

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS: "Walcher Water"

League of Conservation Voters
 "Walcher Water"
 TV:30
 10/1/04

AUDIO	BACKUP
<p>Referendum A - the 2 Billion dollar boondoggle that would have taken our water.</p>	<p>Voters Didn't Just Say "No" To Referendum A. They Said "No Way." In November, 2003 Referendum A, a \$2 billion water bond issue was defeated so resoundingly that it stunned opponents and proponents alike. It was obliterated on the Western Slope, where voters were rejecting it by a nearly 4-to-1 ratio on perceptions that the measure was a poorly disguised effort at a Front Range water grab - a \$2 billion gift bag for housing developers eager for more subsidized reservoirs, dams and pipelines. [Rocky Mountain News, 11/5/03]</p> <p>Roll Call: Referendum A Was "Perceived As An Attempt To take Water From The Western Slope And Divert It To Denver." On June 28, 2004 <i>Roll Call</i> wrote, "Referendum A failed 67 percent to 33 percent statewide but by an even more convincing margin in the 3rd district, where it was perceived as an attempt to take water from the Western Slope and divert it to the fast-growing Denver region." [Roll Call, 6/28/04]</p> <p>Denver Post: "Referendum A Is A Ready Made Boondoggle:" On September 25, 2003 Penelope Purdy, a member of the Denver Post editorial board wrote, "Referendum A is a ready-made boondoggle, an invitation to cronyism and back-room deals." [Denver Post, 9/25/03]</p>
<p>Guess who helped lead the fight to get it passed? Greg Walcher.</p>	<p>Rocky Mountain News: Walcher "Believes Referendum A Could Be Really Good For The Weston Slope." According to the <i>Rocky Mountain News</i> in a June 30, 2003 article, "Walcher, however, believes Referendum A "could be really good for the Western Slope and for Club 20. It's a tremendous opportunity to influence what project will be built." [Rocky Mountain News, 6/30/03]</p> <p>Denver Post: "One Main Supporter Of Referendum A Is Greg Walcher." According to the <i>Denver Post</i>, "One main supporter of Referendum A is Greg Walcher, director of the Colorado Department of Natural</p>

	<p>Resources, and he was Club 20's executive director for a decade before moving to his Denver job with the Owens administration." [Denver Post, 7/8/03]</p> <p>Rocky Mountain News: Walcher "Publicly Supported Referendum A." According to the <i>Rocky Mountain News</i>, Walcher, for instance, publicly supported Referendum A, the ballot issue on water funding that was anathema on the Western Slope and was soundly beaten last fall. As a member of Gov. Bill Owens' cabinet, he didn't really have a choice, but it's not a profile in courage to back off from a position after the fact. [<u>Rocky Mountain News</u>, 2/21/04]</p> <p>Associated Press: "Walcher Actively Stumped For The Proposal." According to the <i>Associated Press</i>, "Walcher actively stumped for the proposal, Referendum A, which voters defeated last November in part because of fear that more western Colorado water would be diverted to the rapidly growing east side of the Rockies." [AP, 8/11/04]</p> <p>Denver Post: Walcher Said He'd Favor Referendum A Even If He Wasn't In The Governor's Cabinet." According to the <i>Denver Post</i>, Walcher said he'd favor Referendum A even if he weren't in the Governor's cabinet. The paper wrote, "Owens spoke in favor of Referendum A at the 2003 water conference. Walcher followed him, and also spoke for it. Indeed, he said it was such a worthy measure that he'd favor it even if he wasn't in the governor's Cabinet." [<u>Denver Post</u>, 8/17/04]</p> <p>Grand Junction Sentinel: "Greg Walcher Was Criss-Crossing The State With The Governor Singing The Praises Of Referendum A." According to the <i>Grand Junction Sentinel</i> while most of the western slope political leadership opposed Referendum A, "Former Club 20 chief and then Department of Natural Resources Director Greg Walcher was criss-crossing the state with the governor singing the praises of Referendum A. [<u>Grand Junction Sentinel</u>, 9/12/04]</p>
<p>As head of the Department of Natural Resources Greg Walcher took the side of the developers and special interests in what critics called a huge water grab.</p>	<p>Western Slope Residents Saw Referendum A As A "Front Range Water Grab." The <i>Rocky Mountain News</i> said, "Referendum A riled Western Slope residents, who saw it as a Front Range water grab." [<u>Rocky Mountain News</u>, 11/5/03]</p> <p>Referendum A "Harkens Back To The Days Of The 'Water Grabs When Somebody Had To Lose For Somebody Else To Win." Critics of Referendum A were troubled that the measure didn't spell out how the communities that provide more water from their rivers and streams would be compensated. With the money in hand to build reservoirs and dams, Front Range utilities could bypass cooperation with local towns and counties affected by the new project, they said. 'It really harkens back to the days of the water grabs when</p>

	<p>somebody had to lose for somebody else to win,' said Peter Roessmann, education specialist for Colorado River Water Conservation District, which opposes Referendum A. [Denver Post, 8/11/03]</p> <p>Referendum A Failed After It Was Perceived As A "Front Range Water Grab." Referendum A was obliterated on the Western Slope, where voters rejected the measure by a nearly 4-to-1 ratio on perceptions that the measure was a poorly disguised effort at a Front Range water grab - a \$2 billion gift bag for housing developers eager for more subsidized reservoirs, dams and pipelines." [Rocky Mountain News, 11/5/03]</p>
<p>So go to Water "grab" Walcher.com -And see how Walcher fights for the special interests – NOT yours.... The League of Conservation is responsible for the content of this advertising.</p>	