

EDITED BY
JIANGUO LIU
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
WILLIAM W. TAYLOR
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Integrating Landscape Ecology into Natural Resource Management

 CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2002

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2002

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Lexicon (*The Enschedé Font Foundry*) 10/14 pt System QuarkXPress™ [S E]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Integrating landscape ecology into natural resource management / edited by Jianguo Liu and
William W. Taylor.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.).

ISBN 0 521 78015 2 – ISBN 0 521 78433 6 (pb.)

1. Landscape ecology. 2. Natural resources. I. Liu, Jianguo, 1963– II. Taylor, William W.

QH541.15.L35 I56 2002

333.7 – dc21 2001052879

ISBN 0 521 78015 2 hardback

ISBN 0 521 78433 6 paperback

Contents

List of contributors	x
Foreword EUGENE P. ODUM	xiv
Preface	xvi
Acknowledgments	xviii
PART I Introduction and concepts	1
1 Coupling landscape ecology with natural resource management: Paradigm shifts and new approaches JIANGUO LIU AND WILLIAM W. TAYLOR	3
PART II Landscape structure and multi-scale management	21
2 Integrating landscape structure and scale into natural resource management JOHN A. WIENS, BEATRICE VAN HORNE, AND BARRY R. NOON	23
3 Focal patch landscape studies for wildlife management: Optimizing sampling effort across scales JULIE M. BRENNAN, DARREN J. BENDER, THOMAS A. CONTRERAS, AND LENORE FAHRIG	68
4 Managing for small-patch patterns in human-dominated landscapes: Cultural factors and Corn Belt agriculture ROBERT C. CORRY AND JOAN IVERSON NASSAUER	92
5 A landscape approach to managing the biota of streams CHARLES F. RABENI AND SCOTT P. SOWA	114

6	Linking ecological and social scales for natural resource management	143
	KRISTIINA A. VOGT, MORGAN GROVE, HEIDI ASBJORNSEN, KEELY B. MAXWELL, DANIEL J. VOGT, RAGNHILDUR SIGURÐARDÓTTIR, BRUCE C. LARSON, LEO SCHIBLI, AND MICHAEL DOVE	
PART III Landscape function and cross-boundary management		177
7	Assessing the ecological consequences of forest policies in a multi-ownership province in Oregon	179
	THOMAS A. SPIES, GORDON H. REEVES, KELLY M. BURNETT, WILLIAM C. MCCOMB, K. NORMAN JOHNSON, GORDON GRANT, JANET L. OHMANN, STEVE L. GARMAN, AND PETE BETTINGER	
8	Incorporating the effects of habitat edges into landscape models: Effective area models for cross-boundary management	208
	THOMAS D. SISK AND NICK M. HADDAD	
9	Aquatic–terrestrial linkages and implications for landscape management	241
	REBECCA L. SCHNEIDER, EDWARD L. MILLS, AND DANIEL C. JOSEPHSON	
PART IV Landscape change and adaptive management		263
10	A landscape-transition matrix approach for land management	265
	VIRGINIA H. DALE, DESMOND T. FORTES, AND TOM L. ASHWOOD	
11	Tactical monitoring of landscapes	294
	DEAN L. URBAN	
12	Landscape change: Patterns, effects, and implications for adaptive management of wildlife resources	312
	DANIEL T. RUTLEDGE AND CHRISTOPHER A. LEPCZYK	
13	Landscape ecology in highly managed regions: The benefits of collaboration between management and researchers	334
	JOHN B. DUNNING JR.	
PART V Landscape integrity and integrated management		347
14	Putting multiple use and sustained yield into a landscape context	349
	THOMAS R. CROW	
15	Integrating landscape ecology into fisheries management: A rationale and practical considerations	366
	WILLIAM W. TAYLOR, DANIEL B. HAYES, C. PAOLA FERRERI, KRISTINE D. LYNCH, KURT R. NEWMAN, AND EDWARD F. ROSEMAN	

16	Applications of advanced technologies in studying and managing grassland landscape integrity	390
	GREG A. HOCH, BRENT L. BROCK, AND JOHN M. BRIGGS	
17	An integrated approach to landscape science and management	412
	RICHARD J. HOBBS AND ROBERT LAMBECK	
PART VI Syntheses and perspectives		431
18	Bridging the gap between landscape ecology and natural resource management	433
	MONICA G. TURNER, THOMAS R. CROW, JIANGUO LIU, DALE RABE, CHARLES F. RABENI, PATRICIA A. SORANNO, WILLIAM W. TAYLOR, KRISTIINA A. VOGT, AND JOHN A. WIENS	
19	Landscape ecology of the future: A regional interface of ecology and socioeconomics	461
	EUGENE P. ODUM	
20	Epilogue	466
	RICHARD T. T. FORMAN	
	Index	473
	Color plates between pages 268 and 269	

Coupling landscape ecology with natural resource management: Paradigm shifts and new approaches

1.1 Introduction

Global human population has now exceeded 6 billion people and this rapidly increasing population has significant implications for natural resources. On the one hand, demands for natural resources have dramatically increased and will continue to increase (FAO, 1997). On the other hand, natural resources have been reduced in both quantity and quality as extraction has become more intensive and extensive than ever before (Vitousek *et al.*, 1997). As a result, much of the world's biodiversity has been lost (Ehrlich, 1988; Myers, 1990; Pimm and Gittleman, 1992), and many species have become threatened and endangered (Wilson, 1988; Rutledge *et al.*, 2001). Other ecological consequences include degradation of ecosystem goods and services (Costanza *et al.*, 1997; Daily, 1997), landscape fragmentation (Harris, 1984), and unsustainable use of natural resources (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987; Lubchenco *et al.*, 1991). Furthermore, the management of natural resources has become more constrained and complex due to the interactions among ecological, political, socioeconomic, demographic, and behavioral factors (Thrupp, 1990; Cairns and Lackey, 1992; FEMAT, 1993; Liu, 2001; McCool and Guthrie, 2001; Chapter 19, this book). In order to address these great challenges in natural resource management and to achieve sustainability of natural resources in the future (Speth, 1992; MacDonald, 1998; Rogers and Feiss, 1998; Kates *et al.*, 2001), resource managers need insightful guidance and new perspectives from emerging disciplines such as landscape ecology (Sharitz *et al.*, 1992; Swanson and Franklin, 1992; Noss, 1983; Dale *et al.*, 2000).

