

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/25/2024 5:51:28 PM

First name: John

Last name: Marcantonio

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Certainly many in the climbing community think this is a wholly negative venture but I am writing as a partial supporter and partial opponent of the proposed measure. Since this is up as a whole, I am against passage as it is currently written. I do believe there is a place for government management of climbing access to the lands but this only goes to create an adverse environment which will not only cause conflict with land managers but more importantly end up causing serious safety concerns. The change in management of hardware in the outdoors which has traditionally been managed within the climbing community will only cause more equipment and routes (which will be climbed) to go into disrepair. As the sport increases in popularity, this is certainly going to create areas of unnecessary increased risk to inexperienced recreational climbers who are not educated enough to understand the potential risk environment of bad or misplaced hardware in NFS. The popularity does need to be addressed though as it can lead to adverse impact to the environment.

I would propose rejection of the currently written rules and an area to find more middle ground with the current management scheme. Putting the management of plans, education, hardware, and route maintenance onto NFS staff is clearly outside of current budget to be executed well and thus requires the community to continue participating. Creation of plans to govern specific areas though is a positive step forward where NFS staff can engage with local communities and adjust as areas become more or less popular for recreating. My number one concern though is the management of hardware being removed from the community and 'criminalized' for managing. Climbers are going to continue climbing in our national forest system. Current NFS staff do not have the time, skill, or knowledge to address all potential hardware issues within the NFS system, this sets up for conflict and safety concerns with the climbing community unnecessarily. Maybe specific areas need a more thorough management plan but a blanket approach to the entire system is just overreaching.