

Interactive comment on “Trail impact monitoring in Rocky Mountain National Park, USA” by J. Svajda et al.

J. Svajda et al.

juraj.svajda@umb.sk

Received and published: 5 January 2016

Thank you very much for the comments made by anonymous referee # 3. The referee considers the study as interesting but recommends several minor revisions that need to be taken into account.

The following are the authors proposed changes and responses to these comments:

- STUDY AREA section: - word “dramatic” excluded - sentence about “fragile environment” re-changed - description about geology re-written into singular - information about trend in temperature increase added – see also comment of referee # 1 (Gonzales, 2012) - sentence about importance of monitoring visitor use changed into 3rd paragraph of section

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- METHODS AND ANALYSIS section: - structured into 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 subsections - repeating word “trail” changed - according to cited methodology (Marion et al. 2011) during trail mapping staff decided and judged what represented the original land surface (pre-trail) - we used tent stakes – metal, 20 cm length - equation with Equation Editor in Word re-typed - rugosity or roughness of trail surface was calculated from measurements taken to compute CSA estimates as the standard deviation of the vertical measurements at each transect - we didn’t perform DEM of the trail surface, however as written in text, pictures were utilized for checking other attributes for each trail transect - photos taken by camera were linked with GPS photo link, for viewing we used MS Office Picture Manager

- RESULTS section: - we think that it is important to highlight in text exclusion of OFIR trail due to different sampling - grade = slope - 89.9 cm units added - statistics transferred into tables with p-values - explanation of used indicators in decision trees moved from results section to methodology section

- TABLES: - we propose making table 1a and 1b from previous table 1 (inventory and impact indicators) – for overall comparison all indicators are important - table 2 – we put information from brackets into the table as in tab. 3, tab. 2 called in text showed distribution of all sample points by inventory indicator category - table 3 – percentage in column label - table 4 – p values added

- FIGURES: - figures 2, 3 and 5 adjusted

We believe these additional explanations and clarifications are satisfactory to account for the remarks and suggestions by reviewer # 3 and we hope that you will find our revised and re-written paper suitable for publication in Solid Earth.

We look forward to hearing from both you and reviewers.

Best regards,

Juraj Svajda

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 3117, 2015.

SED

7, C1769–C1771, 2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1771

