Politics is the practical exercise of the art of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government; somebody must study it, and learn the art, and exercise patience and sympathy and skill to bring the multitude of opinions and wishes of self-governing people into such order that some prevailing opinion may be expressed and peaceably accepted. Otherwise, confusion will result either in dictatorship or anarchy. The principal ground of reproach against any American Citizen should be that he is not a politician. Everyone ought to be, as Lincoln was.”

— Elihu Root

Speech presenting statue of Lincoln to the British people, July 28, 1920

CANDIDATES

“Talk on Water”

SENATE

Congressman Wayne Allard

“If we don’t work together to voluntarily address environmental water needs, then the door is open for federal agencies to impose a ‘Washington solution.’”

—Page 3

3rd CONGRESSIONAL

Al Gurule

“There is nothing more important than water.”

—Page 4

4th CONGRESSIONAL

State Senator Bob Schaffer

“I want to represent Colorado in Congress and continue to serve in the great tradition of former Congressmen Hank Brown and Wayne Allard.”

—Page 5

Congressman Scott McInnis

“Next to our people, Colorado’s most valuable asset is our water. We must be vigilant in our watch over the water, protecting it from other states and the federal government.”

—Page 4

Guy Kelley

“Colorado voters want for all of us — environmentalists, farmers, hunters, water developers — to sit down in a room and find some common-sense solutions to the resource problems that we all know are out there, just waiting to bite us.”

—Page 5

39th Annual CWC Convention

January 30 & 31, 1997

Holiday Inn, Northglenn
October 25, 1996 — CWC WORKSHOP ON LEGAL ETHICS IN WATER & ENVIRONMENTAL LAW — Holiday Inn Northglenn, I-25 & 120th Avenue, Northglenn, CO. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.


November 7, 1996 — CWC WORKSHOP ON GROUND WATER — Quality Inn Denver South, I-25 & Hampden Avenue, Denver, Colorado. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.

November 8, 1996 — CWC WORKSHOP ON A REVIEW OF FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS IMPACTING WATER INTERESTS — CWC Conference Room, Suite 312, 1390 Logan Street, Denver, Colorado. For more information, contact the CWC office in Denver, CO: 303-837-0812.


November 20, 1996 — 16TH ANNUAL CWC WORKSHOP ON FEDERAL AND STATE WATER QUALITY DEVELOPMENTS — CWC Conference Room, Suite 312, 1390 Logan Street, Denver, Colorado. 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.

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 1998 Wayne N. Aspinall Water Leader of the Year Award;
2. Ed Boreen and W. D. Farr Scholarship (for an active member of the agricultural community) for 1997 — 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 1997 — Colorado Water Law Seminar;
4. Bill Hoosby (for either a journalism student or a reporter of a news media organization) Journalist Scholarship for 1997 — Colorado Water Law Seminar;
5. Larry D. Simpson and Ralph Atkins (for either an engineering student or a non-partner of an engineering firm) Engineering Scholarship for 1997 — 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, 1997. 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.

Opinions expressed by the authors are not necessarily those of the officers, members, and/or staff of the Colorado Water Congress.
Colorado's reliance on a sustainable supply of water for use by current and future residents is crucial to the future of the state. Without water Colorado will not be able to plan for new development that will maintain the quality of life in Colorado while providing for wise growth into the 21st Century. Also, without water, one of the economic mainstays of Colorado, agriculture, will be significantly harmed. In the past these were issues that local elected officials would handle at the state or county level in consultation with their constituents. However, in recent years the federal government and politicians from other states have become increasingly involved in water allocation in Colorado. Unfortunately, this means that the Colorado congressional delegation has to spend time defending our water rights. One of the difficulties in protecting state control of water is the education process we must provide to members who are from states that do not follow the doctrine of prior appropriation. These members often do not understand how scarce water can be in Western states and do not understand the impact of actions taken by federal land management agencies.

I do understand the impact that the federal government can have on water rights. As a young man I grew up on my family's farm/ranch in Jackson county and we relied heavily on the water rights we owned. As a former state senator the same thing happened. I worked with Hank Brown, Bill Armstrong, and Ben Campbell in protecting Colorado's supremacy over our water. It never struck me that federal land management agencies would even consider taking over a role that states have so adequately filled.

