

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/24/2024 9:54:11 PM

First name: Sarah

Last name: Inwood

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I live in Utah, and some of my local climbing areas that are <1/2 mile from the highway are technically classified as Wilderness. If the proposed policy prohibiting all fixed anchors is implemented, I am concerned that there will be tremendous confusion and, most importantly, a complete undermining of safe climbing practices that we as climbers have worked hard to develop.

More details:

1) 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.

2) 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.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) Prohibiting fixed anchors 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.

Respectfully,

Sarah