Biodiversity and Conservation

Effects of recreational trampling on vegetation structure in an Australian biodiversity hotspot

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	BIOC-D-14-00822R1
Full Title:	Effects of recreational trampling on vegetation structure in an Australian biodiversity hotspot
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	Wildflower tourism, trampling, resistance, resilience, biodiversity hotspot
Corresponding Author:	David Newsome Murdoch University Perth, Western Australia AUSTRALIA
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Murdoch University
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Sally Mason
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Sally Mason
	David Newsome
	Susan Moore
	Ryan Admiraal
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	RRecreational trampling damage of natural vegetation is an increasing problem in the global context and has the potential to impact on vegetation communities that are of high ecological and socio-economic interest. Wildflower tourism in the national parks of Southwest Australia, a global biodiversity hotspot, has the potential to damage the flora on which it depends through trampling. Little research has been previously undertaken in these largely shrub-dominated communities to identify and quantify such impacts. The behaviours of independent tourists and tour groups were observed. Of the 213 independent visitors observed 41 visitors left trails to view flowers and in the process trampled vegetation. Vegetation height and cover were measured at three sites frequented by wildflower tourists. Vegetation height and cover declined in response to use by tourists. Trampling experiments, which relied on trampling treatments of 0, 30, 100, 200, 300/500 passes, where 0 passes represents the control, were applied at four sites. Trampling led to a significant reduction in vegetation height immediately post-treatment, for all treatments, with a non-significant recovery over time. Trampling also significantly reduced vegetation cover, with the resistance indices for these experimental sites ranging from 30-300 passes. Collectively these results illustrate the low resilience and resistance of these valued communities and the possible impacts of wildflower and other nature based tourism, through trampling. The paper concludes with suggested management strategies, which strongly emphasise the importance of education for the tourism industry and provide for international comparisons in regard to recreational trampling impacts on biodiverse shrub land communities.
Response to Reviewers:	We thank the reviewers for their comments which have improved the paper. We have presented a response to all of the feedback we received and revised the manuscript accordingly. A table of revisions is included as an attached file.

Effects of recreational trampling on vegetation structure in an Australian biodiversity hotspot

Mason[1], S., Newsome[1]*, D. Moore[1], S. and Admiraal[2], R.

[1]Environment and Conservation Sciences Group, School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia

[2]Mathematics and Statistics Group, School of Engineering and Information Technology, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia

Email: D.Newsome@murdoch.edu.au

Phone: +61 8 9360 2614

***Corresponding author**

Abstract

Recreational trampling damage of natural vegetation is an increasing problem in the global context and has the potential to impact on vegetation communities that are of high ecological and socio-economic interest. Wildflower tourism in the national parks of Southwest Australia, a global biodiversity hotspot, has the potential to damage the flora on which it depends through trampling. Little research has been previously undertaken in these largely shrub-dominated communities to identify and quantify such impacts. The behaviours of independent tourists and tour groups were observed. Of the 213 independent visitors observed 41 visitors left trails to view flowers and in the process *trampled vegetation. Vegetation height and cover were measured at three sites frequented by wildflower tourists. Vegetation height and cover declined in response to use by tourists. Trampling experiments, which relied on trampling treatments of 0, 30, 100, 200, 300/500 passes, where 0 passes represents the control, were applied at four sites. Trampling led to a significant reduction in vegetation height immediately post-treatment, for all treatments, with a non-significant recovery over time. Trampling also significantly reduced vegetation cover, with the resistance indices for these experimental sites ranging from 30-300 passes. Collectively these results illustrate the low resilience and resistance of these valued communities and the possible impacts of wildflower and other nature based tourism, through trampling. The paper concludes with suggested management strategies, which strongly emphasise the importance of education for the tourism industry and provide for international comparisons in regard to recreational trampling impacts on biodiverse shrub land communities.*

Key words: Wildflower tourism, trampling, resistance, resilience, biodiversity hotspot

Introduction

Trampling is one of the most visible forms of disturbance to vegetation as a result of recreational use resulting in loss of vegetation height and cover, damage to soils and changes in plant community composition (Kelly et al. 2003; Cole 2004; Hill and Pickering 2006; Pickering and Hill 2007; Monz et al. 2010; Ballantyne and Pickering 2013; Newsome et al. 2013). Trampling of vegetation and soils can occur when recreational users leave an established trail to take a photograph, investigate a flower or create an informal trail for their own purpose (Pickering and Hill 2007; Ballantyne and Pickering 2012; Barros et al. 2013; Newsome et al. 2013). Knowledge about the relationship between the effects of trampling and the sensitivity of vegetation is essential in effectively managing these interactions (Liddle 1997; Cole 2004; Hamberg et al. 2010; Pickering et al. 2010). Moreover, understanding this relationship is particularly important in areas of high conservation value (Hopper and Gioia 2004; Pickering and Hill 2007; Hopper 2009; Sloan et al. 2014).

Southwest Australia (SWA) is a global biodiversity hotspot with high conservation values and serves as an example of globally significant flora that are currently under stress from a range of threatening processes (Myers et al. 2000; Sloan et al. 2014). Australian flora are particularly vulnerable to anthropogenic change due to high levels of diversity and endemism, with many species in Western Australia exhibiting small ranges with low numbers and restricted populations (Hopper 1979; Hnatiuk and Hopkins 1981; Hopkins et al. 1983; Pate and Beard 1984; Burbidge et al. 1990; Hopper and Gioia 2004). The SWA global biodiversity hotspot is also a global destination for wildflower tourism and national parks in SWA attract thousands of visitors each year to experience the ‘show’ of wild flowers (Burbidge et al. 1990; CALM 1991, 1995 and 1999; Agafonoff 1998; TWA 2005 and 2011).

There have been many experimental and descriptive studies worldwide that have examined the impacts of trampling on vegetation and soils (Cole 1987 ; Liddle 1997; Leung and Marion 2000; Buckley 2005; Pickering and Hill 2007; Malmivaara-Lamsa et al. 2008; Torn et al. 2009; Barros et al. 2013; Barros and Pickering 2014; Prescott and Stewart 2014). Trampling studies conducted in North America and Europe have examined a range of vegetation types, from beech forest (Waltert et al. 2002) to arctic tundra plant communities (Monz 2002).

Australian studies have centered on trampling in mountain, subtropical and tropical areas (Whinam and Chilcott 1999; Talbot et al. 2003; Whinam and Chilcott 2003; Hill and Pickering 2009; Pickering and Growcock 2009). Kelly et al. (2003) considered the direct and indirect effects of tourism on 72 plant taxa in Australia by reviewing literature and reports by government agencies. Trampling was identified as the most common impact affecting 20 plant taxa. Ballantyne and Pickering (2012) have recently reported that orchids are directly affected by human trampling of their habitats.

Liddle (1997) and other researchers have demonstrated that different vegetation communities respond to trampling according to differing environmental conditions, plant functional traits and varying types of user and use intensities (Liddle 1975; Cole 1985; Liddle 1997; Pickering et al. 2010; Bernhardt-Romermann et al. 2011; Monz et al. 2013; Prescott and Stewart 2014). The available evidence points to shrubs with sclerophyllous tissues being one of the most susceptible plant communities to trampling damage (for example see, Sun and Liddle 1993a; Liddle 1997; Newsome et al. 2002; Whinam and Chilcott 2003; Pickering and Hill 2007; Bernhardt-Romermann et al. 2011). Data on resistance (plant response to damage) and resilience (recovery of vegetation from disturbance) is especially lacking for sclerophyllous shrub-dominated plant communities in Australia.

Virtually no published data exist regarding how shrub-dominated vegetation has been impacted by, and responded to tourism and recreation, in national parks that form the centrepiece of the SWA biodiversity hotspot. Accordingly, there is an urgent need to add information on the effects of recreation and tourism on such plant communities (Kelly et al. 2003; Whinam and Chilcott 2003; Pickering et al. 2010) to the global store of knowledge on biodiversity hotspots. Accordingly, the objectives of this paper are threefold: (1) to provide observational data on the visitors to these national parks; (2) conduct descriptive studies at these parks on the trampling impact of visitors during the wildflower season; and (3) conduct controlled trampling experiments at these parks and report on the response of vegetation. These objectives are explored through observational, descriptive and experimental studies described in detail in the remainder of the paper.

