

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/23/2023 3:49:05 PM

First name: Mitchell

Last name: Moreland

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As someone who has been climbing for 8 years and is knowledgeable in anchor placement and replacement, I am opposed to any system that requires a land manager to approve fixed anchors on a case specific basis. Also the language "minimum necessary" is very troubling to me. Climbers have been policing themselves for decades on USFS land as you can see in the differences in ethics between Pisgah and Daniel Boone NF, two areas I have climbed in extensively. Fixed anchors have been added to save trees from rappelling damage and make it easier to maintain a safe climbing environment. I would much prefer a system that allowed land managers and local climbing organizations to work together to develop a plan for each specific area as opposed to all anchors being subject to review. Ultimately, it is the climbers who take the burden of risk and labor to maintain these anchors under the current plan and any anchors that are placed improperly or unnecessarily are normally removed by the climbing community promptly. We can police ourselves if you give us the framework to do so. I want climbing to continue on USFS land for generations and I love being a steward of this public land. But if a land manager with limited climbing knowledge had to approve fixed anchors, it would put climbers and the environment they climb in in jeopardy. It is my life on the line when I clip into a fixed anchor so please allow me and other climbers to make judgements on what anchors are necessary or not. Work with local climbing organizations to develop official standardized ethics for areas like Pisgah and Daniel Boone regarding fixed anchors.