APPENDIX E - REFERENCES

Broberg, Leonard E. 1999. Will management of vulnerable species protect biodiversity? Journal of Forestry. 97(7): 12-18.

Caro, T. M.; O'Doherty, Gillian. 1999. On the use of surrogate species in conservation biology. Conservation Biology. 13(4): 805-814

Caro, Tim; Eadie, John; Sih, Andrew. 2005. Use of substitute species in conservation biology. Conservation Biology. 19: 1821-1826.

Landres, Peter B.; Verner, Jared; Thomas, Jack Ward. 1988. Ecological uses of vertebrate indicator species: a critique. Conservation Biology. 2(4): 316-328.

Lindenmayer, David B.; Margules, Chris R.; Botkin, Daniel B. 2000. Indicators of biodiversity for ecologically sustainable forest management. Conservation Biology. 14(4): 941-950.

Niemi, Gerald J.; Hanowski, Joann M.; Lima, Ann R.; Nicholls, Tom; Weiland, Norm. 1997. A critical analysis on the use of indicator species in management. The Journal of Wildlife Management. 61(4): 1240-1252.

Ozaki, Kenichi; Isono, Masahiro; Kawahara, Tawahara; Iida, Shigeo; Kudo, Takuma; Fukuyama, Kenji. 2006. A mechanistic approach to evaluation of umbrella species as conservation surrogates. Conservation Biology. 20(5): 1507-1515.

The Committee of Scientists. 1999. Sustaining the people's lands: recommendations for stewardship of the national forests and grasslands into the next century. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, DC. 193 p. [Online]. Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/includes/cosreport/Committee%20of%20Scientists%20Report.htm

The Wilderness Society, 1999. America's National Forests in the 21st Century - The Wilderness Society's Vision. 71 p. [Online]:

 $\underline{http://www.wilderness.org/Library/Documents/upload/The-Wilderness-Society-s-Forest-Vision.pdf}$

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1990. Critique of land management planning. FS-452. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 35 p. [Online]. Available:

http://www.fs.fed.us/institute/planning_center/1990_Critique_First_Planning_Round/

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2002. A business evaluation of the 2000 and proposed NFMA planning rules. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 66 p. [Online]: www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/2007_planning_rule.html.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2007. Cost-Benefit Analysis The Proposed Rule (36 CFR 219) for National Forest Land Management Planning. 66p.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2001. National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning Proposed Rule Environmental Assessment and Civil Rights Impact Assessment. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 45 p.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2001. NFMA Planning Rule Review. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 28 p. [Online]:

APPENDIX E - REFERENCES

http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/includes/2007_rule/2001_04_10_NFMA_Planning_Review_Report.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2001. NFMA Planning Rule Review. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 28 p. [Online]: http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/includes/2007_rule/2001_04_10_NFMA_Planning_Review_Report.pdf

The Wilderness Society, 1999. America's National Forests in the 21st Century - The Wilderness Society's Vision. 71 p. [Online]:

 $\underline{http://www.wilderness.org/Library/Documents/upload/The-Wilderness-Society-s-Forest-Vision.pdf}$