Methodology

Rationale for park and site selection

Important protected areas and sites of high biodiversity and endemism in SWA include the Stirling Range National Park (SRNP), Fitzgerald River National Park (FRNP) and Lesueur National Park (LNP) (Figure 1). All three have been identified as the most significant areas for flora conservation in SWA, with high species diversity (Gole 2006).

Within LNP and FRNP, two research locations were selected, with one location only in SRNP due to access restrictions. For each location a research site was allocated to descriptive studies and the other to experimental trampling. This gave a total of 10 research sites (Table 1). All locations and sites were selected in consultation with the park management agency staff, with initial selection ensuring locations that are accessed for wildflower tourism.

INSERT TABLE 1 & FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Park descriptions

The three national parks contain hyperdiverse shrublands where in a single plot of 10mx10m (0.01ha) there may be as many as 40 shrub species occurring as mature individuals (Laliberte et al. 2014). Lesueur National Park (26,987 ha) contains 821 different plant species, 111 are endemic to the area (LNP Figure 2a, Table 1) (CALM 1995). Stirling Range National Park (115,920 ha) contains 1,748 species, 75 of which are endemic (SRNP Figure 2b, Table 1) (CALM 1999). Fitzgerald River National Park (329,039 ha) has 1530 species with 82 endemics (FRNP Figure 2c, Table 1) (CALM 1991). Vegetation communities within the parks are dominated by shrubs, significant genera are *Hakea*, *Acacia*, *Banksia*, *Melaleuca*, *Leucopogon* and *Verticordia* (Table 2). Plant characteristics comprise shrub life-forms, erect plants, with woody stems and are typically slow growing (Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2

The wildflower season in Western Australia generally starts in June in the North (around LNP) and finishes in the South (around FRNP and SRNP) in November (TWA 2011). These three national parks play an important role in the wildflower tourism industry.

Observations of the visitors to the national parks (study one)

In order to determine the effects of visitors on the vegetation of the national parks participant observation of tourists to the three national parks was conducted during the wildflower season (Denscombe 1998; Jennings 2010). Observations focused on the behaviours of independent travellers and those on organised wildflower tours. These observations were conducted to determine if visitors went off trail and trampled the vegetation. Independent travellers were observed at sites within the three national parks (Figure 2 a-c). The sites visited by wildflower tourists were selected in consultation with park management agency staff. An unobtrusive observer at each site recorded a range of variables. The variable relevant to this paper was if the visitor stayed on formal trails or went off the trails into the vegetation.

The lead author observed the behaviour of tourists on four organised wildflower tours as an anonymous participant. Due to the availability of tours at the time, these tours did not necessarily visit the three national parks that form the basis of this study but they did visit protected areas in SWA and hence provide a snapshot of tour guide and visitor activity in this region. Tour duration ranged from 3–10 hours (mean=6 hrs) and tour numbers ranged from 12–38 visitors (mean=19 visitors). The researcher observed visitor behaviour in regards to leaving walking trails and in relation to supervision and information provided by the tour guides.

Descriptive studies (study two)

The before mentioned preliminary observational studies were followed by a detailed descriptive study using the comparison of used and unused wildflower visitation sites to determine if visitors had a trampling impact on vegetation over the wildflower season. This comparison relied on the establishment of corridors and quadrats at sites in the three national parks where wildflower tourism activities were evident. Three research sites across the study parks were utilised: in LNP – Lesueur Day use area (LD3) and Information Bay (LD4); and in SRNP – the Pay Station at Bluff Knoll (SD2) (Table 1; Fig. 2). The FRNP sites were not used (FD3, FD4) because they were burnt by wildfire.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

Corridors were used for the LNP sites, with quadrats used in SRNP. For LNP, each site (n=2) comprised three tourist use corridors and one control corridor (Kent and Coker 1992). The control corridor was selected to represent unused sites. The location and layout of the tourist use corridors was determined after observing wildflower tourists in the natural environment. Observations indicated they tended to radiate out from a central access point. Accordingly, the use corridors were arranged to radiate out from a central point to account for the typical wildflower visitors' movements. Locations of visitor use corridors were in areas of tourism interest and points of focus (i.e. exposed rocks, views of valleys, location of significant flowering plants) and were located off formal trails.

The corridors were 1m wide (to enable use of a 1m wide point intercept frame) and 7m long (to account for visitors moving off a trail). Vegetation parameters were measured at eight cross-sectional points: 0m, 1m, 2m, 3m, 4m, 5m, 6m and 7m respectively. At each cross-sectional point 20 measurements from the point intercept frame were obtained, giving a total number of measurements for each transect corridor of 160. The corridors were measured out and reference pegs installed on both sides at intervals of one metre and GPS referenced. The vegetation parameters of vegetation height (cm) and vegetation cover (%) (comprising living and non-living plant matter) were measured at the beginning and the end of the wildflower season to ascertain if there was a change as a result of visitors trampling the vegetation during the wildflower tourist season.

At SRNP transect corridors were not used because park management agency staff were concerned that the point intercept frame could damage the threatened Dwarf Spider Orchid (*Caladenia bryceana* subsp.*bryceana*). As such, vegetation parameters were measured using a 1m square quadrat. The square quadrat had a plastic frame and cross-wires to facilitate measuring vegetation parameters. The square was based on the conventional 1m square with 10cmx10cm subdivisions (Kent and Coker 1992). Four quadrats were placed along informal trails that were forming as a result of visitors leaving formal trails. A control quadrat was positioned further away with no formal access to its location.

Vegetation height and cover data recorded in the field were entered into Microsoft Excel 2010. The average vegetation height (cm) and living vegetation cover (%) was determined for each transect corridor/quadrat at the beginning of wildflower season (initial measurements) and the end of wildflower season (final measurements). The averages of the differences were determined and the standard error calculated.

Trampling experiment (study three)

Four research sites across the parks were utilised: in LNP - Near Lesueur Day Use Area (LE1) and Near Information Bay (LE2); in SRNP – South of Papercollar Bridge (SE1);

and in FRNP – Near East Mt Barren Carpark 1 (FE1) (Table 1; Fig. 2). The other research site at FRNP was not used (FE2) because it was burnt by wildfire (Table 1, Fig. 2). The trampling experiments were undertaken some distance from the descriptive study sites to ensure there was no interference from visitors but ensuring the vegetation type and typography was a similar as possible. The widely-applied trampling experimental approach was used (Cole and Bayfield 1993; Malmivaara-Lamsa et al. 2008; Hill and Pickering 2009; Pickering and Growcock 2009; Hamberg et al. 2010; Pickering et al. 2011). This method has been designed to determine the relationship between amount of use and the impact on vegetation. The objectives of this experiment were to determine the effects "of trampling" on vegetation height and cover, as estimates of resistance and recovery of height and cover over a 12 month period, as a measure of resilience (Cole and Bayfield 1993).

The trampling experiment comprised 5 treatment lanes at each of the study sites, with each lane 1m x 7m with a cross sectional measurement undertaken every 0.5m (Fig. 3). Within each lane there were three replicates (Fig. 3). The standard dimension of the width of our treatment lanes differs from that of Cole and Bayfield (1993), in that the width of the treatment lane was increased from 0.5m to 1.0m. This was to account for the nature of the vegetation communities (shrub-dominated vegetation) and to enable effective use of the point intercept frame, a reliable method that can be used to measure vegetation height and cover both on level and uneven ground (Kent and Coker 1992).

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The treatment lanes at each site were positioned (with a 1m buffer between them) according to areas of homogeneous vegetation structure less than 1 m in height, located on flat ground with no formal visitor activity (Cole and Bayfield 1993).

Treatments of 0 (control lane), 30, 100, 200 and 500 passes were selected. Previous Australian trampling studies have employed a range of trampling intensities including 0, 25, 30, 75, 100, 200, 300, 500 and 700 passes (Liddle and Thyer 1986; Whinam and Chilcott 1999; Phillips 2000; Whinam and Chilcott 2003; Growcock 2006). The shrub-dominated communities at the three national parks were expected to have a low to moderate resistance to trampling due to the communities being dominated by sclerophyllous shrubs so a maximum of 500 passes was determined as adequate for the study. The procedure for the application of the treatments to each lane was in accordance with Cole and Bayfield (1993) including random application of treatments.