Landscape ecology is an interdisciplinary field that studies landscape structure, function, and change (Forman and Godron, 1986; Hobbs, 1995). Although the term was coined by the German biogeographer Carl Troll in 1939 (Turner, 1989), landscape ecology did not draw much attention outside of

Europe until the early 1980s. During the last two decades, the field of landscape ecology has been rapidly advancing (Naveh and Lieberman, 1984; Risser *et al.*, 1984; Zonneveld and Forman, 1990; Forman 1995a; Pickett and Cadenasso, 1995; Wiens and Moss, 1999). Such rapid advancement is evidenced by the formation of the International Association for Landscape Ecology (IALE) in 1982 and its regional chapters (e.g., US-IALE, Europe-IALE, China-IALE), a large number of national and international conferences, creation of the international journal *Landscape Ecology* in 1987 (Golley, 1987, 1995), the proposition of a large number of landscape ecology concepts (e.g., Urban *et al.*, 1987; Pulliam, 1988; Turner, 1989; Levin, 1992; Wiens, 1992; Hobbs, 1995), the formulation of many principles (e.g., Risser *et al.*, 1984; Forman and Godron, 1986; Forman, 1995a,b), and the development of numerous methods and techniques (e.g., Turner and Gardner, 1991; Pulliam *et al.*, 1992; Klopatek and Gardner, 1999).

Although landscape ecology provides a spatial systems perspective and has great relevance to natural resource management (Hobbs, 1995), the application of landscape ecology in natural resource management has been lagging (Forman, 1986; Aspinall and Pearson, 2000; Chapter 18, this book). Likewise, natural resource management actions have not been fully utilized for the advancement of landscape ecology, even though they provide excellent opportunities for further landscape ecology development (e.g., Chapters 13 and 18, this book). Given these needs and potential benefits, the main goal of this book is to identify links and ways of bridging the gaps between landscape ecology and natural resource management. In this chapter, we briefly introduce a number of fundamental concepts, principles, and methods in landscape ecology; discuss how natural resource management paradigms can be modified to fit into a landscape ecology perspective; and provide an overview of this book.

1.2. A brief introduction to landscape ecology: Concepts, principles, and methods

In this section, we briefly introduce some fundamental concepts, principles, and methods in landscape ecology. More details can be found in other chapters of this book and many publications cited throughout this book.

1.2.1 Landscape structure, function, change, and integrity

Although the exact definition of a landscape can vary greatly, most landscape ecologists agree that a landscape is a heterogeneous land area (e.g., Turner, 1989; Forman, 1995a) (Fig. 1.1) that is often hierarchically structured. The basic unit in a landscape is a patch, which is a relatively homogeneous area.




FIGURE 1.1

A diagram of regional context (top row), landscape structure and function (middle row), and landscape integrity (bottom row). Landscape changes are illustrated at two time steps: time 0 (left column) and time n (right column). The top row illustrates that a landscape (white ellipse) is embedded in a region (shaded ellipse). A landscape (middle row) consists of patches with different sizes and shapes. Arrows refer to landscape function (flows of energy, matter, and organisms) within and between patches and landscapes. Landscape integrity (bottom row) can be represented by different indicators such as productivity (p) and diversity of native species (d). In this example, changes in landscape structure and function as well as regional context (different shadings) cause a reduction in diversity of native species but no significant change in productivity.

The size (extent or spatial dimension) of a landscape is dependent on research and management objectives and varies with the perception of the organisms (Pearson *et al.*, 1996). Because different organisms view the same landscape differently, a landscape could range from square meters (from a small insect's perspective; Wiens and Milne, 1989) to thousands of square kilometers or larger (from humans' perspective; Forman and Godron, 1986).

Patches and landscapes are not isolated entities, but embedded in local, regional, and global contexts (Forman, 1995a; Liu and Ashton, 1999) (Fig. 1.1). A landscape is an open system with flows across landscape boundaries and

interactions with other landscapes. For instance, nutrients and pollutants may follow hydrologic flows from uplands to aquatic systems (Carpenter *et al.*, 1998). Landscape functions (or processes) include matter flows, energy flows, and organism flows such as migration and dispersal among patches (Forman, 1995a) (Fig. 1.1). Through these various flows, patches and landscapes connect with and influence each other (Fig. 1.1).

Both landscape structure and landscape function change over time and across space due to natural and anthropogenic disturbances (Pickett and White, 1985; Turner *et al.*, 1997; Dale *et al.*, 1998) (Fig. 1.1). Landscapes change in a variety of ways. For instance, a contiguous large landscape may be fragmented into smaller pieces or some landscape elements may be lost (Forman, 1995a). Conversely, small landscapes or patches may coalesce into larger ones. Rates of change can be differential across a landscape (Liu *et al.*, 2001). Depending on the intensity and frequency of disturbances, some changes are very dramatic, while other changes are gradual or less obvious (Turner, 1987; Baker, 1992; Swanson *et al.*, 1998; Foster *et al.*, 1999).

While landscape structure, function, and change have been extensively studied, landscape integrity is a subject relatively unexplored. The concept of landscape integrity is different from but related to ecosystem integrity (Woodley *et al.*, 1993; De Leo and Levin, 1997), ecological integrity (Crossley, 1996; Pimentel *et al.*, 2000), and biological (or biotic) integrity (Karr, 1981; Hunter, 1999). The major difference lies in that landscape integrity is a health measurement at the landscape level (Fig. 1.1), while other integrity concepts indicate the health status of ecosystems or communities. Landscape integrity may result from complex interactions among ecosystems in the landscape and is unlikely to be a simple summation of ecosystem integrity. Landscape integrity can be measured by indicators such as productivity and diversity of native species at the landscape scale. The exact relationships between landscape integrity and landscape structure and function are unknown but are likely to be non-linear. Changes in landscape structure and function may or may not lead to significant changes in landscape integrity (Fig. 1.1). For example, modifications of some patches in a landscape may not affect its integrity due to elasticity or compensation of other patches in the landscape. Given its importance and lack of knowledge about it, we suggest that landscape integrity should be on the priority list of research by the landscape ecology community.

