

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/25/2024 6:32:05 PM

First name: Brett

Last name: Massie

Organization:

Title:

Comments: \*Fixed anchors reduce waste, tree damage and soil erosion from trees that have been damaged, and provide long lasting safety systems for climbers to be able to enjoy wilderness systems.

\*Fixed anchors are a hardly noticeable staple for recreational climbers to be able to safely enjoy the outdoors.

Other objects such as fixed gear and tat need to be replaced and are often questionable safety measures as opposed to properly bolted hardware that is rated for 20kN+ and has potential to last over 50 years if properly installed. This also takes out a large portion of guesswork on the fly when climbers reach the anchor point and need to hang their lives on unknown pieces of equipment. This will also lead to less consumption of valuable resources such as SAR as safer anchors means less accidents in the wilderness.

\*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.

\*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.

\*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.

\*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.