Assessing the use of swing gates in game fences as a potential non-lethal predator exclusion technique
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Many Namibian farmers are diversifying from exclusive livestock farming to mixed farming, resulting in a sharp increase in the number of game-fenced areas. However, animals such as warthog (Phacochoerus aethiopicus), porcupine (Hystrix africaeaustralis) and aardvark (Orycteropus afer) dig holes under game fences, allowing access to predators such as cheetah (Acinonyx jubatus). Swing gates were installed along a 4800 m section of game fencing in the Otjiwarongo district of Namibia. The fence was monitored before and after gate installation and trip cameras were used to identify species that used the gates. Warthog, aardvark and porcupines commonly used the gates and the number of holes under the fencing was significantly reduced following gate installation. No predators were observed using the swing gates and the cost was substantially lower than fence electrification. This initial research suggests that swing gates could be an important non-lethal predator exclusion technique, although further studies will be needed to confirm their long-term effectiveness. Using techniques such as swing gates, which effectively and economically reduce the frequency with which animals dig holes under fences may not only benefit farmers, but also reduce the unnecessary destruction of non-target wildlife species resulting from unselective trapping.
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INTRODUCTION

Although Namibia is home to the world’s largest population of free-ranging cheetah, 90% of this population does not occur in protected areas, but on cattle-producing farmlands in the north-central part of the country (Morsbach 1987; Marker-Kraus et al. 1996). A long history of conflict exists between Namibian farmers and free-ranging cheetah, and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism indicated that 1624 cheetah were reported as being shot for the protection of livestock between 1986 and 1991 (Marker-Kraus et al. 1996). These figures are incomplete and indicate, at best, minimal removals (Marker-Kraus et al. 1996).

As is the trend in South Africa (Anon. 2002), many Namibian farmers are diversifying from exclusive livestock farming to mixed farming for economic reasons (Van Der Waal & Dekker 2000; Saltz et al. 2004), resulting in a sharp increase in the number of game farms. These are typically fenced with game fencing to control the movement of game animals, but animals such as warthog, porcupine and aardvark dig holes under game fences (Van Rooyen et al. 1996). These holes not only allow valuable game to escape but also allow predators, such as cheetah, to access the game-fenced areas (Du Toit 1996). These holes therefore make game fences ineffective for excluding predators and also increase maintenance costs (Heard & Stephenson 1987). This leads to trapping and shooting of predators and extensive extermination campaigns against hole-digging animals, which can be non-selective and therefore have a serious impact on target and non-target species (Heard & Stephenson 1987; Berger 1999; Marker et al. 2003; Woodroffe & Frank 2005).

One solution to reducing conflict is to exclude predators from the areas where valuable game is confined (Linnell et al. 1999). Exclusion techniques that have been tested against predators include the use of fladry (Musiani & Visalberghi 2001; Musiani et al. 2003) [tested against wolves (Canis lupus) but, as yet, not attempted with African predators], disruptive stimuli such as sound and light, electronic training collars (Beckoff 2001;
Shivik et al. 2003) and electric fences (Mertens & Promberger 2000), as well as techniques where individual problem-causing animals are targeted through methods such as the use of toxic collars (Linnell et al. 1999). In America, electric fencing sharply reduced sheep losses to coyote (Canis latrans) (Linhart et al. 1982) and excluded red foxes (Vulpes vulpes) (Poole & McKillop 2002). In many instances where electric fencing was less effective, it was found that farmers were not inspecting and maintaining their fences and that the fences were poorly constructed (Linhart et al. 1982). Electric fencing has been successfully used in Australia to exclude dingo (Canis dingo) and in England, electric fencing was 99% effective against badgers (Meles meles) (Poole & McKillop 1999). In South Africa, electric fencing has been extensively used to exclude predators (Van Rooyen et al. 1996) and in some cases to confine predators such as lion (Panthera leo) to game-fenced areas as tourist attractions (Peel & Montagu 1999). In another instance in South Africa, the electrification of a 1.3 m high standard mesh wire fence, led to a 93% decrease in the number of holes dug by black-backed jackals (Canis mesomelas) under the fences and sharply decreased the cost of fence maintenance (Du Toit 1996).

