

Field Measures of Wilderness Character

**Big Snowy Mountains
Wilderness Study Area**

2012

**Wilderness Institute
College of Forestry and Conservation
University of Montana**

By Anna Noson and Catherine Filardi

For more information please contact the Wilderness Institute

(406) 243-6936 or citizenscience@cfc.umt.edu

Executive Summary

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character collected in the Big Snowy Mountains Wilderness Study Area (WSA) on the Lewis and Clark National Forest in central Montana. During summer 2012, Wilderness Institute crews hiked trails within and leading into the WSA and made detailed field observations of measures related to the qualities of wilderness character identified in the Wilderness Act of 1964: untrammeled, natural, undeveloped, and opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Wilderness Institute field leaders led eight trips with 37 community volunteers and covered 116 miles of system trails and 1.5 miles of non-system trails.

Monitoring highlights include:

- **Trail Coverage:** Field crews encountered a number of challenges accessing some of the system trails displayed on Forest Service maps. As a result, only 75% of mapped system trails were monitored; conditions on-the-ground point to a need for better signage and labeled trail closures, as well as updated maps that accurately depict currently existing trails and address public/private trailhead access issues.
- **Weeds:** 105 weed patches were recorded, representing 5 species. Of these, 81 (77%) were recorded within the WSA boundary. Canada Thistle and Houndstongue represented 51% and 31% respectively of all weed patches. Estimated total acres infested were 1.7, with 0.6 acres occurring within the WSA boundary. Twenty-six (25%) of patches were pulled or partially pulled.
- **Wildlife:** A total of 29 wildlife encounters were reported. Canid species (e.g. coyote) were most prevalent (55%), followed by bear (41%). The majority (97%) of encounters were indirect (e.g. tracks, scat, or other sign), with a single visual observation of a bull elk.
- **Erosion:** Erosion due to recreation was documented at 8 stream sites. Four showed signs of moderate erosion, three had slight erosion, and one (located outside the WSA at the East Fork Cottonwood Creek (#489) trailhead) was severely eroded.
- **Installations and developments:** A total of 48 installations and developments were reported, 36 within the WSA boundary. Cairns and fences were most common (44% and 21%, respectively), but two latrines, a corral, bridge, and hitching post were also observed.
- **Signs:** A total of 101 signs were encountered along trails, 60 of which were within the WSA boundary. Most signs were trail junction/directions (54%), followed by recreational use (22%), and interpretive (4%). The majority (65%) were in good condition.
- **Trail Closure Devices:** No trail closures were recorded in the study area.
- **Trail width:** Deviation from single-track (e.g. braided or double-track) was recorded for 2.5 miles of trail within the WSA, but trip notes suggest this number is likely low due to incomplete start/stop data for this measure, and the existence of old road beds as trail foundations for some system trails.
- **Non-system trails:** 1.5 miles of non-system trails were surveyed, including 11 non-system trails or trail fragments. Time constraints in the field limited complete surveying of all non-system trails.

- **Mechanized and motorized use:** Evidence of motorized or mechanized use was recorded at 8 locations within the WSA, and included evidence from 5 ATVs, 2 bicycles, and 1 vehicle.
- **Trailheads and people encounters:** The highest vehicle and people numbers were documented near Crystal Cascades (#445) and Half Moon Creek (#493) trailheads, with no people encountered on most trails. The majority (81%) were hiker/backpackers, and 85% of groups consisted of 2 or fewer people.
- **Noise intrusions:** A total of 25 noise sampling sessions were completed (9 morning, 9 midday, and 7 evening). No noise was heard during 60% of noise sampling sessions. The majority of noises heard were airplanes (81%), followed by cows (13%), and a single intrusion by people. Outside of noise sampling sessions, an additional 206 noise intrusions were recorded within the WSA boundary during trail monitoring, 99% of which were airplanes.
- **Visual intrusions:** Visual intrusions were primarily limited to trails traversing the spine of the mountains, including cities or towns (38%), agriculture (23%), buildings (15%), and highways (15%).
- **Campsites:** 19 campsites were recorded. Most (74%) were located on the Uhlhorn trail (#493), with four clustered on Knife Blade Ridge. Of the campsites monitored, 42% were minimally impacted, 53% were moderately impacted, and one site was highly impacted.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
INTRODUCTION.....	5
TRAIL COVERAGE.....	6
DATA MANAGEMENT.....	7
FIELD MEASURES OF WILDERNESS CHARACTER.....	9
I. UNTRAMMELED QUALITY	9
Weed Control Action	9
II. NATURAL QUALITY	10
Weeds	11
Water Erosion	21
III. UNDEVELOPED QUALITY	22
Installations and Developments	22
Mine Prospects	23
Signs	23
Trail Closure Devices.....	25
IV. SOLITUDE OR PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION QUALITY.....	25
Trail Width	25
Evidence of Mechanized and Motorized Use on Trails	26
Non-system Trails	28
Trailheads.....	30
Encounters with People.....	30
Noise	32
Visual Intrusions.....	33
Campsites.....	35
V. FOREST SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES	37
LITERATURE CITED	37
APPENDIX 1. MONITORING ATTRIBUTES.....	39
APPENDIX 2. SUMMARY OF FIELD NOTES AND TRAIL CONDITIONS.....	42
APPENDIX 3. CAMPSITE INVENTORY & CONDITION	45
APPENDIX 4. CAMPSITE CONDITION EVALUATION WORKSHEET	65

List of Tables

Table 1. Number of weed patches where weed control action was taken.	9
Table 2. Evidence of mechanized and motorized use.....	27
Table 3. Summary of vehicles at trailheads.	30
Table 4. Number of people encountered on trails by recreational activity.....	31
Table 5. Summary of visual intrusions by type.	34
Table 6. Number of campsites by impact evaluation score class.	35

List of Figures

Figure 1. System trails monitored within the Big Snowy Mountains WSA in 2012.	7
Figure 2. Location of pulled weed patches and extent of mapped weed infestations.....	10
Figure 3. Number of weed patches by species	11
Figure 4. Distribution of observed weed species.....	12
Figure 5. Number of weed patches by size class (acres).....	13
Figure 6. Distribution of weed patches by species and size.	14
Figure 7. Number of weed patches by density and size.	15
Figure 8. Total area of weed patches and estimated acres infested by species.....	15
Figure 9. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with weed patches.	16
Figure 10. Ecosystem type and dominant lifeform associated with weed species.	17
Figure 11. Habitat type classification associated with weed species in forest.....	18
Figure 12. Distance of weed patches from water by species.	19
Figure 13. Number of wildlife encounters by species or family and detection type.....	20
Figure 14. Location of wildlife encounters.....	20
Figure 15. Location of erosion sites encountered and severity of erosion (all were streams).....	21
Figure 16. Number of installations and developments by type.....	22
Figure 17. Locations and types of installations and developments.....	23
Figure 18. Number of signs by type and condition.	24
Figure 19. Location and condition of signs.	24
Figure 20. Trail width by category.....	26
Figure 21. Location of evidence of mechanized and motorized use by type.	28
Figure 22. Number of non-system trails by trail type and location.	29
Figure 23. Locations of non-system trails and monitoring status	29
Figure 24. Location of encounters with people along trails.	31
Figure 25. Mean duration of noise intrusions by a) source, and b) time of day.	32
Figure 26. Location, source, and intensity of all opportunistic noise intrusions heard within the WSA... 33	33
Figure 27. Visual intrusions by type seen from within the WSA.....	34
Figure 28. Location and impact class of campsites.....	36
Figure 29. Proportion of campsites by impact ranking.....	36
Figure 30. Number of campsites by landform category and impact class.....	37

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Big Snowy Mountains Wilderness Study Area on the Lewis and Clark National Forest in central Montana. This WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by the U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain the wilderness character of WSAs as it existed in 1977. In 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, collaborated with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop field measures of the four qualities of wilderness character identified in the Wilderness Act of 1964 ([Pub.L. 88-577](#)) and described by Landres et al (2008) in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System*. This report summarizes 2012 field monitoring data in the Big Snowy Mountains WSA for selected measures of these four wilderness character qualities: 1) untrammled, 2) natural, 3) undeveloped and 4) opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation.

