T., Hämet-Ahti, L. & Jalas, J. 1968. Vegetation zones and their sections in northwestern Europe. *Annales Botanici Fennici* 5: 167-211.
- Andersson, L.I. & Hytteborn, H. 1991. Bryophytes and decaying wood - a comparison between managed and natural forest. *Holarctic Ecology* 14: 121-130.
- Angelstam, P. & Kuuluvainen, T. 2004. Boreal forest disturbance regimes, successional dynamics and landscape structures - a European perspective. *Ecological Bulletins* 51: 117-136.
- Bader, P., Jansson, S. & Jonsson, B.G. 1995. Wood-inhabiting fungi and substratum decline in selectively logged boreal spruce forests. *Biological Conservation* 72: 355-362.
- Bendiksen, E., Hoiland, K., Brandrud, T.E. & Jordal, J.B. 1998. Truende og sårbare sopparter i Norge - en kommentert rødliste. *Fungiflora*, 221 p.
- Berg, A., Gärdenfors, U., Hallingback, T. & Noren, M. 2002. Habitat preferences of red-listed fungi and bryophytes in woodland key habitats in southern Sweden - analyses of data from a national survey. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 11: 1479-1503.
- Berglund, H. & Jonsson, B.G. 2005. Verifying an extinction debt among lichens and fungi in northern Swedish boreal forests. *Conservation Biology* 19: 338-348.
- & Jonsson, B.G. 2003. Nested plant and fungal communities; the importance of area and habitat quality in maximizing species capture in boreal old-growth forests. *Biological Conservation* 112: 319-328.
- , Edman, M. & Ericson, L. 2005. Temporal variation of wood-fungi diversity in boreal old-growth forests: implications for monitoring. *Ecological Applications* 15: 970-982.
- Brooks, T., Pimm, S.L. & Oyugi, J. 1999. Time lag between deforestation and bird extinction in tropical forest fragments. *Conservation Biology* 13: 1140-1150.
- Christensen, N.L. 1988. Succession and natural disturbance: Paradigms, problems and the preservation of natural ecosystems. In: Agee, J.K. & Johnson, D.R. (eds). *Ecosystem management for parks and wilderness*. University of Washington Press, Seattle and London. p. 62-86.
- Cowlishaw, G. 1999. Predicting the pattern of decline of African primate diversity: an extinction debt from historical deforestation. *Conservation Biology* 13: 1183-1193.
- Dahlberg, A. & Stokland, J. 2004. Vedlevande arters krav på substrat - sammanställning och analys av 3600 arter. *Skogstyrelsen, Jönköping*. 75 p.
- Edman, M., Krus, N. & Jonsson, B.G. 2004a. Local dispersal sources strongly affect colonization patterns of wood-decaying fungi on spruce logs. *Ecological Applications* 14: 893-901.
- , Gustafsson, M., Stenlid, J. & Ericson, L. 2004b. Abundance and viability of fungal spores along a forestry gradient - responses to habitat loss and isolation. *Oikos* 104: 35-42.
- Esseen, P.-A., Ehrnström, B., Ericson, L. & Sjöberg, K. 1992. Boreal forests - the focal habitats of Fennoscandia. In: Hansson, L. (ed.). *Ecological principles of nature conservation*. Elsevier, London and New York. p. 252-325.
- Franklin, J.F., Berg, D.R., Thornburgh, D.A. & Tappeiner, J.C. 1997. Alternative silvicultural approaches to timber harvesting: variable retention harvest system. In: Kohm, K.A. & Franklin, J.F. (eds). *Creating a forestry for the 21st century: the science of ecosystem management*. Island Press, p. 111-139.
- Fridman, J. & Walheim, M. 2000. Amount, structure, and dynamics of dead wood on managed forestland in Sweden. *Forest Ecology and Management* 131: 23-36.

- Gaston, K.J. 1996. Species richness: measure and measurement. In: Gaston, K.J. (ed.). Biodiversity. A biology of numbers and difference. Blackwell Science, Oxford. p. 77-113.
- & Spicer, J.I. 2004. Biodiversity, an introduction. Blackwell Science, Malden. 191 p.
- Groven, R., Rolstad, J., Storaunet, K.O. & Rolstad, E. 2002. Using forest stand reconstructions to assess the role of structural continuity for late-successional species. *Forest Ecology and Management* 164: 39-55.
- Gustafsson, L., De Jong, J. & Norén, M. 1999. Evaluation of Swedish woodland key habitats using red-listed bryophytes and lichens. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 8: 1101-1114.
- Gärdenfors, U. (ed.). 2005. Rödlistade arter i Sverige - The 2005 Red List of Swedish species. ArtDatabanken, SLU. Uppsala.
- Haila, Y. & Kouki, J. 1994. The phenomenon of biodiversity in conservation biology. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 31: 5-18.
