Presentation and Debate by Representatives of the Democrat and Republican Parties on

"Whose Right is the Right Right for 1996?"

The two speakers were Lieutenant Governor, Gail Schoettler (D) and State Treasurer, Bill Owens (R).

The proceedings were held on January 26, 1996 at the Colorado Water Congress' 38th Annual Convention.

Fred Brown, political editor and associate editor at The Denver Post moderated.

Bill Owens won the coin toss and, therefore, opened with his remarks first. Gail Schoettler followed and her remarks were followed by a 20-minute period of questions from the audience after which each of the speakers was given a brief period to sum up.

MR. OWENS: Thank you very much, with his remarks first. Gail Schoettler followed and her remarks were followed by a 20-minute period of questions from the audience after which each of the speakers was given a brief period to sum up.

I appreciate that introduction. Since becoming treasurer, I've had the opportunity to speak to a lot of groups. I have been invited to speak at numerous meetings, from Rotary Clubs to large Chambers of Commerce.

A couple of weeks ago, I was invited to speak to a large dinner meeting, attended by several hundred people. And as sometimes happens, the speech went really well. I could tell from the way the people were listening, and from the questions afterwards. And when we finished, I had a lot of people come up to the head table to continue the discussion. I was really feeling very good about myself. I was driving home that night with my wife, Frances, and I said, "You know, Frances, I wonder how many really important people there are in this world?"

And she said, "One less than you think, dear."

Friends, this has proven to be a pattern. It's been said that Bill Clinton speaks from the middle, but governors from the left. Time after time after time, this has been true, whether you're talking about welfare or Medicare reform or tax cuts or the need for a balanced budget. The fact is, even I agree with what he says; it's just that I disagree with what he does.

That simple fact, that Bill Clinton speaks from the middle but governs from the left, can be explained by the fact that his political base is so different that the base of the country.

You all know that President Clinton was elected president with 43 percent of the vote — the smallest winning percentage since the 1960s. But of more importance is how that base was composed. During exit polling conducted on election day 1992, the day that President Clinton was elected, the voters said by a 55 to 36 percent margin that they wanted less spending and less government. But President Clinton's voters in that same election exit poll said that they wanted more government and more spending by a 55 to 36 percentage. President Clinton's base represents an exact mirror-image difference of the total electorate which by a 55 to 36 percent margin says that it wants a little less government, but President Clinton's base says that it wants more government.

So on issue after issue, President Clinton has to sound like a moderate when, in fact, his base is much more liberal, as he in fact may be. I simply don't know where he actually is and I really don't know what he actually believes.

I do remember what occurred when President Clinton and his party controlled not only the White House but also both houses of Congress for the first two years of his presidency. Do you remember the centerpiece of the Clinton presidency, that ill-conceived massively bureaucratic Robo-Goldberg attempt to socialize one-seventh of the American economy we called the "Clinton Health Care Plan"? The "problem" our government was focused on just two years ago was how to make government bigger.

Do you remember the largest tax increase in American history? How in 1993, just one year after promising to cut taxes in his 1992 election, President Clinton instead raised taxes $258 billion. What we were discussing just two years ago were tax increases, not tax cuts.

And then to compound that error, President Clinton told a bunch of Democrat contributors in 1995 that, "It might surprise you to know that I think I raised taxes too much, too." I happen to have been in Washington when that story hit, and it was the banner headline in The Washington Times. And the lead says: "Clinton's tax confession spurs conservatism in both parties. President
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PETER NICHOLS

Peter Nichols, 67, of Carbondale, was elected CWC Vice President in 1996. Peter is a management consultant whose practice emphasizes strategic planning and the management of water resources. He also directs professional development courses for the Colorado Outward Bound School. Peter was previously General Manager of Lucas's oil shale operation in western Colorado. A former Colorado legislative staffer, Nichols has been active on the local, state, regional and federal political scenes. He has served on numerous governmental task forces and is currently vice-chair of the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission. Peter is serving his fourth term on the CWC Board of Directors and is active on the State Affairs Committee in the past.

Nichols holds a Masters Degree in administration from the University of Colorado and a Bachelors degree in political science and biology from Colorado College.

DOUG KEMPER

Doug Kemper, 50, of Aurora, was elected CWC Treasurer in January. Doug is the Manager of Water Resources for the City of Aurora. He is in charge of raw water operations, water resources planning, and one of the largest agricultural rewater projects in the nation. He is now in his eighth year with the City. Prior to working with Aurora, he worked five years as a consulting engineer chiefly with Rocky Mountain Consultants, Inc.

He is currently serving his fourth term on the Board of Directors of the Colorado Water Congress and has been active in most of this organization's special and standing committees.

DOUG KEMPER

Doug has a Master's Degree from the University of Colorado in Civil Engineering/Water Resources and a Bachelor's Degree from Vanderbilt University in Environmental and Water Resources Engineering. He is a registered Professional Engineer.

KIT KIMBALL

Kit Kimball was elected CWC Assistant Treasurer at the January 1996 convention. Ms. Kimball is a Vice President of The Jefferson Group specializing in mining and natural resource issues.

Ms. Kimball has over 20 years of experience in the natural resource/public policy arena. Before joining The Jefferson Group, she managed the governmental affairs program for Amvac, Inc., a large international resource development company, both in Washington, D.C. and at the state level. In this capacity, she successfully influenced the development of federal and state policies and negotiated numerous rulemakings.

Previously, Ms. Kimball was the principal in Kimball and Associates, a natural resources consulting firm. Ms. Kimball served as the environmental legislative assistant to Senator James McClure (R-ID) in Washington, D.C. She was also Vice President of a Washington, D.C. consulting firm where she represented The Western Regional Council, an organization of western Fortune 500 companies.

Ms. Kimball has served in numerous roles for the Colorado Mining Association and is the past Chairman of that organization. She serves on the Board of Directors of the Colorado Water Congress, the Colorado Water Education Foundation and was a Governor appointee to the Colorado Center for Environmental Management. Ms. Kimball also sits on the University of Colorado Natural Resources Law Center Advisory Board.

Ms. Kimball holds two Masters degrees; one in Business Administration from the University of Colorado and one in Counseling from the University of Montana. Her B.A. is from the University of Idaho.

JIM HOKIT

Jim Hokit, 54, CWC Immediate Past President has lived in Montrose since 1969 and has worked for the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association since 1973. In 1981, he became General Manager responsible for the overall operation of the Project.