During summer 2012, Wilderness Institute crews hiked every trail in the WSA and made detailed observations related to these qualities. Measures of naturalness focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and streambank erosion. Undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation included trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of mechanized and motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. The single measure of the untrammled quality of the area was opportunistic weed pulling by Wilderness Institute crews (all other measures of untrammled require non-field related work). Results for 16 features (attribute groups; see Appendix 1) are reported here, often accompanied by tables and figures.

Please note that this project emphasized collection of quantifiable field data appropriate for collection with GIS-based technology. Many aspects of wilderness character were not evaluated as part of this project, either because non-field measures were required (e.g. agency actions that impact trammeling or recreation opportunities) or because data collection was beyond the scope of this project (e.g. air and water quality data). This report represents a snap-shot of on-the-ground conditions within the Big Snowy Mountains WSA, and does not attempt to infer how measured qualities of wilderness character may be changing over time, or evaluate the efficacy of current management approaches. To do so would require repeated monitoring efforts over a period of years, and the inclusion of non-field measures of wilderness character as outlined in "Keeping it Wild." This report does, however, create a current baseline that will enable subsequent assessments to expose how certain measures of wilderness character are changing. For a detailed description of wilderness character monitoring, please see: <http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=WC>.

This project was conducted as part of the Wilderness Institute's Citizen Science Program, which has recruited community volunteers to help monitor selected components of wilderness character in designated Wilderness and WSAs since 2005. Wilderness Institute field leaders led small groups of volunteers on multi-day backcountry trips, surveying all mapped trails within the WSA as well as non-system (user-created) trails. Eight trips were conducted with xx volunteers. This program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, the University of Montana, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information please contact us at: citizenscience@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-6936.

TRAIL COVERAGE

The WSA has approximately 91 miles of system trails within the boundary. However, field crews repeatedly encountered mapped system trail segments that they were unable to traverse (see below). As a result, only 68.9 miles (75%) of system trails within the WSA boundary were monitored, along with 17.1 miles of trail leading into or adjacent to the WSA (Figure 1). An additional 1.4 mile decommissioned section of the Big Snowy trail (#650) was also monitored from the old trailhead because the closure was not apparent on site. Portions of the following system trails were not surveyed, as illustrated in Figure 1 (please also see Appendix 2 for additional information on these trails):

- #410: Monitoring northward from junction with #493, the trail became overgrown and very difficult to follow. The northern end of the trail (originating on private property) was scouted and appeared easy to follow, however time constraints prevented monitoring southward to establish where the trail degrades.
- #494: Northeastern portion of this trail was monitored from Old Baldy until trail turned into FS road 8956.
- #652: Extensive network of ATV trails come off of #652, making it arduous to monitor and difficult to distinguish between system and user-created trails. Only the portion of trail between forest road 6950 and Swimming Woman Creek was monitored.
- #671: Western side of this loop trail off of #652 was monitored. Locked gate was encountered at bottom of loop and eastern side of trail was not monitored.
- #406: Trail ends at Lime Cave Peak. Forest map indicates trail continues to Jump Off Peak, but no trail was found.
- Green Pole Canyon (spur off of #406): Trail not found.
- #481: Approaching from the north, trail deteriorates then disappears; southern portion to junction with #490 not found.
- #490: Trail deteriorates just west of junction with #403 and then disappears.
- #483 and western end of #490: Trails began on private land and were not surveyed.

Wilderness Character Monitoring Blue Joint Wilderness Study Area

2009

Wilderness Institute

College of Forestry and Conservation

University of Montana

By Michael Krebs, Sarah Potenza, Laurie Yung and Catherine Filardi

For more information please contact the Wilderness Institute

at (406) 243-5361 or wi@cfc.umt.edu.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES	2
LIST OF FIGURES.....	3
INTRODUCTION	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
DATA MANAGEMENT	7
Protocol Development	7
Data Collection	7
Data Analysis	7
WILDERNESS CHARACTER MEASUREMENTS.....	8
Untrammelled Quality.....	8
Weeds Control Action.....	8
Natural Quality	10
Weeds	10
Wildlife Encounters.....	22
Lakeshore or Streambank Erosion	25
Data Summary	26
Undeveloped Quality.....	28
Installations and Developments	28
Signage.....	30
Trail Closure Devices.....	33
Data Summary	33
Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation Quality.....	34
Trail Width	34
Evidence of Motorized Use.....	36
Non-System Trails	39
Trailheads.....	44
People Encounters	45
Noise	45

Visual Intrusions.....	46
Campsites.....	47
Data Summary	54
LITERATURE CITED	55
APPENDIX 1 - Database Attributes and Associated Descriptions	56
APPENDIX 2 - Campsite Inventories.....	60
APPENDIX 3 - Impact Index Worksheet	87
APPENDIX 4 – Signs.....	89

List of Tables

Table 1. Weed patch distance to water.

Table 2. Elevation of weed patches.

Table 3. Slope of weed patches.

Table 4. Aspect of weed patches.

Table 5. Summary of evidence of motorized use.

Table 6. Number of vehicles, horse trailers, and ORV trailers reported at trailheads.

Table 7. Number of damaged trees reported for campsites.

Table 8. Number of trees with exposed roots reported for campsites.

Table 9. Extent of development reported for campsites.

Table 10. Extent of cleanliness reported for campsites.

Table 11. Number of social trails associated with campsites.

Table 12. Amount of barren area associated with campsites.

Table 13. Amount of exposed mineral soil associated with campsites.

Table 14. Percent cover of off-site vegetation associated with campsites.

Table 15. Percent cover of off-site mineral soil associated with campsites.

Table 15. Number of vehicles, horse trailers, and ORV trailers reported at trailheads.

Table 16. Campsite impact index summary for reported campsites.

Table 17. Description of motorized noises.

List of Figures

Figure 1. Locations where weeds were hand-pulled by Wilderness Institute crews.

Figure 2. Number of weed patches by species.

Figure 3. Locations of mapped weeds by species.

Figure 4. Number of weed patches in each size-class.

Figure 5. Locations of weed patches by size-class.

Figure 6. Percent cover class of recorded weed patches.

Figure 7. Phenological phase of recorded weed patches.

Figure 8. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with mapped weed patches.

Figure 9. Lifeforms associated with weed patches.

Figure 10. Forest climax series associated with weed patches.

Figure 11. Dominant/characteristic understory vegetation associated with mapped weed patches.

Figure 12. Largest tree diameter found within 15 and 50 feet of weed patches.

Figure 13. Number of wildlife encounters by species.

Figure 14. Location of wildlife encounters by species.

Figure 15. Number of wildlife encounters by species and type.

Figure 16. Location of impacted stream banks by severity.

Figure 17. Number of installations and developments.

Figure 18. Locations of installations and developments.

Figure 19. Number of signs by type and condition.

Figure 20. Locations of signs by type.

Figure 21. Locations of signs by condition.

Figure 22. Trail lengths by width.

Figure 23. Trail widths.

Figure 24. Location of motorbike tracks.

Figure 25. Summary of non-system trail type.

Figure 26. Length of non-system trail by type and length.

Figure 27. Locations of non-system trail by type.

Figure 28. Non-system trail origin and which trails were completely mapped.

Figure 29. Non-system trails that were fully mapped (finished) and not fully mapped (not finished).

Figure 30. Visual intrusions (developments) located outside of the Wilderness Study Area that can be seen from within the Wilderness Study Area.

Figure 31. Spatial distribution of campsites recorded in the Blue Joint Wilderness Study Area in 2009.

