

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 7:19:52 PM

First name: Deanna

Last name: Molenda

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Fixed anchors are an essential piece of climbers' safety system and are not prohibited "installations" under the Wilderness Act. Following existing climbing policies that allow judicious use of fixed anchors for more than a half century will do more to protect Wilderness character while providing for primitive and unconfined Wilderness climbing.

It is unreasonable for federal agencies to create new guidance policies prohibiting Wilderness climbing anchors across the country when they have allowed, managed, and authorized fixed anchors for decades.

Prohibiting fixed anchors will create safety issues by imposing unnecessary obstacles to the regular maintenance of fixed anchors, a responsibility undertaken by the climbing community. Critical safety decisions often must be made in the moment and any authorization process should not impede those decisions. Fixed anchor maintenance needs to be managed in a way that incentivizes safe anchor replacement and does not risk the removal of climbing routes.

Prohibiting fixed anchors obstructs appropriate exploration of Wilderness areas. Land managers need to allow climbers to explore Wilderness in a way that permits in-the-moment decisions that are necessary when navigating complex vertical terrain.

Prohibiting fixed anchors will threaten America's rich climbing legacy and could erase some of the world's greatest climbing achievements. Climbing management policy needs to protect existing routes from removal.

Restricting the establishment of new routes to "existing climbing opportunities" on non-Wilderness lands is unenforceable and will create confusion amongst land managers and climbers. Non-Wilderness climbing management policy should maintain opportunities for new anchors unless and until analyses determine climbing should be restricted to protect cultural and natural resources.

As a former NFS volunteer, I camp hosted in Maple Canyon UT (Manti-La Sal NF) for two seasons, as well as a route developer enforcing any type of climbing or bolting restriction would only do harm in my opinion. Especially to the area I helped care for, as it is a famous climbing destination. Restricting climbing here, or in any other similar area, could potentially lead to trespassing on the land anyway. Who is going to enforce restrictions to the climbing areas that take a while to get to? Not saying people should break rules, but for a popular place, it could lead to folks be tempted or just trespassing flat out. And who's gonna pay people to ticket each climber or hiker? What your budget for that? Also, majority of the money made in that campground are from climbers staying weeks at a time. Manti-La Sal will lose are that income for climbing restrictions or bans. For bolting restriction, I actively helped replace bolts and anchors in the are while I was camp hosting as there were routes and anchors that were unsafe and needed to be replaced. Since I had the expertise, I did what I could and the Salt Lake City Climbers did the rest (vast majority of bolt replacement). Additionally, if a bolting restriction or ban would occur active and regular bolting would be hard to achieve. In a time where recreational climbing just grows rapidly by the day, we NEED more routes to keep up with the growth of the sport. If there needs to be some registrations of routes and when they get put up, that understandable. But banning bolting completely would be detrimental to the sport, the forest, and safety of the public.