In attempts to exclude predators, Namibian game farmers have resorted to electrifying game fences (Marker-Kraus et al. 1996). Although these farmers considered electrification to be 70–80% effective, the cost of installation is often cited as prohibitive (Marker-Kraus et al. 1996). Installing ‘swing gates’ in existing fences may be an alternative to electric fencing (Fig. 1) as they may allow hole-digging species to traverse fences, thereby reducing the number of holes that digging species make in the fence. Also, when closed, swing gates leave no visible openings in the fence for predators such as the cheetah to use and therefore may exclude these predators.

Although excluding predators from large parts of their natural habitat through fencing is not a desirable long-term objective, human–cheetah conflict in Namibia has increased to levels where game farmers are responsible for more cheetah removals than livestock farmers (Marker & Schumann 1998). This study investigated whether installing swing gates along a fence-line reduced the number of holes dug along the fence, and assessed its potential as a method for excluding predators from game-fenced areas. The study had several aims, which included determining which species passed through holes under game fences, and which species used swing gates once installed. Additionally, we examined whether it was more
effective to place swing gates at set distances along the fence-line, compared to placing them at the most well-used holes. Most importantly, however, we wanted to determine whether the installation of swing-gates significantly reduced the number of holes dug along game fences by wildlife, and to compare the cost of swing gates and electric fencing in order to examine whether these gates could potentially be used as an effective and cost-efficient method of predator exclusion.

STUDY AREA

This study was conducted on the Klein Hamakari farm in the Otjiwarongo district of Namibia. The 5138 ha farm forms part of the Waterberg Conservancy and lies 14 km southwest of the town of Okakarara and 11 km south-east of the Waterberg Plateau Park, in the north-central region of Namibia. The Waterberg Conservancy falls in the Thornbush Savanna vegetation zone as described by Geiss (1997). Dominant woody plants are *Acacia mellifera*, *A. tortilis*, *Dichrostachys cinerea*, *Grewia spp.*, *Terminalia sericea* and *Boscia albitrunca*. The dominant grass species are *Eragrostis cylindrilora*, *E. porosa*, *Stipagrostis uniplumis*, *Tragus berteronianus*, *Cenchrus ciliaris* and *Aristida spp.* (Marker 2002).

The soil in the conservancy is of the Karoo sequence laid down 290–120 million years ago. It consists of the Omingonde Formation, which is a mix of sandstone, conglomerate, mudstones and siltstones (Schneider-Waterberg 1993). A 100-m thick layer of dune sandstone was deposited over earlier sediments and is known as the Etjo formation (Schneider-Waterberg 1993). The soils on Klein Hamakari include ferralic Arenosols, eutric Cambisols and eutric Fluvisols (Anon. 2004).

The mean annual rainfall for the area is 467 mm and temperatures in the area vary from below 0°C in winter to over 50°C in summer (Marker 2002).

Klein Hamakari is used for livestock and game farming and includes a 3000 ha game-fenced (21 strands) area where the study was conducted. The topography of the farm is generally flat with few undulations. Water is found in the form of man-made semi-permanent water reservoirs and cattle troughs. A number of game species were present in the camp, including warthog, springbok (*Damaliscus dorcas dorcas*), impala (*Aepyceros melampus*) and blesbok (*Damaliscus dorcas phillipsi*). Cheetah have been removed from the game-fenced area (W. Diekman, pers. comm., 2001). Jackal and caracal have also been observed in the game-fenced area (W. Diekman, pers. comm., 2001).

METHODS

The use of holes and swing gates by digging species and predators

The study commenced in August 2001 with the selection of a 4800 m section of game fencing, a known access route for cheetah into the game-fenced area (W. Diekman, pers. comm., 2001). This section was chosen as we were particularly interested in whether or not cheetahs and other large predators, which tend to cause conflict in game-fenced areas, would be likely to cross the fence using swing-gates. The fence was surveyed and all existing holes under the fence were identified and numbered using plastic livestock ear tags. Holes that had been closed prior to the study were also identified and labelled as old closed holes. The study was divided into the following phases and during each phase the fence was monitored at intervals of 3–15 days:

1) Pre-gates (seven weeks) – this phase was a monitoring phase used to establish: (a) the animals using holes under the fence by identifying spoor passing through such holes; (b) the number of holes on each monitoring visit, and (c) the most commonly used routes as determined by the frequency of hole reopening. This monitoring continued throughout the study.

