

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 1:44:20 AM

First name: Benjamin

Last name: Murphy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I appreciate the Forest Service's efforts to better codifying fixed anchors usage. Climbing is an important and historically recreational activity; it provides a unique opportunity to explore the "vertical trails" and appreciate everything our wilderness areas have to offer.

Unfortunately, the current proposal is overly constraining, and would in effect prohibit climbing due to introducing considerable safety issues. Fixed anchors are an essential piece of climbers' safety system. Following existing climbing policies that allow judicious use of fixed anchors for more than a half century will do more to protect Wilderness character while providing for primitive and unconfined Wilderness climbing.

The proposed MRA process is unreasonable for a number of reasons, particularly the additional bandwidth required for both climbers and the federal agency to review and approve. Additionally, safety decisions must be made quickly, often when on the wall, resulting in unsafe conditions of anchors can not be placed or replaced. Fixed anchor maintenance needs to be managed in a way that incentivizes safe anchor replacement and does not risk the removal of climbing routes or the safety of climbers.

While I recognize there is no 'de minimis,' limited anchors used for safety are considerably less impactful than trail systems. Future proposals could expand on minimizing the impact without prohibiting fixed, safety critical anchors, further reducing the impact. One such provision could be to necessitate rock colored webbing and bolt hangers.

Prohibiting fixed anchors as currently proposed will threaten America's rich climbing legacy and could erase some of the world's greatest climbing achievements. Climbing management policy needs to protect existing routes from removal.