The Keys to Successful Natural Resource Management in the 21st Century

by Frank Duckle, Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

R ecently, I witnessed the signing of a pact which demonstrates quite clearly how cooperation, common sense, and hard work can always win out in potentially difficult situations. A week later I had the opportunity to share with the Water Congress just how my agency is not only going to help implement the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fishes Pact, but also how we are going to become an increasingly more efficient, effective, and cooperative agency.

Before I go into any detail on the important pact signed, I would like to talk about the Fish and Wildlife Service — where it has been, where it is now, and where I think it should be going.

First, a look at the past. As many of you know, the Service had something of an image problem in recent years. Folks often viewed it as aloof, inflexible, very anti-development, and extremely bureaucratic. And then when those same folks made the effort to find out what the Service was really like, they discovered to their great chagrin that it was all that and sometimes more.

The agency has always had some top-notch people — dedicated and cooperative professionals. The problem was finding those folks and being able to work with them on a continuing basis.

When I first joined the Service several years ago, one of the things that struck me was just how difficult it was to determine not who did what, but who was responsible for what. This went against the grain of practically everything I had ever experienced in my state government career and my long association with the United States military. In Montana state government and the armed services, you understand what rank and the chain of command are early on. And you understand that the purpose of that type of organizational structure is to achieve efficiency and coordinated action.

The Fish and Wildlife Service I entered in the early 1980’s was being managed by something called a “program management system.” Now, I realize that the system has had its champions in the corporate world. And I realize, too, that many a company can point to such a system as the key to its success.

Continued on page 6
If we are to initiate a program like this, we will need the benefit of far-sighted leadership on the local, state, and national levels. Having raised the subject of leadership, I'd like to turn to another topic of importance, which is the concept of conservation. The most outstanding example of the courage to change I have observed in recent times was the process of reorganization for the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington, most of the people who knew about what we were doing were frankly skeptical. Some people just didn't get it. Others just didn't buy it. But I wouldn't have been making any change if I thought the idea was impossible. Still others told me that I ought to give it all I had, simply because it would be a good learning experience for them. The outcome has been quite different for us.

Many of the individuals who had been responsible for positive change at the beginning of the Administration have become so down by their experience and realization that they were surprised anyone would try to do anything. The executive branch of government is not alone in its frustrations. In the last year, half-a-dozen members of Congress, many of them large water users, have announced their retirement. The reason almost all of them give is that they are tired of a process that does not allow them to get anything accomplished.

Congress' response to the Bureau's reorganization proposal is any measure, I can certainly understand why these individuals have decided to leave. I must admit that it was depressing to see a few congressmen try to get a financially and environmentally sound organizational plan made by the people who know their programs. As far as I can see, their intent was largely partisan. As we won the war, the savings and efficiencies that we had anticipated under our original proposal had been diminished under the current federal mandates. It may sound odd, but the idea of Congress is one big reason why federal spending is out of control. If you're personally frightening me to see a young, wet-behind-the-ears citizen who hardly knew what the Bureau of Reclamation was at the beginning of 1987, decide how many people need our Washington office -- and write that number into law. When you think about it, Congress is much more likely than the federal government that the federal government can't do its own job -- produce a full-fledged budget and pass all of the necessary bills -- for over a year. It is rather ironic that Congress is concerned with efficiency and people how to do their jobs.

Dr. Bill Chester was a man who had strength waiting for Congress to produce its own reorganization proposal that calls for the House and the Senate to trim down, shape up, and start working.

Too much of our Nation's government today is dominated by people who see public service as only a job -- even a sinecure. For them, "public service" is an opportunity to serve their personal interests. The most successful of our reorganization proposals is being fashionable. It is little wonder that the people of the United States have become so disinterested in Congress. If the politicians were to take into account the voter turnout on election day, the winner in most elections would be a write-in candidate named nobody. In a very real sense, they are all losers.