Vegetation height and vegetation cover data were collected as part of the trampling experiment as these two parameters are scientifically credible, monitored with relative ease, cost-effective and can be easily re-measured (Cole and Bayfield 1993; Pickering and Growcock 2009; Hamberg et al. 2010; Pickering et al. 2011). Previous studies have shown that changes in physiognomic parameters (vegetation cover and vegetation growth/height) occur more quickly than changes in floristic parameters (vegetation composition) (Cole and Bayfield 1993; Whinam and Chilcott 1999).

Vegetation height and cover were measured before trampling, immediately after trampling, two weeks, six weeks and one year after trampling in line with the approach of Cole and Bayfield (1993). These data were collected using the point intercept frame. The frame was positioned at each cross section (Figure 3) and 20 measurements (number of frame pins) for vegetation height and cover were recorded. The number of recorded measurements taken in each replication was 100 measurements. The number of recorded measurements taken for the whole treatment lane (all three replications) was 300 measurements. The data collected in each of the three replications were used in the analysis of vegetation cover. The data collected for the whole treatment lane was used in the analysis of the vegetation height.

Vegetation height and percentage cover values recorded in the field (absolute values) were utilised in analyses. Relative values are defined as the 'proportion of initial conditions (height or cover) with a correction factor applied to account for spontaneous changes on the control plots' (Cole and Bayfield 1993 p.211). Absolute values rather than relative values are being used increasingly in the analysis of trampling data (Pickering and Growcock 2009; Hamberg et al. 2010; Pickering et al. 2011). To address distributional assumptions underlying the statistical analyses utilised, vegetation heights were transformed using a square root transformation, and percentage vegetation cover values were transformed using the arcsine square root transformation.

To ascertain the effect of trampling on vegetation height, cover and recovery across the four sites, we used linear mixed effects models (LMEM). Vegetation height data were analysed using two different LMEM and fit using R (R Development Core Team 2013) and the "nlme" package for R (Pinheiro et al. 2013). The first model compared the pre- and post-trampling vegetation height data. Fixed effects included an indicator for whether the measurement was taken before or after trampling, number of passes, site, and all possible interactions among the three variables. Random effects were included for lanes for given sites. To account for spatial correlation in vegetation heights across the various point intercept frame locations for a given site and lane, an exponential isotropic variogram model was applied (Cressie 1993). A second model examined the post-trampling vegetation height data and vegetation recovery over time, also using a LMEM. Fixed effects included the initial vegetation height, number of passes, site, weeks since initial trampling, and an interaction between number of passes and weeks since initial trampling. Random effects and an exponential isotropic variogram were specified in the same manner as for the first model.

Post-trampling vegetation cover (as represented through percentage of living matter versus non-living plant matter) was analysed using a LMEM that included fixed effects for the number of passes, site, weeks since initial trampling, and an interaction between number of passes and number of weeks since initial trampling. Random effects were included for lanes within a site, and we assumed that vegetation cover percentages for individual lanes were independent of those for other lanes. Given the small variation in life form categories and low prevalence of living matter across all lanes post-trampling, instructive analyses incorporating individual life forms were not possible, so the focus was restricted to analyses comparing living matter versus non-living matter.

The resistance index for each site was calculated. The index is the number of passes required to cause a 50% reduction in the original vegetation cover (Liddle 1997). Rainfall data for the three parks for the study period (12 months) were obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology.

Results

Observations of the visitors to the national parks (study one)

After 76 hours of participant observation across the three national parks, 213 visitors (LNP n=33, FRNP n=51 and SRNP n=129) were observed. Of the 213 visitors, 41 (LNP n=11, FRNP n=7 and SRNP n=23) were observed leaving the trails. A key observation was that visitors who left established tracks followed a path of least resistance by heading towards bare ground and manoeuvring around larger shrubs and trees. During organised wildflower tours the researcher observed and recorded tourist behaviour in regard to accessing wildflowers in conjunction with information provided by the tour guides. Where the tour guides were strict regarding staying on the trail (two of the tours), there was little movement off trails and associated trampling. Where there was very little emphasis on staying on trails or the guides themselves moved off the trails (the other two tours) trampling occurred.

Descriptive studies (study two)

Effects of visitor trampling on vegetation height

In the descriptive studies the mean vegetation heights at all three sites declined in the corridors used by tourists, while vegetation height in the un-used (control) corridors increased (Figure 4). The vegetation heights for the controls at LD3, LD4 and SD2 increased over the sampling period (Figure 4).

INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

Effects of visitor trampling on vegetation cover

In the descriptive studies mean percentage cover of living material at all three sites declined in the corridors used by tourists, with mean percentage cover in the un-used (control) corridors either remaining unchanged or declining across the sampling period (Figure 5).

There was low percentage cover of living material, non-living material dominated the used sites and provided 52.08% of the percentage initial cover at LD3, 48.33% at LD4 and 80.56% at SD2. The mean percentage vegetation cover at the control sites remained unchanged at LD3 and LD4 and declined by 1.5% at SD2 (Figure 5).

INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

Trampling experiments (study three)

Effects of trampling on vegetation height comparing pre and post (immediately after) measurements

The pre- and post-trampling vegetation height data for all sites were compared using a LMEM to determine the effects of trampling on vegetation height. Conditional *F*-tests were used to determine the significance of individual terms in the model (Table 3), showing the pre- versus post-trampling variable ("Pre- versus post-trampling") to be highly statistically significant (p-value < 0.001) and the trampling variable ("Passes") to be statistically significant (p-value = 0.0020). Examination of variable coefficients for the model demonstrated a significant reduction in vegetation height post-trampling and showed that vegetation height decreases with increased trampling (Table 4: refer specifically to coefficients for “Pre- vs post-trampling”, “Passes” and all interaction effects).

The result suggesting that vegetation height decreases with increased trampling may not be obvious, given that the coefficient for the “Passes” variable is statistically significant and positive (Table 4), suggesting increased vegetation height with increased trampling. Note, however, that the effect of trampling must account for the interaction effects including “Passes,” and the negative coefficient for the interaction effect between number of passes and whether the measurement was taken pre- or post-trampling (“Pre-/post-trampling*Passes”) more than offsets any positive coefficients, resulting in a net effect that is negative for each site.

INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE

Figure 6 also illustrates for all the intensities of trampling (30, 100, 200 and 300/500) the dramatic decline in vegetation height immediately post trampling.

INSERT FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE

Effects of trampling on the recovery of vegetation height post trampling over a 12-month period

The second LMEM, which focuses on vegetation heights post-trampling and vegetation recovery over time, confirmed the result of the first model in terms of trampling leading to a significant reduction in vegetation height. A conditional *F*-test of number of passes showed the number of passes to be highly statistically significant (Table 5, p-value < 0.0001). The coefficient for the “Passes” variable was highly statistically significant and negative, and the coefficient for the interaction effect (“Passes*Weeks”) including number of passes was also negative (Table 6), consistent with vegetation height decreasing with increased trampling. At the same time, however, vegetation height post-trampling was not significantly related to weeks since initial trampling (Table 5, *p*-value = 0.9582), a result consistent with Figure 7, where lines corresponding to post-trampling time periods all lie in very close proximity to each other. Consequently, the results show no significant recovery.

INSERT FIGURE 7 AND TABLE 5 AND 6 ABOUT HERE

Effects of trampling on vegetation cover post trampling over a 12 month period

In all four sites (LE1, LE2, FE1 & SE1), all intensities of trampling (30, 100, 200 and 300/500 passes) caused the percentage cover of living matter to decrease, as illustrated in Figures 8 and 9. A conditional *F*-test shows a significant relationship between the percentage of living matter and the number of passes (Table 7, "Passes" p-value < 0.0001) with increased trampling associated with a reduction in the percentage of living matter (Table 8, statistically significant negative coefficients for "Passes," non-significant interaction effect for "Passes*Weeks" with a net negative effect). This is in line with what is observed in Figure 9. After 30 passes the percentage of living vegetation cover decreased from 53.33% to 37.33% at LE1, 68.0% to 27.67% at LE2 and from 62.0% to 47.67% at FE1 post trampling. A much smaller decrease was recorded for SE1 (40.34% to 39.0%) at 30 passes but after 100 passes the percentage of living vegetation cover decreased from 54.0% to 34.99%.

INSERT FIGURE 8 AND 9 AND TABLE 7 AND 8 ABOUT HERE

Similarly to changes in the vegetation height in response to trampling, the relationship between the percentage cover of living matter and number of weeks since trampling is non-significant (Table 7, “Weeks” *p*-value = 0.0854).

