

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/25/2024 6:05:08 PM

First name: Zach

Last name: Harrison

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I oppose some of the language of the Proposed FSM 2355 Climbing Directives.

While it acknowledges that fixed anchors may be an appropriate use of wilderness lands. The requirement of an application process necessitates an intimate knowledge of a previously unknown landscape. One does not know if fixed anchors are needed unless undertakes a climb, at which point the decision of whether or not fixed anchors are needed is evaluated in the moment. A RMA process is unreasonable in most situations.

Fixed anchors are essential to safety in most climbing situations. There is no substitute for safety in climbing.

Fixed anchors have existed in NFS lands for decades and climbing has co evolved with the story of many landscapes. Climbing in the wild places of many public lands is some of the only visitation to these places.

Fixed anchors are unobtrusive. Most people are never aware of their existence in most landscapes. This includes some climbers.

I do support the idea that the NFS work with climbing groups or individual climbers to replace unsafe fixed anchors. This is largely how management agencies are currently supporting climbing by allowing those who know best to make practical decisions regarding the installation and replacement of fixed anchors.

I do support the protection of cultural resources foremost above that of any recreation, including climbing.