It was because of this that one of the first actions I took after my election was to introduce a wilderness bill with Congressman Dan Schaefer that set aside more land for wilderness than any other legislation. It also explicitly denied a federal reserve water right. At the time Congressman Schaefer and I felt it was important to put into writing that no federal reserve water right would be created by federal decision in wilderness areas. Although our bill ultimately was not passed, it served as an important water language anchor from which Senator Brown was able to negotiate the passage of the Colorado Wilderness Bill.

Over the past two years I've had the responsibility of chairing the subcommittee that has oversight responsibility for the Forest Service. During this time I've become increasingly concerned with the actions they have taken that would deprive Coloradans of their right to manage their water. Specifically, the Forest Service has rescinded a directive that former Secretary of Agriculture Ed Madigan had issuedrestating the doctrine that states had the right to allocate and manage their water and that the permitting process for water facilities on or above federal land would not be used as leverage to force farmers and municipalities to give up a portion of their water in return for the issuance of a permit for current uses. This change in policy was particularly disturbing because it ran counter to testimony given before my subcommittee early in 1995. At the hearing I specifically asked the current Undersecretary for Natural Resources and the Environment about a letter Secretary Madigan had issued to myself and other Western congressmen stating the primacy of state water law in special use permitting. I asked if it was still the policy of the Forest Service to "ensure that private property rights, including water rights, will be recognized and protected in the course of special use permitting."

The following remarks were delivered at the Summer Convention by David Robbins on behalf of Tom Strickland.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. For those of you who missed the introduction, I am not Tom Strickland, a fact that probably dawned on all of you when you realized that I have neither trimmed my mustache, nor had the success in battling the bulge that Tom has had. That having been said, I want you to know that I am pleased to be able to represent Tom before the Water Congress today and that Tom Strickland extends his most sincere apologies for missing this opportunity to discuss issues of importance to the Colorado water community that you all so ably represent. Tom was looking forward to discussing several issues of importance with you but was confronted with the problem presented by several national officials coming into town with whom he had to meet. The 1-1/2 hour drive each way made this presentation make it impossible for him to accomplish that within his schedule, so you are stuck with me.

Suffice it to say that Tom Strickland comes to this race for the U.S. Senate with a substantial amount of personal experience and an interest in matters of natural resources policy. And, although he does not hold himself out to be a water attorney or a water resources expert, he certainly has a significant amount of experience that has dealt directly with these issues, including the enormous amount of time he spent on these issues when he served as Chief Policy Advisor to Governor Lamm. But, heck, having extensive experience in water resources issues is hardly the sole or even most important criteria for choosing a candidate for the U.S. Senate. After all, other issues, such as the deficit, fate of entitlement programs, education, public transportation, tax policy and foreign policy certainly have to have equal if not greater impact on our selection of the candidates for this Senate seat.

That having been said, I do think it is important to explain Tom's position because there are a number of issues of significant importance to our interest group. One issue that would be of U.S. Senator is vitally important to the State of Colorado when it comes to water resource issues. I refer to those issues that relate to the conflict between the State's traditional role in water allocation and the interests of the federal government in water resources and environmental protection, as determined by the Congress. At bare bones, this is a conflict between historic state prerogative and the growing environmental conscience of the nation.

I think it is important for the water community to look very carefully at all the cards in deciding how to vote in the coming election and deciding how to express its very real concern about federal intervention in this business of local water allocation decision-making. That really is what it is all about. Here we are in Colorado, an arid state to say the least, struggling with the need to protect our existing economy and struggling to insulate that our economy remains healthy and able to grow at some reasonable rate. In order to do that, water becomes a key focus. Efforts by the federal government to limit or control Colorado's economic decisions through water use result in an impact on the individual decisions directed by federal decisions and also on the State as a whole and its ability to progress. The beneficiary of decisions adverse to Colorado's interests and desires is very often another community or area in another state that is competing.
The 3rd Congressional Candidates

Thank you for letting me expand on the remarks Denis Berckefeldt made to you on my behalf at your conference in Breckenridge. I am very sorry I could not be there myself but in a district this size you can imagine that it is difficult to be at every event.

