

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/4/2024 5:29:02 PM

First name: max

Last name: pritikin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Fixed anchors are an important safety consideration. Rejecting the use of such anchors would be like forbidding any bridges over rivers in wilderness areas.

Please work with and include climbing organizations in the minimum requirements analysis process. Only established climbing teams and search and rescue (SAR) organizations can provide accurate guidance.

Only established climbing community can describe what an "existing climbing opportunities" is. And the simple answer is that these are defined by the rocks and wilderness. They are not defined by existing anchors, trails, route books or any non-wilderness human thing. Its the rocks that define it.

Climbing is a fundamental and pure way to appreciate and explore the wilderness. Climbing routes are as fundamental to humans moving over the terrain safely as trails are. Please do not threaten America's climbing legacy just because its a smaller group that can be picked on.

Additionally note that the comment "Sound associated with drilling holes in the rock for the placement of fixed anchors may have a negative impact on the solitude quality of wilderness character" rings false. A hand drill is not particularly loud and such activities happen infrequently. The sound and clutter of trail maintenance has a much greater impact on much more people but I doubt you're considering outlawing trail maintenance.

Regarding, "should then select the level or type of fixed anchor use that best preserves the totality of wilderness character and explain the decision" please be aware that fixed anchors are safer and less intrusive to the environment than slings or gear left behind. Any attempt to reject such anchors should explain why the decision is to either allow clutter nobody likes or to outlaw climbing safely. In short: If the more extreme approaches are taken then force the administrators to explain their decisions in writing by addressing the underlying issues. Force them to admit their bias to the community. A possible way of doing this is to force them to publish their decision and reasons and to request comments from the community *and then* to respond to those comments. Perhaps with an independent 3rd party verifying that they have actually responded to the concerns. Clearly I'm worried that the language here allows a non-climber team to simply say "because I said so" which would meet the letter of this draft w/o meeting the spirit of it.

Please do better.