Figure 32. Locations of signs observed in the Blue Joint Wilderness Area.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Blue Joint Wilderness Study Area (WSA) on the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana. The Blue Joint WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by the U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain wilderness character. During spring 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, worked with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop indicators of wilderness character related to the four qualities of wilderness character described by Landres and coauthors in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System* (2008). The findings summarized here will be utilized by the Forest Service to understand different aspects of wilderness character in the Blue Joint WSA.

During summer 2009, we hiked every trail in the Blue Joint WSA and made detailed observations related to the untrammeled, natural and undeveloped qualities of the area, and opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation. Our naturalness measures focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and streambank erosion. Our undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Our measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation included trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of motorized use in places that are not designated for motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. Our only measure of the untrammeled quality of the area was weed pulling by our own crews (all other measures of untrammeled require non-field related work). Results for more than 50 field measures are reported here, often accompanied by tables and maps. The field data was combined with GIS-derived measures such as elevation and longitude and latitude. Please note that sampling of recreational users and wildlife (items that are not stationary) was opportunistic (recorded if field crews happened to encounter people or wildlife), but that all other indicators were comprehensively monitored from all system trails.

Monitoring was conducted by Wilderness Institute field leaders and small groups of community volunteers on multi-day backcountry trips. Four trips were conducted with 25 volunteers who covered 86 trail miles and worked 980 hours total. These trips were open to anyone who wished to participate. In addition to data collection, crews also hand-pulled weeds and conducted other restoration activities related to the maintenance and propagation of native plants. This project was conducted as part of our Citizen Science Program and built on five years of monitoring invasives and campsites in designated wilderness in Montana and Idaho. The Citizen Science Program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information on monitoring protocols or results, or on the Wilderness Institute, please contact us at: wi@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-5361.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Seventy-three weed infestations containing seven known noxious weed species and covering more than 70 acres were reported. Knapweed and sulfur cinquefoil were most prevalent (62%). Most weed patches (67%) were mapped in Douglas-fir and lodgepole pine climax series types dominated by beargrass, bluejoint, and snowberry understories. Most patches (77%) were more than 10 feet from water, and less than or equal to 0.1 acres in size (71%). Weed patches were primarily associated with trails (74%), but also associated with burned areas (68%).
- Three bears and four pikas were observed and 180 carnivore scat piles recorded.
- Areas along twenty-two streambanks were identified as being slightly or moderately impacted by recreational use.
- Fifty-three installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational) were observed. These included 23 water bars, 7 cairns, 5 bridges, 2 water diversions, 2 lookouts, 1 cabin, and 1 corral.
- Twenty-two signs were observed. Most (59%) were in good condition. One was missing and two were illegible.
- Only one trail closure device was encountered (a berm near the trailhead of Trail #223/Little Blue Joint Trail on the eastern Wilderness Study Area boundary).
- Ninety-three percent of the trails were single-track width.
- Evidence of motorized use on trails included motorbike tracks on over 35 km of trail.
- Nineteen non-system trails were identified and 10 were fully surveyed. Most (68%) were new routes created by recreational use (type of use usually unclear, but one route appeared to be created by an ATV and eight appeared to be created by foot travel) as opposed to older, preexisting road beds from mining or other historic activities (27%).
- Three separate groups were encountered with two people each (two mountain bikers and four hikers/backpackers).
- Six motorized noises were recorded. One was an ATV and one was a vehicle on a nearby road. Sources for the other four were not identified. Half were less than one minute in duration and half were far in the distance.
- Twelve visual intrusions were recorded (all dirt roads outside the WSA visible from within the WSA).
- Twenty-six campsites were inventoried and mapped. Impacts to campsites included: social trails (58%), exposed roots (65%), remnant trash and/or fire rings/scars (58%), at least one damaged tree (84%), and at least ten damaged trees (44%). More than half (68%) had little or no development. Nearly half (46%) were lightly impacted overall and nearly a quarter (23%) were not impacted at all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Biophysical background.....	4
Sociopolitical background.....	7
Wilderness character background	9
A framework for monitoring wilderness character	9
Forest Service Region 1 interpretation of minimum protocol.....	10
Wilderness character monitoring in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).....	10
Report background	10
Report contributors	11
Summary of HPBH WSA wilderness character monitoring measures	13
Summary of HPBH WSA wilderness character monitoring trends.....	15
Wilderness Character Monitoring Measures	19
Natural Quality	19
Measure 1-1 Number of indigenous species listed as threatened, endangered, sensitive, or of concern	19
Measure 1-2 Percentage of monitored whitebark pine with evidence of mountain pine beetle	21
Measure 1-3 Percentage of monitored whitebark pine with evidence of white pine blister rust.....	23
Measure 1-4 Average number of whitebark pine seedlings per monitored site	28
Measure 1-5 Number of non-indigenous, non-plant species.....	29
Measure 1-6 Abundance and distribution of indigenous and non-indigenous aquatic species.....	30
Measure 1-7 Percent of area occupied by non-indigenous, invasive plant species.....	34
Measure 1-8 Number of invasive plant species.....	37
Measure 1-9 Acres of grazing allotments with authorized use.....	38
Measure 1-10 Average decidview	41
Measure 1-11 Average sum of anthropogenic fine nitrate and sulfate	42
Measure 1-12 Concentration of sulfur in precipitation	43
Measure 1-13 Concentration of nitrate in precipitation.....	44
Measure 1-14 Extent and magnitude of human-caused stream bank erosion	46
Measure 1-15 Assessment of overall stream water quality	49
Measure 1-16 Percentage of WSA in fire regime condition class two or three.....	50
Solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation quality	52
Measure 2-1 Total estimated site visits.....	52
Measure 2-2 Proportion of trail contacts in high use corridors.....	53
Measure 2-3 Campsite index.....	56
Measure 2-4 Acres affected by travel or access routes within WSA.....	58

**Wilderness Character Monitoring Report
Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn
Wilderness Study Area**

U.S. Forest Service, Region 1
Gallatin National Forest



OCTOBER 2012

Erin Clark, writer/editor
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
2011 Wilderness Fellow

Kimberly Schlenker
Gallatin National Forest
Wilderness and Recreation Program Manager

Catherine Filardi
University of Montana Wilderness Institute
Citizen Science Program Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Gallatin National Forest, in cooperation with the University of Montana, recently completed an updated wilderness character monitoring report for the Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area (HPBH WSA). The Forest has been engaged in documenting changes to wilderness character for over a decade, in preparation for revisions to the Gallatin National Forest Travel Management Plan. This report builds on Schlenker (2003) to better articulate baseline data describing wilderness character in the HPBH WSA.

Recent efforts to standardize wilderness character monitoring (e.g. Landres et al. 2005; Landres et al. 2008) have provided an improved structure and template for building wilderness character monitoring assessments. These efforts are guided by the 1964 Wilderness Act itself, using the statutory language of the Act to identify four qualities of wilderness: "untrammeled", "natural", "undeveloped" and "solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation". These four qualities, with associated indicators and measures, structured and informed the wilderness character monitoring efforts reported here for the HPBH WSA. Additionally, the Forest Service Northern Region recently provided an interpretation of "baseline" wilderness character measures appropriate for designated Wilderness in the Northern Region that are largely applicable to the Region's WSAs as well. This interpretation was also used to identify measures and structure reporting for the HPBH WSA. The ultimate intent of this assessment is to employ standardized monitoring protocols for a set of measures that address each monitoring question and indicator, are easily replicated, and capitalize on readily available data from ongoing monitoring efforts across the Greater Yellowstone Area.

This report makes no attempt to characterize trend. Rather, this effort clearly establishes a "baseline" of wilderness conditions in the HPBH WSA as a snapshot in time. Historic data that mirrors this protocol is largely lacking for most elements, so trend assessments are not yet possible. Additionally, prior to assessing trend following the next round of monitoring, the Forest will need to establish what constitutes "significant change" thresholds, and assign weights for each measure that reflect local and regional importance. Table 3 in this report sets up the format for aggregating data following subsequent monitoring efforts. Please refer to Table 8 in *Keeping it Wild* (Landres et al. 2008) for an example of a populated wilderness character monitoring trend summary.

