Dear Regulatory Agency,

The people have already spoken on this issue in 1982. The canal was rejected then because it would be an environmental disaster then and it would be an environmental disaster now. Do not fool yourselves into thinking that by digging a new river in the delta that the water to fill it will miraculously appear to fill it. By moving the water around the delta, the salinity gradient will move further up the Sacramento river. This has been proven and is a well known fact. By trying to disguise the "new" canal as a boon for the environment is a lie being posited by those who wish more water to go south. By removing more water from the delta through the canal, the problem of massive fish die offs will only increase. Please do not fool yourselves into thinking the way our forebears did, in that "the rain will follow the plow". If and when this canal is built, where is the water going to come from to fill it? All water in the state has been "spoken for" for a very long time, and no new sources have been found yet. Where will this extra water come from to fill this canal? The water in the Sacramento river at Freeport has been claimed and used for a very long time. Instead of trying to take more than is environmentally acceptable at the pumps, why not shut off the pumps for those times when fish are really in danger. Why not review (EIR?) the use of these pumps? Maybe the best and cheapest environmental solution is to remove those pumps from the delta.

The canal is a "band aid" for a serious sickness, and that sickness is the continued removal of the water from the delta by those tide changing pumps. In proposing a canal around the delta for "environmental reasons", you are lying to and spitting in the face of those people who rightfully voted on this proposal in 1982. The people spoke on this issue many years ago, and law was passed. Find another solution.

Sincerely,

Richard Enderlein
renderlein@hotmail.com