Walking the line: investigating ecological characteristics relating to wildlife linear feature use

E. Tattersall[a], K. Pigeon[b,c], D. MacNearney[d], L. Finnegan[a]

[a]fRI Research Caribou Program, Hinton, AB; [b]Yellowstone to Yukon, Canmore, AB; [c]University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, BC; [d]Environment and Climate Change Canada, Ottawa, ON

Background

In the western boreal forest, linear features from industrial development are central to the decline of woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) due to their use by caribou predators[1] (wolves, *Canis lupus*; bears, *Ursus arctos* and *U. americanus*) and alternate prey species[2,3] (moose, *Alces alces*; deer, *Odocoileus hemonius* and *O. virginianus*; and elk, *Cervus canadensis*). Linear feature restoration has been identified as a critical component of caribou conservation; however, for restoration to be effective it must rehabilitate specific linear feature characteristics that promote line use by these species.[4]

Objectives

- Investigate which local habitat characteristics correspond to linear feature use by caribou predators and alternate prey species

- Assess linear feature use for ungulates and bears as a function of vegetation occurring on lines and at line edges

Results

Chinchaga

Figure 2: Local habitat characteristics relating ease of movement and prey availability to linear feature use in the Chinchaga range

West-Central

Figure 3: Local habitat characteristics relating ease of movement and prey availability to linear feature use in the West-Central ranges

Vegetation

Figure 4: On-line vegetation corresponding to moose and deer linear feature use in the West-Central caribou ranges

Methods

Study area & sampling design

- Linear features (seismic lines, pipelines, old roads) within four caribou ranges in West-Central Alberta (Little Smoky, A La Peche, Redrock-Prairie Creek, and Narraway) and one caribou range in north-west Alberta (Chinchaga)
- Established sampling plots along linear features (0, 100, and 500 m from access road) during summers of 2014 and 2015


Figure 1: Overview of the linear feature footprints and sampling plots within West-Central and Chinchaga caribou ranges (BC seismic data unavailable in Chinchaga)

Table 1: Working hypotheses and model forms used to explore factors explaining wildlife use of linear features

Data collection & analysis

- Recorded wildlife track and sign for moose, deer, elk, canines and bears along linear features; measured forest and line characteristic data and vegetation percent cover on-line, at line edges, and off-line
- Built binomial mixed-effects models for each wildlife taxa corresponding to hypotheses 1-3, and binomial models corresponding to hypothesis 4 for ungulates and bears (Table 1); used backward selection to optimize model fit, and combined final variables from hypotheses 1-3 into a global model

Hypothesis	Description	Model covariates
1) Ease of movement	Trails, soil type, and on-line vegetation characteristics that influence movement along lines best explain wildlife use of linear features	humanTrail + gameTrail + DrySoil + MoistSoil + SpongySoil + WetSoil + Online_LateralVegCover + Online_VegHt
2) Risk avoidance	Surrounding forest characteristics and presence of humans or predators best explain wildlife use of linear features	Offline_TreeHt + Offline_LateralVegCover + Human + Bear + Canine
3) Prey availability	Presence of prey species best explain predator use of linear features	1) Moose + Deer + Elk + Caribou 2) AllPrey
4) Forage availability	Vegetation that provides forage subsidy best explains ungulate and bear use of linear features	Alnus + Betula + Carex + Forbs + Graminoids + Rhododendron + Salix + Trifolium + Vaccinium + VAVI

Conclusions

- All species use linear features for ease of movement (more likely to use linear features with game trails or human trails)

- Predators use linear features for prey availability

- Moose and deer use linear features for forage availability (*Salix* and *Betula* for moose, forbs for deer) in West-Central ranges

Management implications

To deter linear feature use by caribou predators and alternate prey species, **restoration should focus on creating movement barriers** that inhibit trail formation and **replacing early seral vegetation** that provide forage for moose and deer.

Twitter: @erin_tatt
Email: etattersall@friresearch.ca

fRI Research — Informing Land & Resource Management

References Cited

[1]DeMars, C. A., & Boutin, S. (2018). Nowhere to hide: Effects of linear features on predator–prey dynamics in a large mammal system. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 87(1), 274–284.
[2]Peters, W., Hebblewhite, M., Decesare, N., Cagnacci, F., & Musiani, M. (2013). Resource separation analysis with moose indicates threats to caribou in human altered landscapes. *Ecography*, 36, 487–498.
[3]Latham, A. D. M., Latham, M. C., Knopff, K. H., Hebblewhite, M., & Boutin, S. (2013). Wolves, white-tailed deer, and beaver: Implications of seasonal prey switching for woodland caribou declines. *Ecography*, 36, 1276–1290.
[4]Tattersall, E. R., Burgar, J. M., Fisher, J. T., & Burton, A. C. (2019). Mammal seismic line use varies with restoration: Applying habitat restoration to species at risk conservation in a working landscape. *Biological Conservation*, 241(November 2019), 108295.