SPATIOTEMPORAL SEGREGATION OF WOLVES FROM HUMANS IN THE BIAŁOWIEŻA FOREST (POLAND)

JÖRN THEUERKAUF, 1, 2 Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17-230 Białowieża, Poland, and Wildlife Biology and Management Unit, Department of Ecosystem and Landscape Management, Munich University of Technical Sciences, 85354 Freising, Germany
WŁODZIMIERZ JĘDRZEJEWSKI, Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17-230 Białowieża, Poland
KRZYSZTOF SCHMIDT, Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17-230 Białowieża, Poland
ROMAN GULA, 3 Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, 17-230 Białowieża, Poland

Abstract: Knowledge about the impact of human activity on the behavior of wolves (Canis lupus) is important to predict habitats suitable for wolf recolonization and for planning management zones. We tested the hypothesis that wolves live spatiotemporally segregated from humans. From 1994 to 1999, we radiotracked 11 wolves in 4 packs and monitored human activity in the Białowieża Forest, Poland. Wolves avoided permanent human-made structures (settlements, forest edge to arable land, roads, tourist trails) more in the day than at night. Wolf avoidance increased with increasing human use. Particularly large settlements and intensively used public roads reduced the area used by wolves. Wolves avoided human presence in the forest (traffic, forestry operations) by temporarily selecting areas where people were absent. One of the wolf packs selected a national park zone with restricted access (50 km²) as the core area of its home range in both day and night. Conversely, wolf packs living in a commercial forest with small nature reserves (<5 km²) did not select reserves in the day or night. We concluded that spatiotemporal segregation is an adaptation of wolves to coexist with humans while keeping their activity pattern optimized toward food acquisition. The distribution of areas with restricted human access, forest, settlements, and intensively used public roads are important factors determining the suitability of an area for wolves.
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Boitani (2000) highlighted the need for knowledge on the capacity of wolves to coexist with human activity, a factor that he regarded as a key element for the conservation of wolves in Europe. Wolves are now recolonizing many areas of Europe and North America where they were extirpated (Mech 1995, Boitani 2000). Because some of the areas that wolves are recolonizing are densely populated by people, wildlife managers need information on the impact of human activity on wolves. However, only a few studies have focused on the influence of human activity on wolf behavior. Thiel et al. (1998) documented that some wolves in Minnesota and Wisconsin even tolerated humans close to their den sites; other studies reported that wolves usually avoided contact with humans. This avoidance can be spatial, as in Alaska, where wolves avoided areas surrounding public roads (Thurber et al. 1994). In contrast, Vilà et al. (1995) and Ciucci et al. (1997) suggested that wolves and humans are temporally segregated, because radiomarked wolves in Italy and Spain mainly were nocturnal. However, in the Białowieża Forest, the daily movement patterns of wolves living with various levels of human activity were not different (Theuerkauf et al. 2001). We therefore hypothesized that humans and wolves are spatiotemporally separated.

We radiotracked wolves and monitored human activity in the Białowieża Forest to test our hypothesis on the spatiotemporal segregation of wolves and humans. Our objectives were to determine whether (1) wolves avoided human-made structures (human settlements, forest edge with arable land, roads) more during the day than at night, (2) the home ranges of wolves were smaller during the day than at night, (3) the size of human settlements or the intensity of road use influenced the level of wolf avoidance, (4) wolves reduced their use of forest areas when humans used these areas intensively compared to periods when people were absent, (5) wolves were more sensitive to human activity when resting than when active, (6) human activity close to a wolf was less than the mean human activity in the wolf’s home range, (7) wolves selected nature reserves more during the day than at night, and (8)
wolves used a forest area more intensively after the area became protected as a reserve.

**STUDY AREA**

The Bialowieża Forest is a forest complex of 1,450 km² (52°30′–53°00′N, 23°30′–24°15′E) that straddles the Polish–Belarussian border (Fig. 1). The forest is a mosaic of deciduous, coniferous, and mixed tree stands. The Polish side of the Bialowieża Forest consists of the Bialowieża National Park and a commercial forest (480 km²), in which timber harvest, reforestation, and hunting occur. Fifty km² of the Bialowieża National Park have been protected as a strict reserve since 1921. No hunting, forestry, or motorized traffic is permitted in the strict reserve, and public access is limited. In July 1996, the Bialowieża National Park was enlarged to 100 km². The extended portion of the national park is open to the public, but vehicle access is restricted, hunting is not allowed and forestry interventions are limited to cutting of sick trees and fencing off regeneration areas. The Bialowieża Forest also has 22 small (0.1–3.7 km²) nature reserves, which are less protected against forestry operations than the national park. The whole Belarussian side of the Bialowieża Forest (870 km²) is a national park, but hunting and limited logging are allowed. On the Belarussian side, a guarded fence was built in 1981 along the state border (in a distance of 0–1.5 km). The zone between the border and the fence is used little by humans.