Congressman Mo Udall tells the story of an elderly lady while he was campaigning for the Presidency in New Hampshire a few years ago. He asked the woman who would be the winner in most elections. When she said, "I don't know," he said, "It only encourages them."

Some people suggest the reason for our problems has been the proliferation of interest groups. I would agree that the number of interest groups seems to be growing, but I don't see that necessarily bad. In a democracy, all of us have the right to represent our views, and we ought to be actively engaged in doing just that. There is a good deal to be said in favor of interest groups if they use that diversity to achieve positive goals. The problem lies at a more fundamental level. Instead of building consensus to achieve their goals, many single-issue groups are using the political tactic to discredit and demonize each other. Instead of accepting the concept that unity builds a stronger nation, they have decided to adopt the concept of divide and conquer. Somewhere along the way, they lost sight of the fact that they ultimately are conquering themselves.

This is not only a national problem, it is a local and regional problem as well. I see this attitude more and more among the various state water groups, and I don't like it. If we continue to insist that we must get "our way" or "our pet project" before any other project begins, we are not going to get very far. A few of our congressmen are so concerned about the political and the financing of water resources development and management may have changed, but the need for unity to achieve our public water goals has not changed. Benjamin Franklin observed that the observation about hanging together has never been more true. If we do not hang together, we will most assuredly hang sepa-

It is time for a change. We again must begin the process of rebuilding the shared water interests of the western states. Unless we can rebuild our unity, we will find our plans and programs paralyzed.
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The Challenges of Colorado's Water

To miss our mission, as we all know, of the Colorado Water Congres-
sion is to protect, conserve, and develop Colorado's water re-
source. The Congress accomplishes its mission through the pro-
cess of legislative, research, education, and interac-
tion. Perhaps at no time in our history has this been moving
more difficult to accomplish than the present. The established
valid property rights, and laws pertaining to water seem to
be challenged by an ever growing number of environmental
units, and special interest groups. The conflicts grow in num-
ber and complexity. They include disagreements between
water interests as well as between non-water interests. My intention
herein is to categorize these conflicts and speculate as to
how the Congress should play in each.

The Colorado Water Congress forum affords each of us the
practice, at times, shed our own personal cloak and focus on long-
term, far reaching questions which extend beyond our immediate
areas of responsibility.

In my mind there are four primary categories of conflict which
are severely impacting Colorado's water economy. These four
constitute 1) development, versus environmental values;
2) intergovernmental competition and disagreement, 3) eco-
nomic development, and 4) geographical region competition
for water resources, development, and distribution.

1) Development and Environmental Conflicts

The risks and cost of water development projects have been
greatly increased by the controversy over the environmental
laws, particularly the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species
Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. The costs and
times of development projects have doubled and may have
swung too fat. Case histories and horror stories are numer-
ous. Colorado can supply its municipal and industrial growth
from water conservation strategies which have already been iden-
tified, or from a realization of resources from agricultural
to municipal. Environmental regulations and conflict are driving
Colorado to the realization side of the equation. Smitten by
environmental law suits, the federal permitting agencies now
function as mediators on permit decisions, rather than adminis-
tering the environmental laws. Two examples are the Endangered
Species Act and the Clean Water Act.

More recent environmental regulation developments include
an increased emphasis on the issue of water quality and spec-
cifically, on the issue of water quality standards. Water quality
standards are original planned to reduce water pollution due
to waste water plant discharges. Now they are being utilized
to establish the myriad of water rights to the diversion from
commons. Administrative procedures being developed in response
to the Federal Land Management Act threaten the utilization
of environmental laws and the end-run of the administrative
process by state and federal courts. The economic impact of the
new regulations has been severe, having a direct impact on water
users in the State.

The new regulations are affecting both conservation and use
in the State and may indeed be stifling the ability of the water
industry to meet the needs of the State and the Nation. The
environmental movement has severely impacted the economic
growth and development of the State.

