

Based on expert opinion (a modified Delphi process with recreation management professionals), the most recent Wisconsin Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) process (WDNR 2006) initiated an overview of recreational use interactions in Wisconsin. The empirical results are summarized in table 1 and represent an extension of earlier work that addresses land use compatibility (Clawson 1974). Note from this table that, according to recreation managers, the outcomes

of recreational use interactions reflect positive (complementary), neutral (supplementary), and negative (ranging from competitive to antagonistic) relationships. In a manner that generally confirms previous work (cf. Knopp and Tyger 1973; Watson et al. 1994), this table shows that there is a general tendency for asymmetrical interactions, most notably along motorized and non-motorized lines.

While the most recent Wisconsin SCORP assessed recreational use interactions from the perspective of recreation managers (seen as experts), there is a continuing need to extend this comprehensive assessment of use interaction to recreational trail users themselves. Indeed, many studies have been done on the conflict between various user groups: between cross-country skiers and snowmobilers (Knopp and Tyger 1973), between floaters and motorized boaters (Shelby 1975), between canoe

paddlers and motorcraft users (Adelman et al. 1982), between mountain bikers and hikers (Watson et al. 1994), between water-skiers and anglers (Gramann and Burdge 1981), and between off-road vehicle users and non-users (Noe et al. 1982). The bulk of the studies that have been completed have been purely descriptive and focused on limited alternative uses. These issues of multiple uses, however, have broad implications for recreation management and the future enjoyment of recreational areas.

**Table 1. Average land-based recreational activity compatibility ratings.**

PRIMARY USE <sup>a</sup>	Interacting use <sup>a</sup>										Average compatibility
	ATV riding	Hunting	Snowmobiling	Horseback riding	Mountain biking	Cross-country skiing	Linear trail biking	Hiking	Wildlife watching	Camping	
ATV riding	X	5.3	6.5	5.1	5.5	4.9	5.5	6.1	6.9	7.5	6.0
Hunting	3.3	X	3.7	4.7	4.3	5.3	5.7	5.4	6.0	6.3	5.0
Snowmobiling	4.3	4.0	X	4.0	4.8	4.3	5.8	5.3	6.3	7.2	5.1
Horseback riding	2.2	3.5	3.0	X	3.8	4.9	4.5	6.3	7.3	7.7	4.8
Mountain biking	3.1	3.6	4.7	4.8	X	5.7	8.1	6.1	7.4	8.0	5.7
Cross-country skiing	1.8	3.6	2.6	3.3	4.2	X	5.6	4.9	8.1	8.5	4.7
Linear trail biking	2.6	3.9	5.5	5.3	8.2	7.1	X	7.4	8.0	8.7	6.3
Hiking	2.4	3.5	3.5	5.7	4.7	6.1	6.5	X	8.9	9.2	5.6
Wildlife watching	2.2	3.2	2.9	6.4	5.2	7.6	6.8	8.6	X	8.3	5.7
Camping	3.9	4.1	5.0	7.5	7.8	8.2	8.2	8.9	8.5	X	6.9
Average compatibility	2.9	3.9	4.2	5.2	5.4	6.0	6.3	6.6	7.5	7.9	

- highly competitive or antagonistic (below 4.0)
- moderately to mildly competitive (4.0–7.0)
- supplementary or complementary (7.0 and above)

Source: WDNR 2006, 4–6.

<sup>a</sup>Compatibility ratings reflect the perceived level of conflict from the perspective of trail users participating in the activities in the left column—the primary use. Ratings should therefore be read horizontally. Results are based on responses from 23 Wisconsin recreation professionals.