He has served on the CWC Board of Directors since 1981. Jim is a member of the river water Users Association and Four States Irrigation Council for which he served as president in 1996. During the past seven years, he has served as a director for the Montrose Economic Development Council and he is also a board member of the Montrose County Chamber of Commerce.

Jim and his wife Betty have three adult children.

RICHARD D. “DICK” MacRAVEY

Richard D. "Dick" MacRavey, 65, is in his seventeenth year as Secretary and Executive Director of the Colorado Water Congress. MacRavey is no stranger to Colorado. He served three years 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 '86 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. During 1988, MacRavey was appointed by the Legislative Leadership and served as one of the 46 members of COLORADOVISION 2000. In 1989, the Legislative Leadership appointed MacRavey to the 16 - member Legislative Council Subcommittee on Long-Range Planning for State Government.

During 1969-71, MacRavey served on the National League of Cities Board of Directors. He is presently a member of the Board for the Colorado Water PAC and the Colorado Water Education Foundation. 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 and his wife, Mary, are the parents of six adult children and two step-grandchildren. MacRavey has a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Wisconsin - Madison and a Master of Science degree (in public administration) from the University of Colorado - Boulder. During the Korean conflict, he served with the U.S. Navy.
Hobbs Appointed to Colorado Supreme Court

Governor Roy Romer appointed Gregory J. Hobbs, Jr. of Denver to the Colorado Supreme Court on April 18, 1996. Hobbs will fill the vacancy created by the retirement of Justice William H. Erickson.

"Greg Hobbs is a man of strong character, intelligence and scholarship," Romer said in announcing the appointment at a press conference in his office. "He has been an exceptionally successful advocate in his chosen field of the law, and I'm confident that his skills and character will serve him well as he moves into this new role.

Hobbs, senior partner of the Denver law firm of Hobbs, Trout & Raley, P.C., has practiced law for 25 years, specializing in water, environmental, administrative, and state and federal legislative law. Prior to establishing Hobbs, Trout & Raley in 1993, he was a partner at Davis, Graham & Stubbs from 1980 - 1992. From 1975 - 1979, he served in the Colorado Attorney General's Office as First Assistant Attorney General in the Natural Resources Section, and later as Special Prosecutor and Acting Director of the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit.

He also worked as an enforcement attorney with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and as a law clerk to 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge William E. Doyle. Prior to earning his law degree, he served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Columbia, and was a sixth grade teacher in New York City.

Hobbs earned his law degree from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1971, where he was awarded the Order of the Coff. He also graduated Magna Cum Laude with a bachelor’s degree in History from the University of Notre Dame.

Hobbs has been admitted to the Bar in Colorado and California, and is a member of the Denver, Colorado and American Bar Associations. He also serves on the National Council of Boy Scouts of America, the Denver Area Council Boy Scouts, Colorado Water Congress, and the National Water Resource Association.

Romer also had high praise for Denver District court Chief Judge Connie Peterson and Colorado Court of Appeals Judge Sandra Rothenberg; the other two nominees forwarded to him by the Supreme Court Nominating Commission. "I was presented with three strong candidates and it was a difficult choice," Romer said, "but I know that Greg Hobbs will serve the state of Colorado well as a Justice on the Supreme Court."

In accepting the appointment, Hobbs said that he was "deeply honored. I am excited by this new challenge, and look forward to serving the people of Colorado."

Hobbs, 51, and his wife, Bobbie, have been married for 29 years. They have a son, Daniel, and a daughter, Emily Hobbs-Wright, who, along with her husband Mark Wright, joined Governor Romer and her father at the April 18th press conference.

Left to right: Bobbie Hobbs, Emily Hobbs-Wright, and Justice Greg Hobbs

Calendar of COMING EVENTS

August 7 - 10, 1996 — NWRA WESTERN WATER SEMINAR — Yosemite Tenaya Lodge Fish Camp, CA. For more information, contact the NWRA office in Arlington, Virginia: 703-524-1544.

August 22 - 23, 1996 — CWC SUMMER CONVENTION — Village at Breckenridge, 505 S. Park, Breckenridge, CO. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.

September 26 - 27, 1996 — CWC ANNUAL COLORADO WATER LAW SEMINAR — Holiday Inn Northglenn, I-25 & 120th Avenue, Northglenn, CO. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.


January 30 - 31, 1997 — CWC 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION — Holiday Inn Northglenn, I-25 & 120th Avenue, Northglenn, CO. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.

August 21 - 22, 1997 — CWC SUMMER CONVENTION — Sheraton Steamboat Resort & Conference Center, 2200 Village Inn Court, Steamboat Springs, CO. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.

CWC 1996 STATE LAWS OF INTEREST TO WATER USERS

The Colorado Water Congress will be publishing, in July, a book containing all water and water-related laws of the second regular session of the sixtieth General Assembly. Since this book is over 175 pages in length; and paper, printing, postage and labor are significant costs; the price of the book is $50 (CWC members) and $100 (non-members) — plus appropriate sales tax, if applicable. Furthermore, since there will be only 25 copies of this book available, distribution will be governed in order of requests. Incidentally, the final status of all bills introduced during the 1996 session are included in this edition, plus the appropriate citations from the Office of Legislative Legal Services. Readers are urged to place their order for the "1996 Colorado Laws Enacted of Interest to Water Users" as quickly as possible. Call or write the Colorado Water Congress, 1390 Logan Street, Suite 312, Denver, CO 80203, or phone 303-837-0812.
Continued from Page 8

Owens and Schoettler: “Whose Right is the Right Right for 1996?”, cont.

Clinton’s George Bush style of confession that he raised taxes too much in 1993, a year after promising a tax cut, had the White House on the ropes yesterday as aides tried to diffuse his explosive comments.

So what is the problem? It’s what you heard in the State of the Union Address is not always what you get. It’s a fact government has gotten too big and currently too much of our resources, resources that we earn and that we have a right to spend them our way. To be sure, the government has grown, I’d like to share with you a few numbers.

In 1990, the average American family of four paid two percent of its income in federal taxes. By 1997, that number had grown to 17 percent by 1997, and is projected to grow to 24-25 percent, and if the present trend is not stopped by this Congress, it will grow to 30 percent in the year 2000.

Government today consumes 40 percent of our gross domestic product. And a child born this year will pay $187,000 in taxes on interest alone on the national debt through his or her life.