2) Intergovernmental Conflict

Nineteen water related intergovernmental conflicts have aris-
en, primarily along the front range, in recent years. These
conflicts have involved cities, counties, special districts, and
state government. These disagreements have potential impacts
on water users in the South Platte, Arkansas, Colorado, and Gunnison
river basins.

The provision of water service as an attraction for urban
development is a competitive factor among metro area entities.
Water service for urban development has historically been pro-
vided by cities and special districts. Now at least one metro-
area county government has asserted that it also should be a
water supplier. This has allowed developers in some areas to
negotiate with cities, counties, and special districts in order to
get the best and cheapest deal for water service. Continued
conflict between Denver and its suburban customers related to
rates and service reliability has driven the suburban to the forma-
tion of Metropolitans Denver Water Authority and the pursuit of
independent water projects. In the northern metro area, cities,
are transferring rights from agricultural to municipal use and
are creating a new set of conflicts between irrigation districts
and municipalities. The State of Colorado has recently issued
a "Draft Environmental Agenda" which in some areas needs
significant input from the water community to avoid another
layer of governmental disagreement. The large number of pend-
ing more irrigated issues between governmental units has
resulted in uncertain land and utility planning, inefficient dupli-
cation of facilities, and needless litigation.

Many of these governmental unit lawsuits are organization members
of the Colorado Water Congress. It should not be the role
of the Congress to take sides in these disputes. However, I suggest
that it should be the organization’s role to provide an out-
court non-adversarial forum to discuss and support issue reso-
novation. Colorado Water Congress can be effective and vocal
supporter of intergovernmental agreements and initiatives on
non-litiga-
tions of means related conflict resolution.

3) & 4) Economic Sector & Regional Conflict

Again the conflicts which are occurring for supply and use and west slope and
west slope continue to be formidable barriers to orderly water supply planning and efficient use of resources. Besides the
renewed interest in irrigated water by the agriculture, the irrigation
division projects must also assess basin of origin impacts. Those
transferring water from agricultural to municipal use and vice versa
must now consider non-agricultural users when analyzing
land use change, and the farmers and irrigators themselves
are opposed by some who wish to preserve the established
economy. Life prospects and social and environmental reasons
are present. The Colorado Water Congress can be effective and vocal
supporter of non-litigation means related conflict resolution.

In my opinion, and consistent with the organization’s role to
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The Colorado State Ground Water Management Act of 1974
would cause the 17 Reclamation States to develop ground
water protection and management programs in order to receive
any funding from the Bureau of Reclamation, even for projects
now underway. The catch is that the criteria established under
this qualified ground water programs — a non-degradation standard —
would make it impossible to get Bureau of Reclamation
funding. Non-degradation standard means even the EPA will
tell you is unwise and unattainable.

Perhaps the most egregious example of ill-conceived water
policy is the "federal water right" concept that the
Congressmen Miller and Celotto attempted to add to the Reclamation
Reform Act of 1982. This amendment would have given federal
bureaucrats the power arbitrarily to decide which water
Reclamation law exists and to slip full-cost charges on certain
types of trust and farm management arrangements — even
through the Reclamation Act itself permits the low cost of
such arrangements. In other words, you would have been
declared guilty, without a fair hearing, it would be up to you to
attempt to prove your innocence, and the Constitution would
be smothered under a weight of that presumption of guilt.

Don’t kid yourself, all of these efforts are directed at one
defaulting - the construction of western water development
and the Bureau of Reclamation programs for water users. If
you believe that water development and the Bureau of Recla-
mation are essential to the health of our local communities and the
western water community to become again the unified force
that it once was.

Water development would be a good place to start rebuilding
a regional consensus. There have been a lot of piecemeal changes
and potential threats to water rights over the past several years.

The trouble with this is not only to take a lookful at what
we have done and what we ought to be doing. National
policies are being developed and set, by both Congress and
some branches of the Administration, that will affect all of
the western States. With the changes likely to be brought about
by increased emphasis on conservation and water marketing and
growing concern over wilderness water rights and intrans
flows, it is in the west for the 1983 Congress to make some decisions about its
future. If the Reclamation states can speak with one voice on a
policy, they have a much greater chance of influencing the
outcome of events if they speak with 17 conflicting voices.

