

PROBLEM ANALYSIS OF PORCUPINE DAMAGE IN YOUNG,
MANAGED FORESTS IN THE
PRINCE RUPERT REGION

by

T. P. Sullivan, Ph.D

Mammal Pest Management Ltd.
Langley, British Columbia

British Columbia Ministry of Forests and Lands
Victoria, B.C.
Forest Service Internal Report
PM-PB-33

Not for Publication. (The contents of this report may not be cited or reproduced in whole or part without the written approval of the Director, Protection Branch, Ministry of Forests and Lands, 2nd floor, 31 Bastion Square, Victoria, B.C. V8W 3E7).

Foreword

This project was funded unilaterally by the Province of British Columbia as a pest control project in the Intensive Forest Management Program, Canada - British Columbia Forest Resources Development Agreement (FRDA), 1985-1990.

Opinions and recommendations are those of the contractor, and not necessarily those of the two governments.

Opinions or comments on the report are welcomed, and should be directed either to the Regional Manager, Prince Rupert Forest Region, Bag 5000, Smithers, British Columbia, V0J 2N0 or to the undersigned.

J. Muir, RPF
Forest Pathologist
Forest Protection Branch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 SUMMARY	1
2.0 INTRODUCTION	4
3.0 METHODS OF STUDY	5
4.0 POPULATION BIOLOGY	7
4.1 Feeding damage and habitat preference	8
4.2 Population fluctuations	11
4.3 Seasonal migrations	14
4.4 Home range	15
4.5 Denning habits	16
5.0 INCIDENCE OF DAMAGE	16
5.1 Forest Districts in B.C.	16
5.2 Related areas of the Pacific Northwest	17
6.0 CONTROL STRATEGIES	18
6.1 Population reduction	18
6.2 Damage reduction	22
7.0 IMPACT OF DAMAGE ON NSR, STAND TENDING, AND AAC	25
7.1 Short-term impact on NSR and stand tending	25
7.2 Long-term impact on AAC	31
8.0 FORECAST MODEL	32
9.0 PLAN OF ACTION	33
9.1 Detection of damage	33
9.2 Recommendations to alleviate damage	34
9.3 Research requirements	36
10.0 LITERATURE CITED	37
11.0 TABLES	42
12.0 LIST OF FIGURES	57
13.0 FIGURES	60
14.0 LIST OF APPENDICES	70
15.0 APPENDICES	71

1.0 SUMMARY

This report discusses the problem of feeding damage to trees by porcupines and intensive forest management in the Prince Rupert Region. The analysis covers population biology, incidence of damage in B.C. and related areas of the Pacific Northwest, control strategies, impact of damage on NSR, stand tending, and AAC, and development of a forecast model and plan of action. During winter months, porcupines feed on the vascular tissues of pole-size (10-30 cm dbh) to mature coniferous and hardwood trees in many areas of Canada and the United States. Damage is particularly significant in the second-growth western hemlock-Sitka spruce forests of the North Coast and Kalum Districts, and in parts of the Alaska panhandle. Porcupine populations have presumably been increasing in recent years in response to availability of preferred summer (early successional stages) and winter (15-35 year-old stands) habitats, as well as a moderate climate and low predator populations on the north coast of B.C.

Porcupine population fluctuations occur over very long periods. Dendrochronological analysis in northern Quebec indicates a significant expansion of porcupine populations in the last 25 years in response to climatic warming and development of forest stands suitable for winter foraging. Densities in spruce-balsam stands in New Brunswick averaged 2.3-3.1/100 ha, and across different forest types of Canada and the U.S. ranged from 0.4-82.3/100 ha. Winter home ranges were smaller than those in

summer and ranged from 0.1-12.1 ha.

Overall incidence of damage in B.C. and the PNW was low (<5%) with severe attack (>50%) recorded for certain localities of the north coast of B.C. and Alaska. The Prince Rupert, Prince George, and Nelson Regions had the majority of damage. For the two northern Regions, 91.7% (11/12) of Districts concluded that damage incidence was increasing with time.

Hunting, trapping, poison, and predator introduction are the major methods of population reduction. Hunting and introduction of the fisher appeared to be the most promising techniques for reducing porcupine populations. Selection of less preferred tree species and leaving of sacrifice trees in management programs are two methods with potential for damage reduction.

Porcupines clearly prefer to feed on vigorous stems which are usually the dominant and co-dominant trees in natural and managed stands. This selective feeding will result in small non-merchantable stems comprising the major component of damaged stands, thereby leading to perpetual NSR. Damage and stand data from Khutzeymateen Inlet and Fords Cove in the North Coast District and from Mitkof Island in Alaska support this prediction. In the relatively young (12-18 years) managed stands in the Kalum Valley, attack of western hemlock (the predominant species) has increased from 0.6% to 1.8% in the last two years. Similar stands in Alaska have cumulative damage of 25% of hemlock and 51% of spruce crop trees attacked by porcupines, and an annual rate of complete girdling (mortality) at 3.9%. These latter stands may

represent the future damage situation for managed stands in the Kalum Valley. With limited quantitative data available, the impact of damage on AAC has been viewed on an incremental or catastrophic basis. These two "worst case" scenarios assume porcupine populations will continue increasing with consequent damage possibly reaching catastrophic levels. Both scenarios result in a significant lengthening of the rotation.

A first approximation of a forecast model to predict when and where outbreaks of porcupine damage will occur is outlined. Stands 25-35 years old (10-30 cm dbh) in the CWH_f and CWH_i and j subzones are particularly susceptible to attack on the north coast. Management of stands may increase the intensity of attack.

Surveys of damage should be continued in the Kalum and expanded to several natural stands in the North Coast District. Where possible, surveys should be done annually and incorporate 5-year measurement of the impact of partial girdling on growth and yield. Surveys may also be used to assess effectiveness of control strategies.

Specific recommendations to alleviate damage include: (1) bounty system with registered participants or organized hunts with incentive payments of \$20-\$50/animal in accessible areas, (2) introduction of fisher to inaccessible areas but requires appropriate agreement with fur trapping interests, (3) spacing and planting programs which leave a greater number of trees (1200-2000/ha) to accomodate loss from attack by both porcupine and other pests, (4) select for less preferred species such as

amabilis fir and western red cedar. Recommendation (1) will succeed only if conducted with commitment and persistence; and (2) will succeed only if a reliable supply of fisher is available and cooperation is reached with fur trapping interests.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The porcupine (Erethizon dorsatum) is a well-known animal damage agent with a widespread distribution across the forests of Canada, southeast Alaska, and the northern and western United States. During winter months, this herbivore feeds on the vascular tissues (phloem and cambium) and foliage of pole-size to mature coniferous and hardwood trees. These barking and girdling injuries may have a considerable impact on intensive forest management.

Porcupine damage is common in many different forest types. In particular, an alarming incidence of porcupine damage has been observed in recent years in the second-growth western hemlock-Sitka spruce forests of the north coast (Prince Rupert Region) of British Columbia. Sullivan et al. (1986) reported on the incidence of damage and its potential impact on growth and yield in the forest stands of Khutzeymateen Inlet. Eglitis and Hennon (1987) reported on the increasing rate of attack of crop trees by porcupines in precommercially thinned stands in the central portion of the Alaska panhandle. Thus, the porcupine and its damage have considerable relevance to current and future

silvicultural operations within the framework of intensive forest management in the Prince Rupert Region. To this end, a Problem Analysis was initiated to discuss the problem, examine various alternatives of dealing with the problem, and develop criteria for selecting a course of action.

This analysis will cover the following objectives in relation to intensive forest management:

- 1) synopsis of the general population biology of the porcupine.
- 2) assessment of the incidence of porcupine damage within Forest Districts of B.C. and other areas of the Pacific Northwest.
- 3) assessment of the effectiveness and practicality of control strategies for porcupine populations and damage.
- 4) assessment of the impact of feeding damage on NSR, stand tending, and AAC.
- 5) development of a conceptual forecast model to predict when and where outbreaks of porcupine damage will occur.
- 6) development of a plan of action with an assessment of alternatives to control porcupine damage in the Kalum and North Coast Districts.

3.0 METHODS OF STUDY

Information on the population biology of the porcupine, as it relates to forest management, was synthesized from available literature. There have been a considerable number of studies conducted on porcupine populations and damage in various forest

types across Canada and the United States. This information was used to assess which factors were relevant to the damage problem in the North Coast and Kalum Districts. In particular, the role of forest management practices in generating suitable habitat for porcupines was emphasized in this assessment.

Relative levels of porcupine damage as perceived by silviculture and protection staff in Forest Districts within B.C., and related areas of the Pacific Northwest, were measured by a survey questionnaire (Appendix 1), and in some cases, follow-up telephone contact. Quantitative surveys of damage are reported from the North Coast and Kalum Districts and from Alaska. Information from Alaska was compiled from A. Eglitis and P. Hennon, Forest Pest Management, USDA Forest Service, Juneau. General incidence of damage in Washington and Oregon was provided by J. Evans and D. Campbell, USDA-APHIS, Animal Damage Control, Olympia, Washington, and from R. Anderson and J. Rochelle, Weyerhaeuser Company, Tacoma, Washington. Porcupine damage in Alberta was reported by the FIDS, Canadian Forestry Service, Edmonton.

Assessment of the effectiveness and practicality of population and damage control strategies was synthesized from available literature and discussion with other workers in this field. Wherever possible, the efficacy of each strategy was based on scientific evidence so that the assessment would recommend realistic management tools for potential use. To this end, an objective critique of current control strategies has been

included.

Assessment of the impact of damage on NSR, stand tending practices, and AAC used limited quantitative data from the North Coast and Kalum Districts and from Alaska. This information was used to estimate the long-term impact on AAC and short-term effects on NSR and stand tending objectives. The AAC analysis was related to potential long-term population fluctuations of the porcupine as reported in the literature. The impact of damage on tree growth and yield was assessed with respect to other studies on the porcupine and related small mammals. This overall analysis was designed to predict future trends for porcupine-damaged stands in the Region.