The living matter in the treatment lanes comprised shrubs, grasses, herbaceous species, sedges, ferns, mosses and liverworts. Characterization of the major living life forms (e. g. Tables 1 and 2) at each trampling experiment site showed that shrubs dominated all four vegetation communities. Prior to trampling, the proportion of the shrubs (averaged across all the lanes) and grasses (averaged across all the lanes) accounted for:

- LE1: shrubs (52.87%) and grasses (5.60%);
- LE2: shrubs (59.40 %) and grasses (5.73%);
- FE1: shrubs (49.60 %) and grasses (16.67%) and
- SE1 shrubs (35.20%) and grasses (18.27%).

While the proportion of non-living material (averaged across all the lanes) accounted for:

- LE1: dead material and bare ground (41.20%);
- LE2: dead material and bare ground (34.07%);
- FE1: dead material and bare ground (33.73%); and
- SE1: dead material and bare ground (46.53%).

Calculation of resistance Index

A resistance index is the number of passes required to cause a 50% reduction in the original value of vegetation cover (Liddle 1997). The index was determined by analysing the vegetation cover data for each National Park (Table 9).

INSERT TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

Rainfall

The rainfall for the 12-month study period was below the long-term average for two of the national parks – LNP was 213.5mm below average and SRNP was 73.8mm below average. For FRNP rainfall was 22.1mm above average (Table 10).

INSERT TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

Overview

The observations of visitors, descriptive, and experimental trampling studies reported in this paper provide much needed data on the effects of trampling on shrub-dominated communities that form a critical part of the Southwest Australia biodiversity hotspot. National parks provide an obvious point for research focus given they are a nexus between high biological values and increasing attention from the tourism industry. No previous studies have determined the effects of trampling by tourists in this international biodiversity hotspot and its national parks. This biome is considered highly vulnerable to disturbance because of high plant specialisation to nutrient deficient soils, a high degree of endemism and restricted population sizes occurring in a Mediterranean climate (Hopper and Gioia 2004; Hopper 2009, Laliberte et al. 2014; Barrett and Yates 2014).

Resistance of vegetation height to trampling

This study has shown that at low levels of trampling there was a considerable decrease in vegetation height in the shrub-dominated communities of LNP, FRNP and SRNP. All trampling intensities (30, 100, 200 and 300/500 passes) (Fig. 6) caused a significant decrease in vegetation height immediately following trampling for all three communities. The results demonstrate a decline in vegetation height greater for higher trampling intensities and that shrub-dominated communities have a low resistance to trampling by tourists.

Such low resistance can be explained by the following characteristics of the dominant genera (e.g., *Hakea, Acacia, Banksia, Melaleuca, Leucopogon and Verticordia*) (Table 2) occurring in the national parks:

1. Shrub life form (morphological trait) leading to sensitivity to trampling (Bayfield 1979; Griffin and Hopkins 1981; Cole and Spildie 1998; Specht and Specht 1999; Pickering and Hill 2007; Pickering and Growcock 2009);
2. Erect growth form (morphological trait) leading to low resistance (Griffin and Hopkins 1981; Sun and Liddle 1991; Liddle 1997; Cole and Spildie 1998; Specht and Specht 1999; Pickering and Hill 2007; Pickering and Growcock 2009) and
3. Woody stems and presence of sclerenchyma (anatomical trait) leading to low resistance (Griffin and Hopkins 1981; Sun and Liddle 1993b; Yorks et al. 1997;

Specht and Specht 1999; Pickering and Hill 2007; Pickering and Growcock 2009).

Another Australian study conducted in a shrub-dominated community in the feldmark vegetation in Kosciuszko National Park. McDougall and Wright (2004) found that shrubs were more susceptible to trampling (they had low resistance) than other life forms and their findings support the results of this study.

Worldwide there have been few studies conducted on the impacts of trampling on shrub-dominated communities. For example, the Lolo National Park (USA) study found the shrub-dominated community was more resistant than the forb-dominated community, which is in contrast to our findings (Cole and Spildie 1998). An explanation for this difference is that vegetation in the USA has evolved in the presence of hard hoofed animals resulting in vegetation communities being more resistant to trampling damage than the shrub-dominated plant communities in Australia which have evolved in the absence of hoofed native herbivores (Newsome et al. 2002; Pickering and Hill 2007). Such differences between environments demonstrate the importance of conducting experimental trampling studies in shrub-dominated communities worldwide.

The descriptive studies in LNP and SRNP also demonstrate a reduction in vegetation height in the used corridors/quadrants. Even low levels of trampling over a wildflower season can cause significant damage to vegetation because of potential damage to flowering parts and other reproductive structures (Liddle 1997; Barros et al. 2013). The impact of a low number of visitors to LNP was noticeable when comparing the used corridors and quadrats to the controls. This finding is also supported by other studies that have shown that low levels of off-trail traffic can wear down vegetation (Wimpey and Marion 2011).

Resistance index (vegetation cover)

It is evident from this study (Fig. 7, Table 8) that even at low levels of trampling there was a substantial change in vegetation cover, which is in accordance with studies undertaken elsewhere (Kuss and Hall 1991; Hamberg et al. 2010; Bernhardt-Romermann et al. 2011). The resistance index at the Stirling Range National Park study sites (300 passes) was the most robust out of the three national parks. One reason could be that the vegetation community at SRNP had the highest proportion of grasses and non-living material relative to the other two national parks. Previous studies have indicated that the grass life form is more resistant and resilient to trampling than shrub life forms (Sun and Liddle 1993c; Liddle 1997; Yorks et al. 1997; Whinam and Chilcott 1999; Hill and Pickering 2009). Grasses tend to have basally-fixed meristems, flexible cells, papery sheaths, increased tiller production and reduced height and leaf size which enable them to resist and recover more effectivly from trampling (Sun and Liddle 1993c; Liddle 1997; Hill and Pickering 2009). This could account for the larger resistance index at SRNP when compared to LNP (30 & 100 passes) and FRNP (100 passes).

Resistance indices for different vegetation communities, as compiled by Liddle (1997), show a wide range of responses from 12 passes to 1,412 passes required to reduce the vegetation cover by 50%. The resistance indices for Western Australian shrub-dominated communities were low (30-300 passes) when considering this possible range. Other vegetation communities having low resistance indices to human trampling include Eucalyptus woodland in Brisbane, Australia (12 passes), the snow-bank community in the

Snowy Mountains, Australia (44 passes) and spruce woodland ground flora in Finland (48 passes) (Liddle 1997; Newsome et al. 2013). It is important to note that in the global context there is likely to be variation in the resistance index for shrub-dominated communities and this is evident when examining the resistance indices from Australian work and this study (Hill and Pickering 2009).

Resilience (recovery) of vegetation (cover and height) to trampling impacts

Trampling experimental work conducted over the period of this study indicates that resilience (recovery) of the vegetation to be poor. As time increased recovery indicators (plant height and proportion of living material) either decreased or remained flat across all three national parks (Figures 6 and 7). The time variable was determined to have a non-significant influence on vegetation recovery. In essence there was virtually no growth, such as an increase in vegetation height in the control and treatment lanes post trampling. The minimal resilience (recovery) of the vegetation height and cover over the sampling period, which included the growing season, can be attributed to a combination of factors including plant characteristics, climatic conditions during the study, and soil types evident in the national parks. Soils in much of the south west of Western Australia are extremely infertile. (e.g. Pate and Beard 1984; Specht and Specht 1999; Lambers at al. 2010; Laliberte et al. 2014). Although the flora has evolved a wide range of nutrient acquisition strategies to enhance nutrient uptake (e. g. Pate and Beard 1984) and respond to fire related disturbances (e. g. Deifs et al. 1987) recovery of biomass is relatively slow where repeated trampling disturbance degrades plant structure and disrupts subtle surface soil and plant root associations (Phillips and Newsome 2002; Hopper 2009).

The effects of trampling thus exacerbate natural environmental stress especially when plant reproductive structures are lost/damaged and where soil disturbance takes place. In this study the slow or absence of growth of dominant plant genera (*Hakea*, *Acacia*, *Banksia*, *Melaleuca*, *Leucopogon* and *Verticordia*) (Table 2) evident over a 12-month period thus relates to the propensity for plant growth to be naturally limited by the availability of water and nutrients (e.g. Yorks et al. 1997; Specht and Specht 1999; Hopper and Gioia 2004).

