

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/20/2024 2:53:13 AM

First name: Chris

Last name: Lim

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a climber who cares first and foremost about our earth, when I first heard about the proposal, it struck me as reasonable. Why shouldn't we regulate impact on wilderness? While I still believe that, the more I learned about how the proposed mechanisms to do so, the more concerned I became. This proposal would increase the danger of climbing significantly and result in climbing deaths and accidents. Specifically, the blanket ban on fixed anchors would result in the closure of existing, historical climbing routes that date back decades. The proposal could also result in more litter as people leave gear to safely rappel instead of having fixed anchors. And outlawing the replacement of bolts unless permitted would create safety problems as climbers rely on them for protection. Realistically putting the responsibility of approving permits in local land managers' hands is unfeasible without an infusion of funding and extra staffing, as well as knowledge of climbing. As a result, the default will be a blanket prohibition on the maintenance of routes, again resulting in dangerous conditions. While I believe we should regulate recreational activities, including climbing, this is not the correct mechanism to do so. I understand the need to control environmental impact, but this does nothing but increase danger. I hope this proposal will be rewritten in a way that balances the realities and history of American climbing with the desire to lessen environmental impact.