

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/19/2026 4:11:01 AM

First name: Valarie

Last name: Anderson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I support Alternative 2: Proposed Action. My comments on Alternative 2 are below.

Where will the new Mondo parking area be? How many parking areas that exist now will have signage indicating use for climbers and or specific climbing areas? Or will none of them have signage, just this new area?

Very much looking forward to signage along the trails selected to be official and maintained.

Not only is the Godfather Boulder a very popular climbing area, the trail that leads to the waterfall beyond this formation is very popular with locals as well. Will this trail still be accessible for walking/hiking to the public? I'd prefer a way be found to save the Godfather Bouldering climbing.

While the loss of the lower camping areas will be great for the climbing community, I agree this area has been overused. Will the forest service still be allowing a portable toilet sponsored by the local coalition or other group during the summer by the lower gate? Is there a plan to manage or use signage for any of the other camping along the road?

I agree with and support plans for both toilet and trash facilities for pet and human waste.

Route Development:

I agree that route development needs to continue. It will help diversify options for climbers, and spread their impacts across more areas.

The proposed review process seems overly complicated and unreasonable for the Forest Services' limited resources. Given that historically management has been underfunded in general for the forest. A field survey sounds expensive enough that it will basically make an application moot. It's not defined in this document, will it be fully outlined in the future?

At the least, the process could be less challenging for developers who want to work in areas with established routes already. It's reasonable to allow development where usage and impact are already established. If restrictions end up being part of the plan, I'd hope they only apply to new non-developed areas. I agree with limitations or denial of development due to reasons like already known cultural, botanical, and animal restrictions only.

The current suggested process will basically end development, and gives the artificial idea that it is even possible. I also do not think the local climbers coalition (current or future) should be involved in the process of approving new development of areas or routes. The Forest Service has a greater obligation to keep the process impartial. If this process is implemented in some form, will there be an appeals process? If yes, what does that process look like?

Thank you for your work and continued support for rock climbing in the Bighorn National Forest.