

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/10/2024 10:12:23 PM

First name: Janet

Last name: Jones

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to voice my opposition to the changes proposed to the interpretation of the word "installations" in the Wilderness Act, which would change how rock climbing anchors are viewed and managed by your agency. For the past half century or more, fixed anchors have been used in a judicious and unobtrusive manner to allow for the constituents to enjoy a safe rock climbing experience, while still preserving the wilderness character of the areas. Changing this policy now makes no sense.

I have been a climber for over 20 years, and can attest to the positive impact that climbing has on the entire outdoors community. Without anchors, climbing would be significantly less safe. It would still happen, but people would be subject to much more severe injuries, requiring rescue, which would necessitate extra work and cost for the NPS.

The idea of reviewing every anchor with the RMA system is completely untenable given the large number of anchors in the country. Thus it can only be applied in limited circumstances, and will therefore be applied unevenly leading to further confusion and a less safe environment overall.

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.

There is no reason to change the definition of installations to include rock climbing anchors, and I urge you not to do so.