If you know, it used to be an American tradition that we pay our children’s college costs. Now we’re threatening to leave the children the farm; we’re selling the farm and leaving our children the mortgage. That’s not right, and that’s not compassionate. These dollars that I’ve been talking about are not being spent on infrastructure as they used to be spent. We’ve been spending billions on defense systems and water projects. We’re not investing these dollars in the capital of our country. No, we’re spending it on consumption, on current transfer payments, and not on investment. And that’s the real problem with our federal spending priorities.

On issue after issue, the battle in Washington between Republicans and Democrats is ever small increases in programs versus large increases in programs. I can give you example after example of how Republican attempts to merely slow the rate of increase in the cost of programs are attacked and vetoed by the Democrats and by President Clinton who falsely call these slower rates of growth cuts.

I first saw this in the school lunch program earlier this year. Owens said the Republicans were going to cut the program, “starve the poor,” “balance the budget on the backs of the children.” I had the opportunity to debate Leon Panetta, the White House Chief of Staff, on this very program just after NewsHour on the President’s Cabinet.

On that program, I pointed out that the President was going to cut school lunch program spending by 4-5 percent per year less each year for the next five years; whereas, we Republicans had an agreement with the Senate, with the states, to continue the school lunch program.

One of the more persuasive arguments that I remember is that the states would get these programs without the burdensome and expensive federal oversight by the bureaucracy in Washington.

I next see this between rhetoric and reality on Medicare. On April 3 of this year, the Medicare Board of Governors announced that Medicare will go bankrupt in seven years unless changes are made.

Clinton, while saying time after time that he supports a balanced budget, is also warning us that we need to move fast to balance the budget in seven years. Only now he says he does, in fact, favor seven years, but by using his own numbers.

The result of all of this has been that President Clinton, while saying time after time that he supports a balanced budget, is also warning us that we need to move fast to balance the budget in seven years. When 34 Democrats joined one Republican in voting against the balanced budget amendment saying it was not needed; this amendment was defeated in Congress last year. This amendment lost because while it achieved a majority of votes in the U.S. Senate, it fell short of the two-thirds vote that it required. It was killed in the U.S. Senate when 34 Democrats joined one Republican in voting against a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Clinton administration actively lobbied to defeat the balanced budget amendment saying it was not needed; that Congress and the president should balance the budget themselves. But now when Congress tries to do exactly that, President Clinton vetoed its balanced budget proposal.

While I focused this morning on the larger issues which affect us all such as the deficit, balanced budget and Medicare, it’s also important to remember the difference between the two parties on issues of particular concern to the West and to water providers. Which party do you think understands the need to reform and refocus the intent and reality of the Endangered Species Act? Which party do you think understands the real problems of our smaller communities face in trying to meet the expense and compliance costs of the Safe Drinking Water Act? In short, which party understands the difference between real people and minnows? And which party has given us Bruce Babbitt, and is he a friend of the West and those who favor responsible water development?

I believe that both parties have made mistakes. Neither party is right all the time. But on balance, and on the great issues facing this country and our future, I think that the Republican view of less government and more personal freedom is the vision that best represents what is good for our country and what is good for our people.

Mr. BROWN: It’s been widely assumed that these two people are both going to run for governor in 1998. But I think that if Bill decides to run for president, he’s got his speech already.

And now we’ll hear 15 minutes from another point of view from the Lieutenant Governor of Colorado, Gail Schoettler.

MS. SCHOETTLER: Thank you. I thought he was running for president, listening to that speech. Aren’t you supporting somebody else for president?

MR. OWENS: I’m not supporting Bill Clinton.

MS. SCHOETTLER: I get it. He’s probably more visible than the one you are, though. I thought it was really important that Bill be on the left and I be on the right just so you’d understand our point of view. But now I see from your vantage point, he’s on the right and I’m left, and so now I’m confused.

There are too many rights in this country. I wanted to spend some time on Medicare because it really is the core issue right now. Medicare is a $17 billion bill, much less on money than on principle.

I’ll spend a moment on welfare, Medicare, and then talk a little bit about taxes. The budget. Most of us don’t know a whole lot about how taxes are structured, but essentially there are three main parts. The first is entitlements and that includes Social Security which, incidentally, is not on the table. Nobody has the courage to take on Social Security, Republicans or Democrats.

The other principal entitlements are Medicaid, Medicare, and AFDC, which is really the core of the welfare program.

The next piece of the budget is discretionary spending, and that is divided between defense spending and non-defense spending. And perhaps you’ve heard on the news this morning the latest defense bill is $7 billion more than what the president had requested and probably will sign even though he doesn’t like it.

Non-defense spending is most of the rest of what we call the federal government. It’s environmental protection, including cleanup. It is most departments. It is agriculture, it is subsidies and student loans and so on.

And finally, who knows the largest piece of the federal budget?

MR. OWENS: Interest.

MS. SCHOETTLER: Interest on the debt. So, of course, that is not an item of discretionary spending, although, I think the Republicans think it might be; Bill. But it’s really not.

So when you look at places to cut, you can look at some of the entitlements. Since Social Security is not on the table, you’re not looking at the largest entitlement.

You can look at non-defense spending which is where most of the cuts are going to come from.

And if you’re looking at how you cut a budget very drastically in order to have a balanced budget — plus if you want to have a tax cut — you’re looking at very substantial cuts in non-discretionary spending.

The current status of the talks is really this: President Clinton has agreed to what the Republicans demanded — that he come up with a budget that was balanced in seven years and that was certified to be balanced by the Congressional Budget Office. He did that.

Now, the Republicans have given us a new excuse for not wanting to come to a deal on the budget and that is that they’re not like the pictures of this budget, even though it meets their demands. So it looks to me like the House Republics want it their way or no way.

As the President suggested in the State of the Union, it’s time now to try to come together and build a budget based on common ground and keep talking about those issues that still divide both parties and the more weighty issues that it looks like the Republicans are saying, Okay, let’s move on with it, our strategy of shutting down government has failed, and let’s deal with the budget.

When we look at values, number one is that we have
A Tribute to John Murphy

Long time southwest Colorado resident, community leader and water district pioneer, John Murphy, died in early December, 1995. His long time advocacy for water storage and prudent water development had a significant impact on southwestern Colorado. John was born in La Plata, New Mexico in 1922. As a young boy, his family moved up the La Plata River into Colorado and resided in the Breen area in dryland farmers. His knowledge of water and how precious it was began in these formative years on the family farm in western La Plata County. After serving in the Armed Services in World War II, John came home and became involved in the efforts of the Rural Electric Association to bring needed electricity to the rural areas of the La Plata and Archuleta Counties. Working his ways up through the La Plata Electric Association, he eventually was appointed as General Manager, a position he held until his retirement in 1985.

