

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/16/2024 11:36:42 PM

First name: Renata

Last name: Bradford

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am extremely concerned about the impact of this policy in the future of climbing in the USA, as well as in the climbing culture we want to establish.

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. The permission and traditions around climbing allowed for a climbing culture deeply integrated with wilderness values. I became a conservationist because of my wilderness climbing experience. I worry that this prohibition will affect not just climbing but also place attachment and the future of the conservation movement.

Thinking about the past and the construction of the wilderness ideals and the climbing culture in the US, this prohibition 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. It also jeopardizes the connection of the wilderness values, preserved on the Wilderness Act, with its history related to outdoor recreationists and climbers themselves, such as Muir.

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. Without this flexibility, wilderness climbing is forever jeopardized, and climbers will go through unnecessary danger. 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. 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.

It is also concerning that this policy is 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

I urge you to revise this new policy that could erase America's most iconic climbing routes and put our safety at risk