Human density on the Polish side of the Bialowieża Forest is about 7 inhabitants per km² and 70 inhabitants per km² in the surrounding region (Podlasie Province, capital: Białystok, Poland). The density of forest roads passable by 2-wheel-drive vehicles is about 1.2 km/km² in the commercial forest, but only about 50 km of paved roads (0.1 km/km²) are intensively used by the public.

Forestry is the main source of human activity in the commercial forest. Other groups of people use the forest seasonally. From July to October, 27% of forest visitors are mushroom collectors; from September to January 15% are hunters; and from May to September 40% are tourists, whereas from October to April only 4% of humans in the commercial forest are tourists. From May to September, around 100 tourists per day visit the strict reserve of the Bialowieża National Park, but the number of tourists decreases to about 20 per day from October to April (estimate based on data of B. Jaroszewicz, Bialowieża National Park, personal communication). The area visited by tourists is restricted to a 4-km tourist trail near the park’s entrance. The rest of the strict reserve is open for permit holders to conduct research or education. Humans traveling in the commercial forest use mostly cars (80%), but also lorries and tractors (10%), as well as bicycles (10%). Tourists mainly go on foot or bicycle and usually stay on roads or trails.

At the beginning of our study, 3 wolf packs inhabited the Polish side of the Bialowieża Forest (Okarma et al. 1998). The core area of 1 pack (National Park pack) was within the strict reserve of the Bialowieża National Park (Fig. 1). The number of wolves in this pack varied during our study between 4 and 7 wolves (in midwinter). Another pack (Ladzka pack, 3–6 wolves) lived in the northwestern part of the Bialowieża Forest, an area with few small nature reserves. The third pack (Leśna pack, 4–7 wolves) lived in the southern part of our study area, which includes most small nature reserves and a large part of the border zone. This pack split in December 1997 into 2 packs (Leśna I and II packs), but because their home ranges overlapped largely after the separation, we pooled data of the 2 packs when comparing them with the other 2 packs. Forest road density was 0.8 km/km² in the home range of the National Park pack and 1.0 km/km² in the home ranges of the Ladzka and Leśna packs.
Wolves have been protected since 1989 in the Polish side of the Białowieża Forest, but humans are still the main mortality factor. During our study, 6 of 12 radiomarked wolves died in poachers’ snares set for wild boar (Sus scrofa) or were shot. In the Belarusian side, hunters on average killed 80% of the wolf population each year between 1975 and 1994 (Jędrzejewska et al. 1996). Immigration of wolves from the northeast compensated for the high human-caused mortality.

The main prey of wolves in the Białowieża Forest (Jędrzejewski et al. 2000, 2002) is red deer (Cervus elaphus), followed by wild boar and roe deer (Capreolus capreolus). During our research, the mean densities of prey species for the entire study area were about 3–7 red deer, 1–6 wild boar, and 1–5 roe deer per km² (Kossak 1997, Jędrzejewski et al. 2000). Wolves occasionally fed on carion at garbage dumps (Ładzka pack) or killed cattle (Lesna I pack).

**METHODS**

**Wolves**

From 1994 to 1999, we captured 12 wolves in 4 packs either with Aldrich foot snares equipped with radioalarm systems or by the fladry and net method (Okarma and Jędrzejewski 1997) and fitted them with radiocollars (Okarma et al. 1998). We relocated wolves in 24-hr radio-tracking sessions of usually 6 days (range 1–9 days; described in detail in Theuerkauf and Jędrzejewski 2002). Data samples for 11 radiomarked wolves (5 breeding females, 1 breeding male, 4 young females, 1 young male) were large enough for analysis (557–8,336 relocations/wolf; 3–42 months of radio-tracking).

Radio locations gathered by 24-hr radiotracking can be autocorrelated (Salvatori et al. 1999). However, time intervals that ensure temporal independence often are large, which can lead to an important underestimate of home-range size of radiomarked animals (Rooney et al. 1998). We therefore decided not to reduce our radiotracking data to temporally independent locations, which would have resulted in a lower accuracy of results. We instead eliminated autocorrelation among consecutive radio locations by calculating 1 value for each wolf. Accordingly, we used the variation among wolves and not among radio location data for statistical testing of selection (Otis and White 1999).