Along the way, John and his wife Mary raised three children, Pat, Michael, and Judy Peino. As a community leader, John served as the local chair of the Democratic Party and was involved in numerous campaigns. As a resident of Durango, John was elected to the Durango City Council, including serving as Mayor of Durango. But John’s passion was water and the need for additional storage along the La Plata and Animas Rivers in Colorado. He was a pioneer in the efforts to get the Animas-La Plata Water conservancy District formed and organized. John served as a director and president of the Animas-La Plata Water Conservancy District for many years.

Murphy went back to Washington, D.C., numerous times to provide testimony on behalf of the water users and communities in the Four Corners region. His understanding of water law, public policy and water development history in the Colorado River Basin was invaluable to the interests of the upper Colorado River Basin states. He played a key role in the successful negotiations that resulted in the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement, agreed to in 1986 and approved by Congress in 1988. John Murphy, as a husband, father, community leader, elected official, water district director and good friend to many, will be missed by all.

Hank Brown

ASPINALL AWARD NOMINATIONS & WATER LAW SCHOLARSHIPS

If interested, the following forms for your completion and return to the Colorado Water Congress office are available:

1. Nomination form for the 1997 Wayne N. Aspinall Water Leader of the Year Award;
2. Ed Boresen and W. D. Farr Scholarship (for an active member of the agricultural community) for 1996 - Colorado Water Law Seminar;
3. Glenn G. Saunders and John U. Carlson (for either a law student or an associate of a Colorado law firm) Legal Scholarship for 1996 - Colorado Water Law Seminar;
4. Bill Hornby (for either a journalism student or a reporter of a news media organization) Journalism Scholarship for 1996 - Colorado Water Law Seminar;
5. Larry D. Simpson and Ralph Adkins (for either an engineering student or a non-partner of an engineering firm) Engineering Scholarship for 1996 - Colorado Law Seminar;

The Wayne N. Aspinall Award nomination form is due at the CWC offices by August 1, 1996. The scholarship nominations are due at the CWC offices by July 1, 1996. If you are interested in any of the above forms, please call, fax or write: Colorado Water Congress, 1390 Logan St., Suite 312, Denver, CO 80203 (phone) 303-837-0812, (fax) 303-837-1607.

NEXT CWC DIRECTORY

The 1995-96 edition of the Colorado Water Almanac and Directory will be published in late July. Due to staff changes and a considerable work load involving constitutional amendment initiatives, the Directory has been delayed. The 1995-96 edition, however, will be even more informative and useful for members.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Richard D. MacRaeve, Executive Director of the Colorado Water Congress has announced the appointment of Carolyn Simon to be the new Administrative Assistant effective April 1, 1996.

Mrs. Simon has many years experience in office administration and in Associate’s degree in Accounting. She was previously associated with the law firm of Davis, Graham & Stubbs from 1978 through 1984 and has been acquainted with many of the organizations and attorneys involved in CWC’s activities.

Mrs. Simon has lived in Colorado for the past 25 years both in Denver and as a Grand Junction resident. Her hobbies include gardening, grandchildren, and traveling within the state of Colorado.
Colorado Water Congress
38th Annual Convention

Former Senate President Fred E. Anderson received his "Will play golf for $7" from Senate President Tom Norton.

The opening general session participants were (L to R) Betty Viks, Sam Meyers, Kit Kimbell, "moderator," and Attorney General Gale Norton.

The Workshop on Strategic Planning for the CWC and the NWRA provided an opportunity for a "healthy and spirited" dialogue.

The Friday panel on "Washington 1996: What's Going to Happen?" could have gone all morning. (L to R) Peter D. Nicholls, Bill Bruck, Ray Keegan, and Tim Johnson.

The Thursday luncheon speaker had an attentive audience.

The Tuesday Flow Workshop was jammed packed.

The general sessions were well attended.

Senate President Pro Tem Tim E. Jones presents Fred E. Anderson with "Tilly" Bishop of York Junction receives an honorary life membership in CWC from Fred E. Anderson.

Legislative Breakfast (L to R) Representative Janice Resor, Representative Lew Eustace, and former Senate President Fred E. Anderson "moderator".

Legislative Breakfast (L to R) Senate President Tom Norton, Senator Don Amos, Senator Tim E. Jones "Tilly" Bishop, and Senator Joan Johnson.

NCWCD President Bill Behrens (R) accepts CWC honorary life membership for W. D. Farr from CWC President Jim Hanks (L).

John Wadsworth and three former Assistant Secretaries of Interior for Water and Science Jim Zigler, Betty Hinks and John Sayre.

Lunchtime speaker John Wadsworth, General Manager, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, spoke on the "Shape of Things to Come."
Continued from Page 4 to balance the budget. And, you know, people say, "Oh, well, Democrats never talk about balancing the budget." I just want you to know that I have been out of political life for five years. I joined that board because I have long believed that we certainly have to balance the federal budget, and there are right ways and wrong ways of doing that.

I think we have to look at entitlements and that means all of them. It's not politically correct, but I think we have to look at all of the entitlements. I think we have to look at fairness and make sure that the budget is fair in terms of spreading the sacrifices that these budget cuts will bring about.

We protect children, the elderly, the disabled, and those who cannot take care of themselves. And we have to invest in our future which means educational training and basic and applied research.

We must insist on the public health and the environment.

And just to give you a quick example, one of the key areas in Colorado that is getting environmental cleanup funds is Rocky Flats. Rocky Flats has 14 1/2 tons of plutonium. It is a great hazard to everybody in the metropolitan area, and it is the only nuclear weapons site that is situated in a large metropolitan area. So the cleanup, which is happening now for Rocky Flats, is dangerous to every single one of us.

And I don't think any one of us wants to see the federal government renounce its obligations to keep its promises.

And finally, I think two more things. One is that we need to reward work. And we need to have tax relief for middle-class families — for middle-class families not upper-class families. And for Colorado we need to make sure that we have the resources within our state to take care of our own people in Colorado.

