

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2024 2:28:58 PM

First name: Steve

Last name: Smith

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have been a climber for my entire adult life, the past 25 years. During this time I have climbed in a few Wilderness areas, mostly the Weminuche in SW Colorado.

At the time of my visits I never felt that the wilderness character of these places was detracted by the fixed protection. Truly the fixed protection was invisible to all other visitors, save for climbers and in some instances I had to look carefully for the fixed protection as a landmark when progressing along the established route. The wildlife impacts of these bolts were also essentially non-existent, save that the fixed protection gave me a motivation to hike somewhere I otherwise wouldn't have.

I believe that a balance must be found that does not prohibit the replacement of existing fixed protection or prohibit all new placement. To do so would necessarily increase risk over time and ultimately result in accidents and the need for rescues or recovery missions. It would also be contrary to 60 years of policy and rob future generations from having experiences like the ones I had and treasure.

I am also interested in preserving the wilderness character of our wilderness designated National Forests and so I do not favor the establishment of sport climbing crags or the sport bolting of moderate alpine routes that would draw and concentrate significant numbers of people in small pockets of wilderness and thus disturb the wildlife and change the nature of the user experience. I am in favor of maintaining the ban on motorized drilling as one strategy to prevent the aforementioned problem. I also am in favor, and follow, site and time specific closures of cliffs to protect raptor nesting. This is another instance of how we can manage the situation without a blanket ban.

For the most part I believe the climbing community has self-policed in these locations and the status quo is both maintainable and desirable. As the policy is written, I think this is possible, but I also think that the subjectivity with determining what the minimum that is necessary and in the Minimum Requirements Analysis will require thoughtful analysis and may require expertise that is not to be found within the staff of the NFS in a given region. I implore the NFS to connect with climbing advocacy groups, local ones when possible and regional or national ones when local ones are not available, to conduct the aforementioned evaluations in a timely, transparent and thoughtful manner.