2) Open gates (10 weeks) – swing gates were installed along two sections of the fence and tied open with string. The swing gates consisted of a metal frame (length 45 cm, width 30 cm) covered with galvanised fencing (mesh size = 75 mm). Each swing gate was installed in the fence on a framework of iron standards and fence droppers (Fig. 1). When the gates were tied open, soil as well as thorn branches were used to close the other holes. The thorn branches were used to make it more difficult for digging animals to reopen their old holes, encouraging them to find the open gates. Two heat-sensitive cameras were installed along the fence when this phase commenced. One camera was installed at an identified aardvark burrow which was located approximately 6 m from a swing gate and the second camera was located 800 m further along the section. The cameras were installed approximately 5 m from the fence. In addition, tracks were noted going through the swing gates to determine if
they were being used.

3) Closed gates (16 weeks) – the string was removed and the gates were closed and allowed to operate freely. When the dry season commenced in April 2002, spoor became difficult as a means of identifying if the gates were being used. A single thread of sewing cotton was then used to tie the gates closed. When this was broken, the gate was recorded as being active. The heat-sensitive cameras were also used in this phase.

At the beginning of the first phase (pre-gates) the fence was divided into three equal distances and each subsequently used for one of the following treatments:

1) Gates on routes – gates were installed on the most commonly used routes, as determined during the pre-gates phase (number of gates = 6).

2) Gates evenly spaced – gates were installed every 200 m (number of gates = 8). This distance was chosen as the pre-gates phase indicated this to be the mean distance between holes along the entire fence.

3) No gates – control section.

Although there was a danger of pseudoreplication by using the same fence-line for all three treatments (Hurlbert 1984), we felt that this was a better study design than using three different fences, as other habitat variables, such as the presence of permanent water sources nearby, or differences in vegetation, would be likely to vary more between fences than if we used one long stretch of a single fence. During the surveying of the fence, we looked for evident differences between the three sections, in terms of the proximity of permanent water sources or human habitation, and no differences were noted which we felt would be likely to substantially bias the results.

During each phase, all treatments were monitored on the same day. New holes were included in the numbering and all the holes found along the three treatments were filled. For each hole, we recorded the depth (measured from the deepest part of the hole to the first strand of fencing wire above the ground) and assigned this to one of four classes (0–9 cm, 10–19 cm, 20–29 cm, >30 cm), and also noted any animal tracks passing through the hole.

Installation and maintenance costs

In addition to the quantitative data on wildlife use of swing-gates, two game farmers (both neighbours of the study farm) were asked to complete a questionnaire about their use of electric fencing, so that the installation and maintenance costs of swing gates and electric fencing could be compared.

Data analysis

To test for differences in the number of holes made by digging species across the phases and treatments, the two-factor ANOVA and the Student–Newman–Keuls tests were used (Zar 1984). The intervals between fence checks \( n = 19 \) were irregular due to vehicle availability and volunteer assistance and varied between three and 15 days. Owing to these circumstances, the average number of days between checks was not equal for all phases, with a mean of three days for the pre-gate phase, seven days for the open gates and nine days for when the gates were closed. The data could therefore not be analysed as number of holes per section per day, but was analysed instead as the number of holes per section per sampling interval. However, the number of holes per section levelled off sharply after three days, indicating that the data were made and old holes were reopened very soon after being closed, i.e. the number of holes dug per section was similar regardless if the interval between checks was three or 15 days, suggesting that this was not a very important source of bias. The chi-square goodness of fit test was used to test for difference in the number of holes in the various depth classes (Zar 1984).

RESULTS

The use of holes and swing gates by digging species and predators

From track identification in all sections throughout the study, several species were detected using holes to pass under the game fence (Table 1). Warthogs were the most commonly recorded species using holes (58% of species recorded), followed by jackal (22%), aardvark (17%) and porcupine (2%). Cheetah (0.5%) and leopard (0.5%) were identified using holes to pass through fences once (Table 1).

After gate installation, several species were photographed passing through the fence via the open gates, including, warthog (85%), steenbok (Raphicerus campestris) (5%), baboon (Papio ursinus) (5%), jackal (2.5%) and aardwolf (Proteles cristatus) (2.5%). Once the gates were closed, only warthog (73%), porcupine (18%) and aardvark (9%) were photographed using the gates.
No predators were recorded using swing-gates to cross the fence, despite being photographed passing close to them [jackal, cheetah, leopard, caracal and African wildcat (*Felis nigripes*)]. Aardwolf and duiker (*Silvicapra grimmia*) were also photographed passing the closed gates (Table 1).