A first approximation of a forecast model incorporated known information on porcupine populations, damage, and forest management scenarios in the Region. Thus, it was based on general relationships and trends from work done, to date. The consequent plan of action was based on this management model in outlining survey methods for monitoring porcupine damage and populations, identifying susceptible forest types and suitability of control measures, and research requirements.

A list of all persons contacted during preparation of this problem analysis is given in Appendix 2.

4.0 POPULATION BIOLOGY

This discussion of population biology will focus on (1) those

factors which make certain forest habitats attractive to porcupines, and (2) the population fluctuations, seasonal migrations, home range, and denning habits of this species.

4.1 Feeding damage and habitat preference

The porcupine is strictly a herbivore feeding on grasses, herbs, and forbs during the summer growing season. During winter months, this mammal utilizes the vascular tissues (phloem and cambium) and foliage of pole-size to mature coniferous and hardwood trees as its principal food. Barking injury by the porcupine leaves broad (0.3 cm), prominent horizontal and diagonal incisor marks on the exposed sapwood (Lawrence et al. 1961) and is particularly common in the upper section of tree stems.

From a comprehensive literature review, porcupine damage was found to be significant in many areas of Canada and the United States. Young, pole-size conifer stands are particularly attractive to porcupines. Various reports of damage to forest stands are summarized in Table 1.

Porcupine damage is common in the mixed conifer-hardwood forests of the northeastern and north-central United States (Curtis 1941, 1944; Rudolf 1949; Cook and Hamilton 1957; Krefting et al. 1962) as well as in the dry western forests, particularly ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa) (Taylor 1935; Curtis and Wilson 1953; Lawrence 1957; Van Deusen and Myers 1962; Storm and Halvorson 1967; Hooven 1971). Although not abundant, porcupines are found in the humid coniferous forests of the Pacific Northwest

where they may feed on Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii) and western hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla) (Dodge and Canutt 1969; Hooven 1971). Damage has also been reported in the western hemlock-Sitka spruce (Picea sitchensis) forests of southeast Alaska (Eglitis and Hennon 1986). Porcupine damage to forests within Canada has been reported for limber pine (P. flexilis) and Douglas fir in southern Alberta (Gill and Cordes 1972; Harder 1979), white spruce (P. glauca)-balsam fir (Abies balsamea) and other species in the Maritimes (Reeks 1942; Speer and Dilworth 1978), and hemlock-spruce forests of north-coastal British Columbia (Sullivan et al. 1986).

Although porcupines exhibit intraspecific differences in feeding patterns within their extensive range in North America, there are similarities in foraging behaviour and diet preferences. Damage is more common in second growth than in mature or old growth stands (Golley 1956; Van Deusen and Myers 1962). Early successional habitats have greater amounts of herbaceous undergrowth during summer months which attract porcupines. Outbreaks of damage often appear in stands associated with recent logging or wildfire disturbance (Curtis 1941; Lawrence 1957; Yocom 1971). This situation has occurred in the hemlock-spruce forests of the north coast of B.C. and Alaska panhandle (Sullivan et al. 1986; Eglitis and Hennon 1986).

The tree species preferred may depend on availability (Speer and Dilworth 1978). However, as reported in Table 1, porcupines feed on a wide range of species with hemlock, Douglas fir, and

ponderosa pine predominating. There is a strong preference for trees less than 30 years old which corresponds well with the size of trees in pole-size stands. The size (dbh) of trees fed on by porcupines ranges from 3 cm to almost 90 cm (Table 2). The bulk of feeding occurs in pole-size trees from 7.6 cm to 38.1 cm dbh. Where information was available, vigorous trees such as co-dominants and dominants were more frequently attacked than those with less vigour (Rudolf 1949; Curtis and Wilson 1953; Van Deusen and Myers 1962; Krefting et al. 1962; Sullivan et al. 1986). Further evidence for this preference, based on radial growth analysis, has been reported by Spencer (1964), Storm and Halvorson (1967), and Harder (1979) for various species of conifers in the interior of North America.

As discussed by Harder (1979), vigorous trees with large open crowns produce a large annual increment of phloem (Bannan 1955; Grillos and Smith 1959), and provide more foliage and a greater volume of inner bark than trees growing in crowded conditions. Since porcupines usually feed on inner bark that is accessible from positions that can be maintained without undue exertion, open-crowned trees, which tend to provide more large branches, allow porcupines greater access to food. According to Kramer and Kozlowski (1960), the phloem and foliage of conifers contain the greatest concentrations of fats and carbohydrates of the aerial tissues. Thus, the tendency of porcupines to feed on these structures in the tree crown where growth is most rapid presumably results in consumption of the most nutritious food available.

This pattern was certainly evident in Khutzeymateen Inlet where the greatest intensity of feeding occurred in the mid and upper sections of hemlock stems (Sullivan et al. 1986). Porcupines may identify vigorous trees by their obvious physical features (Harder 1979). This has particular relevance to silvicultural strategies such as thinning which may predispose crop trees to porcupine attack because of their vigorous growth and accessibility.

Porcupine preference for crop trees in thinned stands has been reported by Van Deusen and Myers (1962) and Dodge and Canutt (1969) in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S., by Eglitis and Hennon (1987) in Alaska, and as reported from damage surveys in the Kalum Valley. Harder (1980) concluded that porcupines preferred "open" leeward stands in southwest Alberta.

In summary, winter habitats which are most attractive to porcupines include pole-size coniferous stands associated with young successional stages which provide good summer habitat. Susceptible species include eastern and western hemlock, Douglas fir, jack pine, lodgepole pine, ponderosa pine, northern white pine, and Sitka spruce.

4.2 Population fluctuations

Although porcupine damage has been continually reported, the actual population biology of this animal is not well known. It has been suggested that porcupine populations can be erratic and irruptive but conversely, also being "relatively stable", compared with other small mammals such as snowshoe hares and voles which

have multi-annual population cycles. For an animal which produces only one offspring a year, the porcupine has demonstrated a high biological potential. This is partly due to a high ratio between conception and embryonic survival (Faulkner and Dodge 1962), and partly to the young being very independent shortly after birth. Porcupines also have a relatively long life span of 5 to 10 years (Brander 1971).

Porcupine population fluctuations occur over very long periods and may be indirectly censused by dendrochronological analysis of feeding scars. A population in southwest Colorado underwent 4 fluctuations over a 120-year period, each spaced at about 10-20 years apart and each 12-20 years in duration (Spencer 1964). The last irruption was the most recent and the largest, lasting from the 1920's to the 1950's (Fig. 1A). The pattern was not like a logarithmic increase with a subsequent crash, as is observed in many small mammal populations (e.g. voles of the genus Microtus). There was a pyramidal pattern of population growth and decline. No explanation of this temporal variation was proposed.

These findings are supported by recent work using the same dendrochronological technique on white spruce in the Hudson Bay region of northern Quebec (Payette 1987). Again, the porcupine has made a significant expansion in the last 25 years, although they have occupied the area for the last 100 years in very low numbers (Fig. 1B). This expansion was attributed to the increase in spruce forests as a result of a warming in the climate during the last 100 years which provided more cover and winter forage for

porcupines. The time lag between the forest expansion and the porcupine population increase may be due to the time required for new tree stands to achieve a certain age and dbh, which provides optimal foraging during winter. Thus, a time lag of several decades may be associated with forest-niche building conducive to porcupines. It is also important to note that the fisher was reported as rare or absent from this study area and may have contributed to the geographical displacement of the porcupine. A similar displacement of porcupines in subalpine sites in Alberta may have resulted from predator control and lower hunting pressure (Gill and Cordes 1972).

Thus, the distribution of porcupines may be affected by climatic change in vegetation over long periods, and porcupine populations have the ability to expand into such regions provided conditions are favourable. Clearly, forestry practices such as logging provide an abundance of early successional stages (summer habitat) and second-growth pole-sized stands (winter habitat) within a forest mosaic in the North Coast and Kalum Districts. Stand tending practices may provide even more attractive winter habitat with vigorous crop trees responding to thinning and fertilization treatments. Combined with a general climatic warming and lack of predators, it is perhaps not surprising that porcupine populations have increased to pest levels in this area. A similar increase in abundance of porcupines has occurred in the coastal forests of Washington, Oregon, and California in the last 20 years (Evans 1987). This climatic warming is expected to

continue, perhaps indefinitely, and may have dramatic effects on forests and vegetation, in general (see review by Harrington 1987).

The number of porcupines in a given area tends to fluctuate greatly, depending on the season and food availability. Porcupines are solitary animals and occur at low numbers except for temporary concentrations due to a local food supply. There was a wide range of population densities recorded for the porcupine (Table 3). Much of this variation may have depended on techniques of population estimation and forest habitat. Densities in mixed hardwood-hemlock forests of the north-central U.S. ranged from 0.4 to 82.3 porcupines (average of 19.9) per 100 ha. In the other forest type somewhat similar to north coastal B.C., spruce-balsam fir in New Brunswick, had 2.3-3.1 porcupines recorded/100 ha. No reliable estimates of population density are available for the north coast or Alaska stands.

4.3 Seasonal migrations

Porcupines will make seasonal migrations from open areas, which have herbaceous summer vegetation, into heavily wooded areas in autumn for a number of reasons. Firstly, dens are needed for breeding in autumn as this usually solitary animal becomes gregarious. Secondly, with the loss of herbaceous vegetation, porcupines must switch to feeding on the inner bark of woody plants (Harder 1979). In addition, conifers in winter offer more shelter than hardwoods (Speer and Dilworth 1978). In spring,

porcupines leave their shelters to feed in "open" areas during summer. The distances moved in these migrations range from 0.83 km (Krefting et al. 1962) to 10 km (Dodge 1982).

4.4 Home range

Winter home range varied from 0.1 to 12.1 ha (Table 4). The somewhat anomalous result of Dodge and Barnes (1975) may be explained by firmly crusted snow offering little barrier to movement, and their study site contained an abundance of den sites which made congregation in special denning areas unnecessary. In addition, this area of Douglas fir-western hemlock forest contained an interspersed variety of seral stages which offered suitable forage throughout the study site (Dodge and Barnes 1975). This latter situation may be similar to that in the hemlock-spruce forest of the north coast. In general, the size of home range is affected by a number of factors such as ambient temperature, snowfall, available vegetation, and cover. However, despite this variability, winter ranges were significantly smaller than early summer and/or spring home ranges, which varied from 2.4 to 83.5 ha (Table 4).