Let me spend a moment on Medicaid. At the moment, the President and the Republicans are about $30 billion apart which is a lot of money in Colorado. In rural Western Pennsylvania, Medicaid is really not a huge amount of money. The big difference is philosophical. The Republicans want to shift all the responsibility to the states without any requirements for the President and they want to put the American commitment for a safety net for children, the elderly, and disabled.

Let me just give you a couple of facts on Medicaid. Fifty percent of Medicaid recipients are children and they consume 12 percent of the Medicaid spending. Colorado spent $1,000 per child on Medicaid. Twelve percent are elderly, so our state consumes 28 percent of the spending. Fifteen percent are disabled, and consume 31 percent of the Medicaid spending.

To be eligible for Medicaid, it's not a poverty line. It's a percentage of a person's income, which is eligibility only of the mother's income, her total income, is under $4,000 a year. And if you have a working family with two working parents you simply aren't eligible.

So the central proposal that the Republicans have put forward would leave no groups entitled to any kind of medical care in this country. It also lays out less pain for big, but great pain our seven years. For example, Colorado, which has about $4 billion general fund debt, over seven years would lose $777 million in federal Medicaid funding if this proposal goes through.

Now, as Bill says, these are cuts in the growth of Medicaid but they are real cuts in the amount of money that we spend per person. And they are real cuts in our ability as state to meet the needs of the poorest members of society.

The original Republican bill that passed Congress and was vetoed by the President cut Medicaid by $182 billion in seven years. Today the gap between what it is really down to $82 billion, so the Republicans have cut their demands for cutting the budget by $100 billion. And the President's proposal is $59 billion in cuts.

Well, what's wrong with the current proposal? Colorado loses big time under this current proposal. There are some states that are getting per capita cuts of the lowest in what states — we will be getting in terms of Medicaid funding from the federal government. Colorado will get 25 percent below the average. And as I said, it's a $777 million cut over the next seven years. Alaska and New York, for example, would get $8,000 per elderly resident on Medicaid and Colorado would get $2,900.

Another thing you have to know that I have been out of political life for five years. I joined that board because I have long believed that we certainly have to balance the federal budget, and there are right ways and wrong ways of doing that.

I think we have to look at entitlements and that means all of them. It's not politically correct, but I think we have to look at all of the entitlements. I think we have to look at fairness and make sure that the budget is fair in terms of spreading the sacrifices that these budget cuts will bring about.

We protect children, the elderly, the disabled, and those who cannot take care of themselves. And we have to invest in our future which means educational training and basic and applied research. We must insist on the public health and the environment.

And just to give you a quick example, one of the key areas in Colorado that is getting environmental cleanup funds is Rocky Flats. Rocky Flats has 14 1/2 tons of plutonium. It is a great hazard to everybody in the metropolitan area, and it is the only nuclear weapons site that is situated in a large metropolitan area. So the cleanup, which is happening now for Rocky Flats, is dangerous to every single one of us. And I don't think any one of us wants to see the federal government renounce its obligations to keep its promises.

And finally, I think two more things. One is that we need to reward work. And we need to have tax relief for middle-class families — for middle-class families not upper-class families. And for Colorado we need to make sure that we have the resources within our state to take care of our own people in Colorado.

Let me spend a moment on Medicaid. At the moment, the President and the Republicans are about $30 billion apart which is a lot of money in Colorado. In rural Western Pennsylvania, Medicaid is really not a huge amount of money. The big difference is philosophical. The Republicans want to shift all the responsibility to the states without any requirements for the President and they want to put the American commitment for a safety net for children, the elderly, and disabled.

Let me just give you a couple of facts on Medicaid. Fifty percent of Medicaid recipients are children and they consume 12 percent of the Medicaid spending. Colorado spent $1,000 per child on Medicaid. Twelve percent are elderly, so our state consumes 28 percent of the spending. Fifteen percent are disabled, and consume 31 percent of the Medicaid spending.

To be eligible for Medicaid, it's not a poverty line. It's a percentage of a person's income, which is eligibility only of the mother's income, her total income, is under $4,000 a year. And if you have a working family with two working parents you simply aren't eligible.

So the central proposal that the Republicans have put forward would leave no groups entitled to any kind of medical care in this country. It also lays out less pain for big, but great pain our seven years. For example, Colorado, which has about $4 billion general fund debt, over seven years would lose $777 million in federal Medicaid funding if this proposal goes through.

Now, as Bill says, these are cuts in the growth of Medicaid but they are real cuts in the amount of money that we spend per person. And they are real cuts in our ability as state to meet the needs of the poorest members of society.

The original Republican bill that passed Congress and was vetoed by the President cut Medicaid by $182 billion in seven years. Today the gap between what it is really down to $82 billion, so the Republicans have cut their demands for cutting the budget by $100 billion. And the President's proposal is $59 billion in cuts.

Well, what's wrong with the current proposal? Colorado loses big time under this current proposal. There are some states that are getting per capita cuts of the lowest in what states — we will be getting in terms of Medicaid funding from the federal government. Colorado will get 25 percent below the average. And as I said, it's a $777 million
make sure that they grow up healthy and well-educated. I think that's the responsibility that we have. I think we're really talking about values here. And clearly, we agree on many different points. We agree, as Republicans and Democrats, that the government should not be spending more than the tax dollars coming in. That's the budget. We've been talking about it for years. And I just want to remind all of you that the person who brought forward the first major deficit reduction package in Washington D.C. was Bill Clinton, and it passed Congress. And this was after an orgy of spending under those liberal tax and spending Reagan and George Bush.

Taxes, if you look at history, are not linked to a better economy. I think that the way to do it first — in fact, trickles down economics under Ronald Reagan didn't work; it simply quadrupled our federal debt. And it didn't improve the economy as George Bush discovered. When he lost, it's the economy, stupid. I think that above all, we simply have to say to ourselves that before we give ourselves a break, that we take care of the responsibilities that we have. And to me it's a core value that if you take on a debt or if you take on a responsibility, you fulfill that before you treat yourself to something that's going to make you feel a whole lot better.

I think in terms of values, we are talking about not making sure that you should slow the growth of government and quite honestly, we're all talking about slowing the growth of government. So if you feel bad about talking about it, Bill, I don't. I think we need to slow the growth of government and I think we need to do a lot better with what we have. I think you all would agree on that.