1.2.2 Principles

Like other disciplines, a set of principles has emerged in landscape ecology. According to Forman (1995b), a general principle integrates various sources of knowledge, addresses important questions, has a wide range of

applications, has predictive ability, is established in theory, and has direct supporting evidence. Based on these criteria, Forman (1995b) lists 12 principles of landscape ecology. One of the principles states that spatial arrangement of patches is a major determinant of functional movement across the landscape. Additional principles have been proposed by others, such as Risser *et al.* (1984), Urban *et al.* (1987), Turner (1989), Ahern (1999), Ludwig (1999), and Farina (2000). These include the principle that local ecological conditions (e.g., organism abundance and species diversity) are affected by landscape context or attributes of the surrounding landscape (Dale *et al.*, 2000). For example, Pearson (1993) reported that bird species richness within a stand is largely affected by the vegetation structure in the surrounding areas. Likewise, Liu *et al.* (1999) found that food in oil palm plantations supports higher levels of wild pigs that, in turn, significantly reduce tree seedling regeneration and tree species richness in stands adjacent to the plantations.

1.2.3 Methods

Research methods in landscape ecology have progressed remarkably fast over the last two decades (e.g., Turner and Gardner, 1991; Klopatek and Gardner, 1999; Farina, 2000). These methods include approaches and tools for collection, analysis, and integration of both spatial and non-spatial data. In terms of data collection, methods like sampling (Cochran, 1977; Chapters 3 and 11, this book) and observations (Hanski, 1991; Grossman *et al.*, 1995) are routinely used in landscape ecology. Experimentation is also becoming popular (Lovejoy *et al.*, 1986; Robinson *et al.*, 1992; Wiens *et al.*, 1995; Ims, 1999), even though it is frequently faced with challenges in identifying suitable replicates (Hargrove and Pickering, 1992; Chapters 3 and 13, this book) because landscape-level experiments often must use large, yet heterogeneous areas. While sampling and experimentation usually require researchers to be physically in the field, remote sensing techniques collect information about an object without direct physical contact and have become an essential tool for obtaining large-scale spatial data in the forms of satellite imagery and aerial photography (Lillesand and Kiefer, 1994; Jensen, 1996; Chapter 16, this book). In addition, global positioning systems (GPS, satellite-based georeferencing systems) are frequently used to gather spatial data, especially for purposes of ground truthing (Liu *et al.*, 2001).

Tools for data analysis and integration include geographic information systems (GIS), spatial statistics, and modeling. Geographic information systems (Maguire *et al.*, 1991) are arguably the most important tool for storing, manipulating, analyzing, and integrating both spatial and non-spatial data. Spatial statistics or geostatistics (e.g., spatial autocorrelation, kriging, spectral

analysis, trend surface analysis) are useful tools for analyzing landscape patterns (O'Neill *et al.*, 1988; Legendre and Fortin, 1989; Turner and Gardner, 1991; Li and Reynolds, 1993; Gustafson, 1998), along with specifically designed software, such as FRAGSTATS (McGarigal and Marks, 1994) and Patch Analyst (<http://flash.lakeheadu.ca/~rrempe/patch/>). Because landscape structure and management practices often vary across space, spatially explicit models are especially useful (Pulliam *et al.*, 1992; Liu, 1993; McKelvey *et al.*, 1993; Dunning *et al.*, 1995; Turner *et al.*, 1995). Spatially explicit models are computer-based models that account for the ecological and socioeconomic differences among different locations in landscapes and allow efficient analysis of spatial interactions (Liu *et al.*, 1994; Dunning *et al.*, 1995; Verboom and Wamelink, 1999). Combining remote sensing and GIS data, these models offer great promise to natural resource managers, because the arrangement of landscape elements differs in space and time, and the visual display makes the comparisons of management alternatives and their ecological consequences much easier (Franklin and Forman, 1987; Liu *et al.*, 1995; Turner *et al.*, 1995; Gustafson and Crow, 1996).

1.3 Shifts in paradigms of natural resource management

While traditional natural resource management has met numerous societal needs, it has also caused a host of problems (Christensen *et al.*, 1996; Kohm and Franklin, 1997), such as conflicts between management for short-term and long-term benefits, between management at small scales and large scales, and between management of different natural resources (Liu, 1995; Scott *et al.*, 1995; Dale *et al.*, 2000; McShea and Rappole, 2000). To overcome the shortcomings of traditional management, it is necessary to facilitate shifts in management paradigms using a landscape perspective. Specifically, it is essential to tie landscape structure with multi-scale management; to link landscape function with cross-boundary management; to connect landscape change with adaptive management; and to use integrated management by incorporating multi-scale, cross-boundary, and adaptive management to achieve sustainable landscape integrity (Fig. 1.2).

From single-scale management to multi-scale management

Traditional management has usually taken place at a single spatial scale. In forestry, for example, management often occurred at the stand level (Crow, 1999). Because a landscape is usually heterogeneous and ecological consequences are often scale-dependent (Toman and Ashton, 1996; Chapter 2, this book), management must be similarly carried out at multiple scales such as patch, patch group, and landscape. If no patches are the same, it may be neces-




FIGURE 1.2

Relationships among the four major aspects of a landscape and the four management paradigms. Each box refers to a specific linkage between landscape ecology and natural resource management: landscape structure and multi-scale management, landscape function and cross-boundary management, and landscape change and adaptive management. Because landscape integrity and integrated management encompass all three linkages, they are represented by the entire ellipse.

sary to undertake different management activities in different patches to accommodate landscape heterogeneity. If two or more patches share the same characteristics, these patches can be grouped and be managed in the same way. For example, in an agricultural landscape with three patches (A, B, C), patch A has low soil fertility while B and C have high fertility, patches A and B have high density of pests whereas pest density in patch C is low, and all three patches have low soil moisture. In order to increase productivity and reduce costs, a multi-scale approach would be to enhance fertility (e.g., through applying organic manure) in patch A, to control pests (e.g., through integrated pest management) in patches A and B (as a patch group), and to improve water conditions (e.g., through irrigation) across the landscape (all three patches). Thus, individual patches or patch clusters need to be assessed and managed in the context of a landscape where management activities can be coordinated to achieve the overall performance of designed management plans at the landscape level.

From within-boundary management to cross-boundary management.

