

The San Francisco Chronicle's Double Standard Regarding Hetch Hetchy

March 30, 2016

The San Francisco Chronicle has long been a strong supporter of environmental restoration in California. In particular it has championed a series of programs to restore degraded and dewatered rivers and wetlands in our state. But when it comes to the opportunity to restore Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park, the Chronicle takes a decidedly negative view. It's hard to see this change of attitude as anything but a double standard.

Following are examples of environmental restoration projects which the Chronicle has championed. In each case, other communities in California and or the state itself had to make additional investments in water or power supply to make restoration possible – often far more than would be required to restore Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park

Mono Lake

The Chronicle called Mono Lake “a splendid ecosystem”, concluding that “Every measure possible should be taken to restore this California treasure.”, even though restoration would limit the amount of water diverted to the “ever thirsty city of Angels” and noting that restoration can be accomplished by “refusing to bow to the greedy demands of Los Angelenos for water”¹

Bay-Delta

The Chronicle has consistently supported restoration of fisheries and wetlands in the central Valley and Bay Delta, including the central Valley project improvement act (1992). Citing “salmon, striped bass and other fish had been devastated by the series of dams, canals and reservoirs built by the federal government in the 1930s and 1940”, the Chronicle specifically supported the reallocation of 800,000 of water annually from Central Valley “growers”.²

After four years of drought (2012-2015), 2016 is a normal but not wet water year. Endangered Species Act restrictions sharply reduced the ability to capture winter flood flows passing through the Delta and out to sea. Senator Feinstein and Republican Senators asked for higher export levels. The Chronicle sided with the fish over “San Joaquin Valley farmers”, ignoring the effect on urban southern California.³

Trinity River

The Chronicle has also supported restoration of the Trinity River in northern California, describing it as a “shadow of its free-flowing self” where “Salmon and steelhead stocks have plummeted to a tenth of pre-dam size, harming both the fishing industry and two Indian tribes”. The Chronicle called the diversions from the river to generate hydropower and provide water for agriculture “no small water grab”.⁴

Klamath River

Finally, the Chronicle has supported the removal of four hydropower dams on the Klamath River in an effort to restore salmon populations. The editorial's title urges that we “Take down the dams”, noting that “an amazing change is suddenly attainable” and that “A river's past could be restored.”⁵

Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park

But when it comes to the Tuolumne River and the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir (the only such facility ever built in a national park), the Chronicle has a decidedly negative view⁶. One has to ask why.

Is restoring Yosemite National Park not as important or valuable as efforts to restore bird habitat at Mono Lake, or salmon and smelt populations in the Bay-Delta and on north coast rivers? If that is the Chronicle's view, it should so opine.

Is Hetch Hetchy Reservoir such an indispensable part of supplying water for San Francisco and other Bay Area cities? Seems unlikely. By any stretch of imagination, the required water supply replacement would be far less than that required as a result of water export reductions in the Bay Delta or on the Trinity River.

Is it the hydropower? The hydropower that would require replacement with renewable resources would be about what was lost when the Trinity River Plan went into effect and a fraction of what will be lost when the Klamath Dams are removed.

So are the Chronicle's views based on the merits? Or is there a double standard? There is some associated loss of water supply and/or hydropower for all these projects, but the replacement required in the case of Hetch Hetchy is generally less than the others.

Some of the Chronicle's editorials on these subjects are copied below..

Draining Hetch Hetchy reservoir is a terrible idea

Published 07:43 p.m., Monday, July 9, 2012

San Francisco Mayor [Ed Lee](#) is right. The proposed ballot measure to require the city to draft a plan for draining the Hetch Hetchy reservoir is "insane."

It's also dangerous, misleading and an absolute waste of money.

The group Restore Hetch Hetchy has turned in more than 16,000 signatures from registered San Francisco voters to require yet another study of how to drain the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir and replace its water with conservation and underground storage. If the measure passes, the group has signaled that it would return with a 2016 measure to mandate draining of the reservoir.

This issue has already been studied ad nauseam. Draining the valley would be incredibly expensive - between \$3 billion and \$10 billion, according to a 2006 state [Department of Water Resources](#) study.