Both treatment and phase had a significant effect on the mean number of holes dug under the fence (Table 2). At the beginning of the experiment (pre-gates), the mean number of holes in each treatment did not differ significantly and each section contained approximately 20 holes (Table 2). However, as the experiment progressed, the mean number of holes in the treatment with gates on routes decreased and differed significantly from the mean number of holes in the other treatments and phases (Table 2). By contrast, the mean number of holes in the gates evenly spaced and no gates treatments did not differ significantly as the experiment progressed (Table 2).

There was a significant difference in the frequency of holes in the different depth classes (Table 3). Most holes were recorded in the depth class 20 – 29 cm (61%) followed by holes greater than 30 cm in depth (28%; Table 3).

### Installation and maintenance costs of swing gates and electric fencing

The two farmers surveyed indicated that the cost of installing electric fencing (materials only) was a minimum of US$752/km. The estimated cost of constructing and installing the swing gates (materials only) was $6.72/gate or $40.32/km using six gates (the number of gates installed on the gates on routes treatment). For the swing gates one worker (at a daily minimum wage of $4.32) was able to install six gates along 1 km in a day ($4.32/km), while for the electric fencing 12 workers were needed to install 1 km of fencing in a day ($51.84/km) (Table 4).

The two farmers both maintained approximately 38 km of electric fencing and indicated that the fences were checked twice a week entailing an annual transport cost which ranged between $560–$1280 (mean $944 per year). The swing gates need to be checked at most once a week and the transport cost is therefore taken as half of $944, i.e. $472 (Table 4).

Plants growing against the electric fences short-circuit the fencing so herbicides are used to limit this problem. The estimated cost of one commercially available herbicide (Roundup) was approximately $56.80/ha, calculated using 5 l of herbicide/ha. At least 0.5 m either side of the fence would need to be sprayed. For 1 km or 0.1 ha, this represents $5.60/km. Two sprays would be needed per rainy season at a cost of $11.20/km ($5.60 \times 2 = $11.20). If herbicide is applied at the same time as the maintenance inspections using a motorized sprayer, additional fuel or labour costs could be prevented. No herbicide or related labour

### Table 1

The number of animals identified from tracks going through holes, and those photographed using and passing the gates during the study (percentage in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Tracks identified going through holes</th>
<th>Animals photographed at gates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open gates</td>
<td>Closed gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going through gates</td>
<td>Passing gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td>109 (58)</td>
<td>34 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aardvark</td>
<td>33 (17)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcupine</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td>42 (22)</td>
<td>1 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheetah</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild cat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aardwolf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duiker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
costs would be incurred for maintaining the swing gates (Table 4).

**DISCUSSION**

**The use of holes and swing gates by digging species and predators**

Prior to our study, only one other incidence could be sourced on the use of swing gates. W. Piepmeyer (pers. comm., 1999) installed swing gates on a fence in the Daan Viljoen Game Reserve (Namibia) to reduce fence maintenance caused by warthog activity. He concluded that warthog would readily use swing gates but that the other digging species such as aardvark and porcupine did not. Photographic evidence obtained during our study indicated that warthog readily used the gates and that piglets were quickly taught by adults to use the gates. However, our study also revealed that aardvark and porcupine used the gates. This difference is probably due to the fact that Piepmeyer was relying on spoor tracking on what was mostly hard rocky terrain, whereas our study combined spoor tracking with the use of trip cameras, making the detection of these species more likely.

Piepmeyer found that the number of holes along the fence was reduced by 70% within the first three months of installation. During our study the maximum decrease in hole frequency was not as high (40%). This discrepancy can probably be explained by differences in the terrain between the two sites, as Daan Viljoen Game Reserve is rocky while Klein Hamakari is sandy. The rocky terrain would make it difficult to dig new holes under fences and encourage the use of existing routes and access points such as the swing gates. In sandy terrain however, creating new holes is relatively easy and additional measures, such as closing holes between the gates with rocks and or thorn branches, should be taken to encourage the use of the gates. During this study it was noted that warthogs are very efficient at displacing thorn branches in their way, and a concerted effort may be needed to pack enough large branches and rocks to deter them. The gates in Daan Viljoen were inspected in 2003 and many were still active, suggesting that they continue to be used by wildlife in the long term. Unfortunately, current staff at the Reserve did not know the function of the gates and