But let's not forget the fundamental values that we as Americans have. And one of those values has always been to make sure that everybody in this society has, at least, access to opportunity, and to make sure that we in this society can provide a safety net to those among us who are least able to take care of themselves. And above all, to make sure that we create opportunity and jobs for people who can go to work to make sure that they do work for a living. I have a son who just graduated from college and thank God he finally graduated about a year ago. And he's kind of puzzling over what to do. And one of the things he said to me was, "You know, Mom, I think kids ought to be able to graduate from college and come home and live off their parents for a while." And we obviously had a bit of a disagreement about it. And I said, "Tom, you graduate on June 12 and on June 12, you're on your own." I think you'd better go figure out how to get a job and not come home to live off your parents.

I believe strongly in those American values and I think that we need to reflect those values as we talk about this budget discussion. And as we go forward, let's make sure we're clear. Let's make sure that we retain the responsibility that we, as Americans, have taken upon ourselves.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Well, we now have some time for the audience to ask questions, and we'll entertain those. I'm surprised and I guess I'm pleased, too, that neither of those speakers have said much about the media's role in all of this.

MS. SCHOUETTLER: Oh, don't get started.

MR. BROWN: But I think much of what they have talked about and much of what they have defended each of their parties against is really the media's interpretation of what's going on in Washington. And the media tend to concentrate on the conflict rather than the conflict resolution. There's a new book out by James Fallows — it's called, Breaking the News, which is a very appropriate title — in which he says that the press is still in the denial state about public unhappiness.

You can, if you want, take this from his book, "By choosing to present public life as a contest between scheming political leaders, all of whom the public should view with suspicion, the news media . . ." — and he says, "brings about an ignorance about the possibility of a better about" — "the news media bring about that very result, a self-fullfilling prophecy.

Well, if any of you have any questions for these scheming political leaders, please raise your hands. Surely, someone must have some.

MS. SCHOUETTLER: Maybe we'll ask each other.

MR. BROWN: That's right. We have questions.

QUESTION: We hear a lot about the individual party perceptions. We don't hear how those two party perceptions are going to be brought together to deal with the public's real concerns rather than the parties' concerns. We're hearing reductions in deficit. We don't hear really any discussions about reductions in debt. How are the parties going to deal with what appears to be a growing citizen distrust of the party system or the two-party system? How are we going to make it work?

MR. BROWN: Who wants to handle that first issue?

MR. BROWN: I may have to lean over to the left to get all of this. I probably have a good question. I'm not sure again — and I'm glad that Fred brought up the press because I don't know that we Americans necessarily hear what our party leaders are talking about. I think we hear interpretations of what the press thinks they're saying.

And I'm not sure that the parties are dealing with what the public wants. I don't think very good question.

We hear about reduction in deficit. We don't hear really any discussion about reduction in debt. How are the parties going to deal with what appears to be a growing citizen distrust of the party system or the two-party system? How are we going to make it work?

MR. BROWN: Who wants to handle that first issue?

MS. SCHOUETTLER: I may have to lean over to the left to get all of this. I probably have a good question. I'm not sure again — and I'm glad that Fred brought up the press because I don't know that we Americans necessarily hear what our party leaders are talking about. I think we hear interpretations of what the press thinks they're saying.

And I'm not sure that the parties are dealing with what the public wants. I don't think very good question.

We hear about reduction in deficit. We don't hear really any discussion about reduction in debt. How are the parties going to deal with what appears to be a growing citizen distrust of the party system or the two-party system? How are we going to make it work?
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stand what each party represents because it's so easy to get confused with all the numbers and the bottom lines and the negotiating points.

Then I think it's the political spin that each party tries to put on it that disgusts so many of us. Sometimes we think we're being guided by what we want in the future, and it turns out that what we want in the future -- they have a perfect example of the differences within American people as represented in the debate between the Congress and the President.

Some of you may think we should have a little more spending; that in fact we should have, perhaps, taxes for a while longer until something in the future happens to bring the deficit down. And I am certain that some of you think we need less taxes and less spending. And if we were a congress, we would find it very hard to reach agreement on the issues that Gail and I have disagreed.

Congress and the President have brought a lot of these issues on themselves in terms of how they have structured their arguments: how they've tried to sell their respective positions to the American people. But I think overall they are addressing very significant policy questions that will impact this country not just this year but for decades to come.

QUESTION: Fred, I'd like for you to put your spin on that question from the press side.

MR. OWENS: I think it's a good question. I think foreign aid, in fact, is fighting for less government spending and less taxes is that the Democrat party which is fighting for somewhat more of each.

And I think there are both legitimate points of view. I agree I disagree with one of them, but they both should be on the table.

Then I think it's the political spin that each party tries to put on it that disgusts so many of us. Sometimes we think we're being guided by what we want in the future, and it turns out that what we want in the future --

MS. SCHOETTLER: All right, Bill, no cheap political shots about Pat Schroeder. The Republicans also have huge pensions when they're coming out of Congress.

I'm in the cattle business, too. You know, I always thought that if you were really lucky, you could afford to raise cattle and live on your cattle ranch; and if you weren't lucky, you'd probably lose it. You almost never make very much money in it, but it's a wonderful business to be in.

In terms of congressional salaries, I really can't respond to that. It's not something that I think is really important in the overall scheme of things because I think it's very, very important to be able to afford to live wherever you have to work and since they're there full time, they have to live there and it's very expensive to live there. My preference would be that they be there half time and cut their salaries in half.

I'd just as soon have the state legislature meet 120 days every other year and cut their salaries in half. I don't know whether they'd agree with that or think that fair.

So I think the bigger issue is foreign aid. We are the world's only great remaining power. And I think because of that, if we're going to maintain world leadership -- which I think we must do; and I think probably all of us want to do -- we are going to have to have foreign aid.

There are many countries that are extremely poor, but that have enormous strategic importance to us. And I think that I agree with Bill on the fact that we need to target that foreign aid, but we can use it effectively to accomplish what it is we want to accomplish.

Right now one of the key things we want to accomplish is making sure that the former Soviet bloc countries that are moving towards market economies continue to move towards market economies and towards democracy.

And I think we can target it to make sure that we support those countries that are going to be peaceful allies of ours in our efforts to bring down the wall. So I don't think you can be a great power without sharing your wealth. But I do think it should be very much in our own interests when we do that.

