

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/3/2024 11:59:35 PM

First name: Eric

Last name: Aker

Organization:

Title:

Comments: What are the factors that are driving the purpose and rationale for this proposal? How can alignment be had amongst so many groups of people if the reasons for change are unexpressed in this proposal? How does the USFS expect to reach common goals?

The objectives listed in this document are no different than they already are today. Land management depends on the land manager's policies.

How does this proposed policy change in land management affect or relate to policies set by individual land managers? Which one will supersede the other should this be approved? How can consensus be reached when individual land manager's want or have their own policies?

Why would setting fixed anchors that reduce risk in climber experience be a burden to the USFS? Climbers will climb, so why remove the fixed anchors and force climbers to create their own anchors and leave behind material every time they climb? Temporary protection and fixed anchors are not the same thing. Many primitive or wilderness areas are visited exclusively by climbers which would deliver more sales of access passes and licenses, and generate more exposure to preserve the quality of what might otherwise be unknown areas.

I would encourage this group to be explicit about the background and context which drive this proposal and state the aligned goals by each of the representing parties, as well as explain how a blanket policy will work in relation to all the discrete land policies already set in place.