This monitoring effort makes no decisions, but rather is simply an aggregation of what was learned through on-the-ground monitoring efforts in 2011, combined with existing data relevant to the specific measures. This report provides a solid basis for documenting future changes in wilderness character across this landscape, and can help inform proposed managerial actions and quantify their impact on the wilderness character of the HPBH WSA.

Measure 2-5	Acres within WSA affected by travel routes outside area	60
Measure 2-6	Number of agency-provided recreational facilities and developments.....	62
Measure 2-7	Number of user-created recreation facilities.....	63
Measure 2-8	Trail miles in developed condition classes 3 to 5.....	64
Measure 2-9	Number of outfitter and guide assigned sites	67
Measure 2-10	Trail miles / acres with restricted use	69
Measure 2-11	Number of additional management restrictions	73
Undeveloped quality	75
Measure 3-1	Number of authorized non-recreational physical installations and developments	75
Measure 3-2	Number of unauthorized non-recreational physical installations and developments	76
Measure 3-3	Acres of inholdings	77
Measure 3-4	Number of trail segments with evidence of unauthorized motorized or mechanized vehicle use.....	79
Untrammeled quality	81
Measure 4-1	Acres with noxious weed mitigation actions.....	81
Measure 4-2	Acres of vegetation planted	82
Measure 4-3	Percent of naturally ignited wildfires that receive a suppression response.....	84
Measure 4-4	Acres of prescribed fire.....	85
Measure 4-5	Number of lakes and other waterbodies stocked with fish.....	86
Measure 4-6	Number of human-caused fire starts	88
Considered, Unimplemented measures	90
References	94
Appendices	97
Appendix A: Region 1 wilderness character monitoring protocols	97
Appendix B: Campsite condition evaluation worksheet	103	
Appendix C: Summer interim travel order.....	105	
Appendix D: Winter interim travel order	108	

List of Figures

Figure 1. HPBH WSA location within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem	5
Figure 2. HPBH WSA.....	6
Figure 3. Mountain pine beetle evidence across whitebark pine monitoring sites, 2004-2011	26
Figure 4. Blister rust evidence across whitebark pine monitoring sites, 2004-2011.....	27
Figure 5. Number of whitebark pine trees <1.4 meters in height across whitebark pine monitoring sites, 2004-2011.	29
Figure 6. Distribution of invasive plants by species, 2011.....	36
Figure 7. Authorized grazing allotments, 2011.....	40
Figure 8. United States sulfate ion concentration, 2010.....	43
Figure 9. NADP/NTN site WY08 annual SO4 concentrations, 1980-2010.....	44

Figure 10. United States nitrate ion concentration, 2010	45
Figure 11. NADP/NTN site WY08 annual NO ₃ concentrations, 1980-2010.....	46
Figure 12. Human-caused erosion sites and severity, 2011	48
Figure 13. Trail contacts and group sizes, 2011	55
Figure 14. Campsites, 2011.....	57
Figure 15. Area within WSA affected by system or non-system trails, 2011.....	59
Figure 16. Impact area of open roads in WSA vicinity	61
Figure 17. Trail classes and mileage, 2011	66
Figure 18. Outfitter and guide assigned sites, 2011.....	68
Figure 19. Interim summer trails	71
Figure 20. Snowmobile trail and open area.....	72
Figure 21. Inholdings, 2011.....	78
Figure 22. Trail segments with evidence of unauthorized vehicle use, 2011	80
Figure 23. Whitebark pine plantings, 2002 & 2003	83

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of travel management, 1977 to 2011	8
Table 2. Summary of all implemented HPBH WSA wilderness character monitoring measures	13
Table 3. Wilderness character trend summary framework for the HPBH WSA.....	15
Table 4. Threatened, endangered, sensitive, or species of concern, 2011.....	20
Table 5. Non-indigenous, non-plant species present within 3 miles.....	30
Table 6. Indigenous trout distribution and genetic purity for HPBH WSA streams.....	31
Table 7. Non-indigenous trout distribution and genetic purity for HPBH WSA streams	32
Table 8. Acres within the HPBH WSA occupied by invasive plant species.....	35
Table 9. Invasive plant species present, 2003 & 2011.....	38
Table 10. Erosion severity by water body type.....	47
Table 11. Agency-provided recreational facilities and developments	63
Table 12. User-created recreational facilities.....	64
Table 13. National trail management condition classes	65
Table 14. Summary of trail use restrictions, 2011.....	70
Table 15. Summary of active additional management restrictions, 2011.....	74
Table 16. Authorized non-recreational installations and developments	76
Table 17. History of fish stocking, 1943-present.....	87

INTRODUCTION

BIOPHYSICAL BACKGROUND

The Hyalite Porcupine Buffalo Horn (HPBH) Wilderness Study Area (WSA) is located on the Gallatin National Forest in south-central Montana. The HPBH WSA consists of approximately 155,000 acres of the northern Gallatin Range between the Gallatin and Yellowstone Rivers. It extends southward from the Hyalite Peaks area along the Gallatin crest to the northwestern corner of Yellowstone National Park. The HPBH WSA is approximately 36 miles in length and between four and 12 miles in width.

The HPBH WSA's topography is highly variable. The northern portion of the study area contains jagged peaks, U-shaped valleys, and cirque basins. A more moderate topography is found in the remainder of the WSA. Elevations range from approximately 5,500 feet to over 10,300 feet. Prominent peaks include Mount Blackmore, Mount Bole, Hyalite Peak, Eaglehead Mountain, and Fortress Mountain. Major streams include the headwaters of Hyalite, Bozeman, Trail, Eightmile, Big, Rock, Tom Miner, Buffalo Horn, Porcupine, Portal, Moose, Swan, Squaw, and South Cottonwood creeks. The City of Bozeman is dependent on the Bozeman and Hyalite drainages for municipal water, and the headwaters of both are partially contained within the HPBH WSA.

The HPBH WSA supports diverse vegetation communities. At the lowest elevations grasslands are found, which then transition into Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and/or limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*) stands. At higher elevations, lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), spruce, and subalpine forests are found. The highest elevations contain whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) and, beyond the timberline, alpine tundra or alpine turf. Forested portions of the HPBH WSA are affected by mountain pine beetle epidemics, dwarf mistletoe, spruce budworm, and white pine blister rust. Riparian areas within the HPBH WSA support wetland vegetation and are influenced by high soil moisture. These areas are highly productive and provide protection against erosional forces.

The variety of HPBH WSA habitats provide for a wide range of wildlife species. Important species found within the WSA include bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*), Rocky Mountain elk (*Cervus canadensis*), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*), moose (*Alces alces*), wolverine (*Gulo gulo*), Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*), westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkia lewisi*), Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkia bouvieri*), and whitebark pine. The HPBH WSA falls within the purview of interagency efforts to manage and study grizzly bear and whitebark pine communities.

Field Measures of Wilderness Character

**Middle Fork Judith River
Wilderness Study Area**

2012

**Wilderness Institute
College of Forestry and Conservation
University of Montana**

By Anna Noson and Catherine Filardi

For more information please contact the Wilderness Institute

(406) 243-6936 or citizenscience@cfc.umt.edu

Executive Summary

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character collected in 2012 in the Middle Fork Judith River Wilderness Study Area on the Lewis and Clark National Forest in central Montana. During summer 2012, Wilderness Institute crews hiked every trail in the WSA and made detailed field observations of measures related to the qualities of wilderness character identified in the Wilderness Act of 1964: untrammeled, natural, undeveloped, and opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Wilderness Institute field leaders led eight trips with 23 community volunteers and covered 77.1 miles of system trails and 6.7 miles of non-system trails (NSTs).

