Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/15/2026 4:42:08 PM
First name: Danett
Last name: Abbott-Wicker
Organization:
Title:
Comments: These lands need to be protected, for clean water, for the animals, and for the future. That is the core of my objection to this Climbing Management Plan, and I am asking the Forest Service to answer the specific failures I raise here before finalizing anything.

The agency cites unsafe roadside parking as a reason to build a 50-space, roughly 2-acre parking lot, and the transportation section argues the lot would solve a highway safety problem. But the agency's own crash data does not support that scale of intervention. The document states, in the Effects on transportation and safety section, that "No clear connection could be made between the crashes reported and the lack of designated parking areas." Only one of the crashes in that dataset was tied to a pullout maneuver. If the agency's own record cannot connect the crash history to the absence of designated parking, then the agency has not shown that a 2-acre lot is what the data demands. The Forest Service must justify the scale and necessity of this parking facility using data that actually links those crash conditions to parking, or reduce the project to what the safety record honestly supports. I am asking the agency to respond to this point on the record.

The second problem reaches every section that claims to analyze environmental effects of that same parking lot. Soil disturbance, wildlife impact, scenic screening, erosion potential: the EA draws conclusions about all of them while the document itself acknowledges, in the Effects on soil and water resources section, that the site is not yet fixed, stating only "though the exact location will be determined after survey and design." Clean water matters to me, and erosion from a disturbed sagebrush or shrubland site feeds directly into the watershed these lands protect. An agency cannot honestly find no significant impact on soils and water when it has not yet identified where the soil will be broken. The Forest Service should identify the parking lot location, or at minimum a defined set of candidate sites, and complete site-specific analysis before this environmental review is used to justify any decision. That analysis belongs in this document, not in some later process the public cannot weigh in on.

I want this land managed responsibly, and I want my tax money spent on decisions the evidence actually justifies. Neither condition is met here.