Conventional management was often conducted within the boundary of land ownership or within the same patch or landscape, without taking account of the interactions between the focal patch/landscape and other patches/landscapes (Reid, 1996). A cross-boundary management approach is thus needed to incorporate landscape functions (i.e., flows of energy, matter, and organisms) because landscape functions may not recognize political, management, ownership, and natural boundaries, and because management within a patch or landscape may have tremendous effects beyond the boundaries (Knight and Landres, 1998; Liu, 2001). The cross-boundary management paradigm considers the impacts of management within a focal system (patch or landscape) on other systems, as well as incorporating the impacts of management in other systems on the focal system (e.g., Chapter 7, this book). Also, it is important to study ecological and socioeconomic factors affecting landscape functions so that the functions can be enhanced or suppressed as appropriate (e.g., to create barriers for the dispersal of invasive species and to remove barriers to the movement of endangered species; Chapter 9, this book).

From static management to adaptive management

In the past, many management practices remained the same, even though significant changes had taken place on the landscape. For example, fire suppression in many regions of the US continued despite accumulation in the amount of fuel (Baker, 1994; Miller and Urban, 2000). Similarly, fishing pressures remained high despite a sharp decline in fish stocks and degradation in fish habitat (Rothschild *et al.*, 1994; Larkin, 1996). Because landscapes are constantly changing due to natural and anthropogenic disturbances (including management practices), management practices suitable for a previous condition are not always appropriate for new conditions. Thus, management strategies need to be changed accordingly. Adaptive management (Holling, 1978; Walters, 1986; Lee, 1993) has become an increasingly popular approach for addressing such dynamic and uncertain issues. The purpose of adaptive management is to accumulate knowledge and, thus, reduce uncertainty about the system. To achieve this purpose, adaptive management uses management alternatives as experiments with testable hypotheses. Furthermore, it is an iterative process that can adjust to new information, new management goals, and landscape changes over broad spatial and temporal scales.

From isolated management to integrated management

Past resource management practices often had single objectives (Scott *et al.*, 1995), which caused many unexpected negative results and varying degrees of socioeconomic and ecological conflicts (Kohm and Franklin, 1997). For

example, the goal of forest management was usually to produce as much timber as possible. However, timber harvesting had secondary effects of improving habitat for white-tailed deer by creating an abundant supply of accessible forage (Waller and Alverson, 1997). Improved habitat increased deer numbers to the point that forest regeneration in many areas had been almost completely eliminated and, thus, timber production could not be sustained (Alverson *et al.*, 1988). Additionally, overabundant deer populations caused crop damage and traffic accidents (Xie *et al.*, 2001). Furthermore, these consequences vary at multiple scales over time. This example illustrates the need for simultaneously and holistically managing deer, timber, and other natural resources in the landscape. To eliminate or minimize such conflicts and maintain high landscape integrity, it is important to take an integrated approach that incorporates multi-scale, cross-boundary, and adaptive management. It is crucial that different types of natural resource management be coordinated in both space and time. Integrated management shares many features with widely discussed ecosystem management (e.g., Grumbine, 1994; Christensen *et al.*, 1996), but integrated management also takes a landscape perspective by dynamically incorporating spatial interactions across heterogeneous landscapes to achieve sustainable landscape integrity.

1.4 Linking landscape ecology with natural resource management

The main objective of this book is to link landscape ecology with natural resource management. The linkages are discussed in six sections, comprising 20 chapters. The first section is introductory and contains this chapter, while the last section offers syntheses (Chapter 18) and perspectives (Chapters 19–20) regarding opportunities and challenges in integrating natural resource management with landscape ecology. The middle four sections (Parts II through V) link four different aspects of landscapes (structure, function, change, and integrity) with four corresponding management paradigms (multi-scale, cross-boundary, adaptive, and integrated management). Part II emphasizes multi-scale management based on landscape structure. Part III discusses the relationships between landscape function (e.g., flows of energy, matter, and species) and cross-boundary management (i.e., management across natural boundaries, ownership boundaries, political boundaries, and/or management boundaries). Part IV ties adaptive management with landscape change. Part V links landscape integrity with integrated management. We should point out that while each of Parts II–V has a particular emphasis, a certain degree of overlap is inevitable, as the four landscape aspects and the four management paradigms are interrelated. Furthermore, each of the 16 chapters in Parts II–V provides background information regarding numerous natural resource

management issues; discusses relevant landscape ecology concepts, principles, or methods that are useful for addressing the management issues; presents one or more case studies (examples) that couple landscape ecology with natural resource management; and offers implications and guidelines for future landscape ecology research and natural resource management practices.

This book encompasses a variety of landscapes, including forested (Chapters 7–8, 11–14, 18, and 20), agricultural (Chapters 4, 12, 17, and 20), grassland (Chapters 2, 8, and 16), aquatic and riparian (Chapters 4–5, 7, 9, 15, 18, and 20), and urban (Chapters 6 and 12). The examples come from both publicly and privately owned lands. Public lands include federal lands (Chapters 4, 7, 10, and 13–14) and state and local government lands (Chapters 5 and 12), while private lands (Chapters 12 and 20) range from industrial and non-industrial lands (Chapter 7), farmland (Chapters 4 and 12) to residential land (Chapters 6 and 12).

A variety of natural resources are discussed in this book, including both ecosystem services and goods (Costanza *et al.*, 1997; Daily, 1997). Ecosystem goods include fish (Chapters 5, 9, and 15), crops (Chapters 4 and 17), livestock (Chapters 2, 4, and 16), and timber (Chapters 2, 7, 13–14, and 18). Ecosystem services include water (Chapters 2, 4–5, 9, and 17–18), biodiversity (Chapters 2–3, 5, 8, 10–13, and 18), non-timber resources (Chapter 18), and pollination (Chapter 4). Management issues associated with the natural resources are diverse, ranging from biodiversity conservation (Chapters 2, 4–5, 7, 12, and 17), timber harvesting (Chapters 2, 7, and 13–14), fishing (Chapters 5, 9, and 15), production yield (Chapters 2, 4, and 14–17), landscape fragmentation (Chapters 3, 12, and 14), soil erosion (Chapters 2, 4–5, and 18), pollution (Chapters 4–6, 15, and 18), urbanization (Chapters 6, 12, 15, and 18) to conflicting objectives (Chapters 2, 5, 8, and 14–15).

