

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/11/2024 3:51:23 AM

First name: Emily

Last name: Texier

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

The restriction of establishing new routes to "existing climbing opportunities" on non-Wilderness lands is confusing and unenforceable. There will be 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.

The development of this policy is counter to American history and the creative exploration of wild lands. Bolts are often not visible even when one stands beneath the climb and purposefully looks for them. The removal of bolts and anchors will jeopardize the safety of climbers; it will not eliminate peoples interest in climbing . In fact, it would be very unsafe to remove these bolts in many cases and the best people to do so would be climbers themselves. These hardware are important to the climbing community and are therefore should be managed by the experts on the subject matter (climbers).

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.

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.