By eliminating one of the Bay Area's few reliable water sources, it would endanger the drinking water for millions of people in not just San Francisco but also on the Peninsula and the South and East Bay. It's appalling that the Restore Hetch Hetchy group would attempt to make plans to shut down the reservoir without offering other Bay Area residents a say in the matter.

Hetch Hetchy also produces about 300 megawatts of carbon-free hydroelectric power for the Bay Area. It has supplied water through a 160-mile, environmentally friendly gravity-fed system for nearly a century.

It would be a huge mistake to turn back the clock at a time when the resources of water and government funding are growing scarce.

CVPIA

The San Francisco Chronicle

JANUARY 3, 1996, WEDNESDAY, FINAL EDITION

Save the Bay-Delta Pact

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A16; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 333 words

WITH GOOD REASON, California environmentalists are hearing alarm bells over a multipronged effort by congressional Republicans to dilute and undermine laws that support the hard-won bay-delta accord that only a year ago was hailed as a happy compromise solution to the state's water wars.

That federal-state water-quality agreement was supposed to be the way to end about 20 years of unproductive bickering among agricultural, urban and environmental interests.

But now, with Representative John Doolittle, R- Rocklin, leading the charge, the House Resources Committee approved a bill last month that would overturn the landmark 1992 **Central Valley Project Improvement Act**, which was designed to protect fisheries and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.

It is also feared that the starboard-leaning Doolittle, chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, will introduce a measure this year that would transfer control of the Central Valley Project to a coalition of farming interests.

The Central Valley Project -- California's largest water system -- is a patchwork of 20 reservoirs, 11 power plants and more than 400 miles of canals. The project delivers nearly a quarter of the state's water, irrigates 20,000 farms and supplies most of the Bay Area.

Water-carrying legislators are also expected to join forces with agribusiness to overhaul the Endangered Species Act and other environmental laws that provided the foundation for the bay-delta accord.

"Agricultural interests are chopping the legs out from under the accord, said Barry Nelson, executive director of the Save San Francisco Bay Association. "We thought we were establishing a partnership, and these folks went to war."

Everyone in California should realize that the fight for the state's precious water resources continues, but the battlefield has shifted to Washington, where difficult gains made here can be easily voted away in an obscure subcommittee meeting.

The San Francisco Chronicle

NOVEMBER 20, 1997, THURSDAY, FINAL EDITION

Water for Salmon

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A26; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 322 words

FIVE YEARS after a milestone water agreement, California's fish and wildlife are still waiting for their promised share.

The 1992 **Central Valley Project Improvement Act** gave consideration to all the factions that had been warring for a share of the state's enormous federal water system. One of its most significant accomplishments was its recognition that salmon, striped bass and other fish had been devastated by the series of dams, canals and reservoirs built by the federal government in the 1930s and 1940s.

Today, the Clinton administration is scheduled to announce -- through Deputy Interior Secretary John Garamendi, at a Long Beach news conference -- how it will manage this federal water. Not surprisingly, the administration has been under heavy pressure from the agriculture industry to renege on the commitment to water for fish and wildlife.

Water law is an almost impossibly arcane and complicated topic, and is often discussed in baffling jargon about "toolboxes," "stakeholders" and "water reserved accounts."

Cut through the jargon, and the Clinton administration plan's value to the environment can reasonably be measured on two counts. They are:

* Does it assure that fishery restoration will get its 800,000 acre-feet of water a year? Or does it provide little exemptions for growers to siphon off some of that water in certain years?

* Are environmental restoration funds going to be used exclusively for environmental restoration? Incredibly, agriculture and urban interests have been lobbying to use some of that money to subsidize water for themselves.

The act has been held up by five years of litigation, rule-making process and negotiation. The administration, understandably, wants to avoid a resumption of water wars. The best way to do that would be to honor the balance for the various interests -- including fish -- in the 1992 legislation.

The San Francisco Chronicle

OCTOBER 15, 1996, TUESDAY, FINAL EDITION

Fighting for the Bay for 35 Years

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A20; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 176 words

THE SAVE San Francisco Bay Association marks a milestone this month, celebrating 35 years of successful efforts to preserve the area's most precious natural asset.

It was a map that started it all.

