

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/17/2024 2:20:39 PM

First name: Wes

Last name: Dong

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear USFS,

I am writing to voice my opposition to addition of the proposed section 2355 - Climbing Opportunities to Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2300 - Recreation, Wilderness, and Related Resource Management.

The proposed Minimum Requirements Analysis in section 2355 will cause unnecessary delays for replacement of existing climbing anchors (i.e. bolts). This is a danger to climbers and requires extra work for Forest Service personnel.

My belief is that overall, climbers make the best decisions for resource management with respect to anchor and protection bolt placement. There is a strong historical ethic for not over-bolting routes. Coupled with the labor intensity of hand-drilling, and the cost of bolt hardware, bolting new routes and replacing old anchors is a self-limiting activity.

I have climbed since the 1980s, and my perception is that even if you're looking for them while on a route, bolts aren't easy to see. Furthermore, the vast majority of climbing routes are located far from places non-climbers would go. Together, this means that bolts do not adversely impact the wilderness experience for National Forest users at all. As one specific example, consider Courtright Reservoir in California. This beautiful area is a fantastic fishing, boating, hiking and climbing resource. Yet if you were to visit, you would not be able to find any evidence of climbing without an energetic hike to one of the granite domes there. Far more evident at Courtright are the paved roads, campsites, boat ramp, parking lots and other man made facilities.

In summary, please don't add regulations that adversely impact climbing safety and also don't add value for National Forest users and employees.

Thank you,  
Wes Dong