Do turtle warning signs reduce roadkill?
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**Abstract**

Roadkill is a serious threat for many species of freshwater turtles. One of the most common road mitigation tools is wildlife warning signs to alert drivers. These warning signs have commonly been used for large mammals, although there is little evidence that they are effective in reducing roadkill. We tested the effectiveness of turtle warning signs at four known roadkill hotspots along a provincial highway in eastern Ontario and compared the results with four control sites on a nearby major road in a before-after-control-impact (BACI) study. We found 30 dead turtles in the four hotspots in 2017 before the signs were installed and 27 in 2018 after the signs were installed. The number of turtles killed on the road after the signs were installed did not change significantly ($\chi^2_1 = 1.1, P > 0.2$). Although turtle warning signs may alert some drivers, they should not be considered a replacement for more effective road mitigation tools, such as wildlife fencing and crossing structures.
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**Introduction**

Roadkill is a major risk for many species of freshwater turtles (Gibbs and Shriver 2002; Steen and Gibbs 2004; Aresco 2005). It can lead to population declines (Gibbs and Shriver 2002) or male-biased populations from disproportionate roadkill of female turtles (Steen and Gibbs 2004; Dupuis-Désormeaux et al. 2017). Turtle populations are sensitive to any threat that increases the adult mortality rate (Congdon et al. 1993; Cunnington and Brooks 1996) and are extremely slow to rebound from declines (Keevil et al. 2018). As a result, roadkill can have a negative effect on turtle populations near roads (Rytwinski and Fahrig 2012).

Wildlife warning signs are one of the most commonly used tools to attempt to reduce roadkill, although there is little evidence that they are effective (Huijser et al. 2015). They can take the form of standard road signs as well as enhanced road signs with flashing lights or symbols (Pojar et al. 1975; Huijser et al. 2015). Most studies on the effectiveness of wildlife warning signs have found that they do not significantly reduce roadkill (e.g., Pojar et al. 1975; Coulson 1982; Bullock et al. 2011; but see Found and Boyce 2011). Most wildlife warning sign studies have focussed on large mammals, and we are unaware of any published studies on the effectiveness of standard wildlife signs on reducing turtle roadkill.

Given that all eight species of freshwater turtles that occur in Canada are listed as species at risk (Government of Canada 2019), it is important to assess whether turtle warning signs lead to a significant reduction in roadkill. To test the effectiveness of turtle signs (Figure 1) we examined roadkill before and after signs were installed at known hotspots in eastern Ontario. The importance of before-after-control-impact (BACI) research design has been stressed in evaluating the effectiveness of road mitigation strategies (Lesbarrères and Fahrig 2012); thus, we also compared roadkill rates with those on a control road over the same period.

**Methods**

As part of a larger project on turtle conservation, road surveys were conducted in eastern Ontario in 2017, and from those surveys four hotspots were identified. In spring 2018, the Ministry of Transportation installed standard turtle signs at these hotspots to help reduce roadkill. The four hotspots were located along provincial highway 15 north of Smiths Falls in Lanark County, along a section of road ~36 km in length (45.0°N, 76.0°W; Figure 2). Turtle warning signs were installed facing oncoming traffic at both ends of each hotspot. The signed road segments at each location averaged 1010 m (range 750–1675 m) in length. Daily traffic at these locations ranged from an...
annual average daily traffic of 4950 to 9400 vehicles (Ministry of Transportation 2019).

The four control road segments were located along Roger Stevens Drive east of Smiths Falls in Lanark County, along a section of road ~28 km in length (Figure 2). Highway 15 and Roger Stevens Drive intersect in Smiths Falls and the two roads are less than 25 km apart at any point. Each control segment was 1000 m in length and was selected based on the presence of at least four roadkilled turtles during 2017. Daily traffic in the four control segments varied by section, and ranged from an annual average daily traffic volume of 2860 to 3900 vehicles (roads department, Lanark County unpubl. data). Both the control and impact roads were paved, two-lane roads, with a posted speed limit of 80 km/h, although this limit was frequently exceeded by drivers (D.C.S. and H.M.-A. pers. obs.).

Road surveys were usually conducted with at least two people in the vehicle, but on some occasions, only one person conducted a road survey. Surveys were conducted during the day, typically from 0900 to 1600. Roads were surveyed by driving at ~50–60 km/h and scanning the road surface and road shoulders for dead turtles. The location of each roadkilled turtle was recorded using a handheld global positioning system unit (eTrex or eTrex 20×, Garmin Ltd., Olathe, Kansas, USA) with a spatial accuracy of at least ± 5 m. All dead turtles were removed from the road or road shoulder to prevent double counting on a subsequent survey. Road surveys were conducted approximately weekly from May until early September in 2017 and 2018. Both control and impact roads were typically surveyed on the same day.

The turtle warning signs were installed at the end of May 2018. Only dead turtles found in 2018 after the signs were installed were included in the analysis for both control and impact roads. Similarly, for 2017, only turtles from after the end of May were included so that the same period in both years was compared. In addition, all live turtles found on the road were excluded to examine only the effect of the road signs on turtle mortality. Live turtles made up <10% of all turtles found on roads. This is as expected, as, if turtles successfully cross a road, they are only present for a few minutes and would only be detected if the crossing coincided with the survey.