In 1961, Save the Bay founders saw an Army Corps of Engineers projection of bay boundaries: A river running through acres and acres of fill. Developers had been adding to the shorelines at the rate of 2,000 acres per year. The bay today is one third smaller than before the Gold Rush.

Save the Bay helped put a stop to that development, and has worked steadily since to ensure public access to shorelines, improve water quality and protect plants and wildlife in bay area wetlands. The group also coordinated the campaign for the landmark **Central Valley Project Improvement Act** in 1992, a water policy reform law.

We wish the group well in its current efforts to restore wetland habitats in the wine country and the South Bay, and urge members to continue in their watchdog role over environmental legislation in Sacramento.

Copyright 1996 The Chronicle Publishing Co.

Mono Lake

The San Francisco Chronicle

SEPTEMBER 22, 1994, THURSDAY, FINAL EDITION

Saving **Mono Lake**

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A22; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 180 words

THE SPLENDID ecosystem that is **Mono Lake** at last has a serious chance of prospering, thanks to the sapience of the state water board staff in refusing to bow to the greedy demands of Los Angelenos for water.

The full board, which votes next week, must not hesitate in adopting the staff recommendation to limit the amount of water from the Mono Basin diverted to the ever-thirsty City of Angels.

A vote for the recommendation, which also requires Los Angeles to begin restoration of the unique waterway and the four streams that feed it, will allow the water level to rise by up to 16 feet, ensuring a healthy environment for the unique plants and wildlife in that other-worldly high desert setting.

Taking advantage of a 50-year-old water authorization, Los Angeles has wasted water at the expense of the health of the lake and its alpine streams. **Mono Lake** is a wonderland of eerie tufa formations, brine shrimp, alkali flies and over 70 species of visiting waterfowl.

Every measure possible should be taken to restore this California treasure.

Klamath & Trinity

The San Francisco Chronicle

SEPTEMBER 17, 2000, SUNDAY, SUNDAY EDITION

LET THE WATER FLOW;

And to the **Klamath** Refuge

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. 6; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 466 words

THE APPROACH of autumn is a period of anticipation in the Lower **Klamath** National Wildlife Refuge. This is where the Pacific Flyway narrows into its "neck," resulting in incredible concentrations of birds making their way south for the winter.

In fact, three out of four birds on the flyway -- up to 10 million waterfowl -- go through the wildlife area, where 12,000 acres of seasonal marshes provide them with food and cover. Several hundred bald eagles stay in the prey-rich area through the winter.

Because of its importance to the flyway, the relative health of the refuge has impact from Canada to Venezuela. For years, conservationists have been struggling to protect the marshland -- now about 20 percent of its turn-of-the-century size -- from the pressures of agriculture and development. That battle should have been settled, or at least weighted more toward the interest of the refuge, with President Clinton's signing of the 1997 Refuge Improvement Act. It was supposed to ensure that refuges get "adequate water quantity and quality" to "fulfill the mission of the refuge system."

Incredibly, the **Klamath** Refuge is suddenly faced with a total shutoff of water just as the migration season arrives. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation recently stopped the flow of water to the marshes. The bureau said the move was necessary to meet its legal requirement to triple flows to the **Klamath** River to protect coho salmon and to boost the level of Upper **Klamath** Lake to protect Lost River and shortnose suckers.

"We find it outrageous that the farmers who are on the refuges have the water to irrigate their crops while the marshes on the refuges go dry," said Wendell Wood of the Oregon Natural Resources Council. "This should not be about fish vs. birds."

Indeed, the Clinton administration needs to develop a short-term plan to get water flowing back into the marshes as soon as possible.

For a longer-term solution, the federal government should attempt to buy out some of the **Klamath** basin farmers whose water demands and agricultural practices are in constant conflict with the refuge. A group of farmers recently offered to sell 30,000 such acres.

The government would have a good source of money for such acquisitions if only Congress would stop diversions from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was set up in 1964 to use offshore oil royalties for environmental and recreation purposes. President Clinton has proposed full funding of the LWCF at \$900 million, but the Republican-controlled Congress has been balking, and the program is caught in the current budget dispute.

The Lower **Klamath** was established as the nation's first wildlife refuge, by President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1908. It deserves a better fate than its current cycle of crises.

The San Francisco Chronicle (California)

March 23, 2008 Sunday

FINAL Edition

WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO SAVE THE SALMON?