Most of the winter feeding occurs within the range and may in part contribute to the "hotspot" damage pattern often reported. It should be noted that porcupines do not necessarily need permanent dens but may inhabit temporary dens in periods of heavy rainfall or strong winds. In northern climates, however, dens provide necessary shelter during winter months. Den fidelity is

high, although it is not uncommon for individuals to make 8-10 km moves when shifting home ranges due to disturbance or other factors (Roze 1987).

4.5 Denning habits

Porcupines will den in any convenient or ready-made cavity. Crevices and outcropping bedrock are common shelters in rugged terrain (Roze 1984). In conifer stands, down or windthrown trees, hollow logs, and scattered slash are often used (Hooven 1971). There is some suggestion that moist sites are preferred although this is not associated with having better accessibility to drinking water (Speer and Dilworth 1978). There is also evidence that a leeward community is preferred over a windward area (Harder 1979).

In northern and coastal climates, most of the winter feeding will occur near the den, often on the same trees from year to year (Dodge 1982). Studies on the winter feeding pattern of the porcupine have shown that the percentage of gnawed stems decreased with increasing distance from dens (Curtis 1941). In shared dens, the immediate area could suffer significant damage, especially when year to year den fidelity is high (see Roze 1987).

5.0 INCIDENCE OF DAMAGE

5.1 Forest Districts in B.C.

The incidence of porcupine damage in Districts within each

Forest Region of B.C. is listed in Tables 5 (Vancouver), 6 (Prince Rupert), 7 (Prince George), 8 (Cariboo), 9 (Kamloops), and 10 (Nelson). In general, overall incidence of damage was low ($< 5\%$), but could be severe locally in "hotspots". Virtually all coniferous species had some degree of attack with lodgepole pine and western hemlock most frequently damaged. A wide range of biogeoclimatic subzones and environmental conditions had reported damage which was not surprising considering the distribution of the porcupine in different forest types. The Prince Rupert, Prince George, and Nelson Regions clearly had the majority of damage. Within the northern half of the province, 91.7% (11 of 12) of the Prince Rupert and Prince George Districts concluded that the incidence of damage was increasing with time. This conclusion was likely a combination of expanding porcupine populations with variable preferred habitat, moderate climate, and intensive management of sapling-pole size stands. Stable populations tended to be reported from Districts in the southern half of B.C. Both mature and immature stands had porcupine attack. The 15-35 year-old stands with average dbh of 10-30 cm appeared most frequently attacked. The majority of damage has been reported in the last 10-15 years. Damage control techniques included leaving more stems/ha after spacing and favouring alternate species where possible.

5.2 Related areas of the Pacific Northwest

Damage incidence in related areas of the Pacific Northwest is

listed in Table 11. Mitkof Island in Alaska had a severe level of attack similar to the North Coast District. Other areas in Alaska had low levels of damage. Pine and Douglas fir-western hemlock stands in Washington and Oregon have a long history of porcupine damage. Forest stands in Alberta apparently have little attack from porcupines. Control techniques in Washington and Oregon based on population reduction with organized hunts and bounties appeared to provide a reasonable degree of control when done on a persistent basis (R. Anderson pers. comm.). However, no quantitative data are available.

6.0 CONTROL STRATEGIES

A wide variety of control methods have been tried to suppress porcupine damage. The most commonly used technique involves poison (toxicants). This approach and a number of other methods will be reviewed for efficacy and applicability to forest protection. There are two major groups of control methods; those which reduce the population, and those which reduce the damage. In evaluating efficacy, not only the reduction of damage must be reviewed, but also the practicality of using a given method on a large scale in a forest stand.

6.1 Population reduction

Most of the control methods used, to date, belong to this category (Table 12). It should be noted, however, that as of yet,

there is no quantitative information relating population reduction to damage reduction (Evans and Matthews 1972; Evans 1987). The population reduction measures discussed here will be removal techniques based on hunting, trapping, poison, and predator introduction.

In areas of noticeable porcupine damage, bounties are often established. Hunting is relatively "easy" to do as porcupines are slow moving animals, they are often found up in a tree, and they do not have to be tracked for long periods of time. In the instances where this was done, however, no significant differences in porcupine numbers were observed (Faulkner and Dodge 1962; Dodge 1982). No controls (checks) were used in these trials.

Trapping has also been recommended as a control measure since it usually ensures a high kill success (Evans 1987). However, no data were available regarding population densities prior to and after trapping. Traps are also non-specific and require constant attention.

Poisons such as strychnine and sodium arsenite baits have been reported as effective with a high kill success in certain regions (Hooven 1971; Neitro 1980). Again, percentage reduction in damage was not measured and no controls were mentioned. Attempts in the northeastern states with strychnine salt combinations have not proven to be successful, possibly due to a higher consumption by porcupines of tannin, an antidote for strychnine (Dodge 1962). Moreover, another disadvantage of poison bait stations is the adverse side effects. Anthony et al. (1986)

report six non-target species and over twice the number of animals killed due to secondary poisoning compared with the number of porcupines killed. Sodium arsenite is extremely toxic to man and requires careful handling. In addition, it must be placed in specific locations to minimize secondary poisoning, hence making it a time consuming process. At present, there is no poison registered for use in Canada.

In the area of biological control, of all the predators of the porcupine, only the fisher has been considered as a control agent. Firstly, other porcupine predators, such as wolverines, cougars, bobcats, and coyotes do not consider porcupines preferred prey and often themselves exist at low densities. Secondly, the porcupine, despite its outer coat of quills, is still a relatively "easy" prey for the fisher owing partially to its slow gait.

Although there have been reports of fisher introduction leading to a consequent observed decline in porcupine numbers (Cook and Hamilton 1957; Powell and Brander 1977), only one study in this survey has discussed a field trial with a control. Earle and Kramm (1982) reported significantly less porcupines sited in roadkills in a fisher-introduced area ($0.4/\text{km}^2$) than in a control area ($3.5/\text{km}^2$). This method, to date, offers more promising control potential than hunting, trapping, or poison as it is not based on the numbers killed as a measure of success but rather on observed porcupine densities after the treatment. Whether or not the decline in numbers correlates with a reduction in damage, requires field monitoring of susceptible stands. It should be

noted, however, that fishers prefer old growth forests over early successional habitats. Pole-size stands may be intermediate in terms of habitat use by fisher, and hence provide some potential for reducing porcupine abundance and damage.

Results of the Khutzeymateen fisher introduction, to date, are inconclusive (Fig. 2). A total of 8 fisher have been introduced since February 1985. There was no radio contact with any of the fisher (implanted transmitters) as of December 1987. Thus, they have been killed, dispersed from the area, or were in underground dens during the fly-over to establish contact. Another method to determine if fisher are still in the area is required (e.g. snow tracks, information from trappers). The number of fisher required to establish a resident population is also an open question. Earle and Kramm (1982) reported a density estimate of 3.6 fisher observations per 100 km² for a resident population that became established after reintroduction. Therefore, one or two fisher within the 13 km² area of stands in Khutzeymateen Inlet would presumably constitute a resident population and eventually reduce porcupine density. In terms of alternative food sources, both red backed voles (Clethrionomys gapperi) in mature stands and long-tailed voles (Microtus longicaudus) in early- to mid-successional stands after logging should provide adequate prey (Banfield 1974; Van Horne 1982).

In summary, controlled field experiments, such as the Khutzeymateen Inlet fisher introduction, are needed to assess the efficacy of these various control methods. The fisher

introduction (and perhaps other predator enhancement) appears to be the most promising technique in terms of population reduction on a long-term basis. Once the initial effort of obtaining, transporting, and releasing fishers has been completed, the technique requires little attention. However, fur trapping efforts within the "introduction" area must be regulated to allow the fisher to settle and maintain a resident population.

6.2 Damage reduction

A comparatively narrower range of control methods has been attempted on damage than population reduction. Mechanical barriers, repellents, and some forestry practices will be discussed (Table 13).

On a large scale, mechanical barriers such as fences and individual tree guards become too expensive both in material costs as well as labour (Dodge 1982). On the other hand, repellents, if applicable from the air or in a perimeter spray might be feasible. However, there are no repellents recommended for porcupines, to date. Some paints and chemicals have been found to be unattractive to porcupines, but these are limited to signs or posts and not applicable to trees. Furthermore, in some instances, porcupines have been known to overcome their "dislike" of a chemical once they become accustomed to it (Dodge 1962; Milodragovich and Nettleton 1973).

In terms of forest management practices: thinning, leaving sacrifice trees, high grading, and pruning to make climbing

difficult, have been suggested. A disadvantage of thinning is that although the damage may be temporarily reduced, the stand of pole-sized timber remains attractive to porcupines. As discussed earlier, there has been some evidence that thinning makes a stand more attractive to porcupines (Van Deusen and Myers 1962; Dodge 1982; Eglitis and Hennon 1986, 1987).

There is some correlation between percentage availability of a given tree species and percentage feeding (Speer and Dilworth 1978). However, if a preferred species becomes less abundant, the percentage feeding will also drop and porcupines may switch to a less preferred species (Curtis 1944). Therefore, thinning which favours a less preferred species may not prevent porcupines from feeding on those crop trees if they are numerically dominant.

