

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/17/2024 8:40:49 PM

First name: Angie

Last name: Diana

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I'm writing in dissent of the proposed legislation. I worry that restricting the use of fixed anchors would have unintended negative consequences. 1. I believe that limiting the replacement of worn out fixed protection will endanger climbers, especially those who are newer to the sport and are not familiar with how to spot unsafe gear (or, for that matter, how to find an alternative to fixed protection). This would cause more injuries and accidents in the wilderness. 2. I believe that limiting fixed protection will simply cause more people to place their own fixed gear, which will have the opposite effect as intended. I think this would be especially pronounced with tat: climbers trying to rappel off a route will simply place and leave their own tat if we no longer all use the same fixed anchors. Considering that tat is by far the biggest eyesore in any climbing area, I think this would decrease the wilderness quality of climbing areas. 3. I am a commercial mountain guide who works in several national forests, including Gifford Pinchot National Forest and Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest. Although I am not entirely certain how this legislation would impact trade routes, I fear that limiting fixed protection will make my job significantly more dangerous and put me at great personal risk. I believe that climbers are some of the best wilderness stewards the world has, and I beg you to let us continue our work making the mountains a beautiful and safe place for everyone.