A large number of landscape ecology concepts have been applied to the various natural resource management issues discussed in this book. For example, the concepts of patch and scale are used in all chapters, and the term heterogeneity is used in almost every chapter. Other important concepts include spatial arrangement or configuration (Chapters 2–4, 7–8, 12, 15, and 17–18), extent and grain (Chapters 2, 4, 6–8, 10–16, and 18), landscape context or surrounding conditions (Chapters 2–6, 8–9, 11–12, 14–16, and 18–20), corridor or connectivity (Chapters 2–5, 8–11, 13, and 15–20), and source–sink habitat or metapopulation (Chapters 2–3 and 7–13). Many chapters discuss how landscape ecology principles are useful to natural resource management (Chapters 2, 5, 7, 9–10, 14, 18, and 20). For example, Wiens *et al.* (Chapter 2) state that “habitat patches close enough together to allow dispersal tend to support populations for longer periods than do patches that are far apart, and that habitat patches connected by habitat corridors or set in a landscape matrix of similar structure will foster frequent dispersal among patches” and illus-

trate the utilities of these principles using spotted owl population dynamics and persistence under different scenarios of landscape structure.

There are numerous landscape ecology methods developed and used in this book. These methods include sampling techniques (Chapters 3 and 11), experimentation (Chapters 2–3 and 13), observation (Chapters 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, and 16–18), and spatial statistics (Chapters 3, 5, 12, 16, and 18). In addition, various models are constructed and widely applied in predicting impacts of land use (Chapter 10), monitoring landscape changes (Chapter 11), simulating organism response to landscape structure and change (Chapters 2–3 and 13), projecting consequences of management alternatives and designs (Chapters 4, 6–7, 14, and 18), and exploring edge effects on a wide range of species (Chapter 8). Geographic information systems, remote sensing, and global positioning systems are three increasingly important spatial tools. Hoch *et al.* (Chapter 16) give a concise introduction to these tools and then apply them in grassland landscape studies. Other authors use geographic information systems and remote sensing techniques to detect and monitor landscape changes (Chapters 6, 10, and 12), to develop conservation priorities (Chapter 5), and to identify appropriate samples (Chapter 11).

Besides convincing arguments and evidence that a landscape perspective is very important in natural resource management, this book offers many specific “rules of thumb” as well as general, yet explicit, guidelines for implementing landscape ecology in the practices of natural resource management. Specific “rules of thumb” include the 50–11–40 rule and 40–20–40 rule for the management of the northern spotted owl (Chapter 2). While no management is identical in the details and the development of specific “rules of thumb” for various management actions requires detailed information, general guidelines are most useful and, thus, are provided in every chapter. For example, research and management should be conducted at multiple scales (Chapters 2–6 and 18), practices should be identified to minimize negative effects and enhance positive effects across boundaries (Chapters 7–9), modeling should be used as a cost-effective method for monitoring and predicting ecological consequences of resource management alternatives so that management actions can be adjusted accordingly (Chapters 10–13), sustained yield and productivity can be enhanced by managing natural resources in space and time (Chapters 14–17), natural and social sciences should be integrated, and the communication between academic and non-academic institutions should be enhanced (Chapters 5–6 and 18–20).

Although guidelines for landscape ecological research are often not as explicitly stated as those for natural resource management, landscape ecologists can identify research needs using the guidelines for management. Landscape ecologists can also benefit tremendously from interacting with natural resource managers who usually have rich field experience and can provide unique insights

(Chapters 13 and 18). For example, management activities can be used to design experimental treatments (Chapters 3 and 13), help landscape ecologists to maintain their landscapes of study, and assist landscape ecologists in understanding the mechanisms of landscape structure, function, change, and integrity.

Summary

There are inherent interrelationships between natural resource management and landscape ecology. On the one hand, management activities can provide unique opportunities for landscape ecology research and can change the study subjects (i.e., landscapes) (Hobbs, 1997; Liu, 2001) because management activities are disturbances that affect landscape structure, influence landscape function, drive landscape change, and alter landscape integrity. On the other hand, landscape ecology can offer useful guidance and tools for how natural resources can be better managed. For instance, landscapes can be designed and managed in a manner that spatial arrangement of patches can be altered to enhance or impede the rates of movement of species, energy, material, and disturbance.

A landscape perspective fosters multi-scale, cross-boundary, adaptive, and integrated approaches to natural resource management. This book provides numerous convincing arguments and case studies to tie landscape ecology with natural resource management. Authors of this book demonstrate that many landscape ecology concepts, principles, and methods are very useful for paradigm shifts in natural resource management. The specific “rules of thumb” and general guidelines proposed in this book are valuable to help ensure the sustainability of natural resources around the world.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Christopher Lepczyk for his constructive reviews of earlier drafts, which have greatly improved the chapter. We also thank Robert Howe and Linda Fortin for their helpful assistance. Financial support was provided by the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health.

References

- Ahern, J. (1999). Integration of landscape ecology and landscape design: An evolutionary process. In *Issues in Landscape Ecology*, eds. J. A. Wiens & M. R. Moss, pp. 119–123. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- Alverson, W. S., Waller, D. M., & Solheim, S. J. (1988). Forests too deer: Edge effects in Northern Wisconsin. *Conservation Biology*, 2: 348–358.
- Aspinall, R. & Pearson, D. (2000). Integrated geographical assessment of environmental