I know that Denis told you the story of trying to interest some Hollywood producers in a screenplay he had written which had a conflict over water rights as its central plot point. He kept getting the same response: Can’t we have something more important than water? Something more important that water. They didn’t understand, but we do. There is nothing more important than water. I often tell people that if they thought the oil crisis was a problem wait until clean usable water is in short supply. Wait until we have no water for irrigation and food production, or clean water to drink. There is no more important issue than water.

I am committed to ensuring that Colorado water stays in Colorado within the parameters under the terms of existing compacts and agreements. I will fight to make certain that those agreements are not rewritten or changed with effect of diminishing Colorado’s share.

Although, I am opposed to the Animas-LaPlata project as it is currently designed I am not opposed to large water projects in general. Each must stand on its own merits and if the project fills a need, and is cost-effective I will support it. However I do have concern about shipping water out of the San Luis Valley or the Western Slope to the front range at the expense of the residents of those areas. I understand the implications for economic growth that the availability of water represents. I am particularly opposed to AWDI or any similar project.

Regarding Animas-La Plate, I am concerned with both the cost effectiveness of the project as well as the fact that as a mechanism to fulfill obligations to the Ute Indians it leaves a lot to be desired. I could support it if the fulfillment to those obligations was in the first phase as opposed to the second.

I fully support the Clean Water Act. However we do need to make certain that undo burdens are not placed on rural areas and if we expect small communities to meet certain standards we must provide help to them in meeting those standards. However, if we do a better job nationally using our available water supplies more efficiently and that includes conservation as well as effective sewage treatment and investing in better and more efficient water treatment plants for drinking water, there will be less pressure on upstream states to provide more potable water.

I also support investment in research and development for alternative sources of water such as solar desalination. This kind of R and D can pay dividends in increased sources of water as well as play a role in job development.

If the opportunity presents itself in the next congress, I will vote for National Park status for the Black Canyon of the Gunnison with the proviso that current water users will not be negatively impacted by that action. I am also opposed to the inclusion of federal reserve water rights language in any wilderness legislation.

Regarding the Endangered Species Act, I do support reauthorization, however I am concerned about the use of the Act to impede worthwhile projects. If lawsuits using the Endangered Species Act are primarily about protecting an endangered species that is one.

Continued on Page 8

Letter from Congressman Scott McInnis

September 18, 1996
Dear Colorado Water Congress

I sincerely regret that I was not able to attend the 1996 Colorado Water Congress Meeting. The following remarks outline my major concerns in regards to water.

As many of you are aware, we live in the only state in the Continental United States where all the water runs out of the state, and not a single drop runs into the state from another state.

Next to our people, our most undervalued asset within Colorado is our water. Unfortunately, Colorado’s ability to retain control over its own water is being threatened by water hungry states like California and Nevada. Furthermore, federal agencies have consistently pushed for significant transfer of water authority from the states to the federal government.

Seventy-five percent of the water flows through Colorado is used by sources outside of our state. Therefore, we must utilize our water. For example, we must keep our treaty with the Ute Tribes by providing them with the water obligations the federal government promised to provide. Animas-LaPlata is a good project and I believe we must honor our commitments. More importantly, if we fail to utilize our water resources, and we do not construct storage facilities, we will play right into the hand of the water hungry states and the federal government.

Finally, I believe that it is incumbent upon all of us to take the time to visit with schools, service clubs and civic organizations to educate our citizens on the importance that the destiny of Colorado be left to the people of Colorado, and not to the people in Washington, D.C.!

Sincerely,
Scott McInnis

Scott McInnis, a Republican is Colorado’s Congressman representing the 3rd District and is seeking a third term.

Al Gurule, a Democrat, is a businessman and city councilman from Pueblo. He is the Democrat candidate for Congress from Colorado’s 3rd District.
The 4th Congressional Candidates

Bob Schaffer, a Republican, is a State Senator from District 14 and is a candidate for U.S. Congress – Colorado District 4

Guy Kelley, a Democrat from Fort Collins is an engineer and business attorney at Hewlett-Packard. He is on the Colorado Board of Regents and is running for Congress for Colorado’s 4th District.

I have deep roots on the plains of eastern Colorado. My grandmother was born in Wray where her parents had homesteaded. My great-grandfather was born in Hastings above Ludlow where her father was a coal miner. Even today, my parents farm in Selbert. I know how important water is to farmers and ranchers in this part of the country. My day job — when not running for Congress — is at Hewlett-Packard, which has gone from being a small blip on Larimer County’s economy to being a major economic force. And I know that economic development like that doesn’t happen without a reliable water supply.

