

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/23/2023 1:33:22 PM

First name: Matthew

Last name: Millard

Organization:

Title:

Comments: This new proposed rule is an obscene overreaction and clearly was not the intent of the law as it was passed in the 1960s. The intent was to preserve America's public lands for future use. Future use also includes climbing and the rescues that may entail, many of whom are also outdoor enthusiasts and climbing guides in the local areas of national parks. I have climbed outside of the United States and national parks around the world, including South America, Europe, and Oceania. It is generally managed well in those places. Though one place where it is not managed well is in places like Russia, such as Mount Elbrus, where permanent structures are clearly placed within national parks. This was the intent of the law, passed in America. It wasn't intended to prohibit legitimate use with minimal impact. As someone who is a political scientist and an avid climber, I can only estimate that it will drive revenue away from American parks for entrance fees and drive them to other countries where such climbing is permitted, such as Canada, Mexico, and even Europe. This will cause a decrease in funds for the National Park Service because those individuals will not be paying to enter the parks because the activity will be prohibited. This rule is an overreaction.