

**Technical Memorandum Name: On Site Treatment, January 2008**  
**Commenter: Steve Paige**  
**Comments Date: January 26, 2008**  
**Responses Date: March 30, 2008**

The following comments were submitted in response to the above listed Technical Memorandum (TM). The TM was developed as part of the EIR process for the project, in order to help facilitate and broaden the discussion of project issues important to the community. The responses should be considered preliminary because the EIR process is not complete, and the information necessary to fully respond has not yet been developed. The project team is grateful to those citizens who took the time to review the TM and provide comments at this early stage in the process. The project team will endeavor to fully address the comments and concerns through the on-going project development process.

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	I will be making a large submission on Urine Sequestering via legal service to validate your receipt for it's inclusion in the EIR. It is disappointing that sequestering was not mentioned in the draft for onsite because sequestering and onsite disposal of the remaining waste is the most energy efficient method of solving the NP and K pollution problem. Sequestering would eliminate the need for carbon bed leach fields AND REPLACING SEPTIC TANKS. Also no mention was made of composting toilets in combination with urine only toilets and sequestering. The LOWWP sewer project will meet with the energy reality before it is complete I have been trying to give you a jump on the issue but myself and many other Green solution advocates are being ignored. It will be your undoing in the end.	It is important to understand that the EIR can only consider alternatives and mitigation measures that are "feasible". In the context of an EIR, "feasible" means "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." We are concerned that the community's response to the urine sequestering system (the "social" aspect) would render this approach infeasible. That is, the majority of residents may not wish to modify their daily lives to the degree required to make sequestering a successful system on a community-wide basis.