It might be nice to sit around and talk about the merits of this
idea for the next several years. But if we do that, we won’t
get anywhere. We must begin rebuilding the western consensus
on water issues.

I can not recall a time when there was a greater number and
variety of water users, a greater number of water users, a greater number and
variety of water users, and a greater number of water users, and a greater number and
variety of water users. If we cannot achieve regional consensus,
we may not be able to achieve national consensus.

If the water user is not selected to fill critical positions are hostile to the views of the western states
on water issues, your Senators certainly ought to know about it.

If the west had unified views on the important issues, then
those views could be used as a latum test to determine whether
a nominee is deserving of western support.

A few months ago, people "in the know" thought it was
impossible to reorganize and restructure the Bureau of Recla-
mation. Nevertheless, we had our goal, and we kept it at it. Today,
we are in the process of doing the impossible. If the west
can successfully set a regional agenda, and stick to it, the west
can see much of that agenda fulfilled. You may need to negotiate
a bit, you may need to give a little on certain points, but you
can see what you set out to do.

Earlier this month, I watched a panel discussion on the future
of American politics. One of the panelists noted that, given
the current population and the current political climate, the
West’s political leadership lies in the south and in the west. It’s hard
to argue with the numbers. But let’s set demographics aside.

Whether or not the population of the West will offer the
specific leadership for our Nation’s future, let’s at least demon-
strate the potential leadership by the example of the West. An
declaring to determine what any one advantage can exist. It is time for the west to
determine the increase in spending more and more to time for that less and less gets done is no way to way to
to advance our goals, set our goals, set our goals, and work for these goals.

As we set our goals, let us remember, we are not simply water users, we are not simply Californians or Arizonans or Mississippians, we are Americans.

The preceding remarks were made by James W Ziglar, Assis-
tant Secretary of Interior for Water and Science at the Colorado
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and source of its profits. But the Fish and Wildlife Service is not in the profit chase — at least, not in the conventional sense. And the Fish and Wildlife Service is not in the business of granting MBRA's. It is supposed to be about the very common public business of managing, safeguarding, and restoring the fish and wildlife resources that each and every citizen in this nation and future generations shares as a public trust. 

And the program management system I found in place in the Service was not serving the public nor saving its resources. It was serving the individual or agency or political amour propre of a few powerful people, and in turn, the needs of those people were being served. (It was, however, vastly improved in subsequent years.) It was a system that had been built on rhetoric and a determination to talk rather than to listen. It was a system that invited the Service to plan, program, and manage the fish and wildlife resources of this nation in a manner that human creativity and personal responsibility were virtually relegated out of the equation. The role of director had become subsumed to that of one of associates — the program managers who, in turn, could and did exercise enormous discretionary authority over the budgets of regional offices. And yet, in all this, there was a hidden decision, a clear-cut yes or no, was ever made, or by whom. 

Some folks tried to convince me just how sophisticated and something of a system, but I just was not buying. I was seeing too little being done for resources. I was seeing field staffs becoming discouraged. And I was seeing the various publics we deal with becoming confused, impatient, and justifiably angry.

In 1986, I had the good fortune (at least, I still believe it to be good) to become Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. And I decided that some very essential changes had to be made to the structure of the outfit, to how we did business.

One of the first things we did was to build a chain of command. I directed that we become a line/staff management system. It meant, simply enough, that when a boss spoke, a worker would talk to that boss and to no one else, and that this occurred on a new line or a committee vote. It meant, "Get the job done." Early on, some folks just didn’t quite grasp what I was trying to do. A few said it was not the job of a governor or of a committee. It meant. "Get the job done." Early on, some folks just didn’t quite grasp what I was trying to do. A few said it was not the job of a governor or of a committee. But it is not the job of anyone; it is the job of the Service.