**Table 2. Number of holes (mean ± S.D.) counted along the section of fence line for each treatment during each phase. Diff. indicates the P-value for the difference between treatments and phases as determined by the Student–Newman–Keuls test.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Gates on routes</th>
<th>Diff. between gates on routes vs gates evenly spaced</th>
<th>Gates evenly spaced</th>
<th>Diff. between gates evenly spaced vs no gates</th>
<th>No gates</th>
<th>Diff. between gates on routes vs no gates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-gates</td>
<td>20.0 ± 1.7</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>25.7 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>21.7 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open gates</td>
<td>10.6 ± 6.2</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>23.4 ± 4.7</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>25.0 ± 5.7</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed gates</td>
<td>12.2 ± 2.8</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>20.2 ± 4.3</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>19.1 ± 3.6</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-factor ANOVA: treatment; F = 19.07, d.f. = 2,48, P < 0.0001; phase; F = 5.53, d.f. = 2,48
P = 0.007; treatment × phase; F = 2.79, d.f. = 4,48, P = 0.37

**Table 3. Frequency of holes (percentage in brackets) recorded in the different depth classes during the study.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth class (cm)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–9</td>
<td>6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19</td>
<td>88(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>509 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>236(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 698.82, d.f. = 3, P < 0.0001.
some of these had been packed closed with rocks, decreasing the effectiveness of the scheme.

Our study revealed that warthog used and probably caused most of the holes in the fence. Warthog movements are seasonal in Namibia in response to the distribution of water (Mason 1982; Skinner & Smithers 1990; Somers 1992) and warthogs may be most abundant near water, especially during the dry season (Mason 1982; Somers 1992). Therefore, the location of water points such as man-made dams, livestock water troughs and natural water points should be considered when deciding where to install gates. As warthogs usually return to the same burrow every evening and therefore do not have very extensive home ranges (Somers 1992), active warthog burrows near fences should also be considered when installing swing gates. A factor not taken into account during our study was seasonal trends in warthog activity and movements, and the subsequent effect on the number of holes along fences. Hole depth may also be an indicator of gate positioning as our study indicated that deeper holes (>20 cm) were most likely to be reopened.

Although our study recorded that leopard, cheetah and jackal used the holes made by digging species, these predators were only photographed walking past the closed gates, suggesting that swing gates may be effective in excluding predators from game camps. However, as our sample size was small, extensive long-term monitoring needs to be conducted to determine the effectiveness of the gates in reducing losses to predators as some predators may, over time, learn to use the gates. Nevertheless, at least in the short term, the gates are effective in reducing the number of holes along fences and should reduce fence maintenance costs and extermination campaigns against hole-digging species.

### Installation and maintenance costs of swing gates and electric fencing

Although the questioning of farmers was not a quantitative, experimental part of the study, we felt that it was a very important component, as farmers are unlikely to use methods which they perceive to be expensive or difficult, regardless of any data available. Discussions with farmers here indicated that the cost of installing swing gates per kilometre is approximately 6% of the cost of electric fencing, and although this will vary slightly for individual farmers, it seems that swing gates are an economically attractive option for farmers. Although maintenance costs of swing gates per kilometre per year are high, this cost is half that of electric fencing and no herbicide is needed along the swing gates. Swing gates therefore offer a viable economic alternative to electric fencing.

### CONCLUSION

Although the initial installation cost of electrification is expensive, when considered in relation to the degree of effectiveness that is achieved with well maintained electric fencing, the long-term benefits make the installation costs viable. However, due to the cost-related reluctance of farmers to install and maintain electrified fencing, our study indicates that swing gates may offer an economic alternative to farmers. Swing gates are non-lethal to wildlife and significantly reduce the number of holes along...
a fence by allowing diggers such as warthogs, porcupines and aardvark through the fence and may exclude predators such as cheetah. Further long-term studies will be required to assess the effectiveness of swing gates in terms of reducing predator access to game farms, but this initial research suggests that they could be an important non-lethal predator exclusion tool. While electrification and swing gates can be useful for protecting valuable game in smaller breeding camps from predation, the long-term effect of fragmenting habitats with game fencing needs to be considered. Although the ideal aim, in terms of human–carnivore coexistence, would be to promote measures that do not restrict carnivore movement or fragment their available habitat, this is currently unrealistic in many areas and the establishment of alternative wildlife management initiatives such as conservancies, which allow free-ranging game, should be investigated. Meanwhile, this research suggests that swing-gates could be used to assist game farmers in reducing wildlife access through game fences, and therefore has potential for alleviating human–carnivore conflict in the short term while other, longer-term coexistence strategies can be developed and implemented.
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