Monitoring highlights include:

- **Trail Coverage:** 96% of system trails within the WSA boundary were monitored. Trail access and coverage was not always straight-forward, largely due to inconsistencies between visitor use maps, USGS quads, and available forest service geospatial layers.
- **Middle Fork Corridor Summary:** This high-use corridor contained a convoluted network of roads and trails with multiple stream crossings and human-mediated disturbance. Field crews documented 26% of the WSA's weed patches, 65% of erosion sites, and 73% of ATV sightings along this corridor.
- **Weeds:** 178 weed patches were recorded (84% of these within the WSA), representing seven species. Canada Thistle and Houndstongue were most prevalent (25% and 45%, respectively, of all weed patches).
- **Wildlife:** A total of 36 wildlife encounters were reported. Canid species (e.g. coyote) were most prevalent (50%), followed by bear (33%), elk (6%), and a single encounter with pika, mule deer, and moose. The majority (86%) of encounters were indirect (e.g. tracks, scat, or other sign).
- **Erosion:** Erosion due to recreation was documented at 51 stream crossings, 44 inside the WSA. All 23 sites with severe erosion were located within the first 5 miles of the Middle Fork Judith River trail (#437).
- **Installations and developments:** A total of 96 installations and developments were reported, 88 within the WSA boundary. Cairns and fences were most common (31% and 29%, respectively). Two outfitter camps contained 28% of developments.
- **Signs:** A total of 104 signs were encountered along trails, 72 of which were within the WSA. Most signs were trail junction/directions or recreational use (37% and 34%, respectively), with <5% trail markers or interpretive. Remaining signs included survey markers and missing signs (posts with no sign, on the ground, or in pieces). The majority (58%) were in good condition.
- **Non-system trails:** A total of 18 NSTs or trail fragments covering 6.7 miles were mapped; 33% were associated with motorcycles or ATVs. NST origin was predominantly reported as newly created by recreation (70%). In several areas, trail designations were not clear on the ground due to insufficient signage, regularly used non-system trails, and trails that appeared on visitor maps but not in current USFS GIS geospatial data for system trails.
- **Mechanized and motorized use:** Indirect evidence of mechanized use (e.g. tracks) were recorded at 24 locations, 17 of which were within the WSA boundary. The majority of documented use was by motorcycles (54%), followed by ATVs (33%). Bicycle tracks were

observed on 3 trail segments outside the WSA boundary. Evidence of heavy use along the Middle Fork Judith River corridor was noted in trip reports.

- **People encounters:** The majority of the 91 people encountered were on ATV or motorcycle (42% and 35%, respectively), with ATV encounters clustered along the Middle Fork Judith River trail.
- **Noise intrusions:** A total of 29 noise-sampling sessions were completed (11 morning, 9 midday, and 11 evening). A noise intrusion was documented during 78% of sessions. The majority of noises heard were airplanes (74%), followed by motorized vehicles (17%), and a single intrusion by people. Outside of noise sampling sessions, an additional 230 noise intrusions were recorded within the WSA boundary during trail monitoring, 92% of which were airplanes.
- **Visual intrusions:** Five visual intrusions were observed from within the WSA, including buildings visible on a private inholding, the Showdown Ski Area, and cities/towns in the far distance.
- **Campsites:** 32 campsites were recorded within the WSA boundary. Based on the summary impact evaluation scores, 13% were minimally impacted, 44% were moderately impacted, 34% were highly impacted, and 6% were extremely impacted.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
INTRODUCTION.....	5
TRAIL COVERAGE.....	6
DATA MANAGEMENT.....	7
FIELD MEASURES OF WILDERNESS CHARACTER.....	9
I. UNTRAMMELED QUALITY.....	9
Weed Control Action.....	9
II. NATURAL QUALITY.....	10
Weeds.....	11
Water Erosion.....	20
III. UNDEVELOPED QUALITY.....	22
Installations and Developments.....	22
Mine Prospects.....	23
Signs.....	24
Trail Closure Devices.....	25
IV. SOLITUDE OR PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION QUALITY.....	27
Trail Width.....	27
Evidence of Mechanized and Motorized Use on Trails.....	28
Non-system Trails.....	30
Trailheads.....	32
Encounters with People.....	33
Noise.....	35
Visual Intrusions.....	39
Campsites.....	40
V. FOREST SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES.....	44
LITERATURE CITED.....	44
APPENDIX 1. MONITORING ATTRIBUTES.....	45
APPENDIX 2. SUMMARY OF FIELD NOTES AND TRAIL CONDITIONS.....	49
APPENDIX 3. CAMPSITE INVENTORY & CONDITION.....	52
APPENDIX 4. CAMPSITE CONDITION EVALUATION WORKSHEET.....	85

List of Tables

Table 1. Number of weed patches where weed control action was taken.	9
Table 2. Evidence of mechanized and motorized use.....	29
Table 3. Summary of vehicles at trailheads.	33
Table 4. Number of people encountered on trails by recreational activity.....	33
Table 5. Summary of visual intrusions by type.	39
Table 6. Number of campsites by impact evaluation score class.	41

List of Figures

Figure 1. System trails monitored within the Middle Fork Judith River WSA in 2012.....	7
Figure 2. Location of pulled weed patches and extent of mapped weed infestations.....	10
Figure 3. Number of weed patches by species	11
Figure 4. Distribution of observed weed species	12
Figure 5. Number of weed patches by size class (acres).....	13
Figure 6. Distribution of large weed patches (>0.1 acres) by species and size class	14
Figure 7. Number of weed patches by density and size.	15
Figure 8. Total area of weed patches and estimated acres infested by species.....	15
Figure 9. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with weed patches.	16
Figure 10. Ecosystem type and dominant lifeform associated with weed patches.	17
Figure 11. Distance of weed patches from water by species	18
Figure 12. Location of wildlife encounters.....	19
Figure 13. Number of wildlife encounters by species or family and detection type.....	20
Figure 14. Location of erosion sites encountered and severity of erosion.....	21
Figure 15. Number of waterbodies (all streams) with erosion, and severity of impact.	21
Figure 16. Number of installations and developments by type.....	22
Figure 17. Locations of installations and developments by type.....	23
Figure 18. Number of signs by type and condition.	24
Figure 19. Location and condition of signs.	25
Figure 20. Location of trail closure devices.....	26
Figure 21. Trail width by category for non-motorized trails. All other trails were single track.	28
Figure 22. Trail segments with indirect evidence of mechanized and motorized use by type.	30
Figure 23. Number of non-system trails by trail type and origin.....	31
Figure 24. Locations of non-system trails and monitoring status.....	32
Figure 25. Location of groups and activity of people encountered along trails.	34
Figure 26. Mean duration of noise intrusions by a) source, and b) time of day.....	36
Figure 27. Location of standardized noise sampling sessions.	37
Figure 28. Location, source, and intensity of all opportunistic noise intrusions heard within the WSA...	38
Figure 29. Visual intrusions by type seen from within the WSA.....	40
Figure 30. Location and impact class of documented campsites.	42
Figure 31. Proportion of campsites with impact ranking of 1=low, 2=moderate, or 3=high	43
Figure 32. Number of campsites by landform category and impact class.....	43

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Middle Fork Judith River Wilderness Study Area on the Lewis and Clark National Forest in central Montana. This WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain the wilderness character of WSAs as it existed in 1977. In 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, collaborated with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop field measures of the four qualities of wilderness character identified in the Wilderness Act of 1964 ([Pub.L. 88-577](#)) and described by Landres et al (2008) in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System*. This report summarizes 2012 field monitoring data in the Middle Fork Judith River WSA for selected measures of these four wilderness character qualities: 1) untrammeled, 2) natural, 3) undeveloped and 4) opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation.

