

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/21/2026 4:36:02 AM

First name: Emily

Last name: Hake

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Tensleep Canyon Climbing Management Plan comments

Although, I support the multi-use of Forest Service land, as I thoroughly enjoy hiking, recreating on the mountain, and all the mountain has to offer, it is apparent (as even stated by the inventory dates, etc) that the climbing plan is proposed to manage how the canyon has been utilized in the past 5-10 years. The answer is not to continue to allow development, parking lots, toilets, structures, etc. This was a canyon that you could go to and not see people, not get worried about being run over, not having a camping site around every turn.

A big concern to this project is cost and upkeep. Who is going maintain the toilets? The trails? The staging areas? I, again, propose a fee for a climbing permit. I think this would help with a couple of things, one cost of maintenance of things implemented specifically for the climbing community and two would give a more 'hard-fast' number of usage each year. Then, maybe after a few years, can implement other changes based on that data. Usage limits could be put in place (fees, time limits (like with 14-day camping), maybe a usage lotto system).

I oppose the implementation of installing up to 4 vaulted toilets. Installing up to 4 vaulted toilets and a huge parking lot (in one specific area) is not the answer. Other areas of the Bighorn National Forest have also seen a huge increase in usage activity and the response is not add 4 vaulted toilets in a small area. (example West Ten Sleep access area or Battle Park area). I think we should hold people accountable for what they should be doing, burying eliminations or packing it out not putting up a bunch of structures. Are we asking that people car-pool to other locations? 3 toilets proposed in 6 miles, when majority of folks climbing up on the rock (that have hiked up there) are going to continue to eliminate off trail by the rock in which they are climbing (as are their dogs), I highly doubt, anyone will be making that hike off the rock just to use a toilet. I propose only ONE initial toilet be placed and then monitor its usage (over 2-5 years for example) and then decide if another needs to be placed. I know the portable toilets have been placed the last few years (so maybe that usage is documented in some form), one in a particular unsightly spot---where it can be seen from across the highway---we do not need to be seeing easily seen structures like toilets in the canyon.

I understand that change is inevitable and management plans are made in response to usage, etc, but most of the suggestions have been made after such high use was in place and damage done and what I can only assume people of late, feel is normal in the canyon. But that is not how the canyon was. The plan seems to suggest we want it to continue to be high use and that is a shame, the integrity of Tensleep Canyon was changed dramatically before inventory and will be changed forever if this climbing plan is implemented as stated and we will never be able to get that back. I think overall, all users of Tensleep Canyon know how very special it is. I appreciate the Forest Service trying to implement a management plan but feel there needs to be more modifications before a final plan be implemented.

And as just a side note, can the 'Gang Bang' wall be renamed?

Thank you,

Emily Hake