QUESTION: You mentioned something that I think we ought to think about and that is the United States is the only remaining great power. Ten years ago, fifteen years ago, there were at least two. One of them had a foreign aid program and when that country went broke, I'd like you to kind of analyze what really happened within the boundaries of that nation. And if we're looking at going broke now, I wonder whether we've sort of set the tone for a different type of money on "feel-good" programs that we're spending on them or should we really be concerned about what's going to happen when we do go broke?

MS. SCHOETTLER: I don't know what you mean by "feel-good programs." Probably what feels good to you may feel good to me.

I think what happened in the Soviet Union is that communism simply was not a system that could sustain itself. It collapsed not because of foreign aid, it collapsed because of an economic system simply could not be maintained.

What they had was huge corporations with thousands, tens of thousands, of employees and they couldn't afford to have all those employees, especially when they were spending their production goals to meet the marketplace needs because they didn't have a marketplace. There was no common system in the way in which we pay and demand. I think it just collapsed because of its own weight.

I look at the communists who are now running for office and being elected to office in the former Soviet bloc and I think to myself, now, what is it they're running for? What is their platform because they simply cannot go back to a communist system. Russia is an example. They can't and they can't buck up all of them. So I think that that probably why the Soviet bloc failed.

I think the real advantage for us is that so many countries around the world who relied on Soviet foreign aid aren't getting it any more. And I think that one of the key reasons why in the Middle East you have Arab countries stepping up to the plate to make up since the year 2007, should we really be spending the same money that we're spending on foreign aid?

MR. OWENS: I have been to the former Soviet Union and Russia eight times in the last ten years. No state taxpayer dollars were involved; these were private trips.

I was there as recently as December as an official observer of the Russian election. I was invited to observe the election by the Russian Central Election Commission.

I would suggest that the Soviet Union collapsed for a number of reasons, one of which was that it became overextended and their military and the foreign aid that was paying for their allies and clients around the world. The Soviet Union was spending billions of dollars subsidizing Cuba. The Soviet Union was pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into Nicaragua and the former Soviet Union was heavily subsidizing the Comecon countries of the former Eastern bloc where it would sell them raw materials at below-market prices so that they could afford to buy those raw materials; where it would buy back the shoddy goods from Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, in effect, subsidizing these other inefficient economies.

The Soviet Union became overextended as an empire because it forgot to concentrate on what was really important to its own people. It lost its "feel-good" ideology -- the ideology that its system would be good for other people -- because in the way of what was in its own national interests.

So I'd suggest that there is a lesson we can learn from what happened to Russia that we can apply to your own domestic economy first. They didn't. They weren't trying to expand around the world, and their own economy wasn't strong enough to sustain that expansion.

MR. BROWN: Let's take one more question and then we'll ask each of our panelists to sum up for five minutes instead of 7-1/2 that will get us more or less back on schedule. So one last question.

QUESTION: What do you see for the elections, the Supreme election, the Labour party, the Liberal party? How do you see the future of this fall? We kind of discussed a lot of national. What's right, right for the state then? Continued on Page 11
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Let's look at how we can do the job better. Let's get away from the ideology — it's very partisan — and try to resolve this in a way that meets the needs of all American people.

I think we must insist on equity and fairness. We cannot allow the federal government to say, "Oh, you guys are doing such a great job we can just cut your funding by a third or cut your funding by half and you go out and do a great job." We will have severe crisis here in Colorado if that happens.

I think we have to insist on responsible budget and taxation policies. We have to balance the budget. We have to look at how we start reducing the federal debt. And we have to go to the political ideology and political correctness. Primarily, what we need to do is use common sense.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Lieutenant Governor Schoettler, for your comments. And now a word from our State Treasurer, Bill Owens.

MS. SCHOETTLER: Shoot. I was hoping you'd give us your prediction on who'd win the Republican primary.

MR. OWENS: You mean for the presidency?

MS. SCHOETTLER: No.

MR. OWENS: It's too early to say. We'll wait until August.

MS. SCHOETTLER: I think Bill's right that in Colorado the legislature is going to stay Republican. I think that there is a very good chance we are not going to be a Democrat to the U.S. Senate, but I agree that it's going to be a very tough, very tough race, with strong candidates on both sides.

And I think that there is a good shot that Colorado will vote for Bill Clinton. The last time was the first time in 30 years that Colorado did vote Democrat in the presidential contest. And I think that there's at least a chance depending on who the Republican nominee is, that that will happen again.

In terms of the Congress, I think it's a possibility that the Democrats will take back the House, but it's very unlikely that we'll take back the Senate.

MR. BROWN: Well, that concludes the questions. And now we'll go to the summing-up. And as agreed to previously, we'll go in reverse order from the opening statements so that Lieutenant Governor, Gail Schoettler, will have the first five minutes.

MS. SCHOETTLER: You know, one of the things I learned in politics is that brief is better so...

Washington budget debate today. I know that it's good for me to be forced to consider and be intellectually challenged concerning my own beliefs. It's always good for citizens to get a chance to see their elected officials up close and in person. So I'm glad that you took time from your schedule to hear from us this morning.

When Gail talks about the Ronald Reagan and George Bush deficits and how those two men, goad, all by themselves, tripled or perhaps quadrupled the deficit, I'm reminded of the fact that not one of their budgets was adopted by Congress. In fact, Congress, until 1994, for the previous 40 years had been heavily Democrat, so don't blame the deficit on those two Presidents.

I was a page to Democratic Speaker of the House Jim Wright, back in 1967 and 1968, and even then the Congress was deficit spending. And so it's easy and partisan to blame that deficit on President Reagan and President Bush, but I would suggest that the Democratic Congress has just a tiny piece of the responsibility for those deficits.

The battle lines are being drawn and they're being drawn over very important issues. These issues are very important to the future of our country. These issues are very important to the future of our country. We do need to slow the growth in federal spending. We don't want to cut all we have to do is slow the growth in federal programs because our economy is growing enough that more tax revenues are being collected each year. So by cutting that growth rate to four, five, or six percent a year instead of the ten percent per year that the federal budget had been growing, we can, in fact, balance the budget without having any of those consequences that my friends on the other side charge will happen.

We need to reform Medicare. Remember, the Medicare trustees themselves said that Medicare will go bankrupt in seven years. Three of the people who signed that are in President Clinton's cabinet. Medicare will go bankrupt in seven years unless we reform that system. The Republicans are trying to do that. It's been tough because they've been accused of "gutting" and "surgery" and cutting Medicare when, in fact, they're increasing Medicare spending by more than $100 billion over the next six years. We simply have to reform Medicare.