SECTION: Main News; EDITORIALS; Pg. G10

LENGTH: 492 words

California's salmon industry is waiting for the blow to fall: a near-certain ban on fishing this year.

It's a drastic step that could keep hundreds of commercial skippers and thousands of weekend fishermen ashore. It could also open a debate over the iconic fish's future and its mountains-to-sea life cycle that touches nearly every hot-button conservation topic from climate change to dam demolition.

The state's salmon mother lode, the Sacramento River, showed a dearth of returning fish last fall. Those are the prime-time months for the river-reared breed that spends its three-year life in ocean **waters** before coming home to spawn.

No one disputes the numbers: only 68,000 were counted against a bare-minimum expectation of 122,000. This drop has brought a federal agency, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, to the brink of canceling this summer's salmon season, with a decision due next month.

It's the nuclear option in the fishing world, but it's met with acceptance by fishing groups, biologists and environmentalists. With stocks so low - and next year possibly as bad - no one sees an alternative.

Salmon challenge California's modern nature like no other creature. The fish live and breed in cold, free-flowing rivers, the same **water** that farms and cities divert, siphon and store behind dams. Californians drive on roads carved into steep hills that can shower mud that smothers spawning beds.

Logging, crop spraying, soil tilling, and riverside cattle-grazing are also harmful.

Fishing groups and environmentalists have long complained about these issues, venting most of their wrath on delta **water** pumps that suck up young fish and disrupt **water** flows.

But the newest factor is climate change as shown by a shift in ocean currents. Instead of bringing up nutrients from the deep, the currents have changed as ocean temperatures have risen. Since salmon spend most of their life at sea, the impact is crucial. Will the currents change for good - or is it a brief disruption? Restoring salmon stocks will be much harder if the ocean's food supply stays scarce.

The salmon's decline underlines another problem. No one is really in charge of the fish and its fortunes. The Pacific Fishery Management Council was conceived 32 years ago along with other coastal councils around the nation to put fishing experts and industry representatives in charge of their resource. It sets yearly catch limits, but its authority stops where the ocean gives way to fresh **water**.

If this mixed-up oversight causes confusion, there's no reason for state leaders to dodge their duties. Logging can't be allowed to destroy fish habitat. Fish populations could revive if dams on the **Klamath** river came down and other streams were restored. **Water** diversions must be calculated for minimal damage to fish.

A changing ocean may be beyond control, but the fish need help elsewhere in their journey to the sea. That should be California's duty in saving the salmon.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE (California)

February 6, 2007 Tuesday
FINAL Edition

Take down the dams

SECTION: EDITORIAL; EDITORIALS; Pg. B6

LENGTH: 269 words

FOR YEARS, Indian tribes, conservationists and fishing groups have argued that removing four power dams blocking the headwaters of the **Klamath** River would reverse the losses of once-plentiful salmon.

Free flows of cold **water** are what the fish need, and the fearsome foursome of dams near the Oregon border were major impediments.

Now the federal bureaucracy has joined the chorus in a roundabout way. As a result, taking down the barriers has never been closer.

Because the dams need new licenses to operate, federal agencies have taken a long look. The results aren't pretty for the dam operator, PacificCorp, owned by billionaire philanthropist Warren Buffett's Berkshire Hathaway Corp.

To keep the dams humming, Commerce and Interior agencies now want \$300 million in fish ladders and screens. This price tag may be too high for PacificCorp, which cranks out only enough power to light 70,000 homes.

A miracle lies within reach. One of the country's biggest dam removal projects could begin, affording a chance at returning surging **waters** not seen for almost a century. Easing this change is the fact that Washington controls most of the land along the river course, and no major city lies downstream. Taking out other dams on big rivers won't be this easy.

Much remains to complete the dam demolition dream. Sediment behind the dam walls must be considered. Other tolls on the **Klamath's** health such as timber cuts, farm diversions and human building should be weighed.

But an amazing change is suddenly attainable. The dams that have plagued a once-mighty salmon river may come down. A river's past could be restored.