In sum, what I have tried to do is redirect the Service back to what I see as its basic mission: to conserve, protect, and enhance the fish and wildlife resources of this nation for the continuing benefit of the American people. I want action, not mere words. I want progress on the ground, not paper plans. 

Organizational, the Service is distinctly different from what it was two years ago. It is now structured to act, not merely to talk.

Philosophically, there are important indicators that we are making progress in overcoming some of the "Good Guys Versus Bad Guys" mentality that characterized so many early Service dealings with fish and wildlife. Many of our staffs have learned that cooperation can be a far more valuable means of saving resources than confrontation. When I first arrived with the Service, the progress the Service has made in less than two years. Please, but not satisfied. We still have a ways to go. But I will touch on the future of the outfit a little later on.

Running a fish and wildlife agency is a very demanding job. There are at least two very important but related topics which tend to serve as indicators of our mutual progress — a report card, if you will, on how well the Service and the various publics we serve are mastering the lessons of communication and cooperation.

The first subject, of course, is the Colorado River. The pact that signed in 1973 is yet another indicator of such progress. We all know that without the dedication of the Water Congress the signing of the pact would not have happened! Interior Secretary Hodel, Governor Romer of Colorado, Governor Sullivan of Wyoming, Governor Bangter of Utah, as well as William Clagett of the Department of Energy’s Western Area Power Administration and myself, all agreed to sign the document — that the needs of endangered fishes will be identified and met, while still allowing water development integrally.

The pact is a first step for recovery efforts by the Service to protect these rare fish in a way that addresses states’ water rights and the needs of fish and wildlife resources. It also allows the Service to monitor the progress of the fish and water development and management in this basin. The recovery program outlines what needs to be done to recover three endangered fishes over the next 15 years. The program could include additional water rights to meet the minimum flow needs of these species, as well as construction of fish passageways and hatcheries. We still have a long way to go. We have just begun a 15-year journey. Everything will not go perfectly, and we should not expect it to. But look how far we have progressed in the past 15 years.

Look back to the 1970’s, to the confrontation, distrust, and outright hostility, to 1978, the Service formally concluded the agency. The future hold quite a lot for the Fish and Wildlife Service. It can if it can effectively communicate biological needs and at the same time sensibly address valid societal interests.

The future hold quite a lot for the Fish and Wildlife Service. It can if it can effectively communicate biological needs and interests and other state and federal agencies. And a further subdivision includes three work groups — Hydrology, Biology, and Program Management.

The Service and the Bureau of Reclamation are proceeding with the implementation of a $1 billion, 50-year plan to improve management of water resources consistent with the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as well as with the state water rights systems of the three states.

The Colorado River is so important we will do our utmost to achieve sound and practical conservation measures.

The Coordinating Committee has a subgroup — the Steering Committee — made up of the same organizations found in the Platte River Coordinating Committee. It will be responsible for overseeing all the components to understanding our current role. Over the long run, the development and management of water resources is a vital component of our nation’s future. As we move forward, we must continue to strengthen the role of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the recovery of endangered species, and I believe that the signed pact marks an historic achievement.
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CWC OFFICERS

TOM GRISWOLD

Tom Griswold, Director of Utilities for the City of Aurora, was elected CWC President at the 30th Annual CWC Convention. In his current position, Tom is responsible for executive management, direction and control of the City’s water, wastewater, and storm drainage systems.

Griswold holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil & Environmental Engineering from the University of Colorado. In addition, he also holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Business from C.U.

Besides being a Registered Professional Engineer in Colorado, Tom Griswold is a member of the Metropolitan Water Providers Executive Committee and the South Platte Participation Project Steering Committee. Tom has also served as Chairman of the Micro Water Conservation, Inc. Tom is also a member of AWWA, APWA and WPCF.

DOUGLAS C. LOCKHART

Doug Lockhart, Manager, Public Service Company of Colorado Western Division in Grand Junction, was elected CWC Vice President at the Annual Business Meeting in January.