The sanitation spacing experiment (1987) at Mouse Creek, Khutzeymateen Inlet, is also incorporating tree species selection, sacrifice trees, and metal tree guards as damage control techniques. The 12-ha stand has alternating 8-m wide control and spaced (250 stems/ha) strips. The spacing favoured western red cedar, amabilis fir, western hemlock, and Sitka spruce in that order. Within the treatment strips, spruce and hemlock have metal sleeves (87.5 cm high) whereas cedar and fir do not. Crop trees in some strips were left unprotected. Thus, this experiment should provide information on: (1) porcupine preference for control or spaced trees, (2) tree species selection (i.e. will cedar and fir be attacked since they were favoured in the spacing treatment?) (3) function of trees in control strips as sacrifice

food with consequent reduction in porcupine attack of spaced trees, and (4) efficacy of metal sleeves to keep porcupines from climbing trees. Although not economically or logistically feasible over large areas, if the metal sleeves are effective (and expand accordingly with tree growth), then they could be implemented on a limited basis in small area high-value stands. This experiment is slated to continue for 5 to 10 years with annual damage assessments.

High grading, or decreasing the number of choice trees near used dens, should be researched more thoroughly as it has some potential for success. This method makes use of two aspects of porcupine biology. Firstly, winter ranges of porcupines are usually confined to an area near their dens. Secondly, porcupines have been known to return to feed on the same trees year after year. Hence, high grading would make a habitat less attractive to porcupines (Dodge 1982). However, there is also the possibility that they may simply move their dens and begin feeding elsewhere. A controlled experiment could be used to test this approach. By the same reasoning, it may be worthwhile to not thin the area near the den, and instead leave an excess of choice sacrifice trees to help maintain a higher yield for the stand as a whole. Again, a controlled experiment could be set up to test this method (Curtis 1941; Sullivan et al. 1986).

Pruning trees as a control measure is limited in several ways (Curtis 1941). Firstly, it is a time consuming process and on a large scale would not be feasible. Secondly, if pruning is not

carried out to a considerable extent, the porcupine may still be able to climb the tree. Hence, pruning is not recommended as a large scale control method.

7.0 IMPACT OF DAMAGE ON NSR, STAND TENDING, AND AAC

The information on porcupine population fluctuations indicated a general increase in numbers during the last 25 years as indicated by relatively high levels of feeding damage. This trend is perhaps best reflected by Fig. 1B which describes porcupine response to forest-niche building (i.e. development of second-growth stands on the north coast). The fluctuations reported by Spencer (1964) in Fig. 1A reflect conditions in mature stands of old growth pinyon pine (P. edulis). However, this latter study did give some indication of population fluctuations over a 120-year period. Thus, the two general scenarios of population fluctuations upon which to predict impacts of feeding damage on NSR, stand tending, and AAC are schematically outlined in Figs. 3A and B.

7.1 Short-term impact on NSR and stand tending

The short-term impact on NSR may be assessed by analyzing porcupine damage and stand data from Khutzeymateen Inlet and Fords Cove in the North Coast District, the Kalum Valley, and from Mitkof Island in Alaska. An underlying assumption in this analysis is that damaged trees may not produce a merchantable stem

in the future. Complete girdling will, of course, lead to mortality of the stem above the point of injury producing spike tops with the lower portion of the tree usually still alive. It is unlikely that these latter trees will ever be of commercial value. In addition, Storm and Halvorson (1967) have presented convincing evidence that the sub-lethal (i.e. partial-girdling) removal of bark by porcupines greatly affects the vigour of a tree for up to 10 years, at least in the case of ponderosa pine. It should also be stressed that any degree of damage to a stem may affect future timber production and/or quality. This could occur by reduced growth via physiological stress from lost vascular tissue and also susceptibility to attack by insects and diseases at the point of injury.

For second-growth stands in Khutzeymateen Inlet, the incidence of cumulative damage to western hemlock up to 1985 was 52.7% (Fig. 4) based on an intensive survey (Sullivan et al. 1986). In general, porcupines attacked a significantly ($r = 0.89$; $p < 0.01$) greater proportion of large than small diameter trees. Stems smaller than 12.5 cm dbh had little (3.7%) damage. Porcupine attack tended to peak (83.3%) among second growth hemlock in the 27.5-32.4 cm dbh class. Higher levels of attack were recorded for trees ≥ 42.5 cm dbh but these included several veterans of the original forest. The percentage of Sitka spruce trees damaged by porcupines during the 1984-85 winter and prior to this period was 7.8%. Amabilis fir and western red cedar were not attacked. The total incidence of cumulative damage was 63.4% of

trees attacked as of spring 1987.

The number of attacks or wounds by porcupines may be considered as a measure of feeding intensity. The average number of wounds per tree based on crown class is illustrated in Fig. 5A. Porcupines clearly preferred to feed on dominant and co-dominant trees which were usually of larger average diameters than those in the intermediate and suppressed crown classes. This pattern was also recorded for the percentage of trees completely girdled (Fig. 5B). Significantly more (2.2 to 2.4 times) dominant and co-dominant trees were girdled by porcupines than intermediate and suppressed trees.

The size distribution of girdled and semi-girdled hemlock trees is illustrated in Fig. 6. The total percentage of completely girdled (direct mortality) stems was 30.9%, and for semi-girdled (50 to 99% of stem circumference) stems was 7.8%. Again, porcupines girdled a significantly ($r = 0.87$; $p < 0.01$) greater proportion of large than small diameter trees. Those trees with a dbh > 27.4 cm had a total of 55.9% of stems girdled.

Several other studies have reached a similar conclusion that porcupines prefer to feed on large diameter stems as well as the dominant and co-dominant trees within a given stand (Curtis 1941; Rudolf 1949; Curtis and Wilson 1953; Krefting et al. 1962; Van Deusen and Myers 1962). Eglitis and Hennon (1986, 1987) also reported this pattern in Alaska. Evidence for this preference to feed on vigorous stems, based on radial growth analysis, has been reported by Spencer (1964), Storm and Halvorson (1967), and Harder

(1979) for various species of conifers in the interior of western North America. A comparable relationship exists for the red squirrel (Tamiasciurus hudsonicus) and its feeding pattern on juvenile lodgepole pine (Sullivan and Sullivan 1982a and b; Sullivan and Vyse 1987).

A possible scenario for describing the impact of this selective attack of "crop" trees by porcupines in second growth stands is illustrated in Fig. 7A. This relationship may be typical of 25- to 35-year old stands where the porcupine concentrates its feeding on dominant and co-dominant stems, thereby leaving the smaller non-merchantable stems as a major component of the stand. Clearly, this situation will lead to perpetual NSR unless the porcupine population is reduced (by natural or artificial means), or the tree species (e.g. amabilis fir and cedar), which are not preferred at present, eventually comprise the stand.

Fords Cove is the other area in the North Coast District which has been surveyed. Incidence of damage was stratified according to: (1) all trees, (2) well-spaced "crop" trees, and (3) estimated attack-size (≥ 10 cm dbh) trees (Table 14) (survey by W. Jackson 1987). Again, porcupine preference for potential "crop" trees was significantly higher (> 3 times) than for total trees. Similarly, incidence of attack was twice as high for trees ≥ 10 cm dbh than for all trees. Proportion of girdled tops (spike-tops) also followed this pattern. As predicted in Fig. 7A, as small trees become dominant in a stand, they may be at risk to porcupine

attack potentially leading to a state of perpetual NSR.

The Kalum District has a considerable area of managed stands (stand tending completed in 9,086 ha and reforestation of 48,560 ha) at a total investment of \$68.6 million. The majority of these stands are 12-18 years of age and just entering the susceptible size range for porcupine attack. Surveys conducted in 1986 and 1987 indicated that 0.44% and 1.03%, respectively, of stems overall were newly attacked. The impact of a 1% annual loss of crop trees on NSR in managed stands is illustrated in Fig. 7B. A free-growing stand of 900 stems/ha at age 10 with an annual loss of 1% would probably still have enough stems (or merchantable volume) at rotation (assuming approximately $1 \text{ m}^3/\text{tree}$). However, this conclusion assumes that porcupines do not selectively attack the most vigorous crop trees and other pests (insects, diseases) will not contribute to crop tree mortality. Clearly, these are bold assumptions which must be carefully reviewed. Damage may decline in accordance with porcupine population fluctuations or control. Alternatively, the annual rate of attack may increase (> 1%) thereby resulting in an NSR condition.

The porcupine population increase outlined in Fig. 3A, which suggests a continual increase in abundance in accordance with availability of habitat, may be occurring in the Kalum Valley. The annual rate of attack has increased from 0.6% (1986) to 1.8% (1987) for western hemlock in managed stands, and this species is the major component of most stands (Fig. 8A). Damage to Sitka spruce has remained constant at 0.84% (1986) and 0.75% (1987)

(Fig. 8A). Cumulative attack levels of 6.5% for hemlock and 3.0% for spruce have been recorded since the stands were thinned.

Porcupine attack of precommercially thinned (1985) stands (12-20 years of age) in Alaska is particularly severe with annual damage increasing from 10.9% (1986) to 17.2% (1987) for Sitka spruce, which comprises 62% of the stands sampled (Fig. 8B) (Eglitis and Hennon 1986, 1987). Attack of western hemlock was 7.1% (1986) and 6.7% (1987). Cumulative damage was 25% of hemlock and 51% of spruce crop trees attacked by porcupines. This rather sobering situation is further intensified by the annual rate of complete girdling of crop trees at 3.9%. Although serious damage in Alaska is restricted to Mitkof Island, this example may represent the future damage situation for managed stands in the Kalum Valley.

Clearly, stand tending practices such as juvenile and sanitation spacing leave crop trees at risk to porcupine attack. Both western hemlock and Sitka spruce are attacked and this may depend on their relative densities in a given managed stand. Lodgepole pine is also attacked in the Kalum Valley. Since the vigorous growth of trees in thinned stands apparently predisposes them to preferential attack, fertilization of such stands would likely make the damage situation even worse. In terms of other small mammal species, fertilization of lodgepole pine in the central interior significantly increased attacks of crop trees by both snowshoe hares and red squirrels (Sullivan and Sullivan 1982b; Brockley and Sullivan 1987).

