

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 6:02:43 PM

First name: Samuel

Last name: Dawson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Fixed anchors are vital for climbers' safety and should not be deemed prohibited "installations" under the Wilderness Act. Upholding historical policies that have allowed the judicious use of fixed anchors for over fifty years will better preserve the Wilderness character while enabling primitive and unrestricted climbing experiences. It's inconsistent and unreasonable for federal agencies to suddenly propose a nationwide ban on Wilderness climbing anchors, given their long-standing acceptance and management of these fixtures. Such a prohibition could lead to significant safety concerns, as it impedes the routine maintenance of these anchors—a responsibility traditionally undertaken by the climbing community. Rapid decision-making is essential in climbing, and any authorization process should not hinder these critical safety judgments. Fixed anchor maintenance needs to be managed in a way that incentivizes safe anchor replacement and does not risk the removal of climbing routes. This ban could also jeopardize America's rich climbing legacy and risk erasing some of the world's most notable climbing achievements. Climbing management policies should focus on preserving existing routes and ensuring safety of climbers.

Additionally, instead of an outright bolt ban, implementing a permit system similar to those in Hueco Tanks or Yosemite might be a more effective approach to mitigate environmental impacts while still accommodating climbers' needs. Such a system could regulate the number of climbers and the placement of new anchors, ensuring a balance between environmental protection and the continuation of climbing activities. This approach would allow for more controlled and sustainable use of Wilderness areas, aligning with both conservation goals and the interests of the climbing community.