- condition in water catchments: Linking landscape ecology, environmental modeling and GIS. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 59(special issue): 299–319.
- Baker, W. L. (1992). The landscape ecology of large disturbances in the design and management of nature reserves. *Landscape Ecology*, 7: 181–194.
- Baker, W. L. (1994). Restoration of landscape structure altered by fire suppression. *Conservation Biology*, 8: 763–769.
- Cairns, M. A. & Lackey, R. T. (1992). Biodiversity and management of natural resources: The issues. *Fisheries*, 17: 6–10.
- Carpenter, S. R., Caraco, N. F., Correll, D. L., Howarth, R. W., Shipley, A. N. & Smith, V. H. (1998). Nonpoint pollution of surface waters with nitrogen and phosphorus. *Ecological Applications*, 8: 559–568.
- Christensen, N. L., Bartuska, A. M., Brown, J. H., Carpenter, S., D'Antonio, C., Francis, R., Franklin, J. F., MacMahon, J. A., Noss, R. F., Parsons, D. J., Peterson, C. H., Turner, M. G. & Woodmansee, R. G. (1996). The report of the Ecological Society of America committee on the scientific basis for ecosystem management. *Ecological Applications* 6: 665–691.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*. John Wiley, New York.
- Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., deGroot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R. V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R. G., Sutton, P. & vandenBelt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387: 253–260.
- Crossley, J. W. (1996). Managing ecosystems for integrity: Theoretical considerations for resource and environmental managers. *Society and Natural Resources*, 9:465–481.
- Crow, T. (1999). Landscape ecology and forest management. In *Issues in Landscape Ecology*, eds. J. A. Wiens & M. R. Moss, pp. 94–96. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- Daily, G. C. (ed.) (1997). *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Dale, V. H., Lugo, A. E., MacMahon, J. A., & Pickett, S. T. A. (1998). Management implications of large, infrequent disturbances. *Ecosystems*, 1: 546–557.
- Dale, V. H., Brown, S., Haeuber, R. A., Hobbs, N. T., Huntly, N., Naiman, R. J., Riebsame, W. E., Turner, M. G. & Valone, T. J. (2000). Ecological principles and guidelines for managing the use of land. *Ecological Applications*, 10: 639–670.
- De Leo, G. A., & Levin, S. (1997). The multifaceted aspects of ecosystem integrity. *Conservation Ecology*, 1 (1) art 3, <http://www.consecol.org/Journal/vol1/iss1/art3/>
- Dunning, J. B. Jr., Steward, D. J., Danielson, B. J., Noon, B. R., Root, T. L., Lamberson, R. H. & Stevens, E. E. (1995). Spatially explicit population models: Current forms and future uses. *Ecological Applications*, 5: 3–11.
- Ehrlich, P. R. (1988). The loss of diversity: Causes and consequences. In *Biodiversity*, ed. E. O. Wilson, pp. 21–27. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] (1997). *State of the World's Forests*. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy.
- Farina, A. (2000) *Principles and Methods in Landscape Ecology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA.
- FEMAT [Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team] (1993). *Forest Ecosystem Management: An Ecological, Economic, and Social Assessment*. US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Washington, D.C..
- Forman, R. T. T. (1986). Emerging directions in landscape ecology and applications in natural resource management. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Science in the National Parks: The Plenary Sessions*, eds. R. Herrmann & T. Bostedt-Craig, pp. 59–88. US National Park Service and The George Wright Society, Fort Collins, CO.
- Forman, R. T. T. (1995a). *Land Mosaics: The Ecology of Landscapes and Regions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Forman, R. T. T. (1995b). Some general principles of landscape and regional ecology. *Landscape Ecology*, 10: 133–142.
- Forman, R. T. T. & Godron, M. (1986). *Landscape Ecology*. John Wiley, New York.
- Foster, D. R., Fluet, M. & Boose, E. R. (1999). Human or natural disturbance: Landscape-scale dynamics of the tropical forests of Puerto Rico. *Ecological Applications*, 9: 555–572.

- Franklin, J. F. & Forman, R. T. T. (1987). Creating landscape patterns by forest cutting: Ecological consequences and principles. *Landscape Ecology*, 1: 5–18.
- Gardner, R. H., Milne, B. T., Turner, M. G. & O'Neill, R. V. (1987). Neutral models for the analysis of broad-scale landscape pattern. *Landscape Ecology*, 1: 19–28.
- Golley, F. B. (1987). Introducing landscape ecology. *Landscape Ecology*, 1: 1.
- Golley, F. B. (1995). Reaching a landmark. *Landscape Ecology*, 10: 3–4.
- Grossman, G. D., Hill, J. & Petty, J. T. (1995). Observations on habitat structure, population regulation, and habitat use with respect to evolutionary significant units: A landscape perspective for lotic systems. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 17: 381–391.
- Grumbine, R. E. (1994). What is ecosystem management? *Conservation Biology*, 8: 27–38.
- Gustafson, E. J. (1998). Quantifying landscape spatial pattern: What is the state of the art? *Ecosystems*, 1: 143–156.
- Gustafson, E. J. & Crow, T. R. (1996) Simulating the effects of alternative forest management strategies on landscape structure. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 46: 77–96.
- Hanski, I. (1991). Single-species metapopulation dynamics: Concepts, models, and observations. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 42: 17–38.
- Hargrove, W. W. & Pickering, J. (1992). Pseudoreplication: A sine qua non for regional ecology. *Landscape Ecology*, 6: 251–258.
- Harris, L. D. (1984). *The Fragmented Forest: Island Biogeography Theory and the Preservation of Biotic Diversity*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Hobbs, R. J. (1995). Landscape ecology. In *Encyclopedia of Environmental Biology*, vol. 2, ed. W. A. Nierenberg, pp. 417–428. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- Hobbs, R. J. (1997). Future landscapes and the future of landscape ecology. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 37: 1–9.
- Holling, C. S. (ed.) (1978). *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management*. John Wiley, New York.
- Hunter, M. L., Jr. (ed.) (1999). *Maintaining Biodiversity in Forest Ecosystems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Ims, R. A. (1999). Experimental landscape ecology. In *Issues in Landscape Ecology*, eds. J. A. Wiens & M. R. Moss, pp. 45–50. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- Jensen, J. R. (1996). *Introductory Digital Image Processing: A Remote Sensing Perspective*, 2nd ed. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Karr, J. R. (1981). Assessment of biotic integrity using fish communities. *Fisheries*, 6: 21–27.
- Kates, R. W., Clark, W. C., Corell, R. J., Hall, M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., McCarthy, J. J., Schellnhuber, H. J., Bolin, B., Dickson, N. M., Faucheux, S., Gallopin, G. C., Grübler, A., Huntley, B., Jäger, J., Jodha, N. S., Kasperson, R. E., Mabogunje, A., Matson, P., Mooney, H., Moore, B. III, O'Riordan, T. & Svedlin, U. (2001). Sustainability science. *Science*, 292: 641–642.
- Klopatek, J. M. & Gardner, R. H. (eds.) (1999). *Landscape Ecological Analysis: Issues and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Knight, R. L. & Landres, P. B. (eds.) (1998). *Stewardship Across Boundaries*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Kohm, K. A. & Franklin, J. F. (eds.) (1997). *Creating a Forestry for the 21st Century: The Science of Ecosystem Management*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Larkin, P. A. (1996). Concepts and issues in marine ecosystem management. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 6: 139–164.
- Lee, K. N. (1993). *Compass and Gyroscope: Integrating Science and Politics for the Environment*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Legendre, P. & Fortin, M. J. (1989). Spatial pattern and ecological analysis. *Vegetatio*, 80: 107–138.
- Levin, S. A. (1992). The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology*, 73: 1943–1967.
- Li, H. & Reynolds, J. F. (1993). A new contagion index to quantify spatial patterns of landscapes. *Landscape Ecology*, 8: 155–162.
- Lillesand, T. M. & Kiefer, R. W. (1994). *Remote Sensing and Image Interpretation*, 3rd ed. John Wiley, New York.
- Liu, J. (1993). ECOLECON: A spatially-explicit model for ECOLOGical-ECONomics of species conservation in complex forest landscapes. *Ecological Modelling*, 70: 63–87.
- Liu, J. (1995). Ecosystem management for sustainable development. In *Wealth, Health*