Although Doug was born in Steamboat Springs, Colorado, at an early age he moved with his family to Wyoming, where he graduated from the Cheyenne High School, and later attended the University of Wyoming. He was first employed as a marketing representative for the Light, Fuel and Power Company, a subsidiary company of Public Service Company of Colorado.

In 1970, he moved to Colorado as a member of the Public Service Company management team and has since held such positions with that company as District Manager, Estes Park; Marketing Manager, Platte Valley Division in Brighton; Manager, High Plains Division in Sterling; and Manager, Mountain Division.

Mr. Lockhart joined the Board of CWC in 1986 as the Industrial Users representative for the Western Slope. He is also currently on the Board of Directors of the Mesa County United Way, the Mesa County Economic Development Corporation, and the Hilltop Rehabilitation Hospital. In addition, he is a member of the Grand Junction Rotary Club and a director of the Colorado National Bank of Grand Junction.

Doug is married, and he and his wife, Naomi, have two children, Jeff and Jandi.

LARRY D. SIMPSON

Larry D. Simpson of Loveland, Secretary-Manager of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District and Municipal Subdistrict, was elected CWC Treasurer at the January annual convention of the Congress. For a four-year period (1972-76), Simpson was a member of the Larimer-Weld Regional Planning Commission and then the Larimer-Weld Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Larimer-Weld COG.

Simpson has a civil engineering degree from the Colorado School of Mines. In addition, he has a Master’s degree in Business Administration from California State University at Los Angeles. He has also done graduate work in engineering at the University of Southern California. Simpson is a licensed civil engineer in both Colorado and California.

Simpson is a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Four States Irrigation Council, Water Resources Congress and the National Water Resources Association. Larry is married and he and his wife, Ruby, have two children (?). Larry also does some farming in both the Loveland and Lucerne areas.

JOHN R. FETCHER

CWC Immediate Past-President John Fetcher, a consulting engineer and rancher, has been a well-known leader in state and local water activities for many years. He currently holds the position of Secretary-Director of the Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District in Steamboat Springs.

John holds a B.S. degree in Business Administration from the University of Colorado at Boulder, and a Master’s degree in Business Administration & Engineering from Harvard. He was employed by the Budd Company, Philadelphia, as a technical representative in Paris from 1936-37 for the construction of stainless steel railway passenger cars for the French railways, and later as Chief Plant Engineer for that company, until 1949, when he moved to Steamboat Springs to start in the cattle business with his brother.

He served as President of the Steamboat Ski area from 1959 to 1970 and was instrumental in the successful promotion of that area. He has also served as Manager of the Mount Werner Water & Sanitation District, as a representative on the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission and as Chairman of the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

RICHARD D. “DICK” MACRAVEY

Richard D. “Dick” MacRavey is in his ninth year as Secretary and Executive Director of the Colorado Water Congress. MacRavey is no stranger to Colorado.

He served three terms as Executive Director to the Larimer-Weld COG and seven years as Executive Director of the Colorado Municipal League. During his tenure with the Larimer-Weld COG, he was responsible for developing and guiding the early stages of the Larimer-Weld “205” Water Quality Management Planning effort.

In 1970, MacRavey served as Chairman of the Colorado Good Government Committee for the promotion of the State Constitutional Amendments One (Governor’s Cabinet), Two (State Civil Service Reorganization) and Three (Local Government Modernization). All three amendments were approved overwhelmingly by the people of Colorado.

MacRavey is a member of the American Society of Association Executives, Colorado Society of Association Executives, Colorado Water Congress, American Water Works Association, and International City Management Association (cooperating member). MacRavey is the father of three adult children (Pat, Mike, and Mark). MacRavey has a bachelor’s degree in science from the University of Wisconsin and a master of science degree in public administration from the University of Colorado.

