

Visual	Audio	Backup
<p>Open on a Gardner spot playing silently on a TV as our announcer watches. She turns to camera.</p>	<p>FEMALE ANNCR: Nice guy, right?</p>	
<p>She walks around the TV talking and strolls to another TV showing Gardner with wind turbines. Pauses. Scroll Gardner’s votes, including Gut Clean Water & Air Acts</p> <p>Source: House Vote 573, 7/13/11; House Vote 738, 9/23/11</p>	<p>But slick TV ads don’t change Cory Gardner’s record of protecting polluters. Even voting to gut our clean water and air laws.</p>	<p><u>Gardner has a record of protecting polluters:</u></p> <p>Gardner wrote bill eliminating cleanup of many toxic waste sites and forcing taxpayers to pay for cleanups instead of polluters. Gardner sponsored H.R. 2279, the co-called Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013, a package of three extreme bills that would significantly reduce the number of cleanups of toxic waste sites, putting communities and the environment at risk through increased exposure to dangerous pollutants. The bill’s proposals weaken the Superfund law and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), the law governing the disposal of hazardous wastes. This reckless legislation would also limit liability for polluters and waste taxpayer dollars by transferring the financial burden of cleaning up Superfund sites from the polluter to the federal government. [House Vote 10, 1/9/14; League of Conservation Voters, 2014 Recent Votes]</p> <p>Gardner wrote energy plan that prioritized oil and gas companies’ interests over public health, hunters, fishermen, and national security. Gardner sponsored H.R. 4480, the so-called Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, a massive giveaway that prioritized the nation’s largest oil and gas companies’ interests over our health, natural heritage, coastal businesses, and national security. The bill delayed clean air standards that would reduce the industry’s pollution by overturning the Clean Air Act’s requirement that national air quality standards be based solely on the best science. It threatened the interests of hunters, anglers, and other outdoorsmen by establishing oil drilling as the primary use of America’s public lands. It endangered fishermen and others who depend on clean oceans and beaches by requiring Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) lease sales off the coast of Virginia and by supporting dangerous offshore drilling elsewhere along the</p>

		<p>Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. This legislation also undermined our nation's national security interests by making it harder for President Obama to quickly respond to an emergency supply disruption by tapping the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. [H.R. 4480; League of Conservation Voters, 2012 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Koch Brothers’ company Koch Industries lobbied on Gardner’s Domestic Energy and Jobs Act in 2012. [Center for Responsive Politics; Koch Companies Public Sector, LLC, 2012 Q2, Q3, and Q4 Lobbying Reports]• Big Oil companies, including Exxon Mobil, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and Conoco Phillips, lobbied on Gardner’s Domestic Energy and Jobs Act in 2012. [Center for Responsive Politics] <p>Gardner voted to protect oil subsidies. Gardner voted against a measure that would have prohibited the use of funds in a stopgap continuing appropriations bill be used for tax benefit or relief for any major integrated oil company. He also voted to bypass consideration of the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act of 2011, which would repeal key taxpayer funded subsidies for oil and gas companies. [HJ Res 44, House Vote 153, 3/1/11; H Res 245, Vote 293, 5/5/11; The Hill, 5/4/11; CBS News, 5/4/11]</p> <p>Gardner voted to protect up to \$53 billion in taxpayer subsidies for oil companies operating offshore. [House Vote 68, 2/16/12; LCV, 2012 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner sided with out-of-state energy companies by supporting a ballot initiative that would have diverted millions of dollars from Colorado water projects. The Durango Herald reported, “Udall issued a news release at the start of the conference, attacking Gardner for supporting a 2008 ballot initiative when Gardner was a state representative that would have diverted millions from water projects to fund transportation. Amendment 52</p>
--	--	--

		<p>would have redirected some gas and oil severance-tax revenues from water to highway projects. The initiative was seen as a competing measure to another ballot question at the time, Amendment 58, that would have eliminated a state tax credit to increase severance-tax collection for college scholarships, among other areas. Both ballot questions were rejected by voters. ... Opponents of Amendment 52 pointed out at the time that three out-of-state energy companies contributed to the initiative.” [Durango Herald, 8/20/14]</p> <p>Gardner voted for a ban on federal fracking safeguards that would prevent the public from knowing about contaminated drinking water. Gardner voted for legislation that would place hydraulic fracturing oversight under a patchwork of inadequate state regulations and delay the Environmental Protection Agency’s congressionally mandated study on the impacts of fracking on drinking water, keeping important information on contamination away from families living near oil and gas drilling operations. [House Vote 604, 11/20/13; League of Conservation Voters, 2013 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p><u>Gardner has voted to gut clean water and air laws:</u></p> <p>Gardner voted for legislation that would dismantle the Clean Water Act. Gardner voted for the so-called Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act of 2011, which would threaten waterways Americans depend on for swimming, fishing, and drinking. The bill would amend the Clean Water Act in such a way as to cripple the EPA’s ability to set a minimum “floor” for a state’s water quality standards, blocking the agency’s ability to limit pollution flowing downstream to other waters and also into other states. The bill would also gut the Clean Water Act provisions that protect streams, wetlands, and other bodies of water from harmful large-scale mining and other destructive projects. As OMB Watch has noted, the bill “would dismantle the federal- state</p>
--	--	--

		<p>relationship envisioned under the [Clean Water Act] by stripping EPA of its abilities to object to state-approved permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, revise state water quality standards, and veto dredge and fill permits issued by the Army Corps of Engineers.” [HR 2018, House Vote 573, 7/13/11; 2011 LCV National Environmental Scorecard; OMB Watch, 7/15/11]</p> <p>Gardner voted to gut the public health basis of the Clean Air Act. Gardner voted for the Latta amendment to H.R. 2401, which would eliminate a central underpinning of the Clean Air Act--affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2001--that clean air standards must be based on what public health science tells us is safe to breathe. This amendment would require the EPA to define healthy air based on the "feasibility and cost" to polluting industries, and would compel the EPA to accept standards that fail to protect public health. [House Vote 738, 9/23/11; League of Conservation Voters, 2011 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner voted to block safeguards protecting our water from dangerous chemicals. Gardner voted for legislation that would block EPA safeