

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/23/2023 2:37:14 PM

First name: Dustin

Last name: Rasnick

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

*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.

*These are Our Lands, we are the stewards of this land, and we as climbers want this land to be WILD and FREE for generations to come; without sacrificing our ability to be safe and return home. The desire to explore new areas, routes, streams is what makes our NFS/non-wilderness land so precious. This exploration is, and should be protected. Whether its establishing new routes or updating existing routes, we "the climbers" are the stewards/tax payers/owners, and acknowledge that we must treat non-wilderness land with the utmost respect. We entrust the protection of this to our governing agencies.

*The USFS does not have the means nor the human power to enforce such an egregious over stepping of Our freedoms on Our lands. Therefore working with and for the climbing community(not against) to create a sustainable and lasting management plan will yield the best results possible for both NFS/non-Wilderness land management, as well as climbers. This includes the use of fixed anchors and fixed protection. These decisions cannot be left up to NFS management individuals, as they do not have the man power or knowledge.

*The notion that all routes must follow a crack or line of weakness is limiting and unrealistic. Many routes follow faint lines of holds where only fixed gear/bolts will allow passage. To limit this athletic pursuit is an infringement upon our freedoms. Language such as FSM-2355.31.3. "Do not allow extensive or arbitrary placement and replacement of fixed anchors and fixed equipment without regard to rock features that provide natural opportunities for ascent and descent, such as where fixed anchors and fixed equipment are placed or replaced at a location that is otherwise climbable purely to make the climb easier" is uninformed. Climbing opportunities/routes are put up using the natural features with a desire at making them as difficult as the "natural rock" allows. The fixed anchors and equipment only make the ascent and descent possible and safer, NOT easier. By the FSM language one would assume that there are two options: 1. Natural protection 2. Death; anything in between is too easy.

*Much of the language in this proposal is very dangerous to Our freedoms. Items such as: FSM 2300.2350.4. "Conduct law enforcement patrols at climbing opportunities as necessary to protect visitors and NFS resources"; are way out of line with any single user group, and make it seem as though Climbers are dangerous and outlaws. This kind of language is too open to interpretation and unjustified acts of suspicion.

*If the NFS is not responsible for maintaining, re-bolting or placement of anchors as per FSM 2300.2350.5. and only responsible for assessment(FSM 2300.2350.7); then why are We(the owners of public lands) allowing them to tell us how to create climbing opportunities. As long as the user group stays within the laws of "protecting cultural and natural resources". The land managers may asses that We(the user group) are within the above stated law, then climbers should be the determining group maintaining, re-bolting, and placing, for climbing opportunities in NFS/non-wilderness areas.