

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 11:41:34 PM

First name: Eric

Last name: Engberg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I would like to express my opposition to the draft proposal as it is currently written . While I am certainly in favor of protecting our natural resources and agree that some area should be kept as wild as possible so that future generation can have the same opportunity that many of us have had, I feel that the current proposal lacks consideration of a lot of details that are important. It tries to implement a one size fits all approach with out consideration for important nuances.

I've been climbing for ~60 years and even though realistically my days of going deep into the wilderness are probably over I hope that my kids and grandkids can have the same experiences I have had.

The broad definition of "fixed anchor" does not make sense - everything from a "bolt intensive" route to a temporary ice screw on an alpine route. there needs to be more thought put into what the goal is and what is realistic. Allowing low key permanent gear - slings, pins and yes occasionally bolts has minimum impact (may even help by providing a clean descent) and is in keeping in tradition with practices that have gone on for 100 years.

If the current proposal was implemented it wold be mostly unenforceable, compromise safety for some and compromise the experience for all. I strongly recommend that you scrap this proposal and if necessary work on another that is less overarching and allows for climbers to work with local land managers to achieve something that makes sense.