7.2 Long-term impact on AAC

The long-term impact of damage on AAC may be viewed on an incremental or catastrophic basis. The increasing attack rate of trees in managed stands in the Kalum Valley suggests an incremental effect on merchantable volume/area, thereby lengthening the rotation (Fig. 9A). This increase in damage may or may not result in the catastrophic effect recorded in stands on Mitkof Island. Clearly, a consistent annual mortality (complete girdling) rate of 3.9% with a cumulative 50% of the dominant crop trees (e.g. spruce) attacked, by age 20, is a catastrophic situation, at least on a local basis (Fig. 9B). A natural decline in the porcupine population, or reduction of damage via introduction of fishers or an effective bounty system, for example, may result in only periodic outbreaks of damage. The incremental attack in the Kalum Valley could become catastrophic in the near future if present trends continue. In both cases, the rotation is lengthened to reach minimum merchantable volume. These are two "worst case" scenarios which assume porcupine populations will continue increasing in abundance and expanding in range in accordance with availability of preferred habitat.

In terms of extent of damage, 5,000 ha of second-growth unmanaged stands may already be NSR with an additional 7,000 ha at risk in the North Coast District. In the Kalum District, 9,086 ha of thinned and 48,560 ha of planted stands are entering the susceptible stage (15-35 years) for intensive porcupine attack. An additional 32,000 ha is proposed for stand tending over the

next 10 years.

8.0 FORECAST MODEL

A first approximation of a forecast model to predict when and where outbreaks of porcupine damage will occur is illustrated in Fig. 10. The CWH_f and CWH_i and CWH_j subzones in the Kalum and North Coast Districts, respectively, currently have damage in stands ranging from 15 to 35 years old. These stands provide winter feeding areas and nearby early successional (post-harvest) stages are where porcupines presumably concentrate their summer feeding. Combined with a moderate climatic trend (e.g. mild winters) and a reduction in the predator population, these favourable habitat conditions lead to a porcupine population increase. Such increases appear to occur over long periods (decades) and may persist indefinitely unless interrupted by catastrophic weather conditions (e.g. severe winter) or a management program. Therefore, it is difficult to evaluate the existence or frequency of cyclic behaviour in porcupine populations on the north coast. In addition, population densities are currently unknown. This increase in porcupine populations leads to an outbreak of feeding damage in susceptible stands. Initial surveys of damage suggest that managed stands may increase the intensity of attack, thereby leading to a potential NSR status for many stands.

9.0 PLAN OF ACTION

9.1 Detection of damage

- 1) Surveys of damage should be conducted on an annual basis using permanent plots or transects.
 - a) The 48 km of survey line in managed stands in the Kalum Valley must be continued to provide annual data on incidence of attack. This is particularly important since these stands are entering the susceptible stage for intensive porcupine attack.
 - b) Additional second-growth stands in the North Coast District should be surveyed to determine the damage incidence on a District-wide basis.
- 2) Transect surveys in managed stands should continue using the same methodology of 2-m wide strips. Surveys in natural stands should use permanent plots located at 50 to 100-m intervals along transects. These transects should be located to provide maximum coverage of terrain types within a given survey area. Variable plot cruise sampling may be used to identify sample trees (> 7.5 cm dbh) in each plot. Species, dbh, crown class, "old" and "current" damage wounds, and spike-tops should be tallied for each tree.
- 3) Surveys should be concentrated in susceptible areas as outlined in the forecast model.
- 4) Surveys may be used as a means to assess effectiveness of population and damage reduction techniques.

9.2 Recommendations to alleviate damage

- 1) Bounty system to reduce porcupine populations on a short-term basis.
 - a) Must be done with persistence and commitment by participants in the field and regulators within the MoFL.
 - b) Strongly suggest that bounty be raised to \$20-\$50/animal to provide sufficient incentive. If 10 ha of spacing costs approximately \$10,000, then for this sum of money, a bounty of \$20-\$50 would pay for 200-500 porcupines. Live-trapping could also be continued as part of the bounty system.
 - c) Best suited for Kalum Valley and related areas with good access.
 - d) Some degree of regulation (e.g. registered trappers/hunters only or perhaps organized hunts) is essential.
 - e) A control (check) area should be set aside to help assess efficacy.
- 2) Introduction of fisher to reduce porcupine populations on a long-term basis.
 - a) Must procure a consistent supply of fishers from somewhere in North America.
 - b) Best suited for inaccessible sites such as Khutzeymateen Inlet and related areas.
 - c) Fur trapping interests in area of "introduction" must be curtailed with appropriate compensation, otherwise fisher will not become a resident population.
 - d) A control (check) area should be established, if possible, to

help assess efficacy.

- 3) Where possible, in spacing/planting programs, leave/plant a greater number of trees/ha (e.g. a post-spacing/density of 1200 to 1600 stems/ha rather than 900, a post-planting density of 2000 trees/ha rather than 1200-1400).
 - a) Flexibility - accomodate tree mortality from future attack by porcupines and other pest agents such as insects and disease.
 - b) Potential for second pass - precommercial/commercial thinning.
 - c) May also be considered as a method of leaving sacrifice trees for porcupines.
- 4) Select for less preferred species (in terms of porcupine attack) such as amabilis fir and western red cedar in spacing/planting programs - subject to experimental results concluding that porcupines will not attack these species even when they comprise a major part of a managed stand.
- 5) Continuation of proposed communications plan to educate members of public in North Coast and Kalum Districts on the porcupine damage problem. This plan is based on a pest leaflet, mall display, video, and specific instruction within the school system. The plan is designed to make people aware of the problem and the alternative methods available to deal with it.

9.3 Research requirements

- 1) Assessment of the impact of partial girdling on tree growth and yield in the Khutzeymateen Inlet stands should be continued at 5-year intervals. Additional growth and yield plots should be established in porcupine-damaged stands at other sites in the North Coast District. Growth and yield plots (or use of already existing plots) should also be set up in managed stands in the Kalum Valley.
- 2) Decay samples should be analyzed for wood-rot fungi (in addition to those from Khutzeymateen Inlet) in association with surveys of other second-growth stands in the North Coast District.
- 3) Commence a population study of porcupines in the Kalum Valley to determine densities in managed and natural stands as well as seasonal migrations. This study would help determine how many porcupines are attacking trees, and could be superimposed on areas of intensive hunting (treatment) and a check (control) to help assess efficacy of population reduction program. If study continued at a basic level over several years in check area, the population trend would become apparent. Basic population monitoring would involve mark and recapture sampling on a grid system during a certain number (minimum of two) of sampling periods each year. Monitoring of movements would require radio telemetry of collared (transmitter) animals.

10.0 LITERATURE CITED

- Anthony, R.M., J. Evans, and G.D. Lindsey. 1986. Strychnine-salt blocks for controlling porcupines in pine forests: Efficacy and hazards. In: Proceedings of the 12th Vertebrate Pest Conference. San Diego, Cal. pp. 191-195.
- Banfield, A.W.F. 1974. The Mammals of Canada. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.
- Bannan, M.W. 1955. The vascular cambium and radial growth in Thuja occidentalis L. Can. J. Bot. 33: 113-138.
- Brander, R.B. 1971. Longevity of wild porcupines. J. Mammal. 52: 835.
- Brander, R.B. 1973. Life history notes on the porcupine in a hardwood hemlock forest in upper Michigan. Michigan Acad. 5: 425-433.
- Brockley, R.P. and T.P. Sullivan. 1987. Relationships of feeding damage by red squirrels to cultural treatments in young stands of lodgepole pine. In: Future Forests of the Mountain West: A Stand Culture Symposium. USDA Forest Service, Int. For. Range Exp. Stn. Technical Paper (In press).
- Clark, M.B. 1958. Porcupine damage on ponderosa pine. Forest Res. Review, B.C. Ministry of Forests, Victoria, B.C. pp. 19-20.
- Clark, M.B. 1959. A further appraisal of porcupine damage in immature ponderosa pine, Kamloops District. Forest Res. Review, B.C. Ministry of Forests, Victoria, B.C. pp. 50-51.
- Cook, D.B. and W.J. Hamilton. 1957. The forest, the fisher and the porcupine. J. For. 55: 719-722.
- Craig, E.H. and B.L. Keller. 1986. Movement and home range of porcupines, Erethizon dorsatum, in Idaho shrub desert. Can. Field Nat. 100: 167-173.
- Curtis, J.D. 1941. The silvicultural significance of the porcupine. J. For. 39: 583-594.
- Curtis, J.D. 1944. Appraisal of porcupine damage. J. Wildl. Manage. 8: 88-91.
- Curtis, J.D. and A.K. Wilson. 1953. Porcupine feeding on ponderosa pine in central Idaho. J. For. 51: 339-341.

- Daniel, T.W. and G.H. Barnes. 1958. Thinning a young stand of lodgepole pine. Proc. Soc. Amer. For. pp. 159-163.
- Dodge, W.E. 1962. An effective poison and repellent for porcupine control. J. For. 57: 350-352.
- Dodge, W.E. 1970. The porcupine in western Washington. Wash. For. Prot. Assoc., Seattle. 6 pp.
- Dodge, W.E. 1982. Porcupine. In: Wild Mammals of North America. Biology, management, and economics. J.A. Chapman and G.E. Feldhamer (eds.). Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. pp. 355-366.
- Dodge, W.E. and V.G. Barnes. 1975. Movements, home range, and control of porcupines in western Washington. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Wildl. Leaflet No. 507.
- Dodge, W.E. and P.R. Canutt. 1969. A review of the status of the porcupine (Erethizon dorsatum epixanthum) in western Oregon. Bur. Sport Fisheries and Wildl., Portland, Oreg. 25 pp.
- Earle, R.D. and K.R. Kramm. 1982. Correlation between fisher and porcupine abundance in upper Michigan. Am. Midl. Nat. 107: 244-249.
- Eglitis, A. and P.E. Hennon. 1986. Porcupine damage in Sitka spruce and western hemlock in southeast Alaska. USDA Forest Service, Pest Management Report. Juneau. 21 pp.
- Eglitis, A. and P.E. Hennon. 1987. Porcupine damage on Sitka spruce and western hemlock in southeast Alaska. Proc. of Symp. Animal Damage Management in Pacific Northwest Forests. Spokane, Wash. pp. 79.
- Evans, J. 1987. The porcupine in the Pacific Northwest. Proc. of Symp. Animal Damage Management in Pacific Northwest Forests. Spokane, Wash. pp. 75-78.
- Evans, J. and R.P. Matthews. 1972. Porcupine damage survey in western Washington. Publ. Wash. Forest. Protect. Assoc. Seattle, Wash. 14 pp.
- Faulkner, C.E. and W.E. Dodge. 1962. Control of the porcupine in New England. J. For. 60: 36-37.
- Gill, D. and L.D. Cordes. 1972. Winter habitat preference of porcupines in the southern Alberta foothills. Can. Field-Nat. 86: 349-355.
- Golley, F.B. 1956. Distribution of porcupine in Upper Michigan. J. Mammal. 38: 526-527.