- Hallenberg, N. & Küffer, N. 2001. Long-distance spore dispersal in wood-inhabiting Basidiomycetes. *Nordic Journal of Botany* 21: 431-436.
- Halpern, C.B. & McKenzie, D. 2001. Disturbance and post-harvest ground conditions in a structural retention experiment. *Forest Ecology and Management* 154: 215-225.
- Hanski, I. 2000. Extinction debt and species credit in boreal forests: modelling the consequences of different approaches to biodiversity conservation. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 37: 271-280.
- & Hammond, P. 1995. Biodiversity in boreal forests. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10: 5-6.
- Harmon, M.E. & Franklin, J.F. 1989. Tree seedlings on logs in *Picea-Tsuga* forests of Oregon and Washington. *Ecology* 70: 48-59.
- , Franklin, J.F., Swandon, F.J., Sollins, P., Gregory, S.V., Lattin, J.D., Anderson, N.H., Cline, S.P., Aumen, N.G., Sedell, J.R., Lienkaemper, G.W., K Cromack, J. & Cummins, K.W. 1986. Ecology of Coarse Woody Debris in Temperate Ecosystems. *Advances in Ecological Research* 15: 133-303.
- Harvey, A.E. 1979. Comparative distribution of ectomycorrhizae in soils of three western Montana forest habitat types. *Forest Science* 25: 350-358.
- Hautala, H., Jalonen, J., Laaka-Lindberg, S. & Vanha-Majamaa, I. 2004. Impacts of retention felling on coarse woody debris (CWD) in mature boreal spruce forests in Finland. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 13: 1541-1554.
- Hawksworth, D.L. 1997. Fungi and international biodiversity initiatives. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 6: 661-668.
- Heilmann-Clausen, J. & Christensen, M. 2005. Wood-inhabiting macrofungi in Danish beech-forests - conflicting diversity patterns and their implications in a conservation perspective. *Biological Conservation* 122: 633-642.
- & Christensen, M. 2004. Does size matter?: On the importance of various dead wood fractions for fungal diversity in Danish beech forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 201: 105-117.
- , Aude, E. & Christensen, M. 2005. Cryptogam communities on decaying deciduous wood - does tree species diversity matter? *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14: 2061-2078.
- Heinonen, P. 2006. Metsähallituksen talousmetsien luontokohteet ja säästöpuusto. In: Horne, P., Koskela, T., Kuusinen, M., Otsamo, A. & Syrjänen, K. (eds). *Metson jäljillä. Etelä-Suomen metsien monimuotoisuusohjelman tutkimusraportti*. Ministry of Forestry and Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, Finnish Forest Research Institute and Finnish Environment Centre, Helsinki. p. 70-72.

- Helm, A., Hanski, I. & Pärtel, M. 2006. Slow response of plant species richness to habitat loss and fragmentation. *Ecology Letters* 9: 72-77.
- Heywood, V.H. & Watson, R.T. (eds). 1995. *Global Biodiversity Assessment*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Hintikka, V. 1993. Occurrence of edible fungi and other macromycetes on tree stumps over a sixteen-year period. *Acta Botanica Fennica* 149: 11-17.
- Hofgaard, A. 1993. 50 years of change in a Swedish boreal old-growth *Picea abies* forest. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 4: 773-782.
- Humphrey, J.W., Newton, A.C., Peace, A.J. & Holden, E. 2000. The importance of conifer plantations in northern Britain as a habitat for native fungi. *Biological Conservation* 96: 241-252.
- Hyvärinen, E., Kouki, J. & Martikainen, P. 2006. Fire and green-tree retention in conservation of red-listed and rare deadwood-dependent beetles in Finnish boreal forests. *Conservation Biology* 20: 1711-1719.
- , Kouki, J., Martikainen, P. & Lappalainen, H. 2005. Short-term effects of controlled burning and green-tree retention on beetle (Coleoptera) assemblages in managed boreal forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 212: 315-332.
- Johansson, P. & Gustafsson, L. 2001. Red-listed and indicator lichens in woodland key habitats and production forests in Sweden. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research-Revue Canadienne De Recherche Forestiere* 31: 1617-1628.
- Jonsell, M. & Nordlander, G. 2004. Host selection patterns in insects breeding in bracket fungi. *Ecological Entomology* 29: 697-705.
- Jonsson, B.G. 2000. Availability of coarse woody debris in boreal old-growth *Picea abies* forest. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 11: 51-56.
- , Kruys, N. & Ranius, T. 2005. Ecology of species living on dead wood - lessons for dead wood management. *Silva Fennica* 39: 289-309.
- Kalliola, R. 1966. The reduction of the area of forests in natural condition in Finland in the light of some maps based upon national forest inventories. *Annales Botanici Fennici* 3: 442-448.
