

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/16/2024 4:28:55 PM

First name: Jeremy

Last name: Freeman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am against the ban on the installation of bolts and the prohibition of safe climbing in and on wilderness and USFS lands because it is a capricious and regressive policy that unfairly treats a small group of people, and creates more danger for climbers to recreate safely.

There is no comparison between the damage and destruction that climbing generates and the destruction that other user groups heap upon wilderness areas. OHV's and pack horses and mules have the greatest impact on wilderness areas and the environment. The scale of destruction from these two groups is astronomically bigger than the placement of bolts in a rock face. The erosion and plant loss generated by these two groups affects the entire ecosystem, and has dramatically altered the state of "wilderness" where these groups are allowed to go. Entire areas have been destroyed by pack teams and OHV groups but there is no proposed legislation to ban these groups because they have a much larger lobby to protect them. If saving wilderness areas was a true concern to the USFS then you would take a closer look at the destruction that the pack teams and OHV groups bring to wilderness areas.

Fixed anchors have been allowed under the wilderness act since its inception, and to ban it now would be an absurd turn. Prohibiting fixed anchors would create a deadly environment for climbers and SAR personnel, and would destroy the rich history of American climbing. There are much bigger issues that are needing immediate action to preserve the beauty and importance of wilderness areas, and this proposed legislation is proof that the USFS is not up to the task to truly preserve these fragile ecosystems. If placing small pieces of metal in a rock face far away from where people go is a danger to the wilderness, then surely all recreation has to be banned under this illogical and regressive approach to "preserving" wilderness.