

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/8/2023 7:52:29 AM

First name: Kees

Last name: Benkendorfer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I'll keep it brief --- I think this is a remarkably bad idea that will decrease access to outdoor recreation without a commensurate benefit to the natural character of wilderness areas.

The climbing community already self-enforces a strong ethos of natural preservation and tries to minimize the impact of fixed bolts and anchors on natural rock faces. These are low-impact safety devices. If the anchors are removed, it would be much more dangerous for people to climb a given route --- likely it would still occur, but those who performed the climbs would have to be of a much higher skill level, and they would be placing themselves at much greater risk. Heck, someone of too-low skill might get to the top, leave a piece of gear, and rappel off of that, which kind of defeats the purpose of this whole "no-anchors" thing, no?

The point is, you would be increasing the barriers to access, driving away people without the necessary time and resources to become elite climbers, for not very much benefit.

Besides, I find it difficult to imagine that the Forest Service has enough personpower to complete a Minimum Requirements Analysis for every single route in a wilderness area (there are probably thousands). That sounds like a lot of paperwork for you, and a lot of red tape for us in the climbing community. Doesn't the Forest Service have more important problems to tackle?

I don't think many people would complain about evaluating and removing anchors "where the District Ranger determines that climbing is causing adverse resource impacts or use conflicts." We want to protect the environment as much as you. I just object to the idea that anchors are to be forbidden unless explicitly permitted -- if we must regulate them, let's put it the other way around. Anchors should be allowed unless a given anchor causes an adverse environmental impact.