Forest Ecology and Management 411 (2018) 223–233

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Forest Ecology and Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/foreco

Elk responses to trail-based recreation on public forests

Michael J. Wisdom[a,*], Haiganoush K. Preisler[b], Leslie M. Naylor[c,1], Robert G. Anthony[d,2], Bruce K. Johnson[e], Mary M. Rowland[a]

[a] USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, 1401 Gekeler Lane, La Grande, OR 97850, USA
[b] USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, 800 Buchanan Street West Annex, Albany, CA 94710, USA
[c] Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA
[d] Oregon Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit, Department of Fisheries & Wildlife, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA
[e] Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 1401 Gekeler Lane, La Grande, OR 97850, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
All-terrain vehicles
ATV riding
Elk
Forest roads
Hiking
Horseback riding
Mountain biking
Motorized traffic
Off-highway vehicles
Public forests
Recreation
Recreation trails
Road avoidance
Roads

ABSTRACT

Trail-based recreation is a popular use of public forests in the United States, and four types are common: all-terrain vehicle (ATV) riding, mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding. Effects on wildlife, however, are controversial and often a topic of land use debates. Accordingly, we studied trail-based recreation effects on elk (*Cervus canadensis*), a wide-ranging North American ungulate highly sought for hunting and viewing on public forests, but that is sensitive to human activities, particularly to motorized traffic on forest roads. We hypothesized that elk would respond to trail-based recreation similarly to their avoidance of roads open to motorized traffic on public forests. We evaluated elk responses using a manipulative landscape experiment in a 1453-ha enclosure on public forest in northeast Oregon. A given type of recreation was randomly selected and implemented twice daily along 32 km of designated recreation trails over a five-day period, followed by a nine-day control period of no human activity. Paired treatment and control replicates were repeated three times per year for each recreation type during spring-fall, 2003–2004. During treatments, locations of elk and recreationists were simultaneously collected with telemetry units. Elk locations also were collected during control periods. Elk avoided the trails during recreation treatments, shifting distribution farther out of view and to areas farthest from trails. Elk shifted distribution back toward trails during control periods of no human activity. Elk avoided recreationists in real time, with mean minimum separation distances from humans that varied from 558 to 879 m among the four treatments, 2–4 times farther than elk distances from trails during recreation. Separation distances maintained by elk from recreationists also were 3–5 times farther than mean distances at which elk could be viewed from trails. Distances between elk and recreationists were highest during ATV riding, lowest and similar during hiking and horseback riding, and intermediate during mountain biking. Our results support the hypothesis that elk avoid trail-based recreation similarly to their avoidance of roads open to motorized traffic on public forests. Forest managers can use results to help optimize trade-offs between competing objectives for trail-based recreation and wildlife species like elk that are sensitive to human activities on public forests.

1. Introduction

Trail-based recreation is common on public forests in the United States, and four types are especially popular: all-terrain vehicle (ATV) riding, mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding (Cordell, 2012). ATV riding, in particular, has increased rapidly. The number of off-highway vehicle (OHV) riders reached 36 million in the early 2000s (Cordell, 2012), and is projected to increase ~30–60% (to 62–75 million participants) by 2060 (Bowker et al., 2012). Increasing ATV use has prompted concerns about effects on wildlife (Proescholdt, 2007; Tarr et al., 2010; Webb and Wilshire, 2012), which include distribution shifts of populations away from trails; increased flight responses, movement rates and energetic costs; reduced foraging times; and reduced carrying capacity from cumulative effects (Havlick, 2002; Brillinger et al., 2004, 2011; Wisdom et al., 2004a; Preisler et al., 2006, 2013; Naylor et al., 2009; Ciuti et al., 2012).

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: mwisdom@fs.fed.us (M.J. Wisdom), hpreisler@fs.fed.us (H.K. Preisler), lesnaylor@ctuir.org (L.M. Naylor), bruce.k.johnson1@state.or.us (B.K. Johnson), mrowland@fs.fed.us (M.M. Rowland).
[1] Current address: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Department of Natural Resources, Agricultural Service Center, Room 2, 10507 North McAlister Road, Island City, OR 97850, USA.
[2] Deceased.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2018.01.032
Received 29 November 2017; Received in revised form 19 January 2018; Accepted 19 January 2018
0378-1127/ Published by Elsevier B.V.

Mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding also are popular uses of public lands in the United States (Cordell, 2012), and all three activities are among those projected to increase most in per capita participation by 2060 (Bowker et al., 2012). Mountain biking, in particular, is growing rapidly, with an increase in users of 22% from 2006 to 2015 (The Outdoor Foundation, 2016). In 2006, cycling (road and mountain biking) was the fourth-most popular recreational activity in the United States, behind fishing, camping, and running (Cordell, 2012); mountain biking had > 820 million user days in 2008 (Cordell, 2012).

In contrast to ATV riding, non-motorized forms of trail-based recreation often are considered benign by recreationists (Taylor and Knight, 2003a; Larson et al., 2016), but current knowledge indicates otherwise (Green and Higginbottom, 2000; Leung and Marion, 2000; Newsome and Moore, 2008; Naylor et al., 2009; Ciuti et al., 2012; Larson et al., 2016; Hennings and Soll, 2017). Effects on wildlife are similar to those of ATV riding (e.g., population displacement away from trails, Larson et al., 2016), but ATVs likely have more pronounced negative effects because of high levels of speed and noise and thus affect more area per unit time (Lovich and Bainbridge, 1999; Wisdom et al., 2004a; Proescholdt, 2007; Naylor et al., 2009; Ciuti et al., 2012; Preisler et al., 2013). Motorized uses like ATV riding thus are more likely to have a greater impact than non-motorized recreation on wide-ranging mammals whose large home ranges put them in more frequent contact with the larger ranges and spatial influence of motorized riders (Wisdom et al., 2004a; Ciuti et al., 2012; Beyer et al., 2013).