During summer 2012, Wilderness Institute crews hiked every trail in the WSA and made detailed observations related to these qualities. Measures of naturalness focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and streambank erosion. Undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation included trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of mechanized and motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. The single measure of the untrammeled quality of the area was weed pulling by Wilderness Institute crews (all other measures of untrammeled require non-field related work). Crews opportunistically hand-pulled weeds and conducted other restoration activities related to the maintenance and propagation of native plants. Results for 16 features (attribute groups; see Appendix 1) are reported here, often accompanied by tables and maps.

Please note that this project emphasized collection of quantifiable field data appropriate for collection with GIS-based technology. Many aspects of wilderness character were not evaluated as part of this project, either because non-field measures were required (e.g. agency actions that impact trammeling or recreation opportunities) or because data collection was beyond the scope of this project (e.g. air and water quality data). This report represents a snap-shot of on-the-ground conditions within the Middle Fork Judith River WSA, and does not attempt to infer how measured qualities of wilderness character may be changing over time, or evaluate the efficacy of current management approaches. To do so would require repeated monitoring efforts over a period of years, and the inclusion of non-field measures of wilderness character as outlined in "Keeping it Wild." This report does, however, create a current baseline that will enable subsequent assessments to expose how certain measures of wilderness character are changing. For a detailed description of wilderness character monitoring, please see: <http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=WC>.)

This project was conducted as part of the Wilderness Institute's Citizen Science Program, which has recruited community volunteers to help monitor selected components of wilderness character in designated Wilderness and WSAs since 2005. Wilderness Institute field leaders led small groups of volunteers on multi-day backcountry trips, surveying all mapped trails within the WSA as well as non-system (user-created) trails. Eight trips were conducted with 23 volunteers. This program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, the University of Montana, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information please contact us at: citizenscience@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-6936.

TRAIL COVERAGE

A total of 77.1 miles of system trails, 8.8 miles of roads, and 1.5 miles of non-system trails were covered by field crews. In all, 96% of system trails within the WSA boundary were monitored (Figure 1). Trail access and coverage was not always straight-forward, largely due to inconsistencies between visitor use maps, USGS quads, and available forest service geospatial layers. These instances are detailed by trail number here (please also see Appendix 2 for additional contextual information on all trails surveyed and additional evidence of non-system trails incompletely captured by data-collection protocols):

- Trail #424 is not depicted on current Forest Service trail layers, but is on the visitor map. This trail was surveyed and included in system trail analyses.
- From Big Deer Point westwards, two trails were monitored: the western end of trail #441 and forest road 2088 that travels north of #441. Available trail layers, quads and the visitor use map give conflicting information about which is the system trail. Both are included in our analyses.
- A 1.3 mile portion of the southern section of trail #443 was not surveyed. Approaching from the north, field crews followed what they thought was the main trail but was in fact a non-system trail descending southeast of the system trail.
- Trail #429 totaling 2.0 miles was accessible only from private inholdings and therefore was not surveyed.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES.....	2
LIST OF FIGURES.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
DATA MANAGEMENT	7
Protocol Development	7
Data Collection	7
Data Analysis	7
WILDERNESS CHARACTER MEASUREMENTS	8
Untrammeled Quality	8
Weed Control Action.....	8
Natural Quality.....	10
Weeds	10
Wildlife Encounters.....	22
Lakeshore or Streambank Erosion	24
Data Summary	26
Undeveloped Quality	28
Installations and Development.....	28
Signage	30
Trail Closure Devices.....	33
Data Summary	33
Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation Quality.....	34
Trail Width	34
Evidence of Motorized Use on Trails	36
Non-System Trails	38
Trailheads.....	43
People Encounters	43

Noise	44
Visual Intrusions.....	45
Campsites.....	46
Data Summary	53
LITERATURE CITED	54
APPENDIX 1 - Database Attributes and Associated Descriptions	55
APPENDIX 2 - Campsite Inventories.....	59
APPENDIX 3 - Impact Index Worksheet	105
APPENDIX 4 - Signs.....	107

List of Tables

- Table 1. Weed patch distance to water.
- Table 2. Elevation of weed patches.
- Table 3. Slope of weed patches.
- Table 4. Aspect of weed patches.
- Table 5. Summary of motorized use on trails.
- Table 6. Number of vehicles, horse trailers, and ORV trailers reported at trailheads.
- Table 7. Number of persons encountered on trails by recreational activity.
- Table 8. Description of motorized noises.
- Table 9. Number of damaged trees reported for campsites.
- Table 10. Number of trees with exposed roots reported for campsites.
- Table 11. Extent of development reported for campsites.
- Table 12. Extent of cleanliness reported for campsites.
- Table 13. Number of social trails associated with campsites.
- Table 14. Amount of barren area associated with campsites.
- Table 15. Amount of exposed mineral soil associated with campsites.
- Table 16. Percent cover of off-site vegetation associated with campsites.
- Table 17. Percent cover of off-site mineral soil associated with campsites.
- Table 18. Campsite impact index summary for reported campsites.

List of Figures

Figure 1. Locations where weeds were pulled by hand by Wilderness Institute crews.

Figure 2. Number of weed patches by species.

Figure 3. Locations of mapped weeds by species.

Figure 4. Number of weed patches in each size-class.

Figure 5. Locations of weed patches by size-class.

Figure 6. Percent cover class of recorded weed patches.

Figure 7. Phenological phase of recorded weed patches.

Figure 8. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with mapped weed patches.

Figure 9. Lifeforms associated with weed patches.

Figure 10. Forest climax series associated with weed patches.

Figure 11. Dominant/characteristic understory vegetation associated with mapped weed patches.

Figure 12. Largest tree diameter found within 15 and 50 feet of weed patches.

Figure 13. Number of wildlife encounters by species.

Figure 14. Location of wildlife encounters by species.

Figure 15. Number of wildlife encounters by species and type.

Figure 16. Location of impacted stream banks by severity.

Figure 17. Number of installations and developments.

Figure 18. Locations of installations and developments.

Figure 19. Number of signs by type and condition.

Figure 20. Locations of signs by type.

Figure 21. Locations of signs by condition.

Figure 22. Trail lengths by width (Bitterroot National Forest portion only).

Figure 23. Trail widths (Bitterroot National Forest portion only).

Figure 24. Location of motorized tracks on trails.

Figure 25. Summary of non-system trail type.

Figure 26. Length of non-system trail by type and length.

Figure 27. Locations of non-system trail by type.

Figure 28. Non-system trail origin and which trails were completely mapped.

Figure 29. Non-system trails that were fully mapped (finished) and not fully mapped (not finished).

Figure 30. Visual intrusions (developments) located outside of the Wilderness Study Area that can be seen from within the Wilderness Study Area.

Figure 31. Spatial distribution of campsites recorded in the Sapphire Wilderness Study Area in 2009.

Figure 32. Locations of signs observed in the Sapphire Wilderness Study Area.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Sapphire Wilderness Study Area (WSA) on the Bitterroot and Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forests in Montana. The Sapphire WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by the U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain wilderness character. During spring 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, worked with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop indicators of wilderness character related to the four qualities of wilderness character described by Landres and coauthors in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System* (2008). The findings summarized here will be utilized by the Forest Service to understand different aspects of wilderness character in the Sapphire WSA.

During summer 2009, we hiked every trail in the Sapphire WSA and made detailed observations related to the untrammeled, natural and undeveloped qualities of the area, and opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation. Our naturalness measures focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and stream bank erosion. Our undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Our measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation include trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of motorized use in places that are not designated for motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. Our only measure of the untrammeled quality of the area was weed pulling by our own crews (all other measures of untrammeled require non-field related work). Results for more than 50 field measures are reported here, often accompanied by tables and maps. The field data was combined with GIS-derived measures such as elevation and longitude and latitude. Please note that sampling of recreational users and wildlife (items that are not stationary) was opportunistic (recorded if field crews happened to encounter people or wildlife), but that all other indicators were comprehensively monitored from all system trails.

