

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/29/2024 6:16:27 PM

First name: Zachary

Last name: Hiedeman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I request that in the course of this process, the Forest Service differentiate between "Fixed Anchors" (i.e., typically two bolts at the top of a climb used for rappelling etc.), and "Progress Bolts" (i.e., 'sport climbing' single bolts one uses for protection as they climb to the anchor).

Placing fixed bolt anchors at the top of a climb limits the visible impact of climbing when climbers aren't present. Fixed bolt anchors also enhance climbing safety as they provide a safe, usually well-located location to rappel from. Progress bolts; i.e. for sport climbing, can be a part of this process (applications etc.) in my opinion.

Encouraging 'Traditional' climbing vs. 'Sport' climbing in the wilderness seems reasonable to me, and bolts for 'anchors' (vs. progress bolts) can be drilled with 'primitive' methods. Providing secure anchors (vs. progress bolts) and rappelling stations should not be a part of the application process.

Climbing is a fascinating way to experience the wildness and wonder of nature and the wilderness. Indeed, some peaks may only be summited with climbing techniques. The Park Service should allow the use of 'anchor' bolting for climbing and rappelling. I oppose the limiting of climbing ANCHORS (vs. progress bolts), and support the application process for installing "PROGRESS BOLTS".

As the FSM directive stands, it is overly broad and encompasses too many activities into a bureaucratic process that hinders the sports of climbing and mountaineering, the freedom of movement in the wilderness.