Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/13/2026 10:25:26 PM
First name: Alan
Last name: Grantham
Organization:
Title:
Comments: My family and I hike and camp in the Bighorn Mountains, and Hunter Campground is one of my favorite places. I photograph birds and wildlife there, and I photograph the bluffs and cliffs because I love the contrast between the rock and the flora. I care how my tax money is spent, and I want this land managed responsibly so my kids can have it. The Tensleep Canyon Climbing Management Plan, as proposed, does not meet that standard.

The agency cannot draw firm conclusions about erosion potential, scenic screening, and wildlife impact from a parking facility whose location has not been chosen. The EA's own text acknowledges this: the effects on soil and water resources section states that the exact location will be determined after survey and design. Yet the Forest Service uses those unanchored projections to support a finding of no significant impact. I ask the agency to respond to this point: how can site-specific effects be responsibly assessed for a site that has not been identified?

The wildlife analysis reveals a gap the agency has not closed. The effects on wildlife species section states that "Unrestricted route development would affect approximately 88% of cliff habitat in the project area," but the document never explains what enforceable cap actually prevents the plan's open-ended review process from approaching that figure over time. The difference between current conditions and the unrestricted scenario is substantial, and the EA does not analyze the reasonably foreseeable cumulative trajectory of route development under the Proposed Action. I ask the agency to explain, plainly, what actually limits total cliff habitat development under this plan.

The safety justification for the parking lot is not supported by the agency's own crash data. The effects on transportation and safety section acknowledges that "No clear connection could be made between the crashes reported and the lack of designated parking areas," and yet the plan proceeds to build a roughly 2-acre, 50-space lot on the premise that it addresses unsafe roadside parking. The Forest Service should justify the scale of this facility using data that actually links crash history to parking conditions. The current record does not do that.

Wildlife protection should take precedent over development convenience. The BLM and Forest Service are too often driven to treat public lands as a commodity. There need to be limits, and the protection of wildlife should come first. New parking lots should not be built simply to accommodate more trails.

I ask the decision to authorize no new climbing routes on cliff habitat beyond the approximately 74 acres that already have established routes. I ask the decision to build no parking lot, sparing the approximately 2 acres of sagebrush and shrubland habitat it would take. I ask the decision to hold the share of deer and elk winter range affected below the Proposed Action's up to 27% by limiting new trails, staging areas, and parking there.