

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/16/2024 7:48:13 PM

First name: Gregory

Last name: Maust

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As nice as it is to codify that climbing is an appropriate use of the land, restricting anchors is unnecessary and imprudent. Fixed anchors have been an important part of the landscape in countless wilderness areas for decades. Like trails themselves, they are an essential tool to allow people to utilize and enjoy the wilderness. Without them, areas become inaccessible (or too dangerous). Our country has many amazing climbing destinations that are world-famous, and threatening fixed anchors puts both the history and future of American climbing at risk.

Wilderness areas and their conservation as wild places are important, but let's not pretend they are unspoiled lands where no foot has trod. We take for granted the scars of pre-conservation industrial destruction in many of these places, and it's farcical to talk about something as trivial as fixed anchors spoiling the experience for visitors. There will always be some sign of human occupation in the wilderness, be it trails, signs or a flattened clearing used as a campsite, and a small anchor up high on a face fits in with that.

Also, trying to define "existing climbing opportunities" and restrict new routes to that is unenforceable, and also silly. Finding new routes is an exciting valid way to interpret the landscape. Pinning it down to what's already been done is pointless.