Malmivaara-Lamsa et al. (2008) found that in Finland the tolerance (combining resistance and resilience) of vegetation increased with fertility of the soil. Lambers at al. (2010) and Laliberte et al. (2014) point out that in the nutrient deficient landscapes of south Western Australia the low availability of plant nutrients constrains plant productivity. Such soil conditions mean that it could take a long time for many plant species to recover from trampling disturbance. Hopper (2009) points out that recovery from disturbance is also closely linked to soil surface conditions as the top 5 to 10 cm of soil is an important repository of micro-organisms and seed which are vital for recovery following disturbance. Damage to this thin soil layer could further limit the capacity of the biodiverse heathlands of Western Australia to recover from trampling by visitors.

Climatic conditions during the sampling period additionally help to explain the low resilience (recovery) of vegetation in both the treatment and control lanes. For example, Bernhardt-Romermann et al. (2011) reported that resilience is largely dependent on active plant growth which is directly connected to climate. The three national parks are characterised by a Mediterranean climate with wet winters and dry summers (Beard 1990; Hopper and Gioia 2004). Rainfall data (Table 10) shows that LNP (213.5mm below the average) and SRNP (73.8mm below the average) had lower than average rainfall. The lower than average rainfall at these sites is likely to have affected the growth and ability of vegetation to recover. At FRNP there was a significant rainfall event during the summer period in January (115mm) which when compared to the average January rainfall (21.6mm) was well above the average. However, this rainfall fell outside of the growing season and would have had a minimal positive effect on plant community growth and ability to recover post-trampling.

Recovery following damage of vegetation caused by recreation and tourism activities is likely to be slowed down under sub-optimal soil moisture conditions brought about by drought and reduced seasonal rainfall. The evidence for climate change and predictions for a continual decline in winter rainfall for southwest Western Australia (Stott et al. 2010; Dai 2013; Watson et al. 2013) is an additional factor that exacerbates the sensitivity of this vegetation to damage from tourists and other visitors.

Management implications for recreation and tourism

The findings reported in this paper are of great importance given that the parks are an interface between biodiversity and tourism and that these environments are highly vulnerable and under threat (Myers et al. 2000; Hopper and Gioia 2004). Observations of tourists and the evidence of tramping damage indicate that both independent travellers and tour operator led groups need additional management attention (Table 11).

INSERT TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

Access into protected areas is facilitated via trail networks. There are a wide range of trail designs that can be applied depending upon environmental conditions and the level of visitation (see Newsome et al. 2013). Where trail networks are unsustainable the risk of visitors leaving trails due to eroded sections and waterlogging increases (Marion and Leung 2004; Newsome et al. 2013). Tourists leaving formed trails and crossing barriers that are designed to protect vegetation from trampling can create constant, year-to-year, low level trampling likely to result in localised site degradation and the unappealing look of damaged vegetation may displace visitors into more pristine areas. The significance of such behaviour will depend on the levels of visitation, the extent to which new areas are visited, presence of other recreational activities that may damage vegetation and the efficacy of existing trail management practices (Newsome et al. 2013). Physical aspects vital to keeping visitors on paths include a comprehensive programme of trail management and monitoring and it is important that resources, expertise and staff are available to achieve trail sustainability (Mende and Newsome 2006; Marion and Reid 2007; Marion and Leung 2011; Marion et al. 2011). Hardened trail surfaces have proven to be effective in containing trail impacts in sensitive environments but are expensive to install and maintain (Hawes and Dixon 2014). However, when planned, installed and maintained they are effective in managing visitor access (Marion and Leung 2004; Randall and Newsome 2009)

Educational programs are also widely employed in protected areas to encourage appropriate tourist behaviours (CALM 1999; Marion and Reid 2007; Newsome et al. 2013). In Western Australia this is particularly important because of the risk of both on and off-trail activity spreading plant pathogens such as *Phytophthora cinnamomi* (dieback disease). *Phytophthora cinnamomi*, for example, is already present along walk trails in SRNP and along access roads in FRNP so the risk of further spread as a result of tourism access is real (Newsome 2003; Buckley et al. 2004). Up to 2,800 species of plant in SWA are susceptible to dieback disease caused by *Phytophthora cinnamomi* and further tourism and recreation mediated spread of the pathogen constitutes a major risk for this biodiverse region (Shearer et al. 2004). Educational programmes combined with dieback hygiene, involving the provision of hiking boot-cleaning stations and sometimes trail closures, have been and are currently, are applied in at-risk protected areas in Western Australia (Newsome 2003; Parks and Wildlife 2015).

Conclusion

The work presented in this paper provides data on the impacts of trampling within an international biodiversity hotspot. Such damage not only constitutes a risk to biodiversity but also to the wildflower tourism resource itself. Using established methodologies this study demonstrates that low levels of trampling cause significant damage to the shrub-dominated communities characterising the vegetation of LNP, FRNP and SRNP and that these plant communities have a low resistance to human trampling disturbance. Furthermore, measurements of trampling impacts at selected intervals over a 12-month period suggest that the vegetation communities also have low resilience to human trampling. Plant characteristics that help to explain the sensitivity of vegetation to trampling are an erect growth form, woody stems, shrub life forms and low productivity. Season of use is an important consideration as the production of flowers and other reproductive structures coincides with peak visitor activity and likely impact. An additional stress factor hindering the recovery of vegetation from trampling damage is seasonal drought especially if this occurs during the growing season.

Tourism is one of a group of threatening processes (eg. see Pickering and Hill 2007; Pickering 2010) that include the presence of feral animals, invasive weeds, spread of fungal pathogens, altered fire regimes and climate change (Burgman et al. 2007). Perhaps considered as the least significant of these threatening process this work has shown that recreational damage via trampling has the capacity to degrade a highly valued tourism resource. The results of this research show the sensitivity of these vegetation communities to trampling and the trampling impact of visitors needs to be effectively managed to protect these communities. Given the increasing visitation to protected areas in Western Australia (TWA and DEC 2010) the promotion of the wildflower tourism industry overseas and a societal push for greater participation in outdoor activities it is important that all of the potential risks associated with trampling biodiverse vegetation are actively conveyed to all. Furthermore, the findings and recommendations derived from this work can be set within an international context in that the biodiverse vegetation communities occurring in the Mediterranean ecosystems of South Africa and South America are also facing increased recreational pressures. Accordingly this work adds to the trampling impact database and provides a useful comparison and platform for further work on the impacts of trampling on biodiverse shrub land communities.

Acknowledgements

To be added

References

Agafonoff A, Brown R, Thomson-Dans C, Marchant N (1998) Western Australia's threatened flora. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Perth Western Australia

Ballantyne M, Pickering CM (2012) Ecotourism as a threatening process for wild orchids. Journal of Ecotourism 11(1):34-47

Ballantyne M, Pickering CM (2013) Tourism and recreation: a common threat to IUCN red-listed vascular plants in Europe. Biodiversity Conservation 22:3027-3044

Barrett S, Yates C (2014) Risks to a mountain flora ecosystem with endemic biota in southwestern Australia. Austral Ecology doi:10.1111/aec.12199

Barros A, Gonnet J, Pickering CM (2013) Impacts of informal trails on vegetation and soils in the highest protected area in the Southern Hemisphere. Journal of Environmental Management 127:50-60

Barros A, Pickering CM (2014) Impacts of experimental trampling by hikers and pack animals on a high-altitude alpine sedge meadow in the Andes. Plant Ecology and Diversity DOI: 10.1080/17550874.2014.893592

Bayfield NG (1979) Recovery of four montane health communities on Cairngorm, Scotland, from disturbance by trampling. Biological Conservation 15:165-179

Beard JS (1990) Plant life of Western Australia. Kenthurst, NSW, Kangaroo Press

Bernhardt-Romermann M, Gray A,Vanbergen AJ, Berges L, Bohner A, Brooker RW, De Bruyn L, De Cinti B, Dirnbock T, Grandin U, Hester AJ, Kanka R, Klotz S, Loucougaray G, Lundin L, Matteucci G, Meszaros I, Olah V, Preda E, Prevosto B, Pykala J, Schmidt W, Taylor ME,Vadineanu A, Waldmann T, Stadler J (2011) Functional traits and local environment predict vegetation responses to disturbance: a pan-European multi-site experiment. Journal of Ecology 99:777-787

Buckley R (2005) Recreation Ecology Research effort: an international comparison. Tourism Recreation Research 30:99-101

