Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2024 4:15:53 PM
First name: Kyle
Last name: Pease
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I understand that climbing has grown rapidly in recent years, however this project is incredibly dangerous to the climbing community as it introduces draconian ruling that will reduce opportunities for safe and legal life protecting anchors as there are not reasonably means within the forest service or national parks service to adequately assess each anchor. In the end this would result in a very limited set of anchors that would insufficiently protect climbers, and inherently lead to parties deciding to take unnecessary risks in order to remain within the confines of these new laws. Climbing anchor placement is inherently in the most challenging terrain to access and involves a complex assessment of risks. This is something much better managed by climbing organizations (IE: American Safe Climbing Association (ASCA), and Access Fund) which have a very long history of evaluating environmental impacts and self policing.

The proposed plan is rooted in an age old idealism argument that does not take into account the reality on the walls, for example see Royal Robbins and how he changed his mind on his widely adopted clean climbing manifestos when he was younger and has since been rehashed ad nauseam.

This level of management has already happened in the Bitterroot Mountains of MT initiated by a single manic actor smashing climbing anchors and putting climbers lives at risk. Many of the most involved members of the climbing community have since moved away with the sense of ostracizing and outlaw the forest service has since supported in their new management plan here which was pushed forward by this lone actor and a group of armchair activists supporting him. It is one loud voice having an outsized say in what many others do with their lives. It is really a sad and unfortunate time as a climber here.

I plan to develop a route here that involves a bolt being placed after 50 meters of natural anchors to safely progress up the wall (see attached images of route). Currently the crack ends after 50 meters of 5.11 climbing and only a fixed piton and nut in the closing crack are left for retreating, which is incredibly dangerous and not sustainable. A couple of bolts would allow this route to safely continue up the wall. Future climbers may be bold and continue up without protection until they can reach the next crack system, however they will be putting their lives at undue risk doing so. Yet it is the inevitable within this sport that if a safe anchor isn't placed, a young and daring climber will continue to push the progression and take the risk to continue up anyways. What is to come of this is yet to be seen. I would like to establish a memorable and safe means of accessing and enjoying this portion of the wall for others within the community to experience for years to come, but I do not see any way for the forest service here to evaluate and permit this route as no new routes have since been developed under the new ruling and I don't expect they plan to have the capacity to ever do so.

These management directives propose to reverse nearly 50 years of policy under the Wilderness Act, and will severely erode a century of cooperation between the climbing community and the National Park and US Forest Services.

The new policies would classify fixed anchors as "prohibited installations" in Wilderness areas. This new classification would apply to both new and existing anchors. This would threaten the existence of fixed protection on routes that have been enjoyed by climbers for decades, and obstructs climbers' ability to replace bolts when they become unsafe.

This creates not only safety concerns but also leads to resource degradation as more climbers seek out natural features like trees for anchoring in the absence of reliable anchors that are typically placed well away from vegetation features in clean sections of rock.

I do not oppose guidance on fixed anchor placement in wilderness areas, but these NPS and FS directives are unreasonable. They are unenforceable, will create more problems than they solve, will deeply impact safety for climbers, and will accelerate impacts on wilderness resources, not reduce them.