

From: "Ann Berg" <annmberg@gmail.com>
Date: Jul 11, 2016 2:48 PM
Subject: re: California Waterfix Policy Statement
To: <deltaactioncommittee@gmail.com>

Dear State Water Resources Control Board,

I am writing to PROTEST any additional diversion from the Sacramento River in the North Delta by use of tunnels and intakes or *any other method*. You allow too much diversion already. I boat/fish/recreate/farm in the North Delta area, and have observed the last few years of lower water flows on waterways like Sacramento River, Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs.

I have been recreating in the Delta for many years, and object to any additional diversions of Sacramento River water until such time as the native fish species have increased substantially over at least a five year time, and until there is a written agreement to protect the fresh water levels for the navigable waterways of the North Delta, specifically Sacramento River, Steamboat Slough and Sutter Slough so that these waterways will remain navigable for all sizes of recreational boats, and open to salmon migration and other fish species year round as they were since California became a state. I object to the placement of flow barriers on any natural waterway of the Delta.

I have seen the increase of non-native water weeds that are a result of too much fresh water diversion, which hinders navigation, raises water temperatures and makes native fish like Chinook salmon not be able to migrate through the Delta, so the species is going extinct.

I have seen historic low tides that also hinder navigation, which may be partly a function of the drought as well as a function of the *mismanagement* of river flows north of the Delta by DWR and USBR. Only "surplus" water from the Delta is supposed to be exported per the past voter approved plan. Much more than "surplus" water is proposed to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the Delta!

I vehemently object to the use of taxpayer funds to pay for the building of intakes and tunnels, or barriers, using funds earmarked for "flood control" or ecosystem restoration, since the actual purpose is water diversion for sale to the highest bidder. Plus, no one has proven the new style of fish screens and water intakes actually work and native fish have been declining as new intakes have been installed! Proof that they will work as intended is adamantly required before spending billions to build something that won't work, only to take "surplus" water that does not exist.

I object to being charged extra from my home water use to pay for the transport and use of Sacramento River water by huge corporate farmers of the lower Central Valley, who pay a much lower rate for the same water. Why should I pay for the mega-corporate produce operations cost since so much of their product is for exportation to other countries anyway?

Thank you for your attention to this important matter,

Ann Berg