We have to return power to the states. We have a very, very strong federal government and there are important things that the federal government does. But our 50 states are wonderful laboratories. And as you look at what's happened in the states, states like Michigan and Wisconsin and Massachusetts, where governors are reining out, taking control, and running programs efficiently, that's the sort of system we ought to have where we can learn from the states, not be dictated to from the federal government.

And we must cut that deficit. Everybody's in favor of cutting the deficit until you actually apply programs to that equation. And then you're "savoring" and "gutting" and "crippling" those programs. We have to cut the deficit. My children can't afford $187,000 in taxes just to pay the interest on the deficit during their lifetime. That's not fair to them. And so that means that we must make the tough decisions: tough decisions to slow the increased growth in spending of the federal government for the good of our children.

Friends, I strongly believe that we must balance the budget because we're not spending our money anymore, we're spending our children's money. And that's not just bad economics, it's just plain wrong.

Thank you, very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you all for attending. You know, I was a little surprised to hear that our treasurer was actually a page to...

QUESTION: A democrat?

MR. BROWN: — Representative Wright. And that brings us full circle now because that answers the question, Whose right is the right right? Remember as you leave now, you have your choice of turning either to the left or to the right.

MS SCHOETTLER: How about right down the center?

Thank you, again, for attending.

Gail Schoettler was elected Lieutenant Governor in 1994 and from 1986 through 1994 she was the State Treasurer managing the state's $2 billion investment portfolio. Before that she was President of the Douglas County School Board and a Trustee for the University of Northern Colorado.

Bill Owens was elected State Treasurer in that same election in 1994. He served in the Senate from 1988 until 1992. Before that he served three terms in the Colorado House. He was Chairman of the House State Affairs committee from 1987 to 1988. Vice-Chairman of the Senate State Affairs Committee from 1981 to 1990, and Chairman of the State Veterans and Military Affairs (then State Affairs) from 1991 to 1994. He also chaired the Aurora Planning Commission for two terms.
1995 CWC MEMBERSHIP REPORT

This report is intended to bring the membership up-to-date with Colorado Water Congress activities for calendar year 1995. No organization, it should be noted, will have a meaningful impact on issues of concern, unless its membership is involved and alerting itself. Also, special thanks is expressed to the members of the General Assembly and the Executive Branch for they have listened to CWC's concerns and acted in a positive and helpful manner.

CWC notes the following in terms of highlights:

1. Eight of the thirteen water bills introduced in the State Legislature and supported by CWC were enacted into law.
2. All three of the water bills opposed by CWC were killed.
3. Continued the major effort (as a CWC Special Project) to address the issues in the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Plate River and Colorado River Threatened and Endangered Species Studies.
4. Established and coordinated efforts as a CWC Special Project to oppose the Public Trust and W.C.D. Board change initiative (CWC was successful before the Colorado Supreme Court in this effort);
5. Participated in the Colorado Water Education Foundation;
6. Participated to a limited degree in the Water Quality Forum; and
7. Initiated a Strategic Planning effort as to CWC's role in the 21st century.

* It should be noted that CWC's efforts with constitutional amendment initiatives is consuming a considerable amount of time.
* It should be further noted that special projects are funded by voluntary contributions used for that purpose only — no general fund monies are used.

The new water laws and resolutions supported by CWC were:
1. SB 83 — concerning creation of the Drinking Water Revolving Fund to provide financial assistance for certain drinking water supply projects, and, in connection therewith, providing for the assignment and deletions from, the project eligibility list of drinking water projects eligible for financial assistance from the Drinking Water Revolving Fund
2. SCR 2 — submitting to the registered electors of the State of Colorado an amendment to Articles V and XIX of the Constitution of the State of Colorado, concerning ballot measures, and, in connection therewith, requiring voter approval of proposed constitutional amendments by sixty percent of the votes cast thereon, permitting, until January 1, 2003, a simple majority of votes to approve amendments to amend or repeal any provision that was previously adopted with less than sixty percent of the votes cast thereon, prohibiting the general assembly from amending or repealing any law enacted by the initiative within four years of adoption unless approved by two-thirds of all the members elected to each House of the General Assembly, and requiring that initiated and referred measures to amend the constitution be submitted to the electors at a general election and not at an election held in an odd-numbered year.
3. HB 1151 — concerning underground water sources.
4. HB 1155 — concerning the Colorado Water Conservation Board Construction Fund.

None of the aforementioned events or bill enactments would have been possible without — as already pointed out — dedicated involvement of CWC members. This involvement is translated into the following statistics as they relate to a number of CWC Board and Committee meetings:

- Board of Directors — 1/25/95, 1/27/95, 6/29/95, 8/23/95 and 12/19/95.
- Management & Budget Committee — 2/6/95, 2/24/95, 3/27/95, 4/28/95, 6/2/95, 7/28/95, 9/22/95, 11/13/95 and 12/19/95.
- CWC Official Business Meeting — 1/27/95 and 8/25/95.
- State Affairs (Legislative) Committee — 1/3/95, 1/9/95, 1/16/95, 1/23/95, 1/30/95, 2/6/95, 2/13/95, 2/27/95, 3/13/95, 3/27/95 and 6/19/95.
- Federal Affairs Committee — 3/6/95, 3/27/95 and 6/19/95.
- CWC Nominating Committee — 12/3/95.
- CWC Aspinal Award Committee — 12/3/95.
- CWC Resolutions Committee — 8/95 and 12/95.
- CWC Fish & Wildlife Special Project Management Committee — 1/8/95, 2/11/95, 3/27/95, 5/11/95, 6/13/95, 8/7/95, 9/12/95, 10/11/95, 10/30/95 and 11/22/95.
- CWC Strategic Planning Group — 9/22/95, 11/13/95 and 12/13/95.

CWC sponsored meetings were another dimension of membership involvement activity and these were:
2. CWC Summer Convention held August 24 - 25, 1995.
8. CWC Workshop on What You Should Know About the Nine Interstate Compacts that Colorado is a Signatory on November 9, 1995.

There were a number of other actions that enhanced and assisted greatly in making CWC more effective. These actions were:

In regard to CWC's written communication (newsletters), the following newsletters were published during 1995:

Again, we are, indeed, proud and honored to be associated with such an outstanding and dedicated group of people as the CWC membership.

Dick MacRavey
Executive Director
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1390 Logan Street, Room 312
Denver, CO 80203