

Public Comment
Draft Construction Permit
Deadline: 6/11/08 by 12 p.m.

From: "Eric Hauser" <eric@galleryhomes.info>
To: commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov
Date: Mon, Jun 9, 2008 11:38 AM
Subject: Comment Letter: Draft Construction Permit

Clerk to the Board Townsend:

For the past several years the SWRCB has been operating without a permit; nor did it have in place any guidelines to curtail over zealous inspectors who inspected upon their own whims. Thus costing home buyers & builders thousands of dollars.

Creating regulations without measurable guidelines will only increase costs and confusion. The counties need help in how to determine what is in compliance, not more regulations that are subject to interpretation.

On behalf of my company, I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed Draft General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities ("the Permit") now being considered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

As a homebuilding professional, I have had regular experience in successfully managing stormwater runoff from construction sites. I am troubled, therefore, by the drastic changes in stormwater runoff management called for in the Permit. The extremes of those changes seem unnecessary given the track record of homebuilders' "best management practices". Instead of improving the best management practice approach, the permit will simply create confusion and uncertainty and lead to increased housing costs.

Some of the Permit's new requirements make no sense. For example, the Permit adopts complicated and costly new sediment-content standards (numeric effluent limits) that the SWRCB's own blue-ribbon panel rejected due to the current lack of data and necessary technology. This and other new requirements are proposed without any demonstration that they will produce any marked improvement water quality.

While I join with California homebuilders in supporting improvements to the management of stormwater runoff, those changes should be practicable, workable and should lead to certain improvements in water quality.

Regrettably, the Permit in its present form appears to fail at meeting those reasonable tests. Accordingly, I urge the SWRCB to resolve the Permit's defects and inconsistencies before moving forward on its adoption.

Sincerely,

Eric Hauser
31618-1 Railroad Canyon Road
Sun City, CA 92587

