

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/12/2024 8:44:52 PM

First name: Halee

Last name: Asch

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have been climbing and recreating in usfs lands for quite some time now. In a lot of ways being able to climb safely with fixed anchors that I knew could be replaced has helped me through some of my hardest times. Thousands of people use climbing outside to build community and maintain mental health. By enacting this you would be directly attacking the well being of so many people. Why is that? It seems the reasoning is for environmental protections. What about the streams and waterways being polluted with your fire retardants? What about the proposal you made to allow companies to bury highly pressurized carbon wastes last year? Was that for the environment? What about all of the fracking you allow. Does that not pose greater risk in the destruction of natural areas and wildlife than new climbing anchors or bolt replacement.

It would not be possible to keep anchors up to date and safe for use with the proposal. Why not put the money you would use to make all of this red tape and confusing regulation and check ins into trail building and climber and outdoor recreation education. Provide poop bags and trash stations and clean up days. Tell us how to be safe and smart if we don't already know because we do care. We care a lot. We need these places and to climb safely. Below are some specific points against this proposal.

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.

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.