

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/29/2024 4:14:28 PM

First name: Ryan

Last name: Minton

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I strongly oppose the proposal put forth by the document and its language for the following reasons:

1. Fixed anchors on rock formations in public land do more to minimize/limit impact and allow for safe passage than the myriad of other temporary installations which, if this comes to pass, would undoubtedly arise to tarnish the vertical landscape of our treasured public land climbing venues.
2. Fixed anchors, much like trail installations for those who venture into wilderness on foot, have long been a component of climbing on public lands and in many cases are paramount to preserving safe access in both ascending and descending from various trade routes. Reversal of this longstanding practice seems arbitrary at best and I would request that a more sophisticated and venue specific evaluation to take place if it is in fact deemed necessary that fixed anchor installation and maintenance require more oversight.
3. I fear for what the removal of fixed anchors/fixed protection bolts would do to the heritage and legacy of climbing on American public lands- in essence, it would erase decades of groundbreaking and historic public land exploration. In addition, removal or prohibition of fixed anchors/fixed protection bolts has the potential to create unsafe situations for climbers who for years have relied heavily on this infrastructure for safe passage.
4. I believe non-Wilderness climbing management policy should maintain opportunities for new anchors unless thorough analysis has determined that climbing and/or climbing access be restricted for the purpose of protecting cultural and natural resources.

Thank you for considering my stance on this issue.

Respectfully,

Ryan Minton  
Leavenworth, WA