

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/31/2024 3:02:21 AM

First name: Evan

Last name: Wilson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am concerned about some of the proposed changes that would impact climbing anchors.

As a climber living in New England I enjoy rock climbing in New Hampshire, as well as in Nevada when I can travel. I rely on the established hardware maintained by local climbing organizations. I believe that the proposed changes are misguided and will dramatically impact climbers who work serve as land stewards as part of their recreation.

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.

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 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.

I hope you will consider improving the proposed changes and look to Protecting America's Rock Climbing Act and America's Outdoor Recreation Act as a model for the types of regulation needed.