We created 10,000 random points with a Geographic Information System (GIS) inside our study area, which we defined as the cumulative area of all the wolves’ home ranges (100% minimum convex polygons). We calculated selection by comparing radio locations of a wolf with the locations of random points inside the home range of the given wolf. We used Ivlev’s electivity index (Jacobs 1974) to indicate selection:

\[
\text{Selection index} = \frac{(p_w - p_r)}{(p_w + p_r - 2p_wp_r)},
\]

where \(p_w\) is the proportion of wolf locations in a given category, and \(p_r\) is the proportion of random points in a given category. Selection indices can vary from +1 (total selection) to −1 (total avoidance). We categorized wolf or random point locations in 500-m-wide classes according to the distance to human-made structures (settlements, forest edges, roads, tourist trails; 250-m-wide classes for distances of 0–1 km to roads or tourist trails) or parts of our study area under different protection (commercial forest, nature reserves, strict reserve, border zone). We calculated selection indices for all categories first for each wolf, and then mean selection indices and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the variation among wolves. We considered that wolves selected (avoided) a given category if the lower (upper) limit of the 95% CI was higher (lower) than zero.

To map the spatiotemporal home-range use of wolves, we calculated selection indices for squares of 250 × 250 m. Because our location error was 194–291 m (Theuerkauf and Jędrzejewski 2002), we used a 500-m radius around the center of the square to compensate for the radio location error.

We defined summer as the period from May to September when wolves are concentrated around dens or rendezvous sites and when many tourists are in the forest. Winter was the period from October to April when wolves use their entire home ranges (Jędrzejewski et al. 2001) and human activity in the forest is mainly limited to forestry operations and hunting ungulates. Breeding females in our study area stayed mostly at the den (denning period) from about 2 weeks before a birth until 6 weeks after the birth (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a). We defined the forest edge as the peripheral borders of the Białowieża Forest as well as all borders to human settlements within the forest.

**Human Activity**

We documented human activity from 1997 to 1999 either visually or with a magnetic traffic counter card (NC-30, Nu-Metrics, Uniontown, Pennsylvania, USA) at 39 counting points on roads in the Białowieża Forest. During visual
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counts, which lasted 2–24 hr (total 569 hr), we counted people and vehicles that passed a given point. The traffic counter card dug in forest roads recorded hourly the numbers of passing vehicles for continuous periods of 1 week (total 5,712 hr). We checked the reliability of the card under our field conditions during 150 hr of direct observations. The card had registered 144 vehicles when 142 vehicles had actually passed. We therefore considered that the card recorded the number of vehicles precisely enough and pooled its data with those gathered visually.

We classified roads inside the forest as primary roads (public paved roads with 1,000–10,000 vehicles per week), secondary roads (regularly used forest roads with 48–500 vehicles per week), and tertiary roads (rarely used forest roads with <40 vehicles per week). We calculated the average human activity on roads in the home range of a wolf by multiplying the proportion (by length) of each road class in the home range of a wolf by the average human activity on the given road class, and then adding the values for the 3 road classes.

In addition, we recorded human activity during radiotracking by noting the number of people and vehicles that passed the person tracking wolves. In 95% of cases, trackers were between 200 and 2,200 m from the wolf, so the count of human activity represents human activity within a radius of about 2 km around the radiomarked wolves. We found no detectable influence of the radiotracker on the behavior of the tracked wolf (Theuerkauf and Jędrzejewski 2002). To test whether wolves selected areas of low human activity, we compared the average human activity on roads around wolves with the average human activity on roads used for radiotracking.

The forestry administration provided us with information about daily locations of forestry operations in an area where we had radiotracked wolves continuously (3 weeks in Jan, Feb, and May 1999). To evaluate the reaction of wolves to forestry operations, we compared wolf use of areas around forestry operations during working hours (day during the working week) and during nonworking hours (nights and weekends).

RESULTS

Permanent Human-made Structures

Wolves in the Białowieża Forest selected areas in the center of their home ranges that were far from the forest edge, especially in summer (Fig. 2). The daytime home ranges of the 11 wolves ($\bar{x} = 205$ km$^2$, SE = 23 km$^2$) were reduced compared to nightly home ranges ($\bar{x} = 257$ km$^2$, SE = 29 km$^2$; t-test for pairs: $P = 0.001$). Wolves used only 74% (SE = 2%) of their home ranges in the day compared to 93% (SE = 2%) at night.

