

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/25/2023 4:19:19 AM

First name: Chris

Last name: Hofer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear National Forest Service,

I'm writing in regards to the proposed update to Ten Sleep Canyon. I have enjoyed some beautiful days climbing in and around Ten Sleep. I feel that there is still a great deal of concern over some of the actions that are being addressed in this document.

More work needs to be conducted with local climbing coalitions and land managers to resolve some of the broad/vague language being used. More discussions will be needed to understand what, why, and how to work together.

I'm very concerned over some of the vague descriptions of how the NFS will close or restrict access to an area that has had controversy/chopping or removal of rock. Who will determine what is what and the reason to leave or close a climb/area.

No fixed anchors?

This comes back to allowing an activity to be performed safely and also preserve the climbs of the past.

Hikers are allowed bridges for safe travel on public lands. Why are climbers not allowed a safe path for their form of recreation? One group can build bridges but the other can't lower safety to the ground?

Applying the CMP only to Ten Sleep canyon and not the entire ranger district. This leaves the rest of the Bighorn NF in limbo and no direct correlation.

No transparency on new route development

- this could show up as a VERY onerous process, and essentially be a ban on new routing if it is super cumbersome.

Resource Natural Areas - Why are we proposing route removal/no climbing in the proposed RNA (Leigh Creek). Are climbers not allowed on these public lands?

Please consider getting closer to the climbers collations to better understand how we can work to improve our relationship as well as not limit our access based on grounds that all can interrupt and understand.

Sincerely,