- Komonen, A. 2003. Hotspots of insect diversity in boreal forests. *Conservation Biology* 17: 976-981.
- , Penttilä, R., Lindgren, M. & Hanski, I. 2000. Forest fragmentation truncates a food chain based on an old-growth forest bracket fungus. *Oikos* 90: 119-126.
- Kotiranta, H. 2001. The Corticiaceae of Finland. *Publications in Botany from the University of Helsinki* 32: 1-29.
- & Niemelä, T. 1996. *Threatened polypores in Finland*. Finnish Environment Institute, Edita, Helsinki. 184 p.
- Kouki, J. 1999. Latitudinal gradients in species richness in northern areas: some exceptional patterns. *Ecological Bulletins* 47: 30-37.
- , Arnold, K. & Martikainen, P. 2004. Long-term persistence of aspen - a key host for many threatened species - is endangered in old-growth areas in Finland. *Journal for Nature Conservation* 12: 41-52.
- , Löfman, S., Martikainen, P., Rouvinen, S. & Uotila, A. 2001. Forest fragmentation in Fennoscandia: linking habitat requirements of wood-associated threatened species to landscape and habitat changes. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research Suppl.* 3: 27-37.
- Kruys, N., Fries, C., Jonsson, B.G., Lämås, T. & Ståhl, G. 1999. Wood-inhabiting cryptogams on dead Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) trees in managed Swedish boreal forests. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 29: 178-186.

- Kuuluvainen, T. 1994. Gap disturbance, ground microtopography, and the regeneration dynamics of boreal coniferous forests in Finland: a review. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 31: 35-51.
- 2002. Natural variability of forests as a reference for restoring and managing biological diversity in boreal Fennoscandia. *Silva Fennica* 36: 97-125.
- , Aapala, K., Ahlroth, P., Kuusinen, M., Lindholm, T., Sallantausta, T., Siitonen, J. & Tukia, H. 2002. Principles of ecological restoration of boreal forested ecosystems: Finland as an example. *Silva Fennica* 36: 409-422.
- Lee, P.C., Crites, S., Nietfeld, M., Van Nguyen, H. & Stelfox, B. 1997. Characteristics and origins of deadwood material in aspen-dominated boreal forests. *Ecological Applications* 7: 691-701.
- Lihtonen, V. 1949. Piirteitä valtion metsätaloudesta. *Silva Fennica* 66: 1-46.
- Lindblad, I. 1998. Wood-inhabiting fungi on fallen logs of Norway spruce: relations to forest management and substrate quality. *Nordic Journal of Botany* 18: 243-255.
- Lindenmayer, D. & McCarthy, M.A. 2002. Congruence between natural and human forest disturbance: a case study from Australian montane ash forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 155: 319-335.
- Linder, P. & Östlund, L. 1998. Structural changes in three mid-boreal Swedish forest landscapes, 1885-1996. *Biological Conservation* 85: 1-8.
- Lindhe, A., Asenblad, N. & Toresson, H.-G. 2004. Cut logs and high stumps of spruce, birch, aspen and oak - nine years of saproxylic fungi succession. *Biological Conservation* 119: 443-454.
- Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J.P., Hector, A., Hooper, D.U., Huston, M.A., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B., Tilman, D. & Wardle, D.A. 2001. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. *Science* 294: 804-808.
- MacArthur, R.H. & MacArthur, J.W. 1961. On bird species diversity. *Ecology* 42: 594-598.
- Magurran, A.E. 1988. *Ecological diversity and its measurement*. Croom Helm, London. 179 p.
- Martikainen, P. 2001. Conservation of threatened saproxylic beetles: significance of retained aspen *Populus tremula* on clearcut areas. *Ecological Bulletins* 49: 205-218.
- , Penttilä, R., Kotiranta, H. & Miettinen, O. 2000. New records of *Funalia trogii*, *Perenniporia tenuis* and *Polyporus pseudobetulinus* in Finland, with notes on their habitat requirements. *Karstenia* 40: 79-92.
- McCann, K. 2007. Protecting biostructure. *Nature* 446: 29.
- 2000. The diversity-stability debate. *Nature* 405: 228-233.
- McCullough, H.A. 1948. Plant succession on fallen logs in a virgin spruce-fir forest. *Ecology* 29: 508-513.
- Meriluoto, M. & Soininen, T. 1998. *Metsäluonnon arvokkaat elinympäristöt*. Metsälehti Kustannus Tapio, Helsinki. 192 p.
- Mikusinski, G. & Angelstam, P. 1994. Woodpecker assemblages in natural and managed boreal and hemiboreal forest - a review. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 31: 157-172.
- Millennium Ecosystems Assessment. 2005. *Ecosystems and human well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC. 86 p.
- Mönkkönen, M. & Reunanen, P. 1999. On critical thresholds in landscape connectivity - management perspective. *Oikos* 84: 302-305.