The Sapphire WSA spans the boundary of the Bitterroot National Forest and the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest. Monitoring on the Bitterroot National Forest side was conducted by Wilderness Institute field leaders and small groups of community volunteers on multi-day backcountry trips. Three trips were conducted with 12 volunteers who covered approximately 63 trail miles and worked 400 hours total. These trips were open to anyone who wished to participate. Monitoring of the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest was conducted by Montana Conservation Corps (MCC) crews trained by Wilderness Institute staff. These crews covered approximately 54 trail miles, making for a total of 117 miles covered in the Sapphire WSA. In addition to data collection, crews hand-pulled weeds and conducted other restoration activities related to the maintenance and propagation of native plants. This project was conducted as part of our Citizen Science Program and built on five years of monitoring invasives and campsites in designated wilderness in Montana and Idaho. The Citizen Science Program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information on monitoring protocols or results, or on the Wilderness Institute, please contact us at: wi@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-5361.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- One hundred-fourteen weed infestations containing eight known noxious weed species and covering nearly 33 acres were reported. Knapweed and sulfur cinquefoil were most prevalent (54%). Most weed patches (82%) were mapped in Douglas-fir and subalpine fir climax series types dominated by beargrass and ninebark understories. Most patches (65%) were more than 50 feet from water, less than or equal to 0.1 acres in size (82%), and low density (82%). Weed patches were primarily associated with roads (58%) and trails (34%).
- Eleven bears, four pikas, and one mountain goat were observed, and 359 carnivore scat piles were recorded.
- Sixty stream banks were identified as being slightly or moderately impacted by recreational use.
- Sixty-six installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational) were observed. These include 37 bridges, 12 cairns, 7 cabins, 4 fences, 2 lookouts, 3 latrines, and 1 dam, water bar, and corral.
- Eight-two signs were observed. Most (65%) were in good condition. One was missing and 4 were vandalized-illegible.
- Only one fence and one boulder closure berm were reported with no evidence of violation to their closure.
- Eight-six percent of the trails were single-track width (Bitterroot National Forest portion only).
- Most evidence of motorized use on trails was from ATVs on nearly 3.6 km of trail.
- Seventy-two non-system trails were identified and at least 39 were fully surveyed. Most (81%) were routes created by foot travel and represented nearly 83% of the total length of all non-system trails recorded.
- Eighteen groups or people were encountered during the field season, with 1 to 6 individuals per encounter and totaling 55 people. ATV users represented over half (55%) of all persons encountered.
- Seven motorized noises were recorded, almost all ATV in origin. Most were heard within a mile and moderately near.
- Eleven visual intrusions were recorded (mostly dirt roads outside the WSA visible from within the WSA).
- Forty-four campsites were inventoried and mapped. Specific impacts to campsites included: social trails (61%), exposed roots (65%), remnant trash and/or fire rings/scars (91%), at least one damaged tree (82%), and at least ten damaged trees (25%). More than half (55%) had moderate to significant development. Overall, close to half (41%) of all campsites were lightly impacted and over two-thirds (36%) were not impacted at all.

Wilderness Character Monitoring Ten Lakes Wilderness Study Area 2010

**Wilderness Institute
College of Forestry and Conservation
University of Montana**

By Anna Noson and Catherine Filardi

For more information please contact the Wilderness Institute

(406) 243 6936 or wi@cfc.umt.edu

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
DATA MANAGEMENT.....	3
WILDERNESS CHARACTER MEASUREMENTS	4
I. UNTRAMMELED QUALITY	4
II. NATURAL QUALITY	5
Weeds	5
Wildlife Encounters.....	14
Water Erosion	16
III. UNDEVELOPED QUALITY	17
Installations and Developments	17
Mine Prospects	19
Signs	20
Trail Closure Devices.....	22
IV. SOLITUDE OR PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION QUALITY.....	23
Trail Width	23
Evidence of Mechanized Use on Trails	25
Non-system Trails	27
Trailheads.....	29
Encounters with People.....	30
Noise	32
Visual Intrusions.....	34
Campsites.....	35
V. FOREST SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTES	38
Sensitive Plants	38
Pine Tree Health	38
LITERATURE CITED	40
APPENDIX 1. MONITORING ATTRIBUTES	41
APPENDIX 2. WEED ATTRIBUTES BY PATCH.....	44
APPENDIX 3. SIGNS	49
APPENDIX 4. CAMPSITE INVENTORY & CONDITION	66
APPENDIX 5. CAMPSITE CONDITION EVALUATION WORKSHEET	94

List of Tables

- Table 1.** Spatial distribution of weed patches by species.
Table 2. Phenological stage of weed patches by species.
Table 3. Summary of evidence of mechanized use.
Table 4. Summary of vehicles documented at trailheads.
Table 5. People encounters by recreational activity.
Table 6. Number of campsites by impact evaluation score class.

List of Figures

- Figure 1.** Number of weed patches by species.
Figure 2. Location of mapped weeds by species.
Figure 3. Number of patches by species in each infestation size class.
Figure 4. Locations of weed patches by size of infestation.
Figure 5. Spatial distribution of weed patches by size class.
Figure 6. Number of recorded weed patches by patch size in each cover class.
Figure 7. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with weed patches.
Figure 8. Ecosystem type and dominant lifeform associated with weed patches.
Figure 9. Habitat type classification associated with weed patches.
Figure 10. Number of wildlife encounters by wildlife group.
Figure 11. Location of wildlife encounters by species category.
Figure 12. Location of water erosion sites by severity.
Figure 13. Number of installations and development by type.
Figure 14. Location and types of installations and developments.
Figure 15. Location and type of mine prospects.
Figure 16. Number of signs by type and condition.
Figure 17. Locations of signs by condition.
Figure 18. Impacted trail width by category.
Figure 19. Location of evidence of mechanized use on trails.
Figure 20. Number of non-system trails by trail type and origin.
Figure 21. Locations of non-system trails and monitoring status (finished/not finished)
Figure 22. Location of people encounters along trails.
Figure 23. Noise intrusions by source and intensity.
Figure 24. Locations and intensity of motorized noise intrusions.
Figure 25. Visual intrusions seen from within the WSA.
Figure 26. Location of sensitive plant species and White Bark Pine trees.
Figure 27. Spatial distribution of campsites and campsite impact classes.
Figure 28. Number of campsites by landform category and impact class.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Ten Lakes Wilderness Study Area (WSA) on the Kootenai National Forest in northwest Montana. The Ten Lakes WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by the U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain the wilderness character of the WSA as it existed in 1977. In 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, collaborated with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop measurable field indicators of the four qualities of wilderness character identified in the Wilderness Act of 1964 (Pub.L. 88-577) and described by Landres et al (2008) in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System*. This report summarizes field monitoring data in the Ten Lakes WSA for selected elements of these four wilderness character qualities: 1) untrammeled, 2) natural, 3) undeveloped and 4) opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. During summer 2010, we hiked every trail in the Ten Lakes WSA and made detailed observations related to these qualities.

Measures of naturalness focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and streambank erosion. Undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Our measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation included trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of motorized use in places that are not designated for motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. Our single measure of the untrammeled quality of the area was weed pulling by our own crews (all other measures of untrammeled require non-field related work). Results for more than 50 field measures are reported here, often accompanied by tables and maps. The field data was combined with GIS-derived measures such as elevation and longitude and latitude.

Please note that some aspects of wilderness character were not evaluated as part of this project, either because non-field measures were required (e.g., assessing the untrammeled quality of the Ten Lakes WSA requires examining agency and non-agency actions that disrupt the naturally functioning ecosystem, such as fish stocking, fire suppression, or herbicide treatment), or because data collection was beyond the scope of this project (e.g., agencies are already collecting air quality data, which requires sophisticated instruments). Furthermore, these protocols were developed to monitor wilderness character in Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, and thus some of the monitoring conducted may not be applicable to designated wilderness (e.g., monitoring evidence of motorized use in areas not designated for motorized travel). For a detailed description of wilderness character monitoring for designated wilderness, please see: <http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=WC>.

