

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/29/2024 6:39:59 PM

First name: Jim

Last name: Hirshfield

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The proposed rules for fixed anchors utterly fail to balance safety, historical use, and the importance of public access with USFS's need to preserve and protect wilderness resources under its stewardship. A national policy that doesn't burden climbers with overbearing, patchwork regulation is essential for any policy to be effective.

In so many other areas - recreation planning, forest health, road access, management of mining, timber, and other extractive activities - USFS and USDA make compromises that sacrifice resource health in the name of economic growth or simple public access. In this case, the policy is driven less by a desire to strike that difficult balance in a way that's rational than a desire to appease absolutist views on what constitutes resource protection, while simultaneously enabling other far more impactful, damaging activities. Picking on smaller groups as a political convenience won't serve USDA or USFS's larger mission. It will only limit the opportunity for citizens to experience their public lands in a way that drives passion and supports the difficult balancing act USFS constantly must make between conservation and wise use.

Make space for fixed anchors with a rational, consistent national policy. Once that doesn't burden climbers with unnecessary regulation and/or inconsistent local policies that pick on smaller user groups.