Strategy III. Modify the Location of Use Within Problem Areas

TACTIC 21: SEGREGATE DIFFERENT TYPES OF VISITORS

PURPOSE
By separating, in space or time, types of use that typically conflict, crowding and conflict can be reduced, resulting in higher quality visitor experiences.

DESCRIPTION
Separate trails could be provided for each type of visitor, or the less common user that typically “causes” the problem could be banned from certain trails or allowed only in certain places. Common conflicting uses include parties with pets or stock, and exceptionally large parties. Segregation of use could be either regulated or suggested. If the segregation is not symmetrical (for example, if stock are prohibited on certain hiking trails, but hikers are never prohibited on stock trails), then this technique is the same as tactic 16—which could also be applied to large parties and conflicting uses other than stock.

CURRENT USAGE
Unknown. There are places where separate trails are provided for hikers and stock parties, particularly in National Parks. Usually uses are only separated for short distances close to trailheads. It is common to prohibit stock on some trails, and probably there are some areas where pets are not allowed on selected trails.

COSTS TO VISITORS
Low to high. Costs increase as increasing numbers of visitors are prohibited from visiting more places. Costs can be reduced by providing desirable use locations for all groups and by making information available during the early stages of trip planning.

COSTS TO MANAGEMENT
Low to moderate. Primary costs are dissemination of information and enforcement, with higher costs. Additional trails and other facilities may be needed.

EFFECTIVENESS
This can be highly effective in reducing visitor conflict.

COMMENTS
A major difficulty is in making certain that each type of visitor is treated fairly. Segregation of uses may require greater facility development, which may be undesirable. Education to reduce objectionable behavior (tactics 25 and 26) and to increase acceptance by other visitors (tactics 32 and 33) may be worthwhile alternatives.
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