Wolves not only avoided coming out of the forest into arable land, but also rarely made incursions into the 2-km-wide forest zone that borders the forest edge (Fig. 3). Daytime avoidance of arable land by wolves was almost total and more pronounced than at night for the 2-km edge zone. Wolves increased both their avoidance level and the width of the avoided forest zone with increasing size of human settlements. The avoidance zone for the largest town in our study area (24,000 inhabitants) was 2 km at night and 3.5 km during the day. Wolves avoided a zone of 0.5 km at night and 1 km in the day around forest settlements with few houses.

Mean distances between wolves and edges of the forest bordering human settlements were larger in the day than at night (Table 1). The difference between day and night became more
pronounced with low levels of human activity, and was most significant for the National Park pack in winter when human activity in the home range of this pack was lowest. Breeding females \( (n = 5) \) were farther from edges of the forest bordering human settlements during the denning
Table 1. Comparison (t-test for pairs) between day and night of distances (km) of wolf radio locations to edges of the forest bordering human settlements in the Białowieża Forest, Poland, 1994–1999 (4 wolves of the National Park pack, 3 wolves of the Lesna pack, and 4 wolves of the Ladzka packs). Seasonal human activity in the wolves’ home ranges: low (<10 people per day on roads/trails on average), moderate (30–60), high (150–200).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Park pack</th>
<th>Lesna packs</th>
<th>Ladzka pack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Human activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The daily patterns of reserve selection differed greatly among packs. The National Park pack strongly selected the strict reserve but avoided other reserves and the border zone (Table 2). Wolves of the National Park pack also avoided the new part of the national park except on winter nights. During the winter, the Lesna packs used nature reserves and the border zone in the day more than randomly, but they did not clearly select these protected areas. The Ladzka pack neither selected reserves nor showed a particular daily pattern in reserve selection. Wolves of the National Park pack (\(n = 4\)) used the area of the new national park less before its creation (8% of time, \(SE = 2\%\)) than after (17%, \(SE = 3\%\); \(t\)-test: \(P = 0.004\)). Wolf use of this area increased at a rate of 0.5% monthly (linear regression: \(P = 0.048\)) during the 3 years after protection was established. Before the creation of the new national park, the monthly use did not increase (\(P = 0.818\)).

DISCUSSION

Vila et al. (1995) and Ciucci et al. (1997) assumed that wolves and humans may be temporally segregated in Italy and Spain, where radiomarked wolves mainly were nocturnal. In contrast, wolves in Canada (Kolenosky and Johnston 1967), in Alaska (Peterson et al. 1984, Fancy and Ballard 1995), in forests of Minnesota (Mech 1992), and in the Białowieża Forest (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a) were active at night and in the day. In Alaska, Thurber et al. (1994) reported that wolves avoided areas surrounding public roads. This might lead to the conclusion that wolves avoid humans spatially in areas with low human density (e.g., Alaska), and temporally in regions with high human activity (e.g., southern Europe). However, in the Białowieża Forest, we found no difference among the daily movement patterns of wolves living with various levels of human activity (Theuerkauf et al. 2001). Further, wolves in the Białowieża Forest were active throughout the day,

Temporary Human Presence

Although the average human activity on roads within wolf home ranges was higher in summer than in winter (Fig. 5), the mean daily number of humans or vehicles on roads in a 2-km radius around wolves was not higher (\(t\)-test: \(P = 0.596\) for humans, \(P = 0.533\) for vehicles) in summer (\(\bar{x} = 7.1\), \(SE = 2.1\) for humans; \(\bar{x} = 4.7\), \(SE = 1.4\) for vehicles) than in winter (\(\bar{x} = 9.2\), \(SE = 3.0\) for humans; \(\bar{x} = 6.0\), \(SE = 1.5\) for vehicles). In both seasons, the hourly mean numbers of humans or vehicles on roads in the 2-km radius around wolves were lower than those on all roads used for radiotracking or on all roads in wolf home ranges (Wilcoxon-test: all \(P < 0.001\)). Wolves used the area up to 1.5 km around forestry operations less during working hours than during nonworking hours (Fisher’s exact test: \(P = 0.043\)).

