

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/31/2024 3:08:02 AM

First name: Erik

Last name: Neumann

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I've been climbing for 50 years in US Forest Service and other public land in the US. Climbing has been a very important part of my life in many ways.

I appreciate that there are places where climbing is in conflict with Indian tribal traditions and that there should be a process to consult in those cases.

But the proposals to restrict use of fixed anchors in these areas are misguided and harmful. These anchors are critically important to the safety of climbers every day. They make available experiences of nature that were part of the motivation of the wilderness preservation acts that were passed around the time I started climbing 50 years ago. Without fixed anchors, we lose amazing experiences, and historical experiences that pre-date the wilderness act. I am convinced that low impact climbing, as practiced today, is compatible with wilderness. Climbers now rarely ever use pitons (I've never used one) in order to preserve the rock for future generations. Modern climbing gear is removable and leaves no impact. But anchors are needed occasionally for rappelling, and to navigate blank sections of rock that don't have cracks or features where removable protection can be placed.

With rare exceptions, bolts have little or no visual impact. They can even be hard for climbers on the route to find sometimes, let alone being visible from a trail far below. They certainly have less impact than putting in a hiking trail which often involves moving tons of dirt and rock around and destroying vegetation. If bolts are not compatible with wilderness, then hiking trails should also be erased and restored to their native state if possible.