Like many people in this room, I am also a skier and a fisherman. And I know that recreation and tourism is now this state’s second largest industry, after agriculture. And all of us recognize that protecting Colorado’s scenic beauty — including its trout streams — is something we have to do to maintain this industry.

Since I announced that I was a candidate for the U.S. Congress, I have traveled up and down the 4th District more times than I can remember. I’ve met with people in places as different as Fort Collins and Fort Morgan. But I am hearing the same things from people across this state — Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal.

They understand the importance of a strong economy for this state’s future. They want to be sure their children and grandchildren will be able to find good jobs in Colorado.

But people in this district also have a gut-sense of how important this state’s open spaces, and its wildlife habitat, are to all of us. They see these — mountain wilderness areas, city parks, trout streams, elk habitat — as a central part of what makes them so proud to be Coloradans.

Those are my first two points — and they have an important bearing on how we manage water resources in this state. In a word — it’s balance. People are depending on you — the people who really set the direction on water policy in this state — to help find a way to make sure that farms, businesses, and towns have a reliable water supply. But they also know about the state instream flow program — and they like it — a lot. They go to the mountains to camp, fish, hunt — and they like being able to take their kids fishing there.

As you know, that it will be no small challenge to do both of these things as we enter the next century. Just how the heck do we do it?

Well, from my conversations with Colorado voters, I think people are telling us a couple more things.

One of the things they are telling us is that they like the idea of making more decisions locally — at a level where people can participate and understand how their decisions will affect their daily lives.

That does not mean they want weaker Clean Water Act standards. It does not mean they are willing to take more risks that endangered species like the whooping crane will disappear. They sure as heck don’t want dirtier air. But they want to make decisions about how we achieve these goals at the state and local level.

Another thing they are saying is that they are tired of all the rhetoric. Colorado voters want for all of us — environmentalists, farmers, hunters, water developers — to sit down in a room and find some common-sense solutions to the resource problems that we all know are out there, just waiting to bite us.

That is what I am hearing, and that is what we
Continued from Page 3

The Forest Service has also issued a proposed regulation concerning changes in management of National Forests that could have adverse effects on Colorado water users. Last year they issued a regulation pertaining to the National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning. This proposal would move the Forest Service to managing on an "ecosystem basis". While there may be some merit in this proposal, there are also some issues that should raise concerns among Colorado water users. In this proposal they only mention water once, and that mention does not conform to public statements from Department of Agriculture officials that states should be able to manage and allocate their water resources. The only mention of water is, "federal management of national forests would provide the opportunity to develop and implement strategies that could address the protection of Federal water rights and interests in the future consumption of water, including instream flow needs." I would prefer that the regulation clearly state that the Forest Service will respect valid existing rights and recognize state primary in water management. This regulation needs to be closely followed to ensure that the Federal government does not usurp current state water management.

These are not the only areas where I have worked to protect Colorado water from federal encroachment. Among the other areas I have had an impact are: additions to legislation protecting private property rights, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. In addition, the Forest Service will recognize and respect obligations to heed the citizens' admonition - balance, local decision-making, and common sense.

The state stepped in, and helped broker a win-win solution. The only mention of water is, "Forest Service will participate in water management decisions for existing water supply facilities. In the future and anticipate changes that will certainly happen. We need to be more proactive in addressing problems before they arise. At times it seems to me that we have given excuses for those outside Colorado to come in and attempt water grabs. If we had acted sooner and defined those situations much heartache could have been avoided. Let me give an example of where this has been done successfully. A couple of years ago the Forest Service had demanded a bypass flow from the cities of Loveland, Greeley, and Ft. Collins. While it initially seemed that the Cities and the Forest Service would go to court over this matter a positive arrangement was reached because of the diligence of local elected officials. The Cities agreed to non-seasonal flows, but they wanted to control the specifics. The result was the Joint Operating Plan, which was locally conceived and implemented and actually put more water in the streams than the Forest Service originally wanted and did not substantially raise costs or lower yields. This is a perfect example of how forward looking officials implemented a plan that boxed out most dissent. This is a model for all water users in Colorado, because if they don't work together to voluntarily address environmental water needs then the door is open for federal agencies to impose a "Washington solution".

