"The lady doth protest too much, methinks."

One has to wonder about the LA Times editorial criticizing farmers for claiming that the state is “allowing good water to be flushed downriver, through the Delta, into the San Francisco Bay and out to sea.”

The editorial states that farmers “pushed hard for diverting every scarce drop of water flowing down streams and rivers to orchards and field crops”. The truth is quite the opposite actually. Since when does a FIVE percent allocation of water equate to “diverting every scarce drop of water”? In the interest of having an honest discussion about water use in California, farmers are not seeking every scarce drop of water. Rather, farmers support legislation by Senator Feinstein and Congressman Valadao. These bills are a measured response to the water supply shortage that will only result in the possibility of farmers receiving a very small amount of water. Water that they are contractually entitled to receive, by the way.

The Times editorial would have their readers believe that farmers are leading some environmental jailbreak, but the bills contain language requiring that the new policy “remains consistent with the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act and the biological opinions.”

And while we’re on the topic of honest discussion, for the record, Westside CVP contractors south of the Delta received no allocation of water in 2014 and 2015 and a 5% water allocation in 2016, which has yet to be delivered. One thing is for certain, the Times is going to great lengths
to justify a water system that isn’t working for farmers or fish. Protest away, editorial board, but remember, as The Bard said, “no legacy is so rich as honesty.”

It's time for honesty in the very worthwhile debate about how YOUR water is being prioritized.