- Grillos, S.J. and F.H. Smith. 1959. The secondary phloem of Douglas fir. *For. Sci.* 5: 377-388.
- Harder, L.D. 1979. Winter feeding by porcupines in montane forests of southwest Alberta. *Can. Field-Nat.* 93: 405-410.
- Harder, L.D. 1980. Winter use of montane forests by porcupines in southwestern Alberta: preferences, density effects and temporal changes. *Can. J. Zool.* 58: 13-19.
- Harrington, J.B. 1987. Climatic change: a review of causes. *Can. J. For. Res.* 17: 1313-1339.
- Hoffer, M.C. 1967. Radio-telemetry: a key tool in porcupine control methods research. *Trans. California Nevada Section, Wildlife Soc.*, pp. 34-44.
- Hooven, E.F. 1971. The porcupine in Oregon. Its life history and control. *Oreg. State Univ. For. Res. Lab., Res. Pap. No. 10.*
- Kramer, P.J. and T.T. Kozlowski. 1960. The physiology of trees. McGraw-Hill, Inc., Hightstown, NJ.
- Krefting, L.W. J.H. Stoeckeler, R. Bradle, and W.D. Fitzwater. 1962. Porcupine - timber relationships in the Lake States. *J. For.* 60: 325-330.
- Lawrence, W.H. 1957. Porcupine control: a problem analysis. *For. Res. Notes.* Weyerhaeuser Company, Centralia, Wash. 43 pp.
- Lawrence, W.H., N.B. Kverno, and H.D. Hartwell. 1961. Guide to wildlife feeding injuries on conifers in the Pacific Northwest. Western Forestry Conservation Association, Portland, Oregon.
- MacDonald, D.R. 1952. Some observations on porcupine attacks to jack pine. *The Annual Ring, Faculty of Forestry, Univ. of Toronto, Canada.* pp. 17-18.
- Marshall, W.H., G.W. Gullion, and R.G. Schwab. 1962. Early summer activities of porcupines as determined by radio-positioning techniques. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 26: 75-79.
- Milodragovich, E. and T.J. Nettleton. 1973. Investigation of porcupine damage to signing materials. USDA Forest Service, Equipment Development Center, Missoula, Montana. ED+T 2166.
- Neitro, W.A. 1969. Aluminum shelters for baiting porcupines. *In: Wildlife and Reforestation in the Pacific Northwest.* (Ed. H.C. Black). *symp. Proc., School of Forestry, Oreg. State Univ., Corvallis.* pp. 86.

- Payette, S. 1987. Recent porcupine expansion at tree line: a dendroecological analysis. *Can. J. Zool.* 65: 551-557.
- Powell, R.A. and R.B. Brander. 1977. Adaptations of fishers and porcupines to their predator prey system. *In: Proc. 1975 Predator Symposium* (Eds. R. Philips and C. Jonkel) Montana For. Conserv. Exp. Stat. pp. 45-53.
- Randall, R.C. 1971. The distribution, movement patterns and population structure of the porcupine (Erethizon dorsatum) in Little Valley, Nevada. M.S. Thesis. Univ. Nevada, Reno. 67 pp.
- Rearden, J.D. 1950. Porcupine damage in a mixed Scotch and red pine plantation. Univ. of Maine, For. Dept. Tech. Note No. 3.
- Reeks, W.A. 1942. Notes on the Canada porcupine in the Maritime Provinces. *For. Chron.* 18: 182-187.
- Roze, U. 1984. Winter foraging by individual porcupines. *Can. J. Zool.* 62: 2425-2428.
- Roze, U. 1987. Denning and winter range of the porcupine. *Can. J. Zool.* 65: 981-986.
- Rudolf, P.O. 1949. Porcupine's preference in pine plantations. *J. For.* 47: 207-209.
- Smith, G.W. 1977. Population characteristics of the porcupine in Northeastern Oregon. *J. Mammal.* 58: 674-676.
- Smith, G.W. 1979. Movements and home range of the porcupine in northeastern Oregon. *Northwest Sci.* 53: 277-282.
- Speer, R.J. and T.G. Dilworth. 1978. Porcupine winter foods and utilization in central New Brunswick. *Can. Field-Nat.* 92: 271-274.
- Spencer, D.A. 1948. An electric fence for use in checking porcupines and other mammalian crop depredation. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 12: 110-111.
- Spencer, D.A. 1964. Porcupine population fluctuations in past centuries revealed by dendrochronology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 1: 127-149.
- Spencer, D.A., J. Wade, and M. Fitch. 1948. Progress report, porcupine investigations on Mesa Verde National Park, Winter 1946-1947. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service. 36 pp.

- Stoeckeler, J.H. 1950. Porcupine damage in a northern hardwood hemlock forest of northeastern Wisconsin. U.S. Forest Serv. Lake States Forest St. Tech. Note No. 326. 1 p.
- Storm, G.L. and C.H. Halvorson. 1967. Effect of injury by porcupines on radial growth of ponderosa pine. J. For. 65: 740-743.
- Sullivan, T.P. and D.S. Sullivan. 1982a. Barking damage by snowshoe hares and red squirrels in lodgepole pine stands in central British Columbia. Can. J. For. Res. 12: 443-448.
- Sullivan, T.P. and D.S. Sullivan. 1982b. Influence of fertilization on feeding attacks to lodgepole pine by snowshoe hares and red squirrels. For. Chron. 58: 263-266.
- Sullivan, T.P. and A. Vyse. 1987. Impact of red squirrel feeding damage on spaced stands of lodgepole pine in the Cariboo Region of British Columbia. Can. J. For. Res. 17: 666-674.
- Sullivan, T.P., W.T. Jackson, J. Pojar, and A. Banner. 1985. Impact of feeding damage by the porcupine on western hemlock - Sitka spruce forests of north-coastal British Columbia. Can. J. For. Res. 16: 642-647.
- Taylor, W.P. 1935. Ecology and life history of the porcupine (Erethizon epixanthum) as related to the forests of Arizona and the Southwestern United States. Univ. Ariz., Biol. Bull. 3: 1-177.
- Tenneson, C. and L.W. Oring. 1985. Winter food preferences of porcupines. J. Wildl. Manage. 49: 28-33.
- Tidswell, J. 1975. Porcupine movements and feeding habits in central New Brunswick. M. Sc. F. thesis. Univ. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick. 62 pp.
- Van Deusen, J.L. and C.A. Myers. 1962. Porcupine damage in immature stands of ponderosa pine in the Black Hills. J. For. 60: 811-813.
- Van Horne, B. 1982. Demography of the long-tailed vole Microtus longicaudus in seral stages of coastal coniferous forest, southeast Alaska. Can. J. Zool. 60: 1690-1709.
- Yocom, C.F. 1971. Invasion of Humboldt and Del Norte Counties of northwestern California by porcupines. Murrelet 52: 1-6.

Table 1. Incidence of porcupine damage in terms of % attack, forest type, area sampled, and age and tree species preferred in various published reports from Canada and the United States.

Location and source	% attack	Forest type	Area sampled (ha)	Age preferred (years)	Species preferred
Prince Rupert (Khutzymateen) (Sullivan et al. 1986)	52.7 7.8	western hemlock Sitka spruce	1296.0	-	western hemlock
Alaska (Eglitis and Hennon 1987)	25.0 51.0	western hemlock Sitka spruce	640 plot trees	12-20	Sitka spruce
Kamloops District (Clark 1958)	20.9	ponderosa pine	1.4	-	ponderosa pine
Kamloops District (Clark 1959)	11.5	immature ponderosa pine	6.4	-	ponderosa pine
SW Alberta (Harder 1979)	a) 37.1 b) 22.4	limber pine D. fir interior spruce	a) 36.3 b) 115.5	-	D. fir (leeward stands)
New Brunswick (Tidswell 1975)	13.0	European larch	-	-	European larch
Ontario, Lake Nipigon (MacDonald 1952)	34.0	jack pine	-	-	jack pine
Pacific NW (Evans 1987)	-	-	-	5-30 3-5	ponderosa pine or D. fir
Western Wash. (Evans and Matthews 1972)	-	D. fir western hemlock	-	6-20	D. fir western hemlock

Table 1. (continued).

Oregon (Hooven 1971)	70.0	seedling ponderosa pine	40.4	seedling ponderosa pine
Western Wash. (Dodge 1970)	-	regenerating stands of D. fir & hemlock	-	5-30 D. fir & western hemlock
Central Idaho (Curtis & Wilson 1953)	a) 15.3 b) 13.3	a)ponderosa pine b)ponderosa pine & D. fir	5.7	- a)pond. pine b)pond. pine
South Dakota (Van Deusen & Myers 1962)	9.8	immature ponderosa pine	7000 trees 56 plots	- ponderosa pine
Southwestern Colorado (Spencer et al. 1948)	84.0 86.0	pinyon- ponderosa pine	-	- pinyon pine ponderosa pine
Wisconsin Lower Michigan (Rudolf 1949)	a) 11.6 b) 11.3	a)mixed Scotch & red pine b)jack pine	-	- a)Scotch pine b)jack pine
Northwestern Minnesota (Tenneson & Oring 1985)	40-70	mixed hardwoods balsam fir	-	- white pine
Central New England (Curtis 1941)	3-5	unmanaged mixed hard & softwoods hemlock dominant	2.0	- eastern hemlock
New York (Roze 1984)	-	beech maple	216.0	- beech

Table 2. Range of tree sizes (dbh) preferred by porcupines in their feeding attacks.

