

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/8/2026 8:04:11 PM

First name: Rosalie

Last name: Averett

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Austin Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My perspective comes from more than 75 years living in this area, relying on these forests and roads for my household needs and community life. The forests, creeks, and roads-like Crawford Creek, Dry Fork, Summit Creek, Taylor Siding, and Sixteen Gulch-are not just places on a map; they are part of our daily lives and the backbone of Grant County's rural way of life. One of my main concerns is the proposal to limit access to designated routes and store or close roads that have served local residents for generations. These roads were built to last, and many are still in excellent condition. For people like me, who rely on access for gathering firewood, picking huckleberries, and supporting family members with mobility or health issues, losing these routes would mean losing the ability to heat our homes, put food on our tables, and maintain our traditions. The DEIS does not clearly show why such closures are needed to achieve the project's stated Purpose and Need, or how the agency weighed the impacts on rural residents who depend on these roads. It is also unclear how emergency access and public safety will be maintained, especially when timely response to wildfires is critical and past closures have already delayed fire crews. I am also concerned about the lack of a clear, enforceable plan to support continued motorized access. The document does not provide enough detail or alternatives that would maintain reasonable access for local residents. Instead, it appears to lay a foundation for future restrictions without explaining how such steps are directly tied to the project's objectives. The maps and definitions in the DEIS do not match what staff have said publicly about road closures, adding to the confusion and making it hard for the public to understand what is actually being proposed. Additionally, the DEIS seems to overstate timber production numbers, which raises questions about whether the agency is presenting a realistic picture of the project's benefits. If timber targets are exaggerated, it risks creating division between those who support motorized access and those hoping for mill jobs that may never materialize. The analysis should be clear and honest about what can truly be achieved and how that relates to the need for road closures. I am also wary of proposed stream restoration projects that involve placing large downed trees in small streams. Based on past experiences like Camp Creek and the Middle Fork, these actions can create eyesores, limit access, and impede water flow for other uses and water rights. The DEIS should provide a clearer explanation of what specific restrictions or restoration actions are planned for each area, so that the public can evaluate their necessity and potential impacts. In summary, the Forest Service needs to provide a more transparent and detailed analysis that connects each proposed action-including road closures, restoration work, and timber harvest-to the project's Purpose and Need. The agency should clearly lay out the impacts on local residents, emergency access, and rural livelihoods, and present reasonable alternatives that maintain access. Without this level of disclosure and explanation, it is difficult to see how the decisions in the DEIS are grounded in evidence or serve the best interests of the community. I urge the Forest Service to reconsider the approach to road management, clarify the intended restrictions, and ensure that all impacts are fully analyzed and disclosed before moving forward.