

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/6/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Becca

Last name: Polglase

Organization:

Title:

Comments: When reading the comments, I am struck by the diversity of personal experiences and perspectives about why this guidance is so fundamentally flawed.

It should be clear to the USFS from the comments that the MRA process is an inappropriate tool to manage fixed anchors. It cannot be done in a timely manner that takes into consideration the realities of the sports that are scoped in this policy. It is onerous and requires resources that don't exist. It is meant to be an administrative exception, yet the proposed policy contradicts itself by stating that USFS personnel are not responsible for placement or replacement of fixed anchors. As noted in MaiLee Hung's comment on behalf of Patagonia, instead of an MRA process which is not an appropriate tool for the context, allowing land managers to determine their own "de minimis" exceptions. Just as motorized devices such as cameras, video recorders, and phones are considered so small they are exempt from the motorized equipment prohibition, some "fixed anchors" should be treated with this same de minimis exception, as determined by the individual district..

It should be clear to the USFS from the comments that the unfunded top-down prescriptive approach in this proposed policy will harm the community. It will reduce safety and lead to more accidents. It will increase barriers to access by requiring a greater level of skill, independence, and expensive gear to participate in climbing activities, thereby ensuring that these incredible experiences are reserved for those already surrounded by privilege. By reducing access to these outdoor sports that promote physical, mental, and emotional health, and lead to healthy, high functioning communities, these policies will reduce the health of our communities.

It should be clear to the USFS from the comments that the unfunded top-down prescriptive approach in this proposed policy will harm these natural resources. It will make it harder for those experts in the sport who are dedicated to preserving these areas to maintain anchors - leading to parties using their own poorly-placed anchors, eroding slopes and destroying trees due to a lack of thoughtfully placed anchors. The outcome of making these places more exclusive will be a reduction of people who care for the lands, who vote for their protection, and who support the agencies managing our public lands.

It should be clear to the USFS from the comments that the climbing, caving, and canyoning communities have been and remain committed to protecting our natural resources, and to engaging in strong partnerships with our land managers. A climbing management policy developed at the district level in partnership with local recreation groups will be more practical, more effective, and more enforceable than a policy drafted in Washington DC.

Please heed the thoughtful, personal requests from thousands of your constituents whose lives are shaped by their experiences on public lands, and who empower healthy communities by sharing these experiences with others. Table this policy, and allow individual districts to partner with their communities to create sensible climbing management plans. Thank you again for taking the time to read and carefully consider each comment.