

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 5:34:08 PM

First name: Carol

Last name: Fittell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Rock climbing is a legitimate and supported recreation in wilderness areas, and therefore I am opposed to the draft changes because:

1. It takes risk management away from individual climbers by removing their right to evaluate, replace, and/or add fixed anchors as needed, in the moment.

2. The outlined process is cumbersome, unnecessary, and impractical.

Sometimes even counterproductive as using a tree as a rappel anchor is going to put more wear and tear on the resource than two, well-installed bolts. Similarly, walking off a climb down steep and loose terrain is going to have considerably more impact than a rappel route on a clean face of rock. A third example involves the need to bail off of a climb for any number of reasons. When fixed anchors are solid, and known, bailing leaves little to no gear on the wall. When a fixed bail route is not installed, tat and gear anchors can litter the wall in ways that are incredibly difficult to clean/remove as the bail rappels are often not in line with the climbing, effectively leaving trash on the wall.

3. Climbing Management Plans are few and far between and a strict interpretation of the policy could result in most of my beloved climbing areas being closed; which I hope is not the intention of this policy, but it could be an outcome of this overly strict draft.

I am supportive of minimizing impacts in wilderness areas in ways that maintain access to existing climbing routes and exploration, and keep the risk management assessment in the hands of the climbers on the route.