

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/22/2024 1:27:09 AM

First name: Michael

Last name: Bielawski

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I oppose the proposed regulation.

(1) There has been sixty years of climbing in wilderness using fixed anchors. Precedence should guide our decisions on wilderness qualities. If climbing using fixed anchors was an appropriate use of wilderness for the past sixty years, what has changed? The proposed regulation does not explain.

(2) The proposed regulation gives no problematic use cases that require further regulation. The closest I see is that: "the establishment of bolt-intensive face climbs is considered incompatible with wilderness preservation." But what is a "bolt-intensive face climb?" Is this defined by just the spacing of bolts given the objective hazard? There can be no solution to a problem left so undefined.

(3) Regulatory capacity. The FS simply does not have the bureaucratic capacity to review the thousands of existing bolt placements. This will lead to a a de facto ban on all fixed placements. There are better uses of FS resources than managing a problem that does not exist.