

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/17/2024 6:05:08 PM

First name: Joe

Last name: Brittain

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello,

Thank you for reviewing these comments.

I am a voting citizen and I am against this changed view of rock climbing via reinterpretation of the Wilderness Act.

Rock Climbing and the fixed anchors needed to climb safely predate the Wilderness Act. Anchors and bolts in rock were not considered installations back then and should not be considered this way now. People of all kinds want, and have the right to be in our public lands. Rock climbing, just like hiking instills in its participants a love of nature and our national parks. To restrict this is to go down a path of thinking that these areas can, and should be restricted from ALL use and ALL human contact, which is unreasonable and unhelpful for environmental causes.

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 restricts when they have allowed, managed, and authorized fixed anchors for decades.

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.

Rock climbers are inherently environmentalists and will organize themselves to change their behavior, protect areas, and self police, arguably much more so than groups such as campers or hikers.

Many thanks for your time,

Joe B.