

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/28/2024 7:06:16 AM

First name: Bo

Last name: Xiao

Organization:

Title:

Comments: One can see climbing as analogous to hiking, which certainly is an accepted activity in national park. The only difference is traveling in the vertical direction, rather than horizontal. Hiking trails are maintained by the NPS, why not climbing routes? Both employ modifications to the landscape that change it from being pure untouched wilderness. The only difference is a purely subjective rationale behind what is considered detrimental to wilderness preservation vs sustainable use. There may be a point at which too many bolts are defacing the natural rock, same as true for the density of hiking trails. Perhaps in an attempt to satisfy the most people from both sides of the issue, there can be a constructive debate on exactly what bolt density should be considered acceptable vs inappropriate. I personally think that answer is quite high, and let us presume that it's overbolting that's the specific issue, as the placement of other protection (slings, pitons, fixed ropes, anchors, etc) are either much more sparse to begin with, or antiquated in usage and not really a concern going forward into the future. Bolts are very small relative to the area they inhabit, and can be made to match the coloration of the rock they attach to. One would practically have to be staring at close proximity to even notice their existence. The same is not true of hiking trails. Furthermore, the maintenance of existing routes across the nation are currently mostly maintained by local climbing communities, at no expense to the park services. To regulate any new bolting would require resources, which I think would be safe to put into the hands of local climbing organizations such as CASA (southern AZ) who are responsible at playing by the rules. But the big question is... what are the rules? At what point does too many bolts affect nature, wildlife, the landscape, and experiences of people outside of the climbing community? I can see bolting on unstable rock as detrimental to the future stability of that rock formation, however that plays out equally on both sides, as climbers don't want to set routes that compromise their safety either. I just think that whatever the new rules will go into affect, that they be done in a manner that does not ignore the voices of climbers, a large percentage of the population that goes into the NPS clientele. We help support the public lands, both in maintenance and financially. The last point I want to support is to not prohibit self regulated maintenance of the hardware protection on existing routes. To do so will jeopardize the safety of countless members of the climbing community that depend on those hardware to be safe on their quest up the walls. Likewise, shutting down access to countless classics in parks across the country would be unequal discrimination of one activity vs another, especially in that that activity (climbing) is not one that puts risk on anyone or anything other than the individual participants. If there is concern of erosion control in paths taken to get to the climbs, that is certainly something that can be regulated, and already is in many NPS areas.