Continued from Page 3

Talking on Water, cont.

Chris Paulson spoke on behalf of Wayne Allard.

Kelley ☆☆☆

Talking on Water, cont.

Continued from Page 5

Said,"I need to hear in mind: balance, local decision making, and common sense."

Wednesday's Denver Post had a story on the back page of the sports section that really brought a lot of this together. The Yampa Valley is one part of the state that is growing fast. But the people of the Yampa Valley got together and they looked at what the valley is likely to do, and what it could look like if they didn't do something - and decided they didn't want to become another Eagle River Valley.

So ranchers, ski area executives, and a lot of ordinary people have been working at fashioning a different future. Ranchers like John Fetterman - who is one of your rackers. He came back to some of us about conservation easements to keep ranchers in the ranching business. The Nature Conservancy has been working with the locals to leverage some money to help that process along, and to buy up critical pieces of land with the promise that the land will become a wildlife corridor. The state has pitched in through Great Outdoors Colorado.

But the most important lesson is that the people who live in the Yampa Valley set aside the rhetoric, and realized that if they don't work together we'll lose our vision of what the valley should look like, 10, and 100 years from today. And they are making it a reality. That is an example many of us should look at very carefully.

So what does this mean for water resource management? Well in many ways it means we should keep on doing what we've been doing - but more of it. This means that the recovery program for endangered fish on the Colorado River has hit some bumpy spots in the road. This isn't the first time. But step back and think about it - you have a program where water users, environmentalists, the states, and the feds are working together. And they have agreed to do their level best to use state water laws to protect the fishes' habitat. That is unprecedented. I think we have an obligation to heed the citizens' admonition - balance, local decision-making, and common sense - and make this work if we possibly can.

Closely to my district, Greeley, Ft. Collins, and a lot of water users were headed toward a head-on collision with the Forest Service over showing the permits for some water projects on Forest Service land. The state stepped in, and helped broker a win-win solution that we should try to replicate in the future. That agreement will help restore trout habitat up in the Poudre River, and it does nothing to diminish the water projects' yield. That is the kind of thing citizens are telling me they want to see more of - the decisions got made here, not in Washington, D.C. People sat down and worked together and came up with a balanced solution that makes common sense. It's a winner.

We here in Colorado have all the essentials we need to make Colorado water law work for all of the state's citizens. We have an instream flow program that has been tremendously successful, and we have elected officials from across the political spectrum supporting our water rights and interests. We have a record of finding innovative, creative solutions to problems like endangered fish on the Colorado River and bypass flows on the Poudre. There are some challenges out there that have so far eluded resolution. The endangered species issues on the Platte continue to be a problem - though Colorado and its water users have been constructive partners in that process.

My goal - as a member of Congress - is to encourage these trends. Not every decision needs to be made back there - though some will always have to be. But I think the future of this state depends on our elected officials having the guts to tell people who are fighting it out over these issues - sit down with the other side, and find a solution that works for the whole state. I won't try to tell you what to do - but I will try to make sure that the people never hold together. You have to find a way to make it work.

For over a decade, water users and environmentalists have been talking about new wilderness areas in this state. There were countless meetings. Each side tried to roll the other side in the Congress. But ultimately, Senator Brown and I reached a compromise that let the delegation told the rest of us - work it out. And we did. We came up with a Colorado solution to a Colorado problem.

That is the model that I intend to use as your representative from the 4th Congressional District.
Talking on Water, cont.
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for the same economic advantage or opportunity. If the Forest Service successfully deprives the northern Front Range of a percentage of its current water supplies, you in effect limit its ability to compete for new business and related jobs that would otherwise depend upon those water supplies and thereby damage Colorado economically.

On the other hand, let's not delude ourselves. The American public, and a majority of the people in the State of Colorado, are vitally concerned about the status of our environment. As we have seen over the last several years, the efforts to dilute or buffer the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act and related pieces of federal environmental legislation have had a significantly difficult time before the Congress, even the Republican-controlled Congress. The time is long past for simple statements of an elected representative that he or she will protect Colorado's Compact-apperitioned waters without regard to other aspects of the environmental equation. We fool ourselves as a State if we think that Colorado is in a position to force water through development projects without regard to the environmental consequences or ignore obligations imposed by federal environmental regulations. We have to find the appropriate middle ground which will allow us to protect the users of the State's waters which we enjoy today and to protect our ability to make additional uses of that water in the future. Doing so will require innovation and the ability to meet not only with the water community but also with the environmental community in order to harmonize conflicting views where possible, and to fight for Colorado's rights to utilize its water resources for the benefit of its citizens when compromise cannot be achieved. That is a role for which Tom Strickland is perfectly suited.