- and Faith: Sustainability Studies, eds. R. Wang, J. Zhao, Z. Ouyang & T. Niu, pp. 56–59. China Environmental Science Press, Beijing, China.
- Liu, J. (2001). Integrating ecology with human demography, behavior, and socioeconomics: Needs and approaches. *Ecological Modelling*, 140: 1–8.
- Liu, J. & Ashton, P. S. (1999). Stimulating effects of landscape context and timber harvest on tree species diversity. *Ecological Applications*, 9: 186–201.
- Liu, J., Cubbage, F. & Pulliam, H. R. (1994). Ecological and economic effects of forest structure and rotation lengths: Simulation studies using ECOLECON. *Ecological Economics*, 10: 249–265.
- Liu, J., Dunning, J. B. & Pulliam, H. R. (1995). Potential impacts of a forest management plan on Bachman's Sparrows (*Atimophila aestivalis*): Linking a spatially-explicit model with GIS. *Conservation Biology*, 9: 62–79.
- Liu, J., Ickes, K., Ashton, P., LaFrankie, J. & Manokaran, N. (1999). Spatial and temporal impacts of adjacent areas on the dynamics of species diversity in a primary forest. In *Spatial Modeling of Forest Landscape Change: Approaches and Applications*, eds. D., Mladenoff & W. Baker, pp. 42–69. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Liu, J., Linderman, M., Ouyang, Z., An, L., Yang, J. & Zhang, H. (2001). Ecological degradation in protected areas: The case of Wolong Nature Reserve for giant pandas. *Science*, 292: 98–101.
- Lovejoy, T. E., Bierregaard, R. O., Rylands, A. B. Jr., Malcolm, C. E., Quintela, L. H., Harper, K. S., Brown, K. S. Jr., Powell, A. H., Powell, G. V. N., Schubart, H. O. R., & Hays, M. B. (1986). Edge and other effects of isolation on Amazon forest fragments. In *Conservation Biology: The Science of Scarcity and Diversity*, ed. M. E. Soulé, pp. 257–285. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, M. A.
- Lubchenco, J., Olson, A. M., Brubaker, L. B., Carpenter, S. R., Holland, M. M., Hubbell, S. P., Levin, S. A., MacMahon, J. A., Matson, P. A., Melillo, J. M., Mooney, H. A., Peterson, C. H., Pulliam, H. R., Real, L. A., Regal, P. J. & Risser, P. G. (1991). The Sustainable Biosphere Initiative: An ecological research agenda. *Ecology*, 72: 371–412.
- Ludwig, J. A. (1999). Disturbance and landscapes: The little things count. In *Issues in Landscape Ecology*, eds. J. A. Wiens & M. R. Moss, pp. 59–63. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- MacDonald, M. (1998). *Agendas for Sustainability: Environment and Development into the Twenty-first Century*. Routledge, New York.
- Maguire, D. J., Goodchild, M. F. & Rhind, D. W. (1991). *Geographical Information Systems*. Longman, New York.
- McCool, S. F. & Guthrie, K. (2001). Mapping the dimensions of successful public participation in messy natural resources management situations. *Society and Natural Resources*, 14: 309–323.
- McGarigal, K. & Marks, B. J. (1994). FRAGSTATS: Spatial Pattern Analysis Program for Quantifying Landscape Structure (Version 2.0). Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.
- McKelvey, K., Noon, B. R. & Lamberson, R. H. (1993). Conservation planning for species occupying fragmented landscapes: The case of the Northern Spotted Owl. In *Biotic Interactions and Global Change*, eds. P. M. Kareiva, J. G. Kingsolver & R. B. Huey, pp. 424–450. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- McShea, W. J., & Rappole, J. H. (2000). Managing the abundance and diversity of breeding bird populations through manipulation of deer populations. *Conservation Biology*, 14: 1161–1170.
- Miller, C. & Urban, D. L. (2000). Modeling the effects of fire management alternatives on Sierra Nevada mixed-conifer forests. *Ecological Applications*, 10: 85–94.
- Myers, N. (1990). The biodiversity challenge: Expanded hotspots analysis. *The Environmentalist*, 10: 243–256.
- Naveh, Z. & Lieberman, A. (1984). *Landscape Ecology: Theory and Application*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Noss, R. F. (1983). A regional landscape approach to maintain diversity. *BioScience*, 33: 700–706.
- O'Neill, R. V., Krummel, J. R., Gardner, R. H., Sugihara, G., Jackson, B., DeAngelis, D. L., Milne, B. T., Turner, M. G., Zygmunt, B., Christensen, S. W., Dale, V. H., & Graham, R. L. (1988). Indices of landscape pattern. *Landscape Ecology*, 1: 153–162.
- Pearson, S. M. (1993). The spatial extent and