Reserves

The daily patterns of reserve selection differed greatly among packs. The National Park pack strongly selected the strict reserve but avoided other reserves and the border zone (Table 2). Wolves of the National Park pack also avoided the new part of the national park except on winter nights. During the winter, the Lesna packs used nature reserves and the border zone in the day more than randomly, but they did not clearly select these protected areas. The Ladzka pack neither selected reserves nor showed a particular daily pattern in reserve selection. Wolves of the National Park pack (\(n = 4\)) used the area of the new national park less before its creation (8% of time, \(SE = 2\%\)) than after (17%, \(SE = 3\%\); \(t\)-test: \(P = 0.004\)). Wolf use of this area increased at a rate of 0.5% monthly (linear regression: \(P = 0.048\)) during the 3 years after protection was established. Before the creation of the new national park, the monthly use did not increase (\(P = 0.818\)).
although human activity in some parts of the forest was high (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a). During periods when many people were in the Bialowieża Forest, wolves used areas where human activity was low. We conclude that the segregation between wolves and humans is spatiotemporal as wolves react to human activity by temporarily avoiding areas being used by humans.

Reasons other than avoidance of humans may account for the nocturnal behavior of wolves in Italy (Ciucci et al. 1997) and Spain (Vilà et al. 1995). In Ciucci et al.’s (1997) study, wolves took regular advantage of anthropogenic food sources, such as garbage dumps. Because these dumps were near human settlements, wolves used the dumps at night (Ciucci et al. 1997). In the Bialowieża Forest, wolves almost completely met their food requirements by hunting red deer, wild boar, and roe deer in the forest (Jedrzejewski et al. 2000). Wolves were active and hunted throughout the day, but both the number of prey killed and activity peaked at dawn and dusk, which appeared to coincide with peaks in the activity patterns of their prey (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a). Activity patterns of wolves feeding on wild prey should therefore be adjusted to the activity rhythms of their main prey species. Bimodal activity patterns are common in many prey species such as red deer (Georgii 1981, Georgii and Schröder 1983), roe deer (Cederlund 1981, Jeppesen 1989), white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus; Montgomery 1963, Kammermeyer and Marchinton 1977), and moose (Alces alces; Geist 1963), whereas wild boar often are more nocturnal (Briedermann 1971, Russo et al. 1997). Besides feeding on carrion and domestic animals, Spanish wolves also prey on wild ungulates, which may be the reason why the activity patterns of wolves were nocturnal but with activity peaks at dawn and just after dusk (Vilà et al. 1995). In Ciucci et al.’s (1997) study, the only potential prey for wolves were wild boar, which are mainly nocturnal in Italy even in regions where they are not hunted (Russo et al. 1997). A possibility exists, however, that wolves under heavy persecution by man would become more nocturnal. Kitchen et al. (2000) showed a temporary shift in the behavior of coyotes (Canis latrans), which moved less in the day during a period of persecution by humans compared to coyotes that had not been persecuted for >8 years. During the period of persecution, coyotes adjusted their activity patterns presumably to reduce the chance of encounters with human hunters, but increased their diurnal activity quickly after the persecution had stopped. Ciucci et al. (1997) and Vilà et al. (1995) did not report a heavy persecution in their study areas of Italy and Spain. We therefore expect the activity patterns of wolves that are not heavily persecuted to be affected more by their mode of food acquisition than by the influence of humans.

In mammalian predator–prey systems, fear of predators plays an important role in shaping the behavior of the prey (Brown et al. 1999). Under high levels of predation, prey species are very vige-
lant. After a reduction of predators, the prey rapidly becomes less wary. Human–wolf relationships likely follow the same principle. Wolves under persecution would thus be more alert and therefore less visible to humans. This does not necessarily mean that wolves would become exclusively nocturnal, because they can spatiotemporally avoid contact with humans. Forest habitat appeared of particular importance in spatiotemporal segregation since wolves rarely left forest cover in daylight in the Białowieża Forest and in Italy (Ciucci et al. 1997). In areas frequented by people, wolves seem able to maintain their activity during the day by taking advantage of available forest cover.

