utility of collars. If predation is severe and if livestock can be
managed to direct predation at collared animals, collars can be
a safe, cost-effective control tool.
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**Viewpoint: Vehicular Recreation Use on Public Lands**

**Stu Bengson**

Vehicular recreation, commonly referred to as off road vehicle (ORV), use of public lands is a very 'hot' issue these
days. Discussions of public land management invariably
focus on "ORV impacts" with heated conversation of the
pro's and con's.

What is vehicular recreation? Vehicular recreation, unheard
of prior to the 1960's, is the fastest growing form of outdoor
recreation in America. In 1976 there were an estimated 5
million ORV motorcycles, 2.8 million 4WD's, more than 2.2
million snowmobiles, and 250,000 "dune buggies." Total
sales of these vehicles in the past 7 years were in excess of 12
million. It is estimated that 4 out of 5, 4 X 4 owners will use
their vehicles occasionally for outdoor recreational pur-
poses. Overall, in 1977, there were some 43.6 million Ameri-
cans (25% of the total recreational public) involved in vehicu-
lar recreation with as much as 40% of this total in four-wheel-
ing.

All these vehicular recreationists need somewhere to go,
which leads to recreational use of the public lands. This
creates a very high demand on some areas and presents the
land use manager with various management problems and
conflicts. The center of the controversy over OVR use on
public lands is "environmental impacts." Without question,
the unmanaged, unregulated use of the public lands by
recreational vehicles has caused much damage to some
areas. There are other examples where well-managed and
regulated OVR use can be accommodated. One study
showed that more than 60% of the public had no objections
to 4-wheel drive or ORV use in a specific area. Another study
showed that only 4% of the public objected to ORV uses.

Everyone involved with the "ORV controversy" has read or
heard of the many reports, texts, etc., that have "docu-
mented" the severe impacts of ORV use. Sheridan & Carroll's
1979 CEQ Report and Webb & Wilshires 1983 book on "ORV
Management" are prime examples of the 'biased' information
that is presently being used to develop management and
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**Editor's Note:** Author is a Director, Land-Use United Four Wheel Drive Associ-
atons of U.S. and Canada, 2nd Vice-President, Outdoors Unlimited Inc.; and
Director, Arizona Outdoor Coalition.
miles of which are designated as motorized recreational trails. It is not the 'acres' of open ORV areas that is important. It is the miles of roads accessible that are important to vehicular recreationists. Most vehicular recreationists do not want unroaded pristine wilderness areas opened up by bulldozing new roads for motorized use. They want existing 'roaded' areas left for 'semi-primitive motorized' recreational use.

Except for some designated "play" areas such as beaches, dunes, etc., ORV use is confined to "existing and designated roadways." Off-road vehicle use involves leaving the paved, improved roads for access to the public lands to hunt, fish, sightsee, or access wilderness and hiking trials. Approximately 60% of vehicular recreationists are family groups using their vehicles to get close to nature.

This dedicated attitude is reflected by vehicular recreationists' willingness to volunteer their time and efforts to protect, improve, and enhance the natural resource areas. In these days of extremely constrained budgets, this becomes a major economic factor for land management agencies. In 1984, 42,000 volunteers working the National Forests accomplished $15 million worth of work. Much of this work is done by vehicular recreationists. A recent study indicated that more than 156,000 manhours have been donated by vehicular recreationists. In the past 2 years, over 48,000 manhours have been volunteered to programs such as "Adopt-A-Trail" and "Forest Watch." Vehicular recreationists are involved in other volunteer programs such as litter patrols, reforestation, historical restoration, fencing and wildlife habitat improvement.

Vehicular recreationists make up a large portion of the American recreational public. Just because a very few "ORV" recreationists are natural resource vandals and bandits, disobeying rules, regulations and common sense, does not mean that all ORV recreationists should be punished and banned from public lands. This would be equivalent to closing all highways because some drivers exceed 55 MPH.

Vehicular recreationists are not opposed to fair regulation and will support 'special registration and fees' within reasonable and logical limits, if the fees are used to further enhance the resources of the ORV use areas. All user groups should be fairly 'taxed' for the use of the recreational areas. Arbitrary regulation and inequitable fee structuring to the detriment of vehicle recreationists to subsidize and favor other recreational groups is unjust.

Local ORV recreational groups are anxious to develop satisfactory and agreeable land management plans and regulations. All it takes is a little cooperative effort on the part of all interested parties. This would reduce the controversy and problems of vehicular recreational use on public lands.

**Cited References and Notes**
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**Viewpoint: Off-Road Vehicle Damage to Public Lands**

**Sid Goodloe**

Lack of understanding of the fragility our Western range and forest lands combined with unenforced regulations have resulted in serious damage to our public lands by off-road vehicles (ORVs). In Wyoming alone 75% of the public lands are impacted by ORV use. Anyone who has driven across southern California in the last few years can attest to the numbers of ORV's using public lands there.

There are more than 400 million acres of public lands in the United States. These include watersheds affecting rivers, streams, lakes, and underground water supplies that are vital to all of us. Although legislation guarantees the public a right of access to these priceless lands, the framers of such legislation did not intend, I believe, for use to constitute misuse.

In the past 30 years, ORV traffic on public lands has gone from almost none at all to overwhelming. While other uses such as timber and fuel wood harvest, energy exploration, grazing and game harvest have reasonably adequate restrictions, regulations for ORV use on these lands go virtually unenforced.

Over 6 million 4-wheel-drive vehicles were built and sold by American auto makers during the past decade. Many of these vehicles, plus uncounted Japanese 4 × 4's, dirt bikes and three-wheelers, are being driven on public lands causing erosion, asthetic deterioration and wildlife habitat damage.

Despite Executive Order 11644 signed by President Nixon on February 8, 1972, off-road vehicles are basically uncontrolled while using our public lands. This Executive Order requires Federal agencies to develop regulations and procedures for control of ORVs on public lands to minimize resource damage. In 1977, yet another Executive Order (11989) issued by