A chi-squared $2 \times 2$ contingency table was used to compare differences in the number of turtles in 2017 and 2018 for both roads (Minitab 8.3; Minitab Inc., State College, Pennsylvania, USA). The turtles from all four hotspots were pooled to prevent pseudoreplication (Hurlbert 1984) and the two years compared. Similarly the four control road segments were pooled and the two years compared. Statistical significance was defined as $P < 0.05$.

Results

Three species of turtles were found during surveys: Painted Turtle (*Chrysemys picta*), Snapping Turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*), and Blanding’s Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*). We found 30 dead turtles in the four hotspots in 2017 before the signs were installed, and 27 in 2018 after the signs were installed. In the four control sections, we found 19 dead turtles in 2017 and 26 in 2018 after the signs were installed.
along the other road. There was no statistically significant difference in the number of turtles found before or after the signs were installed (Table 1; \( \chi^2_1 = 1.1, P > 0.2 \)).

**Discussion**

Our road surveys likely did not detect all of the turtles killed on the roads, as they were conducted approximately weekly and turtle carcases along roads may not persist that long (Santos et al. 2011). In addition, compared with walking surveys, driving surveys may fail to detect some carcases (Santos et al. 2016). There is no reason to assume that carcase persistence or detectability would have differed significantly between the two years, and survey methods and survey frequency were the same in both years.

There were similar numbers of roadkilled turtles in the control road sections in both years, suggesting that roadkill numbers in the impact road sections would also have been similar in both years without the presence of any mitigation. Thus, any significant changes in roadkill numbers in the impact road sections between 2017 and 2018 should be attributable to the road signs. The lack of any significant decrease in roadkill indicates that the signs were not effective. A larger sample size would have increased our chances of detecting a statistically significant difference in the amount of roadkill, if one existed. Nonetheless, a decrease of only 10% in roadkill in 2018 from 2017 is not indicative of effective mitigation, as wildlife barriers and crossing structures can reduce roadkill by more than 90% (Dodd et al. 2004). Any road mitigation strategy that results in only a 10% reduction in roadkill should be considered a failure.

Wildlife warning signs are one of the most commonly installed road mitigation tools (Huijser et al. 2015), likely because of their low cost. However, despite their wide use, there is little evidence that such warning signs are effective at reducing roadkill. Few drivers are even aware of such warning signs. In one study, only 5–10% of drivers who were stopped 200 m after passing a warning sign were able to recall the sign (Drory and Shinar 1982).

For warning signs to be effective, they should result in drivers reducing their speed. Animated deer (*Odocoileus* spp.) warning signs have led to a reduction in speed, but only by <5 km/h (Pojar et al. 1975). Similarly, camel (*Camelus* spp.) warning signs have resulted in a decline in vehicle speed, but only by 3–7 km/h (Al-Ghamdi and AlGadhi 2004). Moose (*Alces americanus*) warning signs reduced driving speeds by only 1.5 km/h in a driving simulator (Jägerbrand et al. 2018). Greater speed reductions (~10 km/h) have occurred when deer carcases were placed next to warning signs to emphasize the reality of the threat (Pojar et al. 1975). The effectiveness of animal warning signs on driving speed may also decline over time as drivers become habituated to the signs (Pojar et al. 1975; Khalilikhah and Heaslip 2017). Hence, it seems that even large-mammal warning signs may only have a small effect on vehicle speeds, even though collisions can result in the injury or death of the driver (e.g., Conover et al. 1995; Niemi et al. 2017).

Ultimately, the main issue is whether animal warning signs result in a reduction in collisions and roadkill. Deer crossing signs did not reduce the number of deer killed in Colorado (Pojar et al. 1975), but deer collisions were reduced, at least for the first year, after warning signs were installed at known hotspots in the city of Edmonton, Alberta (Found and Boyce 2011). Temporary, flashing warning signs installed at known deer migration locations resulted in a significant reduction in vehicle collisions, but this effect lessened during the second year of the study (Sullivan et al. 2004). Warning signs were also not effective at reducing roadkill of kangaroos in Australia (Coulson 1982; Shima et al. 2018), mammals and birds along a major road in South Africa (Bullock et al. 2011), or snakes in Illinois (Shepard et al. 2008).

Enhanced warning signs may be effective under some limited circumstances. Diamond-backed Terrapins (*Malaclemys terrapin*) suffer high rates of road mortality during nesting forays, which are associated with diurnal high tides (Crawford et al. 2014). Flashing warning signs installed but only activated for a 2-h period each day corresponding to the diurnal high tide during the nesting season, significantly reduced Diamond-backed Terrapin roadkill (Crawford et al. 2018). It is also possible that wildlife warning signs may be more effective along roads with a lower speed limit as speed limit is often positively correlated with roadkill (Farmer and Brooks 2012).

Although wildlife warning signs may not significantly reduce roadkill, they can still be valuable within a comprehensive mitigation strategy for public education and sending a message that roadkill of wildlife is a serious issue. Wildlife warning signs should not replace more effective road mitigation tools such as wildlife fencing and crossing structures (e.g., Dodd et al. 2004; Aresco 2005; Baxter-Gilbert et al. 2015; Crawford et al. 2017).

---

**Table 1.** Results of 2×2 chi-squared contingency table comparing the observed number of dead turtles on the control and impact roads, both before and after turtle signs were installed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Roadkill (expected value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact (with signs)</td>
<td>30 (27.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (no signs)</td>
<td>19 (21.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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