Where does Tom stand on issues of importance to this organization? Let's talk about some of those. The Animas-LaPlata Project. Now there's a point of significant contention between water development and the environmental community. It's a bird-in-hand, we're atravésed with them and what protections exist for locally held water that is bottled and sold. We have a successful, vibrant economy. The citizens of Colorado and southwestern Colorado have been granted the use of Colorado's waters for the benefit of its citizens who have a right to enjoy them.

Protection of Colorado's Compact-apperitioned waters. This is another arena where we can determine how a candidate for high office views Colorado's interests. Tom Strickland understands the importance to the State of Colorado of the various Compacts to which we are signatory. He understands there are significant pressures on the State to allow other states to use more of the water flowing in our rivers and the desire of many states downstream to formally or informally reallocate those flows to their respective benefits. He is aware of the ongoing demands from Nebraska for additional supplies from the Colorado River. He understands the situation as it is by the City of Albuquerque for additional water from the Rio Grande. He is aware of the ongoing litigation between the States of Kansas and Colorado. Tom Strickland understands that for any of those Compacts to be changed to Colorado's detriment would require voluntary action by Colorado through agreements to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of water to which it is entitled, a position that Tom opposes, or for some action to occur in the Congress of the United States, the best protection for Colorado's waters.

Protection of existing uses. Tom Strickland is aware of the ongoing litigation between the United States of Kansas and Colorado. Tom Strickland understands the need to protect Colorado's interests under those Compacts and to do everything in his power to see that those Compacts are not breached, changed, or abrogated. He is also aware of what the potential would be through the sale of some or all of Colorado's waters to other states can never make up for the long-term limitations that such sale or lease would place upon future generations of Coloradans in their efforts to continue to have a successful, vibrant economy.

Protection of existing uses with Colorado. Here is where the rubber hits the road. This is the point at which Coloradoans have to make some serious decisions. It is in the interest of Coloradoans to elect officials clearly understand the implications of a federal government seeking to eliminate or reduce senior water rights on which Colorado's citizens depend without compensation or the provision of alternative supplies. Here we stand at a time in our history when the opportunity to develop new water supplies, build new dams or divert more water is challenged at every turn under federal and local environmental regulations. Any effort to trim existing supplies is a direct attack on Colorado's ability to maintain its economic viability and needs to be resisted within the State and within the Congress; and Tom Strickland stands ready to do so.

Finally, let me talk about the Endangered Species Act with regard to the relationship between federal environmental legislation and continued use of Colorado's Compacted water. Two things seem apparent. First, the American public is becoming more aware of the problems of endangered species and the protection that is needed. Second, the public is becoming more aware of the problems of endangered species and the protection that is needed. For example, in the case of the specific case of endangered species, there are very interesting proposals for creating economic incentives for protecting endangered species on private land that offer potential sin-win solutions: the species would benefit and so would the landowner. If elected to the U.S. Senate, Tom would be a strong proponent of such changes. Tom also strongly believes that all regulations that affect private property should be based on sound and objective science and that every effort should be made to minimize the social and economic impacts. This is the sort of moderate, independent leadership that has served Colorado well in the U.S. Senate, and I believe will do so again with the election of Tom Strickland.

Similarly, Tom Strickland will support reauthorization of the Clean Water Act and related efforts so long as they continue to reflect the need for protection of our water supplies in the arid West and provide for the reasonable protection of the operation of various water storage and diversion facilities so that beneficial use of water can be made in a way that insures the long-term economic life of Colorado.