The San Francisco Chronicle

NOVEMBER 27, 2000, MONDAY, FINAL EDITION

Letting the River Flow

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A22; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 331 words

A GLARING injustice that has decimated fish and depleted the **Trinity River** may be partially righted. Federal regulators are considering releasing more water behind huge Northern California dams that now divert flows for power and agriculture. The tale of the Trinity is a shameful story of broken promises. The Trinity, an overlooked river that flows through sparsely populated country between Eureka and Redding, was dammed in the early 1960s.

Despite pledges that the river's health would never suffer, the federal system eventually took 7 out of every 10 gallons of Trinity water. It's no small water grab. The diversions now supply a fourth of the Central Valley Project's electricity and a seventh of its water.

The Trinity became a shadow of its free-flowing self. Salmon and steelhead stocks have plummeted to a tenth of pre-dam size, harming both the fishing industry and two Indian tribes that fished the river as a way of life. Deprived of seasonal surges, the riverbed became muddy.

The diverted water created new problems. Much of the flow went to irrigate an arid expanse of the western San Joaquin valley known as Westlands. Crops flourished but run-off water was tainted by selenium, a toxic substance that sickened wildlife.

Environmentalists led the Interior Department to rethink its practices. Now federal planners say they are considering doubling downstream flows.

The increase would restore almost half of the Trinity's water. To some, the change isn't enough. But the restored flows will surely make a difference in restoring the river's health.

The changes may not occur for several years while further studies and preparations are made. Farm interests, based hundreds of miles away, may sue to stem their loss of diverted water.

But the pending decision is a welcome change of mind. A clear promise to safeguard the Trinity will be honored. The dangers of dam building and water diversion will be recognized. The Trinity may find new life.

The San Francisco Chronicle

SEPTEMBER 17, 2000, SUNDAY, SUNDAY EDITION

LET THE WATER FLOW;

To the **Trinity River** . . .

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. 6; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 473 words

INTERIOR SECRETARY Bruce Babbitt has a chance to finally rectify an unconscionable breach of faith by the federal government.

More than four decades ago, Congress authorized the "**Trinity River Act**" with assurances that the new dams on the Northern California river would not divert water for agriculture at the expense of the **Trinity River's** ecological health. Rep. Clair Engle told a skeptical Weaverville audience one Friday night in 1952 that not even "one bucketful" that was needed in the watershed would be shipped out. Congress then wrote the promises of fish-and-wildlife preservation into the 1955 legislation.

The locals' apprehensions proved well-founded. The completion of the Trinity and Lewiston dams in the early 1960s set in motion a water grab of staggering audacity. Almost immediately, nearly 90 percent of the runoff in the rugged Trinity Alps was sent through a system of tunnels, reservoirs and pumps (near Tracy) to the Westlands Water District in an arid pocket of the western San Joaquin Valley. The agricultural users there paid a fraction of market value for the water -- as little as \$3 an acre foot -- while taxpayers picked up the tab for the elaborate plumbing system to deliver that water, as well as the many tens of millions of dollars that have been spent trying to offset the system's toll on the environment.

The extent of the Trinity-diversion disaster finally was acknowledged by Washington in the 1980s, when a series of well-intended but ultimately inadequate mitigation programs began. By the 1990s, salmon and steelhead runs in the Trinity were down to less than 10 percent of what they were before the dams. The water diversions and resulting devastation of the fishery caused particular grief to the Hoopa Valley and Yurok tribes who relied on the river for sustenance. Meanwhile, hundreds of miles to the south, the grotesque legacy of polluted runoff from Westlands farms became apparent with the discoveries of waterfowl deformities at the Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge.

All the government spending or engineering ingenuity in the world could not compensate for what the fish really need: water.

This long and sorry story of broken promises has reached a critical juncture. The Clinton administration, through Babbitt, is expected to decide within the next two months whether to significantly reduce the diversions from the **Trinity River**. It would be a bold move, one

that would challenge the agricultural and utility interests that want to keep the endless bucketfuls of water moving through the power turbines en route to selenium-laden lands that were never meant for large-scale farming.

At stake is the **Trinity River's** ability to support steelhead and salmon populations that have been strained to the brink of extinction by these costly water diversions.

The San Francisco Chronicle

AUGUST 31, 1993, TUESDAY, FINAL EDITION

Saving Salmon Or Ruining a River?

