Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/9/2022 7:40:30 PM
First name: Rob
Last name: Wipfler
Organization: Kingswood Camp for Boys
Title: Co-director
Comments: Back in 2014, as director of Kingswood I was faced with the dilemma that the camp needed a new septic system. Given the fact that our campus is relatively small, abutted on three sides by the WMNF and the lake on the 4th, I was informed that our only option would be to build three separate septic fields each with a Presby system designed to pretreat our effluent. To be specific, given our proximity to the national forest it would be unlawful for any of our treated wastewater to leach underground into the federal lands. Therefore the Presby systems would be needed and the end result of the process would be wastewater which is literally potable. The cost of installation for this septic upgrade came to approximately $500,000; for reference the previous septic system we had installed 18 years prior cost around $80,000.

We didn't ask any questions and we spent half a million dollars to improve our septic system. We did this because it seemed the right thing to do. We revere the resource that is our National Forest. Should not the WMNF itself hold itself to the same standard we did when evaluating its potential impact on the same forest parcel and on the water quality of Lake Tarleton? There are three scant vague sentences. Three sentences! Mind you, this is for 880 acres of timber management activities in the Lake Tarleton watershed. To these concerned neighbors, it certainly doesn't seem just, fair, or even at all reasonable to not take this issue more seriously. We understand that effluent requires a certain level of care, but we also believe that logging upwards of 880 acres also merits an in-depth study and review of impacts on the water quality, and should also trigger significant efforts to protect this watershed. We appreciate the buffers around permanent streams, the addition of water-bars to roads, etc., but this action would still disturb hundreds of acres and to claim- without a more in-depth analysis- that this would have no significant impact is disingenuous. A revised EA or an EIS with a much more specific and robust hydrology report must be provided for the public to see and comment on. Short of that, this project should not continue or the land should be designated a scenic area.