Finally, let me say a word about taxes. Tom is a strong supporter of tax reform. As a private citizen who has helped build a thriving business here in Colorado, Tom knows as well as anyone in this room that our tax code is a mess. Tom will fight in Washington for tax reform that will simplify the system, ease the tax burden on all Americans yet still retain the essential foundation of progressiveness. But Tom understands that before we pass tax reform legislation, we must address the issue of deficit spending. It is absolutely unacceptable that Congress, under the leadership of both Republicans and Democrats, has been unable to operate the federal government in a fiscally responsible manner. That's one of the reasons why Tom Strickland is one of the few Democrats running for public office who supports a Balanced Budget Amendment.

Tom understands that until we balance the budget, things that are vital to the economic health of Colorado, like funds for the Animas-LaPlata Project, funds to continue operating reclamation projects, funds for various agricultural cost-sharing programs, funds to fight forest fires, funds to maintain our national parks, and many, many others will be jeopardized every year at budget time. And across the board, tax cuts will only make the prospects of future funding for these essential projects more precarious. If we are to put for substantial cuts in taxes before we get our economic house in order, we should be aware of where the cuts in spending will occur. I can assure you that they will not all come from programs that benefit the populated eastern and southern states or the West Coast. Anyone like Tom Strickland, who will support a tax cut only when there is an understanding of where the federal spending cuts will be made, should represent us.

I must explain to you all that I certainly am not the keeper of Tom Strickland's every thought and, to the extent you have questions about other topics, I ask that you do him the favor of attending another gathering where he will speak and personally ask him your questions. Thank you all for your courtesy. As always, it is a pleasure to see you and have an opportunity to talk about issues that are of such significant concern to us all.

New CWC Directory & Almanac

The new CWC Directory and Almanac will be mailed to those members who pay dues. Mailing will be in October. If you desire further information on the Directory, please write CWC, 1390 Logan Street, Suite 312, Denver, CO 80203 or call 303-837-0812.

Colorado Water Rights

David Robbins for Tom Strickland.
Continued from Page 4

thing. However, I am opposed to the use of the Act to merely block a project when no other way can be found by opponents of a project to block it. I think we need to look at some litigation limits or parameters and include them in the bill.

I am a strong supporter of the Gunnison Grazing Proposal and am very disappointed that the congress did not endorse it and use it as a model for other states to provide local management of resources. The Republican congress has paid lip service to the idea of local management but has been very selective in how they endorse it. Federal lands belong to all the people but clearly people closest to those lands and most greatly impacted by decisions about the use of those lands are in the best position to participate in that decision making. Philosophically I am committed to the small and medium sized family farmer and rancher. I believe that the Gunnison proposal was a win-win that helped local ranchers maintain their grazing rights and their cost-effectiveness.

Similarly, working in partnership with the federal government local water agencies need to coordinate efforts to use available water most efficiently. This can be done to ensure in-stream flows and minimum winter flows. We must move past the notion that the federal government is the enemy. As a member of Congress that will be my primary focus.

Also as our state continues to grow we must redouble our efforts to ensure the quality of life that is so attractive to people about Colorado. The governors leadership on Smart Growth has been beneficial but we must, at the federal level support programs and legislation that does not halt economic growth but that protects our environment and quality of life. Full funding of EPA is necessary. We cannot afford more Summitville Mine-type problems. The expense goes well beyond the actual dollars that clean-up is costing. The negative impact on water quality has far-reaching consequences and potentially negative impacts on property values. Imagine what would happen to the tourism industry and property values in Summit County for instance if we allowed the Blue River to become polluted with mine waste.

Thank you again for your kind attention.
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Today, I confess that I do not possess all the answers, nor all of the knowledge that exists with respect to water law. But I know where the experts are and how to work with them. I’ve done it for nearly a decade as a State Senator. As a member of Congress I will continue to seek your council and advice and further pledge to avail myself to your opinions and initiatives.

There is much work to be done in evaluating the Endangered Species Act, for example, to seek sound scientific date and scientific peer review to support species listing and reasonable options.

We must work together to insist that any taking of water rights be accompanied by fair and timely compensation.

The Clean Water Act should not be permitted to impair water rights allocated under state law and its primary goals should not exceed water quality protection. Implementation of the Clean Water Act should incorporate risk assessment, cost benefit analysis and proven science.

Nearly three quarters of the water that flows in Colorado is used outside of the state. We must utilize our water efficiently. I support water conservation and the responsible management and use of our resources. But we simply cannot consent to federalization of water conservation programs, especially if the result would be the further reallocation of water resources through federal mandates.