Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/17/2021 4:00:00 AM
First name: Bill
Last name: Strachan
Organization: Red River Gorge Climber's Coalition
Title: Executive Director Emeritus
Comments: Email chain between Bill Strachan, Red River Gorge Climber's Coalition, and Timothy Eling, Staff Officer, DBNF. Entered into CARA by Andrea Felton, Forest Environmental Coordinator, 7/23/2021.

Hi Bill,

Eric can correct me if I am wrong but Table 10 is a list of [ldquo]potential hardening & stabilizing sites[rdquo].

Earlier in the document on p. 15, there is a statement about priority:

[ldquo]Priority for stabilization work would be given to areas suffering from erosion, compaction, or loss of vegetation, and impacted areas in or within the dripline of a rockshelter.[rdquo]

Note: Emerald City / Global village are outside the scope of this project and LAC as those areas are south of the RRG Geological Area boundary.

I hope this information helps clarify and helps with your official comments.

Tim Eling

Subject: Re: [External Email]Red River Gorge Management Planning Question

Tim,

Sorry I missed your call yesterday evening as I was outside mowing. Thanks for the clarifications on Table 10. and on the end date for the comment period. Now I have a couple more questions on Table 10. What was the basis used for selecting the 12 listed climbing areas as potential hardening and stabilization locations? Most of the locations appear to be pretty obvious like MIlitary Wall, Left Flank, Long Wall, and Funk Rock City. However, others such as Dip Wall, Moonshiner's Wall, and Doorish Wall seem to be less popular than other climbing area locations such as Eastern Sky Bridge Ridge, Wall of Denial, and Emerald City / Global village. Also, I am going to be forwarding this email string to others in the RRGCC and Access Fund working on preparing comments and loop them into the conversation.

Thanks,

Bill

On Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 6:05 PM Eling, Timothy - FS <Timothy.Eling@usda.gov> wrote:

Hi Bill,

The numbers in 2nd column of Table 10 are an approximation and we often use the word

[ldquo]Maximum[rdquo] or [ldquo]up to[rdquo] to describe the various proposed actions. So for example, Military Wall

states 30,013 sq ft. Think of that as a number that is a maximum amount for cliffline stabilization.

This number was not from the LAC inventory (and numbers you may have seen from Chris and

Nick). The Team simply took the linear length of a Crag and then buffered out about 20-25[rsquo] so

they had a number for this table. I doubt there would be 30,013 sq ft of stabilization work. As

you know, there are nodes along a climbing crag that have some impacts and bare ground

clustered around some climbing routes (belay stations & hang outs) then there may be a stretch

with minimal impacts until another node.

Long Wall, has a number of 65,463 sq ft because the linear length of the crag is so long.

Table on page 8 states the total amount of stabilization and hardening at clifflisde locations may

Maximum 6.14 acres.

Proposed Activity Maximum Number

Stabilize and Harden Cliffside Locations 12 sites (6.14 acres)

Page 15 states 12 heavily impacted areas that total 267,550 sq ft (6.14 acres):

[ldquo]Through partnerships with local recreation and volunteer groups, we propose to stabilize,

rehabilitate, and increase resiliency of approximately 267,550 square feet (6.14 acres) across 12

heavily impacted cliffside access locations. Priority for stabilization work would be given to areas

suffering from erosion, compaction, or loss of vegetation, and impacted areas in or within the

dripline of a rockshelter. Site improvement techniques may include planting of native vegetation,

constructing dense graded aggregate pads to reduce erosion, constructing platforms and/or

boardwalks, and installing fencing to limit extent of impacts at the base of geologic features

I hope that helps!

Oh, yes July 26 is correct for the last day to submit comments.

Tim Eling

Staff Officer (GIS, Admin, Planning, Partnerships, Public Affairs

Dear Mr. Pope,

I have a question related to Table 10. Potential Hardening Sites in the Red River Gorge Management Planning, Draft Environmental Assessment and FONSI document. The areas listed in the second column for each named climbing area are significantly greater than the areas measured and/or estimated during the Limits of Acceptable change process. What is the basis for the areas listed in Table 10.? Were these areas remeasured or do the areas in the table include the user created trails between climbsites? The answer to this question will have a bearing on my comments regarding the proposed hardening and stabilization of these climbing areas.

