

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/11/2026 11:26:28 PM

First name: Terry

Last name: George

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Having reviewed the Austin Project Draft EIS, I am writing to express my deep concerns about how the proposed actions will affect both my way of life and the broader rural community that depends on this landscape. I have lived in Austin since 1967, worked in mills, and used these mountains for firewood, hunting, gathering mushrooms and huckleberries, and countless family activities. My connection to Summit Creek, Crawford Creek, Idaho Creek, Taylor Siding, Bridge Creek, Clear Creek Dry Fork, and Squaw Creek is not casual-these places are central to my daily life and to the lives of many residents. A major concern is the plan to limit access to only designated routes, including the use of "stored roads." The Draft EIS and project maps say there will be no road closures, but the maps themselves show a different story. The distinction between a "stored road" and a closed road seems meaningless for the public, as both remove access for local people while continuing to allow access for agency staff, permittees, and contractors. This approach directly undermines the Purpose and Need if one of the stated goals is to support continued public use and community connection to the forest. The DEIS does not clearly explain why this level of restriction is necessary, nor does it show how these access changes are justified to meet the project's objectives. The loss of motorized access will have real consequences for firewood gathering, household needs, hunting, and other traditional uses. Many rural families, including my own, depend on being able to use the existing road system. DEIS does not adequately analyze these impacts or provide a reasonable alternative that maintains access for the public. Additionally, there is no clear, enforceable plan direction in the document that protects motorized access for residents. The lack of transparency and consistency between the maps, the text, and staff statements makes it difficult to trust that the decision is based on a fair and open process. When key details are missing or unclear, it feels as though the outcome was decided before the analysis was complete. I am also concerned about how timber production numbers are presented in the DEIS. The document overstates the volume and benefit, to gain support for the project at the expense of public access. Yet, the tables and figures do not show enough acres or volume to support these claims, especially for sawlogs that would be delivered to local mills. This creates unnecessary tension between those who support motorized access and those who rely on forest jobs, when neither group may see the promised benefits. Finally, I am wary of proposed stream "restoration" projects that involve placing large amounts of down and dead wood in streams. Past efforts in areas like Camp Creek and the Middle Fork have led to giant eyesores, restricted access, and even affected water flow and water rights. DEIS does not clearly define what restrictions would be in place for restoration areas, nor does it analyze the full range of impacts for these actions. The Forest Service needs to provide clear, specific disclosure-using accurate maps and tables-about what is being proposed, who will be affected, and how these actions are tied directly to the Purpose and Need. The analysis should show why these impacts are necessary, and alternatives that maintain public access must be seriously considered. Until these issues are addressed and the decision-making process is made transparent, it is difficult for the public to have confidence in the outcomes. Please ensure that the final decision is based on full disclosure, honest analysis, and a genuine effort to meet the needs of the people who live and work here.