Buckley R, King K, Zubrinich T (2004) The role of tourism in spreading dieback disease in Australian vegetation. In: Buckley R (ed) The Environmental Impacts of Tourism. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, pp 317–324

Burbidge A, Hopper S, van Leeuwen S (1990) Nature conservation, landscape and recreation values of the Lesueur area. Report to the Environmental Protection Authority from the Department of Conservation and Land Management. Bulletin 424. Environmental Protection Authority, Perth, Western Australia

Burgman MA**,** Keith DA, Hopper SD, Widyatmoko D, Drill C (2007) Threat syndromes and conservation of the Australian flora. Biological Conservation 134:73-82

CALM (1991) Fitzgerald River National Park Management Plan 1991 – 2001. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Perth, Western Australia

CALM (1995) Lesueur National Park and Coomallo Nature Reserve Management Plan 1995 – 2005. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Perth, Western

Australia

CALM (1999) Stirling Range National Park and Porongurup National Park Management Plan 1999-2009. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Perth, Western Australia

Cole DN (1985) Recreational trampling effects on six habitat types in western Montana. USDA For. Serv. Res. Pap., INT-350. Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, Utah

Cole DN (1987) Research on soil and vegetation in wilderness: a state of knowledge review. National Wilderness Research Conference: issues, state of knowledge, future directions. U. F. Services. Odgen USA. Gen Tech Rep. INT 220:135-177

Cole DN (2004) Impacts of hiking and camping on soils and vegetation: a review. In: Buckley R (ed) Environmental Impacts of Ecotourism. Cambridge, CABI Publishing, pp41-60

Cole DN, Bayfield NG (1993) Recreational trampling of vegetation: standard experimental procedures. Biological Conservation 63:209-215

Cole DN, Spildie DR (1998) Hiker, horse and Ilama trampling effects on native vegetation in Montana, USA. Journal of Environmental Management 53:61-71

Cressie N (1993) Statistics for Spatial Data. Wiley, New York

Dai A (2013) Increasing drought under global warming in observations and models. Nature Climate Change 3:52-58

Deifs J, Pate J, Bell D (1987) Northern sandplain kwongan: community biomass and selected species response to fire. Journal of the Royal Society of Western Australia 69:133-138

Denscombe M (1998) The good research guide for small scale-social research problems. Open University Press, Buckingham, UK

Gole C (2006) The Southwest Australia Ecoregion: Jewel of the Australian Continent. Southwest Australia Ecoregion Initiative, Perth Western Australia

Griffin T, Hopkins A (1981) Short-term effects of brush harvesting on the Kwongan vegetation at Eneabba, Western Australia. Report No 45. Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Perth, Western Australia

Growcock AJ (2006) Impacts of camping and trampling on Australian alpine and subalpine vegetation and soils. School of Environmental and Applied Sciences. Gold Coast, Griffith University. Doctor of Philosophy

Hamberg L, Malmivaara-Lamsa M, Lehvavirta S, O'Hara RB, Kotze DJ (2010) Quantifying the effects of trampling and habitat edges on forest understory vegetation - A field experiment. Journal of Environmental Management 91:1811-1820

Hawes, M. and Dixon, G. (2014) A methodology for prioritising management tasks for an extensive recreational walking track system. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 5-6: 11-16

Hill R, Pickering CM (2009) Differences in resistance of three subtropical vegetation types to experimental trampling. Journal of Environmental Management 90:1305-1312

Hill W, Pickering CM (2006) Vegetation associated with different walking track types in the Kosciuszko alpine area, Australia. Journal of Environmental Management 78:24-34

Hnatiuk R, Hopkins A (1981) An ecological analysis of Kwongan vegetation south of Eneabba, Western Australia. Australian Journal of Ecology 6:423-438

Hopkins A, Keighery G, Marchant N (1983) Species rich uplands of south Western Australia. Proceedings of the Ecological Society of Australia 12:15-26

Hopper SD (1979) Biogeographical aspects of speciation in the southwest Australian flora. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 10:399-422

Hopper SD (2009) OCBIL theory: towards an intergrated understanding of the evolution, ecology and conservation of biodiversity on old, climatically buffered,infertile landscapes. Plant and Soil 322:49-86

Hopper SD, Gioia P (2004) The Southwest Australian floristic region: evolution and conservation of the global hot spot of biodiversity. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 35:623-650

Jennings G (2010) Tourism Research. Wiley, Milton, Queensland, Australia

Kelly CL, Pickering CM, Buckley R (2003) Impacts of tourism on threatened plant taxa and communities in Australia. Ecological Management and Restoration 4(1):37-44

Kent M, Coker P (1992) Vegetation description and analysis: a practical approach. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester

Kim M, Daigle J (2012) Monitoring of vegetation impact due to trampling on Cadillac Mountain Summit using high spatial resolution remote sensing data sets. Environmental Management 50(5):956-968

Kuss FR, Hall CN (1991) Ground flora trampling studies: five years after closure. Environmental Management 15(5):715-727

Laliberte E, Lambers H, Burgess TI, Wright SJ (2014) Phosphorus limitation, soil-borne pathogens and the coexistence of plant species in hyerdiverse forests and shrublands. New Phytologist doi: 10.1111/nph.13203

Lambers H, Brundrett M, Raven J, Hopper S (2010) Plant mineral nutrition in ancient landscapes: high plant species diversity on infertile soils is linked to functional diversity for nutritional strategies. Plant and Soil 334:11-31

Leung Y, Marion JL (2000) Recreational impacts and management in wilderness: a state of knowledge review. Wilderness Science in a time of change conference, Proceedings RMPS-P15-Vol 5, Vol 5: Wilderness visitors, experiences and visitor management, Missoula, USDA Forest Service, Rockey Mountain Research Station

Liddle MJ (1975) A theoretical relationship between the primary productivity of vegetation and its ability to tolerate trampling. Biological Conservation 8:251-255

Liddle MJ (1997) Recreation ecology: the ecological impact of outdoor recreation and ecotourism. Chapman & Hill. London UK

Liddle MJ, Thyer NC (1986) Trampling and fire in a subtropical dry sclerophyll forest. Environmental Conservation 13(1):33-39

Malmivaara-Lamsa M, Hamberg L, Lofstrom I,Vanha-Majamaa I, Niemela J (2008) Trampling tolerance of understorey vegetation in different hemiboreal urban forest site types in Finland. Urban Ecosystems 11:1-16

Marion J, Leung Y (2004) Environmentally sustainable trail management. In: Ralph Buckley (ed) The environmental impacts of tourism. CABI Publishing, UK, pp. 61-82

Marion J Leung Y (2011) Indicators and protocols for monitoring impacts of formal and informal trails protected areas. Journal of Tourism and Leisure Studies 17(2): 215–236

Marion J Reid S (2007) Minimising visitor impacts to protected areas: The efficacy of low impact education programmes. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 15:5–27

Marion J, Wimpey J, Park L (2011) The science of trail surveys: Recreation ecology provides new tools for managing wilderness trails. Park Science 28(3):60–65

McDougall KL, Wright GT (2004) The impact of trampling on feldmark vegetation in Kosciuszko National Park, Australia. Australian Journal of Botany 52:315-320

Mende P, Newsome D (2006) The assessment, monitoring and management of hiking trails: a case study from the Stirling Range national Park, Western Australia. Conservation Science Western Australia 5(3): 27-37

Monz CA (2002) The response of two Arctic Tundra plant communities to human trampling disturbance. Journal of Environmental Management 64:207-217

Monz CA, Cole DN, Leung Y, Marion JL (2010) Sustaining visitor use in protected areas: future opportunities in recreation ecology research based on the USA experience. Environmental Management 45:551-562

Monz CA, Pickering CM, Hadwen WL (2013) Recent advances in recreation ecology and the implications of different relationships between recreational use and ecological impacts. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 11(8):441-446

Myers N, Mitterneier RA, Mittermeier G, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature 403: 853-858

Newbey KR (1995) A biological survey of Fitzgerald area, Western Australia. Part 4: Vegetation and Flora. CALM Science 3:29-46

Newsome D (2003) The role of an accidentally introduced fungus in degrading the health of the Stirling Range National Park ecosystem in South Western Australia: status and prognosis. In: Rapport DJ, Lasley WL, Rolston DE, Nielsen NO, Qualset CO, Damania A.B. (eds.) Managing for healthy ecosystems., Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Florida, USA