Concerns about ATV use and the more general effects of motorized traffic on wildlife and other natural resources prompted the USDA Forest Service to revise its policy regarding motorized travel management on National Forests in 2005. A new regulation that year required that all roads, trails, and areas open to motorized use be formally designated to better manage vehicle traffic and prevent resource damage (USDA Forest Service, 2004; Federal Register, 2005; Adams and McCool, 2009). This change in policy acknowledged a variety of negative effects from unmanaged motorized uses, especially OHVs, whose numbers had been increasing steadily on National Forests (Cordell, 2005; Federal Register, 2005). Similar changes in policy have occurred on state-managed forests in response to negative effects of OHVs (Asah et al., 2012a, 2012b).

Despite the changes in public forest policy that occurred over a decade ago, current knowledge of both motorized and non-motorized recreation is not well-developed regarding the extent and intensity of effects at most spatial and temporal scales meaningful to wildlife populations (Gutzwiller et al., 2017). Wisdom et al. (2004a), Preisler et al. (2006, 2013), and Naylor et al. (2009) addressed some of these knowledge voids with their ungulate research in northeast Oregon, United States, and Ciuti et al. (2012) conducted a similar study in Alberta, Canada. Replication elsewhere and for many wildlife species, however, is lacking. Knowledge voids have likely contributed to ongoing public debate about recreational uses on public forests, particularly ATV riding (Asah et al., 2012a, 2012b). Public comments on National Forest travel management plans have been diverse and contentious (Yankoviak, 2005; Thompson, 2007), reflecting strong societal views in the face of limited knowledge and perceptions of overly restrictive federal policies (Adams and McCool, 2009).

In response to these issues, we studied effects of trail-based recreation on elk (*Cervus canadensis*), a wide-ranging North American ungulate highly sought for hunting and viewing on public forests, but that is sensitive to human activities, particularly to motorized traffic on forest roads (e.g., Lyon, 1983; Cole et al., 1997, 2004; Rowland et al., 2000, 2004; Frair et al., 2008; Montgomery et al., 2012, 2013; Prokopenko et al., 2016). We hypothesized that populations of elk would avoid trail-based recreation similarly to their avoidance of roads open to motorized traffic on public forests during non-hunting periods of late spring through early fall. We further hypothesized that avoidance would occur at distances that allow elk to stay out of view of recreationists, and that avoidance would be strongest in response to motorized recreation (ATV riding).

We tested our hypotheses by evaluating behavioral responses of elk to trail-based recreation using a manipulative landscape experiment in a 1453-ha enclosure on public forest in northeast Oregon. We had 2 objectives: (1) to document the degree of elk avoidance of trails during each recreation activity, compared to control periods of no activity; and (2) to evaluate direct, real-time responses of elk to recreationists during each type of recreation. We estimated distances between elk and the trails during recreation activities, and in real time between elk and recreationists based on simultaneous collection of telemetry locations of animals and humans. We provided context for interpreting results by estimating the distances at which elk could be viewed from the trails, per our hypothesis that avoidance occurs at distances that allow elk to hide from view. We also characterized differences in spatial distributions of elk during each type of recreation treatment versus paired control periods when no humans were present.

Research was conducted with approval and guidance by the Starkey Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC 92-F-0004), as required by the United States Animal Welfare Act of 1985. We followed protocols established by the IACUC for conducting ungulate research at the Starkey Experimental Forest and Range (Wisdom et al., 1993).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study area

Research was conducted from April-October 2003–2004 at the USDA Forest Service Starkey Experimental Forest and Range (Starkey), 35 km southwest of La Grande in northeast Oregon, USA (Fig. 1A). In 1987, approximately 10,125 ha of elk summer range within Starkey were enclosed with a 2.4 m (8-foot) elk-proof fence for long-term ungulate research (Rowland et al., 1997; Wisdom, 2005). Our study was conducted in the 1453-ha Northeast Study Area (Fig. 1A), which is separated from Starkey's other study areas by elk-proof fence (Wisdom et al., 2005). The Northeast Study Area is further subdivided by elk-proof fence into 2 pastures, East (842 ha) and West (610 ha) (Stewart et al., 2005). Approximately 98 elk occupied the East Pasture (69 adult females, 16 calves, and 13 adult males) and 25 occupied the West Pasture (18 adult females, 2 calves, and 5 adult males). Elk were last hunted in the study area in 1996 as part of a rifle hunt of males to evaluate their responses to motorized versus non-motorized hunting access (Wisdom et al., 2004b). Our research did not include hunting and focused on the non-hunting periods of late spring through early fall.

Approximately 70% of the area was forested, arranged in a mosaic of patches interspersed with thin-soiled grasslands. Forested areas were composed of dry or mixed conifer types common to the interior western United States (Wisdom et al., 2005). Dominant tree species included Ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), grand fir (*Abies grandis*), and western larch (*Larix occidentalis*). Approximately 50% of the forest types underwent commercial timber harvest from 1992 to 1994 that included clearcutting, seed tree, and shelterwood prescriptions applied as small (1–22 ha) harvest units interspersed with untreated stands (Wisdom et al., 2004b). Regeneration cuts established a mosaic of open and closed forest structural conditions, interspersed with the less common open grasslands (Wisdom, 2004b). Rowland et al.,(1997), Stewart et al. (2005), Wisdom (2005), and Naylor et al. (2009) provide details about the study area and past research.

2.2. Data collection

2.2.1. Recreation treatments and locations of recreationists

We implemented ATV riding, mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding as four separate types of recreation treatments to which elk responses were evaluated during spring-fall, 2003–2004. A given