Hi Bill,

Eric can correct me if I am wrong but Table 10 is a list of [ldquo]potential hardening & stabilizing sites[rdquo].

Earlier in the document on p. 15, there is a statement about priority:

[ldquo]Priority for stabilization work would be given to areas suffering from erosion, compaction, or loss of vegetation, and impacted areas in or within the dripline of a rockshelter.[rdquo]

Note: Emerald City / Global village are outside the scope of this project and LAC as those areas are south of the RRG Geological Area boundary.

I hope this information helps clarify and helps with your official comments.

Tim Eling

Subject: Re: [External Email]Red River Gorge Management Planning Question

Tim,

Sorry I missed your call yesterday evening as I was outside mowing. Thanks for the clarifications on Table 10. and on the end date for the comment period. Now I have a couple more questions on Table 10. What was the basis used for selecting the 12 listed climbing areas as potential hardening and stabilization locations? Most of the locations appear to be pretty obvious like MIlitary Wall, Left Flank, Long Wall, and Funk Rock City. However, others such as Dip Wall, Moonshiner's Wall, and Doorish Wall seem to be less popular than other climbing area locations such as Eastern Sky Bridge Ridge, Wall of Denial, and Emerald City / Global village. Also, I am going to be forwarding this email string to others in the RRGCC and Access Fund working on preparing comments and loop them into the conversation.

Thanks,

Bill

On Wed, Jul 14, 2021 at 6:05 PM Eling, Timothy - FS <Timothy.Eling@usda.gov> wrote:

Hi Bill,

The numbers in 2nd column of Table 10 are an approximation and we often use the word [ldquo]Maximum[rdquo] or [ldquo]up to[rdquo] to describe the various proposed actions. So for example, Military Wall states 30,013 sq ft. Think of that as a number that is a maximum amount for cliffline stabilization. This number was not from the LAC inventory (and numbers you may have seen from Chris and Nick). The Team simply took the linear length of a Crag and then buffered out about 20-25[rsquo] so they had a number for this table. I doubt there would be 30,013 sq ft of stabilization work. As you know, there are nodes along a climbing crag that have some impacts and bare ground clustered around some climbing routes (belay stations & hang outs) then there may be a stretch with minimal impacts until another node.

Long Wall, has a number of 65,463 sq ft because the linear length of the crag is so long.

Table on page 8 states the total amount of stabilization and hardening at clifflisde locations may Maximum 6.14 acres.

Proposed Activity Maximum Number

Stabilize and Harden Cliffside Locations 12 sites (6.14 acres)

Page 15 states 12 heavily impacted areas that total 267,550 sq ft (6.14 acres):

[ldquo]Through partnerships with local recreation and volunteer groups, we propose to stabilize, rehabilitate, and increase resiliency of approximately 267,550 square feet (6.14 acres) across 12 heavily impacted cliffside access locations. Priority for stabilization work would be given to areas suffering from erosion, compaction, or loss of vegetation, and impacted areas in or within the dripline of a rockshelter. Site improvement techniques may include planting of native vegetation, constructing dense graded aggregate pads to reduce erosion, constructing platforms and/or boardwalks, and installing fencing to limit extent of impacts at the base of geologic features

I hope that helps!

Oh, yes July 26 is correct for the last day to submit comments.

Tim Eling

Staff Officer (GIS, Admin, Planning, Partnerships, Public Affairs

Dear Mr. Pope,

I have a question related to Table 10. Potential Hardening Sites in the Red River Gorge Management Planning, Draft Environmental Assessment and FONSI document. The areas listed in the second column for each named climbing area are significantly greater than the areas measured and/or estimated during the Limits of Acceptable change process. What is the basis for the areas listed in Table 10.? Were these areas remeasured or do the areas in the table include the user created trails between climbsites? The answer to this question will have a bearing on my comments regarding the proposed hardening and stabilization of these climbing areas.