Spatial avoidance of humans by wolves appeared to occur alongside spatiotemporal segregation. Human settlements, public roads, and edges to agricultural land reduced the area used by wolves even at night. Human settlements and roads both produce noise and light, which may explain why the wolf avoidance found in our study increased with the size of settlements and the intensity of road use. Thurber et al. (1994) noted a similar behavior in Alaska where wolves avoided a public

Fig. 5. Daily patterns of average human activity (mean number of people or vehicles per hour) on roads in the wolves’ home ranges (dashed lines), mean human activity on roads used for radiotracking during absence of wolves (dotted lines), and average human activity on roads used for radiotracking during the presence of wolves (continuous lines) in the Białowieża Forest, Poland, in 1998 and 1999.
road but selected little used roads for ease of travel. In a Canadian area with little human activity on linear corridors (mostly pipeline or seismic lines), wolves were even closer to these corridors than expected (James and Stuart-Smith 2000). Wolves were most affected by human activity (e.g., avoided human-made structures) in areas where human activity was lowest, indicating that wolves are more sensitive to human activity when they have the least contact with humans. This means that wolves may habituate to some degree to human activity also in areas where they are not completely free of human persecution.

Spatial avoidance is especially important for wolves during the denning period because breeding females are unable to spatiotemporally avoid human contact. Breeding females can either choose particularly quiet places or they have to tolerate human activity. In Minnesota and Wisconsin, some wolf packs tolerated forestry operations close to their den sites (Thiel et al. 1998). In the Bialowieza Forest, breeding females were farther from forest edges that bordered with human settlements during the denning period than during the rest of the year. Den and rendezvous sites were farther than expected from human settlements, the forest edge, and intensively used public roads, but wolves did not abandon the den when foresters worked near the den sites (Theuerkauf et al. 2003b).

Distribution of prey may have interfered with the influence of humans on wolf habitat use. Prey abundance in the Bialowieza Forest is not affected by roads, however (J. Theuerkauf et al., unpublished data), thus wolf avoidance of roads was not biased by prey. Prey abundance is higher within the strict reserve than in the commercial forest (J. Theuerkauf et al., unpublished data). However, wolves in the National Park regularly leave the strict reserve from dusk to dawn to hunt, but usually return to the reserve during the day. Because wolves in the Bialowieza Forest hunt mainly from dusk to dawn (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a), we conclude that wolves select the strict reserve during the day to avoid humans, rather than because of higher prey density.

### MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Wolves are protected by law in many European countries and in the United States with the exception of Alaska. As a result, wolves are slowly expanding their ranges in both Europe (Boitani 2000) and the United States (Mech 1995). However, legal protection is not the only factor that determines the speed and extent of wolf recolonization, since the first wolves to recolonize are often killed illegally (Mech 1977).

In the United States, Thiel (1985), Jensen et al. (1986), Mech et al. (1988), and Mech (1989) estimated a road density of about 0.6–0.7 km/km² as a threshold for wolf occurrence. Road density was, therefore, a major factor used to predict suitable habitats for wolves in the United States and Italy (Mladenoff et al. 1995, 1999; Mladenoff and Sickley 1998; Corsi et al. 1999). However, in the Bialowieza Forest, wolves survived in a commercial forest with a road density of about 1.2 km/km², although humans caused many wolf deaths (Jedrzejewska et al. 1996). Similarly, Merrill (2000) reported that a wolf pack in Minnesota survived in a military area with a road density of 1.4 km/km². Therefore, wolves likely will recolonize areas of increasingly high road density.

Fritts and Carbyn (1995) outlined the necessity for nature reserves of up to several thousand square kilometers to maintain an isolated wolf population. However, medium-sized nature reserves (e.g., strict reserve of the Bialowieza National

---

Table 2. Mean reserve selection indices (± difference to the 95% CI limits) for 4 wolves of the National Park pack (protected forest reserve), 3 wolves of the Ladzka pack (commercial forest), and 4 wolves of the Lesna packs (commercial forest) in the Bialowieza Forest, Poland, 1994–1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Park pack</th>
<th>Leśna packs</th>
<th>Ładzka pack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature reserves</td>
<td>−0.94 ± 0.06</td>
<td>−0.86 ± 0.15</td>
<td>−0.08 ± 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict reserve</td>
<td>0.91 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New National Park</td>
<td>−0.53 ± 0.37</td>
<td>−0.20 ± 0.19</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border zone</td>
<td>−0.70 ± 0.19</td>
<td>−0.76 ± 0.36</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Park pack</th>
<th>Leśna packs</th>
<th>Ładzka pack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature reserves</td>
<td>−0.81 ± 0.23</td>
<td>−0.83 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict reserve</td>
<td>0.87 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New National Park</td>
<td>−0.25 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border zone</td>
<td>−0.71 ± 0.23</td>
<td>−0.52 ± 0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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