

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/11/2024 8:43:04 PM

First name: Anna

Last name: Campbell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Climbing has a rich history in the United States and allows the public to gain a new appreciation for the areas that are protected and meant for such activities. The issue with banning fixed anchors becomes one of safety. If unable to update, add or provide maintenance the lives of civilians comes into question. That in turn could lead to higher rescue costs, a service that is already often under-funded and limited.

Fixed anchors have been allowed and managed for decades and because of that thousands of people have been kept safe while climbing. By banning them you also run the risk of anchor systems that though they can be removed easier are an eye sore, and can be dangerous if the person setting it up is not knowledgeable in how to do so.

Creating a system that still allows fixed anchors and therefore does not threaten historical climbing routes but is possibly more regulated by an authorized climbing organization could be a solution. Work with the climbing community and those representing it as oppose to against it. We all want to recreate in the areas that are protected for us to enjoy. Safety though needs to be a priority for the NPS and by limited what can be replaced it is certainly called into question for climbers recreating in these amazing areas.

Lastly by 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.