

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/20/2026 1:06:49 PM

First name: Art

Last name: Dickens

Organization:

Title:

Comments: After reviewing the Austin Project Draft EIS, I am left with a number of concerns about how the proposed actions will affect public access and resource use in the Taylor Siding, Bridge Creek, and Squaw Creek areas. My family and I rely on this area for firewood gathering, mushroom picking, and hunting, and I am worried that the approach outlined in the DEIS could severely limit these traditional uses. The DEIS appears to rely on designated routes and stored roads as the only means of motorized access, effectively eliminating cross-country travel and closing off many roads that the public has historically used. This not only threatens access for firewood and household use but also raises serious questions about emergency access and public safety, especially in a forest that is already overstocked and at risk for severe wildfire. The counties and local families depend on both the jobs and the resources that come from responsible forest management, and it's not clear how further restricting access aligns with the project's stated Purpose and Need. Additionally, I am concerned about the lack of clear, enforceable plan direction to support continued motorized access. The DEIS is missing key data and assumptions about how access will be maintained, and it does not offer a reasonable alternative that would keep traditional access open. The maps provided in the document do not match up with project definitions or statements made by staff, who have said there would be no road closures. This inconsistency makes it difficult to understand what is actually being proposed and to trust that the impacts have been fully considered. When the project's maps and definitions don't align, it's hard to see how the public can meaningfully review or comment on what is truly at stake. Another issue is the potential to overstate timber production numbers in the DEIS, possibly in an attempt to gain support for the project by promising jobs and volume that may not materialize. This risks pitting supporters of motorized access against those hoping for mill jobs, when in reality both are important to the community. If the agency is going to close access in the name of timber production, it needs to be honest and transparent about what will actually be produced and whether those jobs and revenues will really show up. Finally, I am wary of the restoration projects that would place large downed trees in streams, as has happened in places like Camp Creek and the Middle Fork. In my experience, these have created giant eyesores, limited access, and impeded water flow for other uses and water rights. The DEIS does not clearly define what restrictions might be placed in restoration areas or how those would be enforced, which adds to the uncertainty. Before any decisions are made, the Forest Service needs to provide clear and specific disclosure-including maps and tables where appropriate-explaining exactly how each proposed action is necessary to meet the project's stated Purpose and Need. The analysis should lay out the true on-the-ground impacts so the public can meaningfully review and comment. Right now, the gaps and inconsistencies in the DEIS make it feel like the decision is being made first and justified after, rather than building from a careful, evidence-based analysis.