Proceedings: National Workshop on Recreation Research and Management
February 8-10, 2005 Portland, Oregon
pages 107 and 108
http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/pnw_gtr698.pdf

3. Use science, stakeholder collaboration, and adaptive management to implement and fund recreation management decisions that address specific problems or issues.

In the abstract, there are probably two responses to these suggestions. The first, probably held most strongly by researchers in the audience, is that the list is old news. The other response, probably more common among managers, is sure they *sound* good, but they are too broad, idealistic, and impractical. Some of you may hold both opinions.

I agree the suggestions are old news, but do not agree they are idealistic or impractical. The primary barrier is a lack of administrative support for recreation programs. Not only is it possible to meet all of the recommendations, I believe it is the essence of ecosystem management (see, Clark et al. 1999, Cortner and Moote 1999; Gilmore 1997). To illustrate, I will present two examples of Forest Service reconciliation-based recreation management: a landscape-level, threatened plant protection program on the Wasatch Cache National Forest and a watershed-level motorized travel plan on the Dixie National Forest.

Case 1: Maguire's Primrose Protection in Logan Canyon

Maguire's primrose (*Primula maguirei*) is a threatened plant found only in northern Utah's Logan Canyon. The primrose grows primarily on rock faces and ledges, so wildlife officials and environmentalists asked the Forest Service to close Logan Canyon to rock climbing in the early 1990s. Predictably, local climbers opposed the action. Rather than forcing a trade-off between ecological protection and human use, Mead Hargis, a staff member on the Logan Ranger District, invited rock climbing groups to participate in a collaborative effort to create a plan they could support. The objective of the plan was to protect the primrose and to allow rock climbing to continue.

Forest staff agreed to close only the climbing routes where the primrose was found, but because there had never been a complete survey of the primrose, rock climbers agreed to map the plant's locations on all routes. In the years following the plan, the climbers designed and printed an informational brochure that identified closed routes, explained the climbing policy, and discussed low impact climbing techniques. Climbers also helped enforce the policy by talking to violators themselves and reporting violations to district staff. The climbers also agreed to help remap primrose locations after 5 years to monitor the policy. If monitoring found the primrose on other routes, those routes would be closed.

This case shows it is possible meet social *and* ecological protection goals if they are included in management objectives. Several management strategies were combined to meet the goals, and the strategies were based on empirical data and collaborative stewardship. Simply closing the canyon to climbing would meet only the plant protection goal. Likewise, setting a visitor capacity would make no sense. Although use limitations were used, they were minor and had nothing to do with the *number* of climbers. Through zoning, education, and enforcement, the primrose would be protected even if many more climbers used the canyon.

This project also met the ideal ecosystem management decision criteria: it was ecologically sustainable, socially acceptable, and, with rock climbers helping collect data and enforce the closures, it was economically feasible. Monitoring and adaptive management were also part of the initial decision, but unfortunately, they were never implemented. Several years after the plan was developed, Mead Hargis[3] left the ranger district, and current staff members say they do not have the budget or staff to continue the collaborative effort. Later, differences of opinion arose and new climbers moved to the area, and there has been a breakdown

[3] Mead Hargis is currently the wilderness manager on the Kamas Ranger District.

in both the implementation of the agreement and level of trust between the agency and the climbers.

Case 2: A Tale of Two Road Plans

Two different road designation plans in the same region of southern Utah illustrate differing orientations toward recreation objectives, management strategies, and implementation and funding. In 2002, the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GS) approved a road plan that was very contentious and has never been implemented. The plan called for closing 1,200 miles of roads, and it has fueled angry meetings and confrontations, editorial wars, and lawsuits. Local officials have torn out BLM road closure signs, and posted their own road signs, essentially trying to "designate" their own road system. The "resolution" of this conflict appears to be years away. While this may sound like the inevitable result of an inherently contentious, county rights/road ownership issue, it was not inevitable; it was the product of a top-down process driven by traditional conceptions of public involvement rather than collaboration.

In contrast, the Dixie National Forest, just to the north of the Grand Staircase, developed a motorized travel plan for the two most heavily used watersheds on the Cedar City Ranger District: the Duck Creek and Swains Creek watersheds (Carter and Meier 2005). While the plan required closing 60% of the road miles, it was approved in fall 2003 with no appeals or lawsuits, and the first phase was implemented in summer 2004. The planning region included many of the same officials and stakeholders as the GS, but the Dixie plan followed a more scientific and collaborative process, and some of the *staunchest opponents of the GS plan became active proponents of the Dixie plan*. One Garfield County Commissioner who was ripping up signs on the GS, even helped implement the Dixie plan by writing letters and contacting OHV leaders and asking for their support.

So what was different? For one, the scale of the Dixie's plan was smaller and more manageable, and some of the final decisions were made by officials in Washington DC (Thomas 2006). But the public involvement processes and the implicit objective of the travel plans also differed dramatically. Based on very broad public input obtained during the GS management planning process and a very spotty road analysis, the GS staff identified the road system internally and then tried to implement it by closing routes. This was perceived as a top-down road *closure* plan, and intended or not, a closure plan implies ecological protection is the sole objective. The objective of the Dixie plan was to designate a system that "addressed concerns for access, recreation experiences, wildlife, and resource protection" (Carter and Meier 2005). Both recreational and ecological protection objectives explicitly drove the plan and its implementation.

Dixie staff also made better use of data. They mapped all road segments, collected recreation use and impact data for each segment, and used a special places data set as a starting point for understanding important visitor destinations. District staff developed a detailed but user-friendly map of existing routes, including social and spur trails, which they used as both a public involvement and educational tool. The map was used in public meetings to identify key destinations, route preferences, and confusing and redundant routes. Forest staff also analyzed wildlife and trail and stream erosion issues and collected targeted data to help prioritize the environmental problems. Collaboration also played a key role as stakeholders reviewed the science results, and on-the-ground field trips allowed stakeholders to understand current conditions and make useful recommendations for closures, rerouting, and rehabilitation alternatives (Carter and Meier 2005, Thomas 2006).

Rather than simply closing roads, the Dixie project used a variety of implementation strategies. New maps, route identification and mileage signs, new road segments, and road rehabilitation work were implemented *first*, so people could see the tangible benefits of the road system. Barriers and closure signs went in