

**Technical Memorandum Name: On Site Treatment, January 2008**  
**Commenter: Surfrider**  
**Comments Date: February 15, 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	As per the Technical Memorandum reviewing On Site Treatment, the Environmental Committee stated, "The EIR should consider the feasibility of permitting any type of onsite treatment and disposal system in the project area." Therefore, we urge you to critically evaluate the document submitted to you by Steve Paige on February 4, 2008 entitled, "Making Los Osos a Post Carbon City." Mr. Paige has developed and implemented a water treatment system for his home that meets the water quality standards required, and, has already been approved of by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). His design warrants evaluation, co-equal analysis as a viable alternative, since one of TAC's primary concerns is what type of treatment systems the RWQCB will approve.	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.