

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/31/2024 4:49:54 AM

First name: Brandon

Last name: Reedy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have several concerns regarding this sudden proposal to regulate/prohibit fixed anchors on land managed by the USFS:

1. I worry that, in reality, this process will not be feasible due to a lack of funding/time/resources, which will in practice turn into an automatic "no" (or extremely delayed answers) for climbers. A case of "drown them all with bureaucracy".
2. I worry that the staff making these assessments will not be knowledgeable enough about climbing to make good or reasonable decisions.
3. I worry that this plan will severely affect the safety of climbers by limiting their options. (Like alcohol and abortion bans of the past, we know that people are still going to do it regardless, it's just a matter of allowing it to happen in a safe and decriminalized fashion vs unsafely and secretly.) For example, a climber stuck high on a wall in an electrical storm shouldn't have to weigh criminal charges in their decision to escape to safety.
4. The absurdity of making a bolt illegal when it's right next to a loud road, full of large crowds of tourists and the litter that follows them. (Some wilderness boundaries seem poorly planned and arbitrary.) The hypocrisy of installing safety railings and signs on extremely popular trails, e.g. the CABLES ROUTE on Half Dome... visible from space!

I will concede that I also don't want to see high density, purely bolted "sport" crags developed in the wilderness either (though fine in non-wilderness land), and I do support a reasonable plan to prevent that. Perhaps a limit on average anchor density (bolts per area)? I do believe that climbing (even by modern standards) is still compatible with wilderness ethics, and should be allowed to continue more or less as it has for decades without any major problems. Please consider my concerns in your final decision.