Newsome D, Milewski A, Phillips N, Annear R (2002) Effects of horse riding on national narks and other natural ecosystems in Australia: implications for management. Journal of Ecotourism 1(1):52-74

Newsome D, Moore SA, Dowling RK (2013) Natural Area Tourism: Ecology, Impacts and Management 2nd ed. Channel View Publications, Bristol

Paczkowska G, Chapman AR (2000) The Western Australian Flora: a descriptive catalogue. Wildflower Society of Western Australia, Nedlands WA

Parks and Wildlife (2015) Phytophthora dieback. Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia. http://www.dpaw.wa.gov.au/management/pests-diseases/phytophthora-dieback. Accessed 23 March 2015

Pate J, Beard J (1984) Kwongan: plant life of the sandplain. University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands, Perth

Phillips N (2000) A field experiment to quantify the environmental impacts of horse riding in the D'Entrecasteaux National Park. Environmental Science. Perth, Murdoch University. Bachelor of Science (Honours)

Phillips N, Newsome D (2002) Understanding the impacts of recreation in Australian protected areas: quantifying damage caused by horse riding in D’Entrecasteaux National Park, Western Australia. Pacific Conservation Biology 7:256-273

Pickering CM (2010) Ten factors that affect the severity of environmental impact of visitors to protected areas. AMBIO 39:70-77

Pickering CM, Growcock AJ (2009) Impacts of experimental trampling on tall alpine herbfields and subalpine grasslands in the Australian Alps. Journal of Environmental Management 91:532-540

Pickering CM, Hill W (2007) Impacts of recreation and tourism on plant biodiversity and vegetation in protected areas in Australia. Journal of Environmental Management 85:791-800

Pickering CM, Hill W, Newsome D, Leung Y (2010) Comparing hiking, mountain biking and horse riding impacts on vegetation and soils in Australia and the United States of America. Journal of Environmental Management 91:551-562

Pickering CM, Rossi S, Barros A (2011) Assessing the impacts of mountain biking and hiking on subalpine grassland in Australia using an experimental protocol. Journal of Environmental Management 92:3049-3057

Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, R Development Core Team (2013) nlme: Linear and Nonlinear mixed effects models, R package version 3.1-108

Prescott O, Stewart G (2014) Assessing the impacts of human trampling on vegetation: a systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental evidence. PeerJ 2:e360; DOI 10. 7717/peerJ360

Randall M, Newsome D (2008) Assessment, evaluation and a comparison of planned and unplanned walk trails in coastal south-western Australia. Conservation Science Western Australia 7(1): 19-34

R Development Core Team (2013) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-project.org/

Roovers P, Verheyen K, Hermy M, Gulinck H (2004) Experimental trampling and vegetation recovery in some forest and healthland communities. Applied Vegetation Science 7:111-118

Shearer BL, Crane C, Cochrane A (2004) Quantification of the susceptibility of the native flora of the Southwest Botanical Province, Western Australia, to *Phytophthora cinnamomi*. Australian Journal of Botany 52:435–443

Sloan S, Jenkins CN, Joppa LN, Gaveau DL, Laurance WF (2014) Remaining natural vegetation in the global biodiversity hotspots. Biological Conservation 177:12-24

Smith A (2014) Personal Communication, National Park Visitor Data. Parks and Visitor Science Coordinator, Department of Parks and Wildlife, Perth, Western Australia

Specht R, Specht A (1999) Australian plant communities: dynamics of structure, growth and biodiversity. Oxford University Press, Melbourne, Australia

Stott PA, Gillett NP, Hegerl GC, Karoly DJ, Stone DA, Zhang X, Zwiers F (2010) Detection and attribution of climate change: a regional perspective. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Climate Change 1:192–211

Sun D, Liddle MJ (1991) Field occurrence, recovery and simulated trampling resistance and recovery of two grasses. Biological Conservation 57(2):187-203

Sun D, Liddle MJ (1993a) Plant morphological characterisitics and resistance to simulated trampling. Environmental Management 17(4):511-521

Sun D, Liddle MJ (1993b) A survey of trampling effects on vegetation and soil in eight tropical and subtropical sites. Environmental Management 17(4): 497-510

Sun D, Liddle MJ (1993c) Trampling resistance, stem flexibility and leaf strength in nine Australian grasses and herbs. Biological Conservation 65:35-41

Talbot LM, Turton SM, Graham AW (2003) Trampling resistance of Tropical rainforest soils and vegetation in the Wet Tropics North East Australia. Journal of Environmental Management 69:63-69

Thomson C, Hall G, Friend G (1993) Mountains of Mystery: A Natural history of the Stirling Range. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Perth

Torn A, Tolvanen A, Norokorpi Y, Tervo R, Siikamaki P (2009) Comparing the impacts of hiking, skiing and horse riding on trail and vegetation in different types of forest. Journal of Environmental Management 90:1427-1434

TWA (2005) Tourism Western Australia Strategic Plan 2005-2010. Tourism Western Australia, Perth, Australia

TWA, DEC (2010) Review of nature-based tourism, Perth, Western Australia

TWA (2011) Wildflower holiday e-guide. http://www.tourism.wa.gov.au (Accessed 26/8/14)

Waltert B, Wiemken V, Rusterholz H, Boller T, Baur B (2002) Disturbance of forest by trampling: effects on mycorrhizal roots of seedlings and mature trees of *Fagus sylatica*. Plant and Soil 243:143-154

Watson M, Iwamura T, Butt N (2013) Mapping vulnerability and conservation adaptation strategies under climate change. Nature Climate Change 3:989-994

Whinam J, Chilcott N (1999) Impacts of trampling on alpine environments in central Tasmania. Journal of Environmental Management 57: 205-220

Whinam J, Chilcott N (2003) Impacts after four years of experimental trampling on alpine/sub-alpine environments in western Tasmania. Journal of Environmental Management 67:339-351

Wimpey J, Marion JL (2011) A spatial exploration of informal trails networks within Great Falls Park, WA. Journal of Environmental Management 92:1012-1022

Yorks TP, West NE, Mueller RJ, Warren SD (1997) Toleration of traffic by vegetation: life form conclusions and summary extracts from a comprehensive data base. Environmental Management 21(1):121-131

Table 1. Sites selected for descriptive and trampling experiment studies

National Park	**Site**	**Plant Community**	**Typical genera ***
Lesueur National Park: 821 species (111 endemic) Visitation (2013-2014) 11,655	**LD3**: Lesueur Day Use Area **LE1**: Near Lesueur Day Use Area	Dominated by shrubs	*Hakea, Acacia, Eucalyptus, Melaleuca, Grevillea, Daviesia, Darwinia, Thysanotus, Tetratheca, Petrophile*
	LD4: Information Bay **LE2**: Near Information Bay	Dominated by shrubs	*Astroloma, Leucopogon, Cryptandra , Daviesia, Gastrolobium, Synaphea, Lechenaultia, Olearia, Leptospermum, Lomandra*
Fitzgerald River National Park: 1530 species (82 endemic) Visitation (2013-2014) 63,4017	**FD3:** East Mt Barren Carpark 1 (burnt in wildfire, not used) **FE1**: Near East Mt Barren Carpark 1	Dominated by shrubs	*Eucalyptus, Banksia, Acacia, Calothamnus, Stylidium, Leucopogon, Hakea, Melaleuca, Verticordia, Schoenus*
	FD4: East Mt Barren Carpark 2 (burnt in wildfire, not used) **FE2**: Near East Mt Barren Carpark 2 (burnt in wildfire, not used)	Dominated by shrubs	*Eucalyptus, Leucopogon, Banksia, Jacksonia, Adenanthos, Calothamnus, Lasiopetalum, Sphenotoma, Hibbertia, Acacia*
Stirling Range National Park: 1,748 species (75 endemic) Visitation (2013-2014) 68,365	**SD2**: Pay Station at Bluff Knoll **SE1:** South of Papercollar Bridge	Dominated by shrubs	*Acacia, Hakea, Stylidium, Banksia, Kunzea, Petrophile, Astroloma, Leucopogon, Melaleuca, Verticordia*

Sources (CALM 1991: Thomson et al. 1993; CALM 1995; Newbey 1995; CALM 1999; Paczkowska and Chapman 2000; Smith 2014)

*Recorded genera from NatureMap website: http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au

Table 2. Morphological, anatomical and physiological characteristics of plant genera dominating the vegetation community at LNP, FRNP and SRNP study sites

Genus present and dominant at study sites				**Plant characteristics**			
Plant genus	LNP	FRNP	SRNP	Shrub life form (morphological)	Erect plant (morphological)	Woody stem (anatomical)	Slow growing (physiological)
Hakea	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Acacia	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Eucalyptus	√	√	×	√	√	√	√
Melaleuca	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Leucopogon	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Banksia	×	√	√	√	√	√	√
Stylidium	×	√	√	× (herb)	√	×	√
Verticordia	×	√	√	√	√	√	√

Sources (Beard 1990; Paczkowska and Chapman 2000; Hopper and Gioia 2004; http://florabase.dpaw.wa.gov.au Accessed 03/03/14).