- Niemelä, T. 2005. Polypores - lignicolous fungi. *Norrinia* 13: 1-320.
- , Renvall, P. & Penttilä, R. 1995. Interactions of fungi at late stages of wood decomposition. *Annales Botanici Fennici* 32: 141-152.

- Nitare, J. & Norén, M. 1992. Nyckelbiotoper kartläggs i nytt projekt vid Skogsstyrelsen. *Svensk Botanisk Tidskrift* 86: 219-226.
- Norden, B. & Paltto, H. 2001. Wood-decay fungi in hazel wood: species richness correlated to stand age and dead wood features. *Biological Conservation* 101: 1-8.
- Ohlson, M., Söderstrom, L., Hornberg, G., Zackrisson, O. & Hermansson, J. 1997. Habitat qualities versus long-term continuity as determinants of biodiversity in boreal old-growth swamp forests. *Biological Conservation* 81: 221-231.
- Orme, C.D.L., Davies, R.G., Burgess, M., Eigenbrod, F., Pickup, N., Olson, V.A., Webster, A.J., Ding, T.-S., Rasmussen, P.C., Ridgely, R.S., Stattersfield, A.J., Bennett, P.M., Blackburn, T.M., Gaston, K.J. & Owens, I.P.F. 2005. Global hotspots of species richness are not congruent with endemism or threat. *Nature* 436: 1016-1019.
- Pedlar, J.H., Pearce, J.L., Venier, L.A. & McKenney, D.W. 2002. Coarse woody debris in relation to disturbance and forest type in boreal Canada. *Forest Ecology and Management* 158: 189-194.
- Penttilä, R. 2004. The impacts of forestry on polyporous fungi in boreal forests. PhD thesis. Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki. 35 p.
- & Kotiranta, H. 1996. Short-term effects of prescribed burning on wood-rotting fungi. *Silva Fennica* 30: 399-419.
- , Siitonen, J. & Kuusinen, M. 2004. Polypore diversity in managed and old-growth boreal *Picea abies* forests in southern Finland. *Biological Conservation* 117: 271-283.
- , Lindgren, M., Miettinen, O., Rita, H. & Hanski, I. 2006. Consequences of forest fragmentation for polyporous fungi at two spatial scales. *Oikos* 114: 225-240.
- Pianka, E.R. 1966. Latitudinal gradients in species diversity: a review of concepts. *American Naturalist* 100: 33-46.
- Prendergast, J., Quinn, R., Lawton, J., Eversham, B. & Gibbons, D. 1993. Rare species, the coincidence of diversity hotspots and conservation strategies. *Nature* 365: 335-337.
- Rassi, P., Alanen, A., Kanerva, T. & Mannerkoski, I. (eds). 2001. The 2000 Red List of Finnish species. Ministry of the Environment. Helsinki. 432 p.
- Rayner, A.D.M. & Boddy, L. 1988. Fungal decomposition of wood - its biology and ecology. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester. 587 p.
- Renvall, P. 1995. Community structure and dynamics of wood-rotting fungi on decomposing conifer trunks in northern Finland. *Karstenia* 35: 1-51.
- Rohde, K. 1992. Latitudinal gradients in species diversity: the search for the primary cause. *Oikos* 65: 514-527.
- Rouvinen, S. & Kouki, J. 2002. Spatiotemporal availability of dead wood in protected old-growth forests: a case study from boreal forests in eastern Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 17: 317-329.
- Rudolphi, J. & Gustafsson, L. 2005. Effects of forest-fuel harvesting on the amount of deadwood on clear-cuts. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 20: 235-242.
- Ryvarden, L. & Gilbertson, R.L. 1993. European polypores, Part 1. *Synopsis fungorum* 6: 1-387.
- Siitonen, J. 2001. Forest management, coarse woody debris and saproxylic organisms: Fennoscandian boreal forests as an example. *Ecological Bulletins* 49: 11-41.
- , Hottola, J. & Lommi, S. 2006. Säätöpuuston merkitys vaateliaalle kääpä- ja epifyyttijäkälälajistolle. In: Horne, P., Koskela, T., Kuusinen, M., Otsamo, A. & Syrjänen, K. (eds). *Metson jäljillä - Etelä-Suomen metsien monimuotoisuusohjelman tutkimusraportti*. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Ministry of Environment, Finnish Forest Research Institute and Finnish Environment Institute, Helsinki. p. 339-341.

- Sippola, A.-L. & Renvall, P. 1999. Wood-decomposing fungi and seed-tree cutting: A 40-year perspective. *Forest Ecology and Management* 115: 183-201.
- , Lehesvirta, T. & Renvall, P. 2001. Effects of selective logging on coarse woody debris and diversity of wood-decaying polypores in eastern Finland. *Ecological Bulletins* 49: 243-254.
