

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/22/2024 7:55:42 PM

First name: Anna

Last name: Maxwell

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a struggling female, LGBTQIA, law student who has recently ventured into trad climbing, this new legal interpretation would put me at a significant disadvantage and limit my ability to engage in recreational activities in national parks.

If fixed anchors are no longer permitted on climbs in wilderness areas, I would often find myself having to abandon a substantial amount of gear. In situations where I can't secure proper anchor points, I might have to place at least two (maybe three) pieces of gear and leave them behind. This entails abandoning two \$100 totems/cam/nuts (contributing to litter in the wilderness), along with a sling and a carabiner. Consequently, each pitch could result in a loss of \$300, considering the gear I have to leave behind per pitch, to rap off.

Of course, in certain situations, I could use a cordelette/ sling / carabiner... which would be less than \$100 dollars per pitch, but for a multiple pitch climb, which is all I am interested in doing, this would still make traditional climbing in wilderness financially infeasible for me and would lead to an tremendous amount of gear being left in wilderness. While I'm aware of certain quick-release options, I am uncomfortable with their safety, adding another layer of concern to this already challenging situation.

This financial burden would make traditional climbing in wilderness areas financially impractical for me and could lead to a significant amount of gear being left behind. This scenario would only allow affluent climbers to pursue multiple-pitch climbing in wilderness areas, exacerbating issues of diversity and financial barriers already prevalent in a sport dominated by wealthy individuals, particularly white male tech bro. It's crucial to consider diversity, financial accessibility, and overall safety in outdoor activities.

People will cut cost and use sub-par anchor material if they know they will have to leave it behind, greatly increasing the number of injuries in these areas and the corresponding number of rescues.

Also regarding the law itself: "wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of RECREATION, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation and historical use... (1133(b)) .. prohibition provisions: commercial enterprise, permanent or temporary roads, mechanical transports, and structures or installations; exceptions: area administration and personal health and safety emergencies.."; (1133(c))... Since one of the key purposes of the Act is recreation, I think using the land for climbing/ skiing etc... comes fully within the Act. We let people use "mechanical transport"; when we use backcountry skis in wilderness areas, I think bolts fall under a similar category of activities that could arguably fall under some interpretations of "mechanical transport" (depending on which dictionary definition you cherry pick), but which should be allowed because they do not conflict with the spirit /purpose of the Act and in fact support people using said land as it was intended to be enjoyed. Also.... the Wilderness Act was created as a direct response to peoples displeasure with cars in national parks... that historical context should be kept in mind when understanding what the legislature meant by "mechanical transport" ....