Source	Tree dbh (cm)	Stand
Sullivan et al. (1986)	27.5-32.4	hemlock/spruce
Clark (1958)	≤ 17.8	ponderosa pine
Harder (1979)	16.9-26.0	Douglas fir
Roze (1984)	> 3.0	beech/maple
Curtis & Wilson (1953)	20.3-25.4	ponderosa pine & Douglas fir
Van Deusen & Myers (1962)	17.8-20.0	ponderosa pine
Krefting et al. (1962)	22.9-38.1	second-growth hardwoods
Rudolf (1949)	> 7.6	pine
Marshall et al. (1962)	> 17.8	conifer-hardwood forest
Taylor (1935)	10.2-25.4	ponderosa pine
Rudolf (1949)	17.8	Scotch pine
Rearden (1950)	7.6-15.2	Scotch & red pine
Daniel & Barnes (1958)	12.7-15.2	lodgepole pine
Spencer et al. (1948)	> 10.2	pinyon pine & ponderosa pine
Dodge & Canutt (1969)	30 - 52 75 - 90	unmanaged forests

Table 3. Range of population densities estimated for porcupines in various study areas of Canada and the United States.

Location and Source	Density per 100 ha	Area surveyed & forest type
New York (Roze 1984)	10.7	216 ha beech/sugar maple
Michigan (Earle & Kramm 1982)	a) 0.4 b) 3.5	each site min. of 160 ha hardwood - hemlock
Oregon (Smith 1977)	12.6	259 ha mixed D. fir & ponderosa pine
Michigan (Golley 1956)	>0.77	mixed hardwood-pine-swamp
Maine (Curtis 1944)	9.3	mixed hardwood-hemlock
Lake States (Krefting et al. 1962)	25.5-82.3	1020 ha hardwood-hemlock
Southwest U.S. (Taylor 1935)	1.2-5.8	ponderosa pine
Michigan (Powell and Brander 1977)	2.8	hardwood-hemlock
New Brunswick (Reeks 1942)	2.3 -3.1	Spruce-balsam fir
Nevada (Randall 1971)	15.9	mixed pine-fir
Michigan (Brander 1973)	12.4, 16.6, 9.2	mixed hardwood-hemlock
Wisconsin (Stoeckeler 1950)	37.2	mixed hardwood hemlock
Northern California (Hoffer 1967)	3.9	pine-juniper forest

Table 4. Home range estimates (ha) for porcupines in various study areas of Canada and the United States.

Location and Source	Summer &/or Spring	Winter
Northwestern Minnesota (Tenneson and Oring 1985)	-	0.2
Southeastern Idaho (Craig and Keller 1986)	23.1	0.1
Central New Brunswick (Speer and Dilworth 1978)	-	0.3
Pacific Northwest (Evans 1987)	-	12.1
New England (Faulkner and Dodge 1962)	2.4	-
New York (Roze 1987)	64.9	7.4
Minnesota (Marshall et al. 1962)	13 - 15	-
Western Washington (Dodge and Barnes 1975)	83.5	83.5
Northeastern Oregon (Smith 1979)	63.9	-

Table 5. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the Vancouver Forest Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%; M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T (thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Bella Coola	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chilliwack	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maple Ridge	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Powell River	L	Pl	30-60	10-25	2000-5000	N	ESSF	500-1500	N-S-W	50-100	1986	S
Sechelt	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Squamish	L	Ba	20-40	15-30	600-900	N	CWH _{b5}	600-800	S	10	1985	S
		Pl	5-15	3-10	500-900	P	CWH _{b5}	700-900	W	30	1985	
		F	10-20	10-25	400-600	P	CWH _{cl}	300	E	5	1985	

Species code: Ba (balsam fir); F (Douglas fir); Pl (lodgepole pine).

Table 6. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the

Prince Rupert Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%;

M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T

(thinned or spaced); N (Natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Bulkley	L	Pl	100+	35	500-600	N	SBS _e	300	variable	0-30	1985	+
Cassiar	L	Pl	<60	<25	500-9000	N	ICH _g	750	variable	var.	1986	S
Kalum	L	Ss	10-20	4-20	750-900	T	CWH _{fl}	0-250	variable	0-80	?	+
		Hw	10-20	4-20	750-900	T	CWH _{fl}	0-250	variable	0-80		
		Pl	10-20	4-20	750-900	T	CWH _{fl}	0-250	variable	0-80		
Kispiox	L	Hw	30-60	20-25	600-800	N	ICH _{g3}	300-450	S	30-60	1978	+
		Pl	30-60	20-25	600-800	N	ICH _{g3}	300-450	S	30-60	1978	
		Pl	10-15	10-20	1200	P	ICH _g	600-750	S-SW	20-30	1978	
Lakes	L	Pl	80-120	15-25	-	N	SBS _d	700-900	S	var.	?	+
Morice	L	Pl	41-60	18-30	7300	N	SBS _{e4}	800-1000	NE	10-30	1980	+
North Coast	S	Hw	20-35	10-25	4000	N	CWH _{ij}	0-500	var.	var.	1974	+
		Ss	20-35	10-25	150-200	N	CWH _{ij}	0-500	var.	var.		

Species code: Hw (western hemlock); Pl (lodgepole pine); Ss (Sitka spruce).

Table 7. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the

Prince George Forest Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%;

M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T (thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species pref.	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Dawson Creek	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fort Nelson	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fort St. James	L	Pl	80+	20-50	800	N	SBS _{d,e,k} ESSF _n	800-1200	S-W	var.	1981	+
Fort St. John	L	Pl	35	20-30	1200-2200	N	BWBS _{c,d}	750	N-W	0-20	1985	+
Mackenzie	L	Pl Ba	60+ 80-100+	24+ 40+	- -	N N	ESSF/SBS ESSF/SBS	var. var.	var. var.	var. var.	1970 1970	+
McBride	L	Pl Sx	- -	15+ 15+	var. var.	N N	SBS _h ESSF	900 1100	S S	0-40 0-40	? ?	+
P.G. East	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P.G. West	L	Pl	40-80+	15-20	-	N	-	-	-	-	1987	-
Vanderhoof	L	Pl	10-20	5-15	1000	T	SBS _k	-	-	-	-	+

Species Code: Ba (balsam fir); Pl (lodgepole pine); Sx (interior spruce).

Table 8. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the Cariboo Forest Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%; M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T (thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Chilcotin	L	F	80-100	30	-	N	IDF _{b5}	850	S	20-45	1983	+
Horsefly	L	Pl	15-30	8-30	3000-5000	N+T	SBS _k	1000	var.	5-20	1984	S
		F	15-30	8-30	3000-5000	N+T	ICH _{eh} SBS _k	1000	var.	5-20	1984	
100 Mile House	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quesnel	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Williams Lake	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Species code: F (Douglas fir); Pl (lodgepole pine).

Table 9. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the

Kamloops Forest Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) < 5%;

M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) > 50%; Stands code: P (plantation); T

(thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Clearwater	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kamloops	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lillooet	L	Pl	60-80	15	1000	N	IDF _{bl}	1250	-	flat	1987	?
	M	Pl	24	8	1100	T	IDF _d	1170	-	flat	1980	+
	L	Pl	34	8-10	1100	T	IDF _{bl}	950	SW	15	1984	S
	L	Pl	30	8-10	1000	T	MS _C	1400	N	25	1987	?
Merritt	L	Pl	15	10	2000	N	IDF _d MS _{bl}	1200	-	flat	1985	+
Penticton	L	Sx	-	8-9	-	N	ESSF _d	-	-	-	?	?
		Pp	-	-	-	N	PPBG	-	-	flat	?	?
Salmon Arm	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vernon	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Species code: Pl (lodgepole pine); Pp (ponderosa pine); Sx (interior spruce).

Table 10. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within Districts of the Nelson Forest Region. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%; M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T (thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported	Status
Arrow	L	Pl	12	10-15	2000	P	ICH _{a2}	1100	E	30	1975	+
		Lw	45	15	1200	N	ICH _a	853	E	20-50		
		Ba	80+	30	-	N	ESSF _C	1500	var.	var.		
		Cw	40	20	-	N	ICH _a	800	var.	var.		
Boundary	L	Pl	20-50	12+	<7000	N	ESSF _C ICH _a	1600 1300-1500	flat E	5 25	?	?
Cranbrook	L	Pl	30-80	15-20	2000-	N+T+P	MS _a	1500	S	25-40	?	S
		Lw	30-80	15-20	6000	N+T+P	ESSF ICH _a	1800 1900	S S	25-40 25-40		
Golden	L	Pl	-	-	-	N	ICH _a	-	-	-	?	S
		Ba	-	-	-	N	MS _a ESSF _C	-	-	-		
Invermere	L	Pl	70+	25	800	N	ESSF	2000	SW	20	1979	?
Kootenay Lake	L	Ba	100+	20-30	200-425	N	ESSF _C	1500	S-SE	0-50	1982	S
Nakusp	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Revelstoke	L	Hw	20-40	25-40	-	N	ICH _b	914	NE	10-35	1975	S

Species code: Ba (balsam fir); Cw (western red cedar); Hw (western hemlock; Lw (western larch); Pl (lodgepole pine).

Table 11. Incidence of porcupine damage based on survey questionnaire within related areas of the Pacific Northwest. Percentage of trees attacked based on: N (nil) 0%; L (low) <5%; M (moderate) 5-25%; H (high) 26-50%; S (severe) >50%. Stands code: P (plantation); T (thinned or spaced); N (natural). Damage status code: + (increase); - (decrease); S (stable).

