

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/27/2024 5:38:51 AM

First name: Eric

Last name: Quiggle

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to the currently proposed bolting and fixed anchor rules. The practice of judicially placed fixed anchors predates the wilderness act, is minimally impactful, and frankly difficult to spot if uninitiated. Climbers were significant supporters of the act at the time, and continue to be so. We are by definition conservationists, and a significant percentage of wilderness use groups, which as a group (hikers, campers, and climbers) is a billion dollar a year constituency. The décor of the cafeteria near camp 4 in Yosemite testifies to an historic and mutually beneficial partnership between U.S. Parks and wilderness areas and climbers.

All this aside, the proposed rules, if put into effect, would make climbing - which will continue regardless of legality - much less safe. Anchor bolts and rappel stations are crucial to safe retreat from climbing areas. Climbing accidents would increase, straining various SAR entities. Enforcement of the rules would tax already overburdened land managers. These considerations will simply raise the cost to all involved.

Conversations must be had concerning land impact, but they are already happening. Crag cleanups, re-bolting efforts, and ethical practice conversations are happening both within the climbing community and between that community and land managers already. The proposed rules are NOT the way forward.

Eric Quiggle