SECTION: EDITORIAL; Pg. A10; EDITORIALS

LENGTH: 339 words

IS IT POSSIBLE that the federal government's efforts to improve conditions for salmon on the **Trinity River** may actually be degrading their habitat even further? Are we, to paraphrase a bit of military misspeak, destroying this glorious finny traveler in order to "save" it?

That's the heart of the debate recently outlined by Chronicle staff writer Glen Martin that is now simmering between federal engineers and anglers on an issue that goes back to construction of Trinity Dam in the 1960s.

With the advent of the dam, fish populations on the river dropped by more than 80 percent as the lake behind it flooded spawning grounds and water was shunted to Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley farmers. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation engineers are now trying to enhance the water flow to protect the dwindling piscine population.

The current dispatch of water is not enough, however, to properly clean the Trinity's spawning beds; what's needed, bureau engineers say, is "bank feathering" -- i.e., stripping vegetation from the water's edge and carving out side channels for juvenile salmon.

BUT ANGLERS demur.

"It's having a terrible effect on the summer run of salmon and steelhead because the water gets too warm without the trees," says Herb Burton, owner of the Trinity Fly Shop. "A lot of other sensitive riparian species are also being hurt."

The bureau has established seven bank feathering test plots along a 40-mile stretch of river between the dam and the North Fork of the Trinity, and is moving apace to create 123 more at a rate of 15 to 30 a year.

With the future of a splendid fish at stake, and such vehemently stated divergences of opinion, surely some caution is now advisable. Perhaps the seven test sites now in place won't provide proof positive of the viability of the experiment, but surely their evidence will indicate whether the program is likely to work.

So let's take care and go slowly. These salmon have suffered sufficiently from man's intrusive hand.

Don't trade away our salmon

San Francisco Chronicle March 26, 2016 Updated: March 27, 2016 4:10pm



1 Juvenile winter-run salmon are released into the Sacramento River as part of an effort to save the species that has seen die-offs two years in a row. Photo: Andreas Fuhrmann, AP

In yet another battle in California's water wars, politics is attempting to override science. This has proved disastrous for fisheries and water quality in the past. There is little reason to think it is a good idea now.

In this latest skirmish in the favored battleground — the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta — Sen. Dianne Feinstein and Republican members of the House are calling on the president to order more water pumped out of the delta to San Joaquin Valley farmers. Scientific indicators say federal water managers should reduce pumping to protect endangered fishes.

California water politics revolve around the delta smelt, the tiny fish that serves as one of the legal indicators of the delta's environmental health. But water diversions also threaten with extinction the fish we know and love as an icon of Pacific Coast human culture — the salmon.

Feinstein justifies increased delta exports as necessary for farmers struggling with drought. And she is rightly calling for more holistic ecosystem management. Yet she contradicts that when she says pumping is separate from water management activities in the Upper Sacramento River that have killed fish the past two years. Maybe separate as policies, but not to the fish.

Salmon have a three-year life cycle. Decisions one year affect the fish for the next two. Wipe out almost all of the baby salmon in the Upper Sacramento by failing to release cooling flows from dams, as happened in 2014, and there are few juveniles in the delta in 2015. Pump the delta to

the max while storing more water upstream, as happened in 2014 and 2015, and the fish are harmed by the reversed flows and toxic algae. Then despair when weakened salmon fail to survive their arduous migration to the sea and back this year or next.

With the Pacific Coast salmon fishery at stake, water managers can't get it wrong again. More mistakes will destroy the fishery and with it the salmon fishing industry. Salmon bakes will be a memory, not an event.

In reviewing the letters from the senator and the House Republicans, President Obama might note this cautionary tale: In 2002, President George W. Bush ignored scientific data and ordered water diverted to Klamath River Basin farmers, resulting in high water temperatures that killed 34,000 chinook and endangered coho salmon.

Salmon belong to us all and must not be bargained away in a water deal.

¹ San Francisco Chronicle Editorial, September 22, 1994

² San Francisco Chronicle Editorials January 3, 1996 and November 20, 1997

³ San Francisco Chronicle Editorial March 26, 2016

⁴ San Francisco Chronicle Editorial, November 27, 2000

⁵ San Francisco Chronicle Editorial, February 6, 2007

⁶ San Francisco Chronicle Editorial, July 9, 2012