

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/8/2026 1:10:28 AM

First name: Marty

Last name: Stroy

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Having reviewed the Austin Project Draft EIS, I feel the analysis does not adequately address the real-world effects of restricting access across the project area. My family and I, like many local residents, rely on side by side vehicles to access these lands for recreation, household needs, and firewood gathering. The move to designated routes only, with stored roads and closures, will limit these traditional uses and change the character of access for our rural community. This matters deeply to me, as I want these areas to remain open and available not just for myself, but for my kids and grandkids as well.

The DEIS does not clearly explain how the proposed access restrictions-especially the removal of cross-country travel and the closure or storage of roads-are necessary to meet the project's stated Purpose and Need. Instead, it appears that the project may go beyond what is required, establishing a foundation for future access limitations without a clear, enforceable plan to support ongoing motorized use. There is also a lack of clarity on how emergency access and public safety will be maintained when roads are closed or stored, which is a significant concern for anyone living or recreating in the area.

Additionally, the information provided about timber production targets seems overstated and may not be realistic, especially if access restrictions are being justified by claims of economic benefit that won't materialize. This creates unnecessary tension between those who support motorized access and those concerned with local jobs, when in reality, both are important to the community. The DEIS should clearly disclose the assumptions behind its timber volume projections, including details on species mix, market feasibility, and how access changes could impact these outcomes.

The project documents are also inconsistent, with maps not matching the definitions or staff statements about road closures. The public is told in some places that no roads are being closed, yet the maps and project language suggest otherwise. Without clear, up-to-date maps and tables showing exactly what is proposed, it's impossible for the public to understand the full impact or provide informed input. The analysis should also include a reasonable alternative that maintains access, so the community can see what options exist besides widespread closures.

At a minimum, I am asking the Forest Service to remove all closed and stored roads from the project area and provide clear, specific disclosure-including maps and tables-explaining how any proposed action is necessary to meet the project's stated Purpose and Need. The impacts on access, rural residents, and future generations must be fully analyzed and presented so the public can have a meaningful say in the decision. Right now, the analysis doesn't show the agency fully worked through the impacts before landing on this outcome.