HYPOGEOUS AND SEMI-HYPOGEOUS MACROFUNGI ASSOCIATED WITH ANTARCTIC BEECH (*NOTHOFAGUS MOOREI*)

N.L. Bougher
CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products, Private Bag PO Wembley, Western Australia 6014

The following information on hypogeous and semi-hypogeous fungi has been compiled from the CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products Mycology Herbarium database as a follow-on to the article on epigeous macrofungi by A.M. Young (*Australas. Mycol. News.* **16,** 19–20, 1997)—'Some macrofungi associated with Antarctic Beech in Lamington National Park, Queensland, Australia.' During the years 1988 to 1993 an Australia-wide fungal collection program was undertaken by CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products to obtain ectomycorrhizal fungi for trial inoculation experiments in forest plantations. As part of this program, mycorrhizal fungi associated with *Nothofagus moorei* were collected in New South Wales and Queensland during April/May 1992. Representatives of at least 19 genera of hypogeous fungi were collected (Table 1), and the specimens are currently under taxonomic study. Conditions were presumably less favourable for above-ground fruiting, as during the same time only two epigeous fungi were observed under *Nothofagus moorei*—an unidentified species each of *Cortinarius* and *Laccaria*.

Single visits to the various sites yielded a broad range of hypogeous macrofungi—all of which are putatively mycorrhizal. The findings add weight to the notion that *Nothofagus moorei* may associate with a large diversity of ectomycorrhizal fungi similar to that reported for other *Nothofagus* species.

Table 1. Hypogeous fungi collected in association with *Nothofagus moorei* in New South Wales and Queensland[1].

Location[2] / Fungus	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL COLLECTIONS
Arcangeliella sp.	1							1
Boughera sp.					2			2
Chamonixia sp.			1	1	1			3
Cortinomyces sp.		1						1
Descomyces albellus	1	2			2			5
Descomyces sp. 1	1						1	2
Descomyces sp. 2		3			8	1	2	14
Endogone sp.		2	1					3
Glomus sp.	3	2	2		1			8
Gymnomyces sp.		1	1					2
Hydnangium sp.		1						1
Hysterangium sp.							1	1
Macowanites sp.		2	1	1			1	5
Martellia sp.	3	4	1	2	1		3	14
Octavianina sp.					2		1	3
Stephanospora sp.							1	1
Thaxterogaster sp.				2				2
Timgrovea sp.	2	6		4				12
Zelleromyces sp.	3	3	3	1	1	1	4	16

[1] All specimens are lodged at the CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products Mycology Herbarium, Perth, Western Australia. (Note: identifications in some cases tentative, awaiting confirmation).

[2] Key to locations in Table

New South Wales

A. Mt Allyn lookout and nearby area, **Barrington Tops National Park**, 28.4.92
B. Burraga Swamp Trail, **Barrington Tops National Park**, 28.4.92
C. Mountaineer Trail, **Barrington Tops National Park**, 28.4.92
D. Banksia Point, **New England National Park**, 30.4.92
E. Wrights Point, **New England National Park**, 30.4.92

F. Antarctic Beech Campground, **Border Ranges National Park**, 5.5.92

Queensland
G. Border Track, **Lamington National Park**, 6.5.92

Acknowledgments
Other major participants on the 1992 fungal collection expedition in eastern Australia were Dr J. Trappe and T. Lebel (Oregon State University, Corvallis Oregon USA), and Dr M. Castellano (USDA Forest Service, Corvallis Oregon USA). National Parks & Wildlife Services of New South Wales and Queensland issued collecting permits.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR FROM ASBS NEWSLETTER[1]

from *Australian Systematic Botany Society Newsletter* **90,** 5 (1997).

On the distribution of ABRS grant funds to Flora and Fauna

An open letter to Dr Hal Cogger, Chairman, Australian Biological Resources Study Advisory Committee

From the report in *Biologue* 17 on the ABRS grants for 1997, it is clear that for this round the Advisory Committee abandoned the 50:50 split in funding between flora and fauna that has been adopted previously. This year the proportion of grant funding going to flora projects amounts to 44% of the total, with fauna projects receiving 56%. No explanation for the decision is given in *Biologue*.

One can argue inconclusively till the Linnaean system is superseeded whether the botanists or zoologists have the larger task in discovering and classifying our large biota, but this kind of action is both a slap in the face to the botanical community and unlikely to increase cordiality between them and zoologists. In our efforts to further the cause of systematics in Australia we need co-operation, not division.

I trust that the Advisory Committee redresses this situation by reversing the proportions for 1998 grants, and thereafter returns to equivalent funding.

Alex George
'Four Gables'
18 Barclay Road
Kardinya, WA 6163

from *Australian Systematic Botany Society Newsletter* **91,** 4–6 (1997).

Distribution of funds under the ABRS participatory grants program

Dear Dr Short,

Thank you for forwarding a copy of Alex George's open letter to me, as published in issue 90 of the ASBS Newsletter. His letter criticises the 1997 distribution of funds under the Australian Biological Resources Study's Participatory Grants Program.

In seeking to respond to his criticism, I have framed my reply around the following three questions:

1. What has been the policy basis for the traditional 50:50 split between 'flora' and 'flora'.

2. Is this current (1997) deviation from the 50:50 split the result of a shift in policy on the part of Environment Australia, ABRS or the Advisory Committee?

3. Is it the intention of the Advisory Committee, as argued by Dr George, to redress '... this situation by reversing the proportions for 1998 grants, and thereafter return[s] to equivalent funding'?

---

[1] Reprinted with the permission of the authors and ASBS