- relative influence of landscape-level factors on wintering bird populations. *Landscape Ecology*, 8: 3–18.
- Pearson, S. M., Turner, M. G., Gardner, R. H., & O'Neill, R. V. (1996). An organism-based perspective of habitat fragmentation. In *Biodiversity in Managed Landscapes: Theory and practice*, eds. R. C. Szaro & D. W. Johnston, pp. 77–95. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Pickett, S. T. A. & Cadenasso, M. L. (1995). Landscape ecology: Spatial heterogeneity in ecological systems. *Science*, 269: 331–334.
- Pickett, S. T. A. & White, P. S. (eds.) (1958). *The Ecology of Natural Disturbance and Patch Dynamics*. Academic Press, New York.
- Pimentel, D., Westra, L. & Noss, R. F. (eds.) (2000). *Ecological Integrity: Integrating Environment, Conservation, and Health*. Island Press, Washington, D. C.
- Pimm, S. L. & Gittleman, J. L. (1992). Biological diversity: Where is it? *Science*, 255: 940.
- Pulliam, H. R. (1988). Sources, sinks, and population regulation. *American Naturalist*, 132: 652–661.
- Pulliam, H. R., Dunning, J. B. & Liu, J. (1992). Population dynamics in complex landscapes: A case study. *Ecological Applications*, 2: 165–177.
- Reid, W. V. (1996). Beyond protected areas: Changing perceptions of ecological management objectives. In *Biodiversity in Managed Landscapes: Theory and Practice*, eds. R. C. Szaro & D. W. Johnston, pp. 442–453. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Risser, P. G., Karr, J. R., & Forman, R. T. T. (1984). *Landscape Ecology: Directions and Approaches*, Special Publication No. 2, Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.
- Robinson, G. R., Holt, R. D., Gaines, M. S., Hamburg, S. P., Johnson, M. L., Fitch, H. S., & Martinko, E. A. (1992). Diverse and contrasting effects of habitat fragmentation. *Science*, 257: 524–526.
- Rogers, J. J. W. & Feiss, P. G. (1998). *People and the Earth: Basic Issues in the Sustainability of Resources and Environment*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Rothschild, B. J., Ault, J. S., Gouletquer, P. & Heral, M. (1994). Decline of the Chesapeake Bay Oyster population: A century of habitat destruction and overfishing. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 111: 29–39.
- Rutledge, J., Lepczyk, C., Xie, J. & Liu, J. 2001. Spatial and temporal dynamics of endangered species hotspots in the United States. *Conservation Biology*, 15: 475–487.
- Scott, J. M., Ables, E. D., Edwards, T. C., Eng, R. L., Gavin, T. A., Harris, L. D., Haufler, J. B., Healy, W. M., Knopf, F. L., Torgerson, O., & Weeks, H. P. (1995). Conservation of biological diversity: Perspectives and the future for the wildlife profession. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 23: 646–657.
- Sharitz, R. R., Boring, L. R. Vanlear, D. H., & Pinder, J. E. (1992). Integrating ecological concepts with natural resource management of southern forests. *Ecological Applications*, 2: 226–237.
- Speth, J. G. (1992). The transition to a sustainable society. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 89: 870–872.
- Swanson, F. J. & Franklin, J. F. (1992). New forestry principles from ecosystem analysis of Pacific Northwest forests. *Ecological Applications*, 2: 262–274.
- Swanson, F. J., Johnson, S. L., Gregory, S. V., & Acker, S. A. (1998). Flood disturbance in a forested mountain landscape: Interactions of land use and floods. *BioScience*, 48: 681–689.
- Thrupp, L. A. (1990). Environmental initiatives in Costa Rica: A political ecology perspective. *Society and Natural Resources*, 3: 243–256.
- Toman, M. A. & Ashton, P. M. S. (1996). Sustainable forest ecosystems and management: A review article. *Forest Science*, 42: 366–377.
- Turner, M. G. (1987). *Landscape Heterogeneity and Disturbance*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Turner, M. G. (1989). Landscape ecology: The effect of pattern on process. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 20: 171–197.
- Turner, M. G. & Gardner, R. H. (eds.) (1991) *Quantitative Methods in Landscape Ecology*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Turner, M. G., Arthaud, G. J., Engstrom, R. T., Hejl, S. J., Liu, J., Loeb, S. & McKelvey, K. (1995). Usefulness of spatially explicit animal models in land management. *Ecological Applications*, 5: 12–16.
- Turner, M. G., Dale, V. H. & Everham, E. E. III. (1997). Fires, hurricanes, and volcanoes: Comparing large-scale disturbances. *BioScience*, 47: 758–768.

- Urban, D. L., O'Neill, R. V. & Shugart, H. H. (1987). Landscape ecology. *BioScience* 37: 119–127.
- Verboom, J. & Wamelink, W. (1999). Spatial modeling in landscape ecology. In *Issues in Landscape Ecology*, eds J. A. Wiens & M. R. Moss, pp. 38–44. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J. & Melillo, J. M. (1997). Human domination of earth's ecosystems. *Science*, 277: 494–499.
- Waller, D. M. & Alverson, W. S. (1997). The white-tailed deer: A keystone herbivore. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 25: 217–226.
- Walters, C. J. (1986). *Adaptive Management of Renewable Resources*. Macmillan, New York.
- Wiens, J. A. (1992). What is landscape ecology, really? *Landscape Ecology*, 7: 149–150.
- Wiens, J. A. & Milne, B. T. (1989). Scaling of 'landscapes' in landscape ecology, or, landscape ecology from a beetle's perspective. *Landscape Ecology*, 3: 87–96.
- Wiens, J. A. & Moss, M. R. (eds.) (1999). *Issues in Landscape Ecology*. International Association for Landscape Ecology, Guelph, Canada.
- Wiens, J. A., Crist, T. O., With, K., & Milne, B. T. (1995). Fractal patterns of insect movement in microlandscape mosaics. *Ecology*, 76: 663–666.
- Wilson, E. O. (ed.) (1988). *Biodiversity*. National Academy Press, Washington D. C.
- Woodley, S., Kay, J. & Francis, G. (1993). *Ecological Integrity and the Management of Ecosystems*. St. Lucie Press, Delray Beach, FL.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Xie, J., Liu, J. & Doepker, R. (2001). DeerKBS: A knowledge-based system for white-tailed deer management. *Ecological Modelling*, 140: 177–192.
- Zonneveld, I. S. & Forman, R. T. T. (eds.) (1990). *Changing Landscapes: An Ecological Perspective*. Springer-Verlag, New York.