- Speight, M.C.D. 1989. Saproxylic invertebrates and their conservation. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.
- Spence, J.R. 2001. The new boreal forestry: adjusting timber management to accommodate biodiversity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16: 591-593.
- Stokland, J. 2001. The coarse woody debris profile: an archive of recent forest history and an important biodiversity indicator. *Ecological Bulletins* 49: 71-83.
- Sverdrup-Thygeson, A. 2002. Key habitats in the Norwegian production forest: A case study. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 17: 166-178.
- Syrjänen, K., Kalliola, R., Puolasmaa, A. & Mattsson, J. 1994. Landscape structure and forest dynamics in subcontinental Russian European taiga. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 31: 19-34.
- Söderström, L. 1988. The occurrence of epixylic bryophytes and lichen species in an old natural and managed forest stand in northeast Sweden. *Biological Conservation* 45: 169-178.
- Thor, G. 1998. Red-listed lichens in Sweden: habitats, threats, protection, and indicator value in boreal coniferous forests. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 7: 59-72.
- Tikkanen, O.-P., Martikainen, P., Hyvärinen, E., Junninen, K. & Kouki, J. 2006. Red-listed boreal forest species of Finland: associations with forest structure, tree species, and decaying wood. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 43: 373-383.
- Tokeshi, M. 1999. Species coexistence. Ecological and evolutionary perspectives. Blackwell Science, Oxford. 454 p.
- Uotila, A., Maltamo, M., Uuttera, J. & Isomäki, A. 2001. Stand structure in semi-natural and managed forests in eastern Finland and Russian Karelia. *Ecological Bulletins* 49: 149-158.
- Vanha-Majamaa, I. & Jalonen, J. 2001. Green tree retention in Fennoscandian forestry. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research Suppl.* 3: 79-90.
- Vellend, M., Verheyen, K., Jacquemyn, H., Kolb, A., Van Calster, H., Peterken, G. & Hermy, M. 2006. Extinction debt of forest plants persists for more than a century following habitat fragmentation. *Ecology* 87: 542-548.
- Wilson, E.O. (ed.). 1988. Biodiversity. National Academy Press. Washington, D.C. 424 p.
- Yrjönen, K. 2004. Metsälain erityisen tärkeät elinympäristöt. Kartoitus yksityismetsissä 1998-2004. Loppuraportti. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Vammala. 60 p.

APPENDIX. Polypore species included in this thesis.

Complete list of species included in the original articles (I, II, III, IV) in this thesis. Nomenclature for polypores follows Niemelä (2005); those synonym names that have been used in the original articles are also provided, as well as names used in Rassi et al. (2001). Nomenclature of corticiaceous fungi follows mainly Kotiranta (2001). Red List categories are according to Rassi et al. (2001): RE, regionally extinct; EN, endangered; VU, vulnerable; NT, near-threatened. Figures are total numbers of records in the data sets. Note that in IV the total numbers include all records at the same sites in three different years.

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Amylocystis lapponica</i>	VU	2	-	-	6	
<i>Anomoporia bombycina</i>	NT	-	-	2	1	
<i>Anomoporia kamschatica</i>		5	-	7	14	
<i>Antrodia albobrunnea</i>	NT	11	-	-	6	
<i>Antrodia infirma</i>	VU	1	-	-	3	
<i>Antrodia macra</i>		-	9	5	-	
<i>Antrodia mellita</i>	VU	1	3	-	-	
<i>Antrodia pulvinascens</i>	VU	-	7	-	-	
