

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 8:41:26 PM

First name: William

Last name: Lohman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The proposals to prohibit new and existing anchors hurts stakeholders like climbers and the prohibition will increase risk, decrease safety, hinder exploration, threaten climbing history and long standing routes that have been enjoyed for decades. This proposal hurts climbing un-proportionately.

An issue of safety will be created. The proposals will create safety issues because fixed anchors are the only reliable piece of safety gear that keeps climbers from hitting the ground. Fixed anchors are an essential and necessary part of the sport.

The use of fixed anchors enables climbers to enjoy wilderness areas in a safe manner. The majority of the climbing population relies on fixed anchors for their climbing activities. Without fixed anchors, most of the climbing in wilderness areas will cease to exist. Climbers will not have the option to explore wilderness areas in ways that been allowed since climbing started. This will in turn ruin the sport in wilderness areas and cause over crowding and land misuse in the climbing areas that are not wilderness areas. These policies would be unprecedented in the history of the sport.

Concerning the policy of restricting new route establishment to existing climbing opportunities; restricting the establishment of new routes would essentially be killing the sport. Any sort of restriction of new routes would be unsustainable for the sport. The areas of "existing climbing opportunities" no longer have opportunities for new routes. When new climbing areas are discovered, it isn't long until the whole area is developed and there are no longer opportunities for new routes. Generally, in the U.S., mostly concerning forest service land, there are no opportunities for new routes at existing climbing areas. Restricting new development would stop the sport in its steps. New route development is what keeps the sport moving, evolving, and progressing. New route development is the life blood of the sport. Not only that, but this restriction would be hard for climbers and land managers to understand, manage, and police together. Instead, restriction should only apply once an analysis has determined that a restriction is needed to protect cultural and natural resources. Otherwise, the Forest Service would just be restricting those who take part in climbing and enjoy Forest Service lands just like the rest of the stakeholders.

Thank you