

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/4/2024 12:32:12 AM

First name: Pavel

Last name: Plekhanov

Organization:

Title:

Comments: \*Public lands, such as National Forests and National Parks exist for the purpose of enjoyment of natural resources by the public. By prohibiting fixed anchors for rock climbing, the NFS and USFS management attempts to take away a significant and lawful aspect of the use of those lands for rock climbing.

\*Fixed anchors are an essential piece of climbers' safety system and are not prohibited "installations" under the Wilderness Act. Following existing climbing policies that allow judicious use of fixed anchors for more than a half century will do more to protect Wilderness character while providing for primitive and unconfined Wilderness climbing.

\*Fixed rock climbing anchors have virtually no impact on preservation of national forests and national parks. Fixed anchors are infinitesimal on the scale of those lands and have no impact on vegetation or wild life. They are also microscopic in size compared to rock formations, and the change they introduce is absolutely negligible compared to natural erosion of the rock going on daily. It makes no sense to worry about the tiny fixtures placed on the rock while they are dwarfed by the natural processes going on with that same rock.

\*Prohibiting fixed anchors serves no other purpose but to restrict the public from lawfully enjoying the richness of public lands and put more restrictive controls in the hands of bureaucrats of USFS and NPS to boost their sense of importance and egocentrism. The claims of protecting public interests are just a screen to conceal the management's personal desire to accumulate power by prohibiting any reasonable freedoms. Prohibitions serve no other interests but the interests of bureaucrats at the helm of USFS and NPS.

\*Prohibiting fixed anchors will create safety issues by imposing unnecessary obstacles to the regular maintenance of fixed anchors, a responsibility undertaken by the climbing community. Critical safety decisions often must be made in the moment and any authorization process should not impede those decisions. Fixed anchor maintenance needs to be managed in a way that incentivizes safe anchor replacement and does not risk the removal of climbing routes.

\*If the prohibition takes effect, it should be expected that over the years we will witness multiple injuries and deaths of climbers caused directly by the inability to install or maintain the safety level fixed anchors. The blood of those climbers will be solely on the hands of USFS and NPS administration seeking to prohibit fixed anchors, and it is likely that it will also create a legal liability of USFS and NPS.

\*Prohibiting fixed anchors obstructs appropriate exploration of Wilderness areas. Land managers need to allow climbers to explore Wilderness in a way that permits in-the-moment decisions that are necessary when navigating complex vertical terrain.

\*It is unreasonable for federal agencies to create new guidance policies prohibiting Wilderness climbing anchors across the country when they have allowed, managed, and authorized fixed anchors for decades.

\*Prohibiting fixed anchors will threaten America's rich climbing legacy and could erase some of the world's greatest climbing achievements. Climbing management policy needs to protect existing routes from removal.

\*Administrators who practice excessive restriction of the reasonable and lawful use of national parks and national forests, such as climbing, should be relieved of their duties as they work against, not for, the public interests.