<i>Antrodia serialis</i>		46	3	11	145	
<i>Antrodia sinuosa</i>		103	-	13	423	
<i>Antrodia xantha</i>		62	-	8	185	
<i>Antrodiella americana</i>	VU	-	-	1	-	
<i>Antrodiella faginea</i>		-	2	12	8	
<i>Antrodiella onychoides</i>		-	-	1	-	
<i>Antrodiella pallescens</i>		8	8	45	16	<i>Antrodiella semisupina</i>
<i>Antrodiella parasitica</i>		-	-	-	1	
<i>Antrodiella romellii</i>		-	13	6	5	
<i>Bjerkandera adusta</i>		1	37	29	34	
<i>Bjerkandera fumosa</i>		-	-	4	-	
<i>Byssoporia mollicula</i>		48	-	2	37	<i>Byssocorticium molliculum</i>
<i>Ceriporia excelsa</i>		-	-	4	-	
<i>Ceriporia reticulata</i>		-	-	20	-	
<i>Ceriporia viridans</i>		3	26	2	3	
<i>Ceriporiopsis aneirina</i>		-	2	-	-	
<i>Ceriporiopsis resinascens</i> coll.		-	9	13	2	
<i>Cerrena unicolor</i>		4	-	24	110	
<i>Cinereomyces lenis</i>	VU	15	-	-	9	<i>Skeletocutis lenis</i>
<i>Cinereomyces lindbladii</i>		2	-	11	25	
<i>Datronia mollis</i>		-	20	17	2	
<i>Dichomitus squalens</i>	NT	-	-	-	35	
<i>Diplomitoporus crustulinus</i>	NT	-	-	-	3	
<i>Diplomitoporus flavescens</i>	VU	-	-	-	1	
<i>Erastia salmonicolor</i>	NT	-	-	-	1	<i>Hapalopilus salmonicolor</i>

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Fibroporia gossypium</i>		1	-	1	-	
<i>Fibroporia norrlandica</i>		-	-	2	1	
<i>Fomes fomentarius</i>		41	18	346	697	
<i>Fomitopsis pinicola</i>		67	23	180	552	
<i>Fomitopsis rosea</i>	NT	-	1	-	18	
<i>Funalia trogii</i>	EN	-	3	1	-	
<i>Ganoderma lipsiense</i>		-	7	3	-	
<i>Gelatoporia subvermispora</i>	NT	-	1	-	3	
<i>Gloeophyllum odoratum</i>		-	-	-	1	
<i>Gloeophyllum sepiarium</i>		154	20	7	4041	
<i>Gloeoporus dichrous</i>		-	-	22	27	
<i>Gloeoporus pannocinctus</i>	NT	-	5	5	14	<i>Gelatoporia pannocincta</i>
<i>Hapalopilus rutilans</i>		1	-	14	1	
<i>Heterobasidion parviporum</i>		-	-	2	-	
<i>Hyphodontia paradoxa</i>		-	2	3	-	
<i>Hyphodontia radula</i>		-	-	2	2	
<i>Inonotus obliquus</i>		6	-	83	31	
<i>Inonotus radiatus</i>		-	-	9	-	
<i>Inonotus rheades</i>		-	4	1	1	
<i>Irpex lacteus</i>		-	2	1	-	
<i>Ischnoderma benzoinum</i>		2	-	3	1	
<i>Junghuhnia collabens</i>	VU	-	-	-	1	<i>Steccherinum collabens</i>
<i>Junghuhnia lacera</i>		-	5	5	-	
<i>Junghuhnia luteoalba</i>		93	-	8	101	
<i>Junghuhnia nitida</i>		-	-	6	-	
<i>Lenzites betulinus</i>		1	4	3	495	
<i>Leptoporus mollis</i>		-	-	-	3	
<i>Meruliopsis taxicola</i>		6	-	3	1	
<i>Oligoporus cerifluus</i>	EN	-	-	-	1	
<i>Oligoporus fragilis</i>		1	-	7	11	
<i>Oligoporus guttulatus</i>	NT	-	-	-	5	<i>Postia guttulata</i>
<i>Oligoporus hibernicus</i>	NT	1	-	1	1	<i>Postia septentrionalis</i>
<i>Oligoporus lateritius</i>	VU	2	-	-	13	<i>Postia lateritia</i>
<i>Oligoporus mappa</i>	RE	-	1	-	-	<i>Postia mappa</i>
<i>Oligoporus parvus</i>	NT	-	-	-	5	
<i>Oligoporus ptychogaster</i>		-	-	1	1	
<i>Oligoporus rennyi</i>		7	-	2	8	
<i>Oligoporus sericeomollis</i>		41	-	8	71	
<i>Oligoporus stipticus</i>		1	-	9	4	
<i>Perenniporia tenuis</i>	EN	-	1	-	-	
<i>Phellinus chrysoloma</i>		-	-	2	16	
<i>Phellinus conchatus</i>		1	-	21	1	
<i>Phellinus ferrugineofuscus</i>	NT	3	-	1	37	

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Phellinus igniarius</i> coll.		11	-	398	199	
<i>Phellinus laevigatus</i>		10	-	14	65	
<i>Phellinus lundellii</i>		1	-	9	16	
<i>Phellinus nigrolimitatus</i>		4	-	1	6	
<i>Phellinus pini</i>		7	-	2	72	
<i>Phellinus populicola</i>		-	4	1	12	
<i>Phellinus punctatus</i>		-	-	136	-	
<i>Phellinus tremulae</i>		-	44	21	30	
<i>Phellinus viticola</i>		17	-	12	156	
<i>Physisporinus vitreus</i>		-	-	14	6	