Monitoring was conducted by Wilderness Institute field leaders and small groups of community volunteers on multi-day backcountry trips. Four trips were conducted with 22 volunteers who covered 79 trail miles and worked over 700 hours. Approximately 9 of these trail miles were on trails leading into the WSA but were outside the WSA boundary. These trips were open to anyone who wished to participate. In addition to data collection, crews also hand-pulled weeds and conducted other restoration activities related to the maintenance and propagation of native plants. This project was conducted as part of our Citizen Science Program and built on six years of monitoring invasives and campsites in designated wilderness in Montana and Idaho. The Citizen Science Program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information on monitoring protocols or results, or on the Wilderness Institute, please contact us at: wi@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-5361.

Wilderness Character Monitoring West Pioneer Wilderness Study Area

2009

Wilderness Institute

College of Forestry and Conservation

University of Montana

By Michael Krebs, Sarah Potenza, Laurie Yung and Catherine Filardi

For more information please contact the Wilderness Institute

at (406) 243-5361 or wi@cfc.umt.edu.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES.....	2
LIST OF FIGURES.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
DATA MANAGEMENT.....	7
Protocol Development.....	7
Data Collection.....	7
Data Analysis.....	7
WILDERNESS CHARACTER MEASUREMENTS.....	8
Untrammeled Quality.....	8
Weeds Control Action.....	8
Natural Quality.....	10
Weeds.....	10
Wildlife Encounters.....	22
Lake or Stream Erosion.....	24
Data Summary.....	26
Undeveloped Quality.....	28
Installations and Development.....	28
Signage.....	30
Trail Closure Devices.....	33
Data Summary.....	33
Solitude or Primitive and Unconfined Recreation Quality.....	34
Trail Width.....	34
Evidence of Motorized Use.....	34
Non-System Trails.....	37
Trailheads.....	42
Encounters with People.....	42

Noise	43
Visual Intrusions.....	43
Campsites.....	43
Data Summary	51
LITERATURE CITED	52
APPENDIX 1 - Database Attributes and Associated Descriptions	53
APPENDIX 2 - Campsite Inventories.....	57
APPENDIX 3 - Impact Index Worksheet	99
APPENDIX 4 – Signs	101
APPENDIX 5 – Mussigbrod Lake Data	158

List of Tables

Table 1. Weed patch distance to water.

Table 2. Elevation of weed patches.

Table 3. Slope of weed patches.

Table 4. Aspect of weed patches.

Table 5. Summary of violations of motorized use on trails not designated for motorized use.

Table 6. Number of vehicles, horse trailers, and ORV trailers reported at trailheads.

Table 7. Number of persons encountered on trails by recreational activity.

Table 8. Number of damaged trees reported for campsites.

Table 9. Number of trees with exposed roots reported for campsites.

Table 10. Extent of development reported for campsites.

Table 11. Extent of cleanliness reported for campsites.

Table 12. Number of social trails associated with campsites.

Table 13. Amount of barren area associated with campsites.

Table 14. Amount of exposed mineral soil associated with campsites.

Table 15. Percent cover of off-site vegetation associated with campsites.

Table 16. Percent cover of off-site mineral soil associated with campsites.

Table 17. Campsite impact index summary for reported campsites.

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Locations where weeds were hand-pulled by Montana Conservation Corp (MCC) crews.
- Figure 2. Number of weed patches by species.
- Figure 3. Locations of mapped weeds by species.
- Figure 4. Number of weed patches in each size-class.
- Figure 5. Locations of weed patches by size-class.
- Figure 6. Percent cover class of recorded weed patches.
- Figure 7. Phenological phase of recorded weed patches.
- Figure 8. Primary and secondary disturbances associated with mapped weed patches.
- Figure 9. Lifeforms associated with weed patches.
- Figure 10. Forest climax series associated with weed patches.
- Figure 11. Dominant/characteristic understory vegetation associated with mapped weed patches.
- Figure 12. Largest tree diameter found within 15 and 50 feet of weed patches.
- Figure 13. Number of wildlife encounters by species.
- Figure 14. Location of wildlife encounters by species.
- Figure 15. Number of wildlife encounters by species and type.
- Figure 16. Location of impacted streambanks and lakeshores by severity.
- Figure 17. Number of installations and developments.
- Figure 18. Locations of installations and developments.
- Figure 19. Number of signs by type and condition.
- Figure 20. Locations of signs by type.
- Figure 21. Locations of signs by condition.
- Figure 22. Location of motorbike tracks.
- Figure 23. Summary of non-system trail type.
- Figure 24. Length of non-system trail by type and length.
- Figure 25. Locations of non-system trail by type.
- Figure 26. Non-system trail origin and which trails were completely mapped.
- Figure 27. Non-system trails that were fully mapped (finished) and not fully mapped (not finished).
- Figure 28. Spatial distribution of campsites recorded in the West Pioneer Wilderness Study Area in 2009.

Figure 29. Locations of signs observed in the West Pioneer Wilderness Study Area.

Figure 30. Location of Mussigbrod Lake area.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes field measures of wilderness character in the Pioneer Wilderness Study Area (WSA) on the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest in Montana. The Pioneer WSA, like other Forest Service Wilderness Study Areas in Montana, was designated by the U.S. Congress through the Montana Wilderness Study Area Act of 1977. The Act requires that the Forest Service maintain wilderness character. During spring 2009, the Wilderness Institute, part of the College of Forestry and Conservation at the University of Montana, worked with the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service, and several local non-governmental organizations to develop indicators of wilderness character related to the four qualities of wilderness character described by Landres and coauthors in *Keeping It Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System* (2008). The findings summarized here will be utilized by the Forest Service to understand different aspects of wilderness character in the Pioneer WSA.

During summer 2009, we hiked every trail in the West Pioneer WSA and made detailed observations related to the untrammeled, natural and undeveloped qualities of the area, and opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation. Our naturalness measures focused on invasive plants, wildlife, and lake and streambank erosion. Our undeveloped measures included installations and developments (both recreational and non-recreational), signage, and trail closure devices. Our measures of opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation include trail conditions, non-system (user created) trails, campsite conditions, evidence of motorized use in places that are not designated for motorized use, recreational use, motorized noise, and visual intrusions. Our only measure of the untrammeled quality of the area was weed pulling by our own crews (all other measures of untrammeled require non-field related work). Results for more than 50 field measures are reported here, often accompanied by tables and maps. The field data was combined with GIS-derived measures such as elevation and longitude and latitude. Please note that sampling of recreational users and wildlife (items that are not stationary) was opportunistic (recorded if field crews happened to encounter people or wildlife), but that all other indicators were comprehensively monitored from all system trails.

Monitoring was conducted by a Montana Conservation Corps (MCC) crew trained by Wilderness Institute staff. MCC crews spent 39 days in the field, covering approximately 180 trail miles in the West Pioneer WSA. An MCC crew also spent three days monitoring the Mussigbrod Lake area, approximately 30km northwest of the West Pioneer WSA (see Appendix 5 for data from this area). In addition to data collection, crews also hand-pulled weeds and conducted other restoration activities related to the maintenance and propagation of native plants. This project was conducted as part of our Citizen Science Program and built on five years of monitoring invasives and campsites in designated wilderness in Montana and Idaho. The Citizen Science Program was founded on the belief that including community members in on-the-ground stewardship of public lands builds community capacity, increases public involvement in nearby public lands, and improves the dialogue between local communities and managing agencies.

This work was funded by the Forest Service, the National Forest Foundation, and the Cinnabar Foundation. For more information on monitoring protocols or results, or on the Wilderness Institute, please contact us at: wi@cfc.umt.edu or (406) 243-5361.