Table 3. Conditional *F*-tests for individual terms in the model assessing the difference between pre- and post-trampling vegetation height

Variable	Num. df	Den. df	*F*-value	Sig.
Pre- vs. post-trampling	1	24	105.4938	< 0.0001
Passes	1	24	11.9604	0.0020
Site	3	24	10.3544	0.0001
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes	1	24	29.8635	< 0.0001
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Site	3	24	2.2473	0.1087
Passes * Site	3	24	1.6595	0.2022
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes * Site	3	24	5.6194	0.0046

Table 4. Parameter estimates, standard errors, and *p*-values for linear mixed effects model assessing the difference between pre- and post-trampling vegetation height

Variable	Coefficient (SE)	*t*-value	Sig.
Pre- vs. Post-trampling	-0.2098859 (0.3341879)	-0.628040	0.5359
Passes	0.0031834 (0.0014077)	2.261430	0.0331
Site: Near Lesueur Day use area (LE1)	-0.6334236 (0.3175151)	-1.994940	0.0575
Site Near Information Bay (LE2)	-0.1162316 (0.3175151)	-0.366066	0.7175
Site: South of Papercollar Bridge (SE1)	-1.1488627 (0.3342305)	-3.437337	0.0022
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes	-0.0105661 (0.0019908)	-5.307571	< 0.0001
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Site (LE1)	-0.3294392 (0.4490342)	-0.733662	0.4703
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Site (LE2)	-0.5762841 (0.4490342)	-1.283386	0.2116
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Site (SE1)	0.2139973 (0.4726432)	0.452767	0.6548
Passes * Site (LE1)	-0.0034634 (0.0016519)	-2.096572	0.0468
Passes * Site (LE2)	-0.0032789 (0.0016519)	-1.984866	0.0587
Passes * Site (SE1)	0.0010465 (0.0019909)	0.525635	0.6040
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes * Site (LE1)	0.0078925 (0.0023362)	3.378352	0.0025
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes * Site (LE2)	0.0085012 (0.0023362)	3.638912	0.0013
Pre- vs. post-trampling * Passes * Site (SE1)	0.0035279 (0.0028154)	1.253063	0.2223

Table 5. Conditional *F*-tests for individual terms in the model assessing post-trampling vegetation height by number of passes and number of weeks since initial trampling

Variable	Num. df	Den. df	*F*-value	Sig.
Passes	1	73	149.5651	< 0.0001
Weeks	1	73	0.0028	0.9582
Site	3	73	1.8340	0.1485
Passes * Weeks	1	73	0.3341	0.5650

Table 6. Parameter estimates, standard errors, and *p*-values for linear mixed effects model assessing post-trampling vegetation height by number of passes and number of weeks since initial trampling

Variable	Coefficient (SE)	*t*-value	Sig.
Initial Height	0.2546271 (0.0051148)	49.78245	< 0.0001
Passes	-0.003871 (0.0003965)	-9.763	< 0.0001
Weeks	0.0011503 (0.00316292)	0.36367	0.7172
Site (LE1)	-0.0804366 (0.13890964)	-0.57906	0.5643
Site (LE2)	0.0766594 (0.13882101)	0.55222	0.5825
Site (SE1)	-0.2335296 (0.13828217)	-1.68879	0.0955
Passes * Weeks	-0.0000087 (0.00001505)	-0.57801	0.565

Table 7. Conditional *F*-tests for individual terms in the model assessing post-trampling percentage vegetation cover by number of passes and number of weeks since initial trampling

Variable	Num. df	Den. df	*F*-value	Sig.
Passes	1	165	244.911	< 0.0001
Weeks	1	165	2.994	0.0854
Site	3	8	1.800	0.2251
Passes * Weeks	1	165	0.284	0.5949

Table 8. Parameter estimates, standard errors, and *p*-values for linear mixed effects model assessing post-trampling percent vegetation cover by number of passes and number of weeks since initial trampling

Variable	**Coefficient (SE)**	***t*-value**	**Sig.**
Passes	-0.0009134 (0.000075081)	-12.1652	< 0.0001
Weeks	0.0004542 (0.000519213)	0.87484	0.3829
Site (LE1)	-0.044417 (0.027659929)	-1.60583	0.147
Site (LE2)	-0.0130105 (0.027752223)	-0.46881	0.6517
Site (SE1)	0.0179287 (0.027752223)	0.64603	0.5363
Passes * Weeks	0.0000013 (0.00000247)	0.53272	0.5949

Table 9. Resistance indices for national park sites

National Park	Site	Vegetation Community	Resistance Index (number of passes)
Lesueur National Park	LE1	Shrub-dominated community	100
	LE2	Shrub-dominated community	30
Fitzgerald River National Park	FE1	Shrub-dominated community	100
Stirling Range National Park	SE1	Shrub-dominated community	300

Table 10. Rainfall at the closest weather station to each national park during the trampling experiment period

National Park and Site	Closest Weather Station (Bureau of Meteorology)	Rainfall (mm) during BASE study period	Long term annual average rainfall (mm) for study period	Difference in Rainfall
Lesueur National Park (LE1 & LE2)	Warradarge (Number 8278)	333.2mm	July to June 546.7mm	213.5mm below the average
Fitzgerald River National Park (FE1)	Hopetoun (Number 9557)	525.8mm	Sept to August 503.7mm	22.1mm above the average
Stirling Ranges National Park (SE1)	Amelup (Number 10502)	271.1mm	Oct to Aug 344.9mm	73.8mm below the average

(Accessed www.bom.gov.com on 17/04/2013)

Table 11 General, case by case, recommendations for additional management attention in regard to increasing wildflower tourism

1. Educational programs for tour operators that convey messages about the effects of trampling and the low resilience and resistance of these highly valued plant communities.
2. The installation of interpretive panels at tourism activity nodes that highlight the sensitivity of the vegetation and provide information about the consequences of trampling on vegetation and species of tourism interest.
3. Effective trail signage to minimize visitor movement off formal trails and the potential creation of informal trails.
4. Provision of boardwalks that allow for discovery and seclusion opportunities while minimising the movement off formal trails by visitors.
5. Creation and design of new trails and/or upgrading existing trails.
6. Ongoing monitoring with a view to closing some sites so that there is scope for the recovery of sites damaged by trampling.
7. Where appropriate placing physical barriers to minimise the movement off formal trails (Roovers et al. 2004; Kim and Daigle 2012; Barros et al. 2013).
8. Further research in shrub-dominated communities in other biodiversity hotspots to build knowledge regarding the resilience and resistance of these communities to trampling and other impacts associated with tourism.

Figure 1
Click here to download Figure: Figure 1.tif



Figure 2

Click here to download Figure: Figure 2.tif



Figure 1. Protected areas that exhibit high endemism and form core components of the Western Australian international biodiversity hotspot

Figure 2. Study area locations within the national parks



Figure 3. Size and approximate layout of a treatment lane in the trampling experiment



Figure 4. Change in vegetation height at descriptive sites



Figure 5. Change in percentage cover of living material at descriptive sites



Figure 6. Mean vegetation heights (and corresponding standard errors, represented as vertical bars) for the four sites during trampling experiment study before trampling, immediately after trampling, and 2 weeks, 6 weeks and 52 weeks after trampling



Figure 7. Mean vegetation heights (and corresponding standard errors, represented as vertical bars) for the four sites during trampling experiment study for varying levels of trampling and at various time points



Figure 8. Percentage cover of living matter (and corresponding standard errors, represented as vertical bars) for the four sites during trampling experiment study before trampling, immediately after trampling, and 2 weeks, 6 weeks and 52 weeks after trampling



Figure 9. Percentage cover of living matter (and corresponding standard errors, represented as vertical bars) for the four sites during trampling experiment study for varying levels of trampling and at various time points