<i>Piptoporus betulinus</i>		24	-	64	171	
<i>Polyporus brumalis</i>		-	-	8	26	
<i>Polyporus ciliatus</i>		8	-	4	14	
<i>Polyporus leptocephalus</i>		-	11	4	1	
<i>Polyporus melanopus</i>		-	-	1	-	
<i>Polyporus tubaeformis</i>		-	-	1	-	
<i>Porpomyces mucidus</i>		1	1	11	4	
<i>Postia alni</i>		-	24	50	17	
<i>Postia caesia</i>		1	-	36	27	
<i>Postia leucomallella</i>		1	-	4	7	
<i>Postia lowei</i>	EN	-	-	-	1	<i>Oligoporus lowei</i>
<i>Postia tephroleuca</i>		1	6	16	10	
<i>Protomerulius caryae</i>	VU	-	10	3	14	
<i>Pycnoporellus fulgens</i>		-	-	1	-	
<i>Pycnoporus cinnabarinus</i>		19	2	3	618	
<i>Rhodonía placenta</i>	NT	-	-	-	3	<i>Postia placenta</i>
<i>Rigidoporus corticola</i>		-	49	11	29	
<i>Rigidoporus populinus</i>		-	1	19	3	
<i>Sarcoporia polyspora</i>	VU	-	-	1	4	<i>Parmastomyces mollissimus</i>
<i>Sistotrema alboluteum</i>	NT	2	2	2	1	
<i>Sistotrema muscicola</i>		2	-	4	4	
<i>Skeletocutis amorpha</i>		39	-	14	248	
<i>Skeletocutis biguttulata</i>		49	-	22	37	
<i>Skeletocutis brevispora</i>	VU	1	-	-	5	
<i>Skeletocutis carneogrisea</i>		1	-	3	2	
<i>Skeletocutis chrysella</i>	NT	-	-	-	1	
<i>Skeletocutis jelicii</i>	EN	-	-	-	2	
<i>Skeletocutis kuehneri</i>		2	-	3	7	
<i>Skeletocutis nivea</i>		-	-	1	-	
<i>Skeletocutis odora</i>	NT	-	3	-	2	
<i>Skeletocutis papyracea</i>		2	-	6	16	
<i>Skeletocutis stellae</i>	VU	2	-	-	2	
<i>Spongiporus undosus</i>		-	2	5	3	<i>Postia undosa</i>

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Trametes hirsuta</i>		1	9	14	352	
<i>Trametes ochracea</i>		5	78	68	717	
<i>Trametes pubescens</i>		6	7	3	47	
<i>Trametes velutina</i>		-	-	6	3	
<i>Trametes sp.</i> (young frb)		11	-	-	90	
<i>Trechispora hymenocystis</i>		-	7	141	2	
<i>Trechispora mollusca</i>		-	-	1	5	
<i>Trichaptum abietinum</i>		300	1	176	755	
<i>Trichaptum fuscoviolaceum</i>		119	-	26	318	
<i>Trichaptum pargamenum</i>	NT	3	-	-	10	
<i>Tyromyces chioneus</i>		-	2	7	65	
<u>Corticiaceous fungi (sensu lato):</u>						
<i>Aleurodiscus lividoeruleus</i>		2				
<i>Amphinema byssoides</i>		26				
<i>Amylocorticium cebennense</i>		1				
<i>Asterodon ferruginosus</i>		6				
<i>Asterostroma laxum</i>	NT	14				
<i>Athelia bombacina</i>		13				
<i>Athelia decipiens</i>		3				
<i>Athelia epiphylla</i>		1				
<i>Basidioradulum radula</i>		10				
<i>Boidinia furfuracea</i>		2				
<i>Botryobasidium candicans</i>		5				
<i>Botryobasidium intertextum</i>		1				
<i>Botryobasidium medium</i>	NT	1				
<i>Botryobasidium obtusisporum</i>		1				
<i>Botryobasidium subcoronatum</i>		94				
<i>Botryobasidium vagum</i>		108				
<i>Botryohypochnus isabellinus</i>		9				
<i>Byssomerulius albostramineus</i>		4				
<i>Ceraceomyces borealis</i>		3				
<i>Ceraceomyces cystidiatus</i>	VU	1				
<i>Ceraceomyces eludens</i>		13				
<i>Ceraceomyces microsporus</i>		7				
<i>Ceraceomyces serpens</i>		13				
<i>Ceratobasidium cornigerum</i>		1				
<i>Chaetodermella luna</i>		3				
<i>Chondrostereum purpureum</i>		1				
<i>Conferticium ochraceum</i>		1				
<i>Coniophora arida</i>		12				
<i>Coniophora fusispora</i>		20				
<i>Coniophora olivacea</i>		46				
<i>Coniophora puteana</i>		18				

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Corticium polygonioides</i>		1				
<i>Cristinia helvetica</i>		9				
<i>Cylindrobasidium evolvens</i>		2				
<i>Dacryobolus karstenii</i>		21				
<i>Dacryobolus sudans</i>		2				
<i>Dichostereum boreale</i>		2				
<i>Gloeocystidiellum porosum</i>		1				
<i>Gloiothete citrina</i>		1				
<i>Henningsomyces candidus</i>		1				