District	% trees attacked	Species	Age (years)	Size dbh (cm)	Stand density (stems/ha)	Managed or natural	Zone or subzone	Elev. (m)	Aspect	Slope (%)	Year first reported		Status
											Year	first reported	
Alaska (Mitskof Is)	S	Ss	12-20	10-25	750	T	Spruce-hemlock/ Vaccinium	0-300	SE-SW	0-60	1984		+
		Hw	12-20	10-25	750	T		0-300	SE-SW	0-60			
Alberta	L	Pl	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S
		Pj	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Washington-Oregon (U.S. Forest Service)	L	Pl	5-20	5-15	>1000	N	Interior pine	600-1900	var.	var.	1900		S
		Pp	5-20	5-15	>1000	N							
		Ba	5-20	5-15	>1000	N	Transition D. fir-hemlock	>1000	var.	var.	1950's		
		F	10-20	10-15	>1000	N		<1000					
		Hw	10-20	10-15	>1000	N		<1000					
Western Washington Southeast Oregon (Weyerhaeuser)	L	F	<20	8-15	1000	N+T	Douglas fir/hemlock	1000+	var.	var.	1950's		+
	L	Pp	<12	30-35	1000	T	Interior pine	1300+	var.	var.	1910		+
		Pp	20-40	30-35	750	N							
		Ba	<50	30-35	750	N							
		Pl	<50	30-35	1250	N							

Species code: Ba (balsam fir); F (Douglas fir); Hw (western hemlock); Pj (jack pine); Pl (lodgepole pine); Pp (ponderosa pine).

Table 12. Summary of control strategies to reduce porcupine populations.

Source	Method	Control (Check)	Efficacy
Anthony et al. (1986)	strychnine salt blocks	yes	poor kill success negative side effects
Faulkner & Dodge (1962)	a) sodium arsenite b) bounties	none none	a) 71% kill 1st year b) numbers remain high
Dodge (1962)	sodium arsenite	none	high kill success
Nietro (1980)	strychnine shelters	none	high kill success
Hooven (1971)	a) strychnine & sodium arsenite	none	successful but non-specific & potent to plants & animals
	b) trapping	none	nonspecific
	c) hunting/bounties	none	nonsystematic, expensive sometimes effective
Dodge (1982)	a) bounties	none	unsuccessful
	b) hunting		
Evans & Mathews (1972)	a) toxicants	none	a) questionable efficacy
	b) hunting		
Krefting et al. (1962)	hunting		recommended, unstudied
Eglitis & Hennon (1986)	hunting	none	nos. continue to rise
Powell & Brander (1977)	fisher intro.	none	nos. reduced from 11.8 to 2.8/km ² (by sitings)
Cook & Hamilton (1957)	fisher intro.	none	observed porcupine decline since intro.
Earle & Kramm (1982)	fisher intro.	yes	0.4/km ² vs 3.5/km ² (porcupine densities) with vs without fisher

Table 13. Summary of control strategies to reduce porcupine damage.

Source	Method	Control	Efficacy
Dodge (1982)	a) repellents b) natural succession c) high grading	none	a) none recommended b) increase canopy cover, takes too long c) to decrease choice trees near den, recommended, no study
Dodge (1962)	a) repellents	none	no protection
Curtis (1941)	a) sacrifice trees b) pruning		a) recommended where population not high b) inhibits climbing, time consuming to implement
Sullivan et al. (1986)	a) sanitation spacing b) sacrifice trees		recommendations
Van Deuson & Myers (1962)	thinning		not recommended
Spencer (1948)	mechanical barriers e.g. electric fences		not feasible for large areas

Table 14. Incidence (%) of porcupine damage in unmanaged second growth stands at Fords Cove, North Coast District. Sample size (trees/ha) in parentheses. Hw: western hemlock; Ss: Sitka spruce.

Stratum	<u>Damage class</u>			Girdled trees	<u>Species selection</u>	
	Pre-1987	1987	Total		Hw	Ss
Total trees (2916)	8.5	1.4	9.9	4.5	89.3	10.7
Well spaced trees (920)	27.0	4.5	31.5	14.2	-	-
Attack-size trees (≥ 10 cm dbh) (1458)	17.0	2.8	19.8	9.0	22.2	21.2

11.0 LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Porcupine population fluctuations in (A) southwest Colorado (Spencer 1974) and (B) northern Quebec (Payette 1987).

Figure 2. Percentage of western hemlock and Sitka spruce trees attacked by porcupine in stands on control and treatment sides of Khutzeymateen Inlet, fisher introduction experiment.

Figure 3. General scenarios of porcupine population trends based on (A) long-term increase in abundance in response to availability of preferred forest habitat and (B) fluctuations in abundance in old growth forest.

Figure 4. Percentage of western hemlock trees damaged by porcupines during the 1984-1985 winter (□ ; total = 5.1%), prior to 1984-1985 (■ ; total = 47.6%), and both during and prior to the 1984-85 winter (▨ ; total = 52.7%) over a range of diameter classes. Sample sizes are shown above each bar (from Sullivan et al. 1986).

Figure 5. Intensity of porcupine attack with respect to crown class of western hemlock trees (□ , dominant; ▨ , codominant; ■ , intermediate and suppressed). (A) Average number of wounds per tree (totals (average per tree): □ ,

2.7; , 3.2; , 0.9). (B) Percentage of trees girdled (totals: , 40.0a; , 36.7b; , 16.5ab; values followed by the same letter are significantly different at $p < 0.01$ (χ^2 test)). Sample sizes (number of trees) are shown above each bar (from Sullivan et al. 1986).

Figure 6. Percentage of girdled and semigirdled western hemlock trees by porcupines (percent girdled classes: , 1-49; , 50-75; , 76-99; , 100) over a range of diameter classes (totals: , 13.9%; , 4.3% , 3.5%; , 30.9%). Sample sizes are shown above each bar (from Sullivan et al. 1986).

Figure 7. Possible impact of feeding damage on NSR in (A) selective attack of dominant and co-dominant trees in unmanaged stands and (B) attack of crop trees in managed stands.

Figure 8. Percentage of trees attacked on an annual and cumulative basis in managed stands in (A) the Kalum District and (B) Mitkof Island, Alaska.

Figure 9. Possible impact of feeding damage on AAC in terms of (A) incremental attack and (B) catastrophic attack.

Figure 10. First approximation of a forecast model to predict when

and where outbreaks of porcupine damage will occur in the Kalum and North Coast Districts.

PORCUPINE POPULATION FLUCTUATIONS

Figure 1.

-60-

(A)




FIG. 4. Porcupine population fluctuations on Mesa Verde. Expressed by the relative abundance of feeding scars.

(B)





FIG. 3. Age distributions (histogram) and cumulative relative frequencies (percent) of feeding scars (dotted line) at the five study sites. For sites 1, 2, and 5 the cumulative relative frequencies (percent) of the ages of scar-bearing stems (solid line) are also presented.

FISHER INTRODUCTION - KHUTZEYMATEEN INLET

Figure 2.

-61-



SCENARIOS OF PORCUPINE POPULATION TRENDS

Figure 3.

-62-




Figure 4.




Figure 5.




Figure 6.





Figure 7. (A) IMPACT OF SELECTIVE FEEDING DAMAGE ON NSR
IN UNMANAGED SECOND GROWTH STANDS



(B) IMPACT OF FEEDING DAMAGE ON NSR IN
MANAGED STANDS





Figure 8. ⁻⁶⁷⁻ **PORCUPINE DAMAGE IN MANAGED STANDS**

① KALUM DISTRICT



② MITKOF ISLAND, ALASKA





Figure 9. IMPACT OF FEEDING DAMAGE ON AAC

① INCREMENTAL ATTACK



② CATASTROPHIC ATTACK





Figure 10.

FORECAST MODEL

-69-



PORCUPINE DAMAGE SURVEY

District _____

Region _____

1) INCIDENCE OF DAMAGE

(% of trees attacked in
your District or area)

_____ Nil 0%
 _____ Low <5%
 _____ Moderate 5-25%
 _____ High 26-50%
 _____ Severe >50%

2) TREE SPECIES AGE SIZE (dbh) STAND DENSITY MANAGED (Thinning/Fert.) or
 (Rank preference by porcupine) NATURAL

a) _____
 b) _____
 c) _____

2) (continued)

BIOGEOCLIMATIC ZONE AND SUBZONE ELEVATION ASPECT SLOPE

a) _____
 b) _____
 c) _____

3) When (year) was porcupine damage first observed or reported? _____

4) Has incidence of damage been increasing, decreasing, or remaining
 stable over time? _____

5) Incidence of damage in past decades?

1981-87 _____

1971-80 _____

1961-70 _____

1951-60 _____

(Nil, low, moderate, high, severe, or
 unknown)

6) What damage or population control methods have been or are currently
 used in your area? _____

Effective or ineffective in reducing damage? _____

COMMENTS

Figure 11. Bark removed by tree squirrels. Debarked surface is smooth and may occur higher in the tree.




Figure 12. Bark and sapwood deeply gnawed from bole and branches by porcupines.






FIG. 2. Porcupine feeding injury to western hemlock. Note the prominent horizontal incisor marks on the exposed sapwood. Scale is indicated by 25-cm increments on the pole.

NOTES

445




FIG. 1. (A) Snowshoe hare feeding injury to lodgepole pine. Note the traces of inner bark still attached to the sapwood. (B) Red squirrel feeding injury to lodgepole pine. Arrow indicates accumulation of bark strips on the ground. (C) Porcupine feeding injury to lodgepole pine. Note the prominent incisor marks on the exposed sapwood.

Appendix 2.

Ministry of Forests and Lands, Smithers, B.C.

W. Martin	A. Banner
M. Geisler	F. Newhouse
J. Pojar	G. Lloyd

MoFL, Prince Rupert, B.C.

W. Jackson
C. Salter
M. LaRock
M. Grainger

MoFL, Terrace, B.C.

J. Katasonoff
T. Jobb
P. Eng

MoEP, Smithers, B.C.

D. Steventon

Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C.

A. Harestad

Canadian Forestry Service - Forest Insect Disease Survey,
Victoria, B.C.

A. Stewart and associate Rangers

CFS - FIDS, Edmonton, Alberta

H. Cerezke

USDA Forest Service, Juneau, Alaska

A. Eglitis

P. Hennon

USDA Forest Service, APHIS, Animal Damage Control, Olympia,
Washington

J. Evans

D. Campbell

USDA Forest Service, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

J. Caslick

Weyerhaeuser Company, Tacoma, Washington

J. Rochelle

R. Anderson