The Colorado Water Congress presents
A Video Tape

“THE HISTORY OF COLORADO WATER LAW”

by Glenn G. Saunders

This video tape of “The History of Colorado Water Law” by Glenn G. Saunders is a must for any lawyer, engineer or student of Colorado’s rich and exciting history of water law. Mr. Saunders has experienced and participated in over half of that history, and his observations and comments are certainly educational and worthy of preservation. The video is two hours in length and is VHS. The tape, incidentally, was produced on September 24, 1987 at the Sixth Annual CWC Colorado Water Law Seminar. The supply of this visual-oral history is very limited — so don’t delay in sending your order to the Colorado Water Congress. The price is $100.00 (tax and mailing included). You may want to consider purchase of this tape for a school or college library.

“THE HISTORY OF COLORADO WATER LAW”

by Glenn G. Saunders

Name:
Address:
City, State, Zip:
Payment enclosed: $ ___ ($100/tape ordered) Bill me:
Signature Date

Colorado Water Rights

July 17, 1988 — COLORADO WATER CONGRESS 8TH ANNUAL LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP — Grand Junction

June 19-23, 1988 — AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE — Orlando, Florida

July 24-26, 1988 — NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION WESTERN WATER SEMINAR — Key­ stone, Colorado

September 29-30, 1988 — COLORADO WATER CONGRESS SEMINAR ON COLORADO WATER LAW — Holiday Inn Northglenn, Northglenn, Colorado

The Colorado Water Congress holds a comprehensive annual calendar of workshops, seminars and educational programs. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver (303) 837-0812.
What Price Leadership... Is It Worth It?

by Dr. Randy H. Hamilton

I ask your indulgence as I recount for you the consequences willing and knowingly undertaken by some in our history, who were "leaders" and who served the public interest and who stood for what was right. I refer to the 55 men who signed the Declaration of Independence...

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors: about ten percent of the total. They were tortured before they died in captivity. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary War. Another two had sons captured and imprisoned.

Nine of the 55 fought and died from wounds received on the battlefield or the hardships of the Revolutionary War - a war dedicated to the notion of local self-government.

What kind of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers or large plantation owners. They were men of means, well-educated men - persons much like you, the local government leaders of today. They signed the Declaration knowing full well that the penalty was DEATH if they were captured. They pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader saw his ships swept from the seas by the British navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts. Poverty was his "reward" for "leadership" and government service. He died in rags.

Thomas McKean was so hounded by the British that he was forced to live in fear, moving his family constantly. He served in the Congress without pay. His family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him and poverty was his "reward" for leadership.

Vandals or soldiers or both looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., a Captain of Artillery, saw that his home had been taken over as Headquarters for the British General, Cornwallis. The owner of the house, Nelson, went to his Commanding Officer, General George Washington, saluted and said: "Sir, permission to open fire on the enemy's headquarters." Washington quietly answered, "Permission granted." Nelson opened fire and destroyed his own home at Yorktown, the turning point of the revolution. Captain Nelson died a bankrupt!

Francis Lewis was driven from his wife's bedside as she lay dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, to return home after the war to find his wife dead, his children vanished. A few weeks later he died of exhaustion - and some say a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such is the story and sacrifices to local self-government that are part of American history. These men cast a long shadow in which you inescapably stand. It is there. You are there. Your city stands in that shadow along with you.

The men whose story I recount were not wild-eyed ruffians or rabble rousers or "activists." They were soft-spoken men of means and education. They had security. They had their businesses and professions, their homes and occupations. But, they valued liberty - local self-government - more. Standing tall and straight they unwaveringly pledged: "For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor."

Their shadow, in which you stand, is inescapable. It may stand! Now let me hear you gripe about your "sacrifices" for leadership when the board meeting runs past midnight.

Dr. Randy H. Hamilton is Dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Golden Gate University in San Francisco, California. His speech, "What Price Leadership - Is It Worth It?" was delivered at the Colorado Water Congress' 35th Annual Convention on January 29, 1988.