

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2024 3:29:04 AM

First name: lucas

Last name: barth

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Restricting the establishment of new routes to "existing climbing opportunities" on non-Wilderness lands is unenforceable and will create confusion amongst land managers and climbers. Non-Wilderness climbing management policy should maintain opportunities for new anchors unless and until analyses determine climbing should be restricted to protect cultural and natural resources.

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.

I think that instead of new regulations we could focus on education of current regulations which state that bolt intensive face climbs are not compatible with wilderness, and that fixed anchors should be rare in wilderness. I think that this is generally the case, and while there are some areas that have sprouted more fixed anchors than the spirit of this regulation suggests, I think we can focus on education and community management to solve this problem. I also think that overall it is very rare when people bolt intensive face climbs in wilderness.

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 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.

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.

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.

It is completely unreasonable and an impossible mission for parks to regulate climbing in the manner laid out in this plan. Parks do not have the trained staff and funding for this. For parks to be required to develop a climbing management plan before issuing programmatic MRA's for bolt placement is an unreasonable requirement. Most parks do not have the staff trained to write a climbing management plan and this is a years long process that would stall the placement and re-placement of fixed anchors in that time.

Please consider majorly revising this plan to be less rigid and easier for parks to implement. I also think you need to ask yourself why? Why is this plan being created? What are the environmental impacts to fixed anchors? I think that impacts are minimal and that fixed anchors are compatible with wilderness. Some of my most cherished wilderness experiences have been while climbing and I used fixed anchors to safely descend from the mountain. Please don't take that away.