

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/9/2024 8:47:24 PM

First name: Anon

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern,

Fixed anchors are a cornerstone of climbing safety and history that have been allowed on public lands for more than five decades. This new proposition flies in the face of all of that history of climbing recreation on public lands in the United States. Climbing opportunities allow for personal enrichment through enjoyable, sustainable interaction with wilderness areas and bolster the economies of local towns, some of whom have business that depends largely or even solely on climbers to make ends meet.

To say that fixed anchors like a set of bolts are an "installation" akin to a building or road system is, on its face, absurd. The amount of impact that bolts create, both physically and visually, is minimal especially in wilderness areas with lower levels of travel. The provision allowing for a Minimum Requirements Analysis is toothless, as the amount of bureaucratic red tape involved and the current state of federal agency funding mean that, functionally, all but the most readily accessible areas will stew in paperwork hell waiting for approval for bolting. Furthermore, this provision will give pause to climbers who may need to establish a fixed anchor to ensure a safe descent in the event of an emergency. Where a handful of bolts may allow for safe passage, in following the letter of this provision it may instead necessitate a costly and time-consuming technical rescue.

To the above point, not allowing for maintenance of existing fixed anchors without an MRA at the thousands of established routes on public land has the potential over time to lead to a massive increase in costly rescues both technical and non-technical. If anchors cannot be maintained, eventually they will fail and the most likely scenario is they will fail while someone is using them. The potential for resulting ground falls, even on shorter routes close to roads, is not to be taken lightly.

Because of the outsized increase in red tape and danger this proposal would create, in effect it will kneecap the spirit of exploration that has driven American climbers for decades. It would severely limit opportunities for outdoor climbing recreation in a way that would be detrimental economically, societally and on a personal level. This does not seem to me to be in keeping with the spirit of managing America's public lands for the enjoyment of all. This policy would be detrimental to communities, rescue organizations, and individuals across the nation