<i>Hyphoderma argillaceum</i>		5				
<i>Hyphoderma praetermissum</i>		40				
<i>Hyphoderma puberum</i>		1				
<i>Hyphoderma setigerum</i>		178				
<i>Hyphoderma sibiricum</i>		4				
<i>Hyphodontia abieticola</i>		11				
<i>Hyphodontia alutacea</i>		16				
<i>Hyphodontia alutaria</i>		1				
<i>Hyphodontia aspera</i>		15				
<i>Hyphodontia breviseta</i>		46				
<i>Hyphodontia hastata</i>		16				
<i>Hyphodontia pallidula</i>		5				
<i>Hyphodontia subalutacea</i>		70				
<i>Hyphodontiella multiseptata</i>		1				
<i>Hypochniciellum ovoideum</i>		1				
<i>Hypochnicium eichleri</i>		23				
<i>Hypochnicium multiforme</i>		1				
<i>Hypochnicium punctulatum</i>		6				
<i>Jaapia ochroleuca</i>		2				
<i>Laxitextum bicolor</i>		7				
<i>Leptosporomyces fuscostratus</i>		3				
<i>Leptosporomyces galzinii</i>		7				
<i>Leptosporomyces septentrionalis</i>		4				
<i>Leucogyrophana mollusca</i>		6				
<i>Leucogyrophana romellii</i>		53				
<i>Leucogyrophana sororia</i>		4				
<i>Megalocystidium leucoanthum</i>		1				
<i>Metulodontia nivea</i>	NT	9				
<i>Mucronella bresadolae</i>		1				
<i>Mucronella calva</i>		2				
<i>Mucronella flava</i>		2				
<i>Odonticium romellii</i>	NT	10				
<i>Peniophora incarnata</i>		2				
<i>Peniophora pithya</i>		71				

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Phanerochaete laevis</i>		37				
<i>Phanerochaete magnoliae</i>		2				
<i>Phanerochaete sanguinea</i>		147				
<i>Phanerochaete sordida</i>		115				
<i>Phanerochaete velutina</i>		18				
<i>Phlebia cornea</i>	NT	4				
<i>Phlebia cretacea</i>		12				
<i>Phlebia firma</i>	NT	2				
<i>Phlebia fuscoatra</i>		7				
<i>Phlebia gigantea</i>		49				
<i>Phlebia lilascens</i>		1				
<i>Phlebia livida</i>		19				
<i>Phlebia radiata</i>		3				
<i>Phlebia rufa</i>		1				
<i>Phlebia segregata</i>		2				
<i>Phlebia serialis</i>	NT	1				
<i>Phlebia tremellosa</i>		6				
<i>Phlebia tristis</i>		1				
<i>Phlebiella allantospora</i>		1				
<i>Phlebiella borealis</i>		1				
<i>Phlebiella pseudotsugae</i>		7				
<i>Phlebiella sulphurea</i>		854				
<i>Piloderma byssinum</i>		19				
<i>Piloderma fallax</i>		213				
<i>Pseudomerulius aureus</i>		6				
<i>Resinicium bicolor</i>		31				
<i>Resinicium furfuraceum</i>		639				
<i>Scytinostroma praestans</i>	NT	1				
<i>Serpula himantioides</i>		24				
<i>Sistotrema brinkmannii</i>		5				
<i>Sistotrema octosporum</i>		23				
<i>Sistotrema raduloides</i>	NT	1				
<i>Sistotremastrum sueticum</i>		146				
<i>Sphaerobasidium minutum</i>		2				
<i>Steccherinum ochraceum</i>		1				
<i>Stereum hirsutum</i>		14				
<i>Stereum rugosum</i>		4				
<i>Stereum sanguinolentum</i>		139				
<i>Stereum subtomentosum</i>		1				
<i>Thanatephorus cucumeris</i>		1				
<i>Thanatephorus fusisporus</i>		7				
<i>Thelephora terrestris</i>		147				
<i>Trechispora byssinella</i>		3				

Species name	Red-listed	I	II	III	IV	Synonym name
<i>Trechispora cohaerens</i>		5				
<i>Trechispora farinacea</i>		55				
<i>Trechispora kavinioides</i>		2				
<i>Trechispora lunata</i>		6				
<i>Trechispora nivea</i>		2				
<i>Trechispora subsphaerospora</i>		2				
<i>Trechispora tenuicula</i>		1				
<i>Tubulicrinis borealis</i>		1				
<i>Tubulicrinis calothrix</i>		3				
<i>Tubulicrinis glebulosus</i>		6				
<i>Tubulicrinis medius</i>		1				
<i>Tubulicrinis strangulatus</i>		4				
<i>Tubulicrinis subulatus</i>		14				
<i>Tylospora fibrillosa</i>		1				
<i>Vararia investiens</i>		10				
<i>Veluticeps abietina</i>		3				