

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/31/2024 1:19:24 AM

First name: Peter

Last name: Williams

Organization:

Title:

Comments: - The proposal seems overly broad and a sharp departure from the long held history of access and use, without specific justification that the general complaints often mentioned about overuse will be specifically addressed by these changes. Instead they seem more likely to impose additional layers of bureaucracy and confusion in already challenging legal and regulatory environment where the public's access and safety may be compromised as any shifts or needed repairs languish.

- This proposal will not change the number of climbers or any supposed access and environmental pressures, instead it seems likely further longer-term environmental harms by ultimately increasing the risk and number of rescues required over time. In this sense, climbers are no different from other user groups often requiring assistance but given their unique access abilities seem to be singled out for an increasingly risky experience and when, inevitably in the future, fixed anchors fail and rescues are required it does strain the imagination too much to imagine further restrictions on climbing itself as opposed fixed anchors and bolts.

- Fixed anchors are an essential piece of climbers' safety system and are not prohibited "installations" under the Wilderness Act. Following existing climbing policies that allow judicious use of fixed anchors for more than a half century will do more to protect Wilderness character while providing for primitive and unconfined Wilderness climbing.

- It is unreasonable for federal agencies to create new guidance policies prohibiting Wilderness climbing anchors across the country when they have allowed, managed, and authorized fixed anchors for decades.

- Prohibiting fixed anchors will create safety issues by imposing unnecessary obstacles to the regular maintenance of fixed anchors, a responsibility undertaken by the climbing community. Critical safety decisions often must be made in the moment and any authorization process should not impede those decisions. Fixed anchor maintenance needs to be managed in a way that incentivizes safe anchor replacement and does not risk the removal of climbing routes.

- Prohibiting fixed anchors obstructs appropriate exploration of Wilderness areas. Land managers need to allow climbers to explore Wilderness in a way that permits in-the-moment decisions that are necessary when navigating complex vertical terrain.

- Prohibiting fixed anchors will threaten America's rich climbing legacy and could erase some of the world's greatest climbing achievements. Climbing management policy needs to protect existing routes from removal.

- Restricting the establishment of new routes to "existing climbing opportunities" on non-Wilderness lands is unenforceable and will create confusion amongst land managers and climbers. Non-Wilderness climbing management policy should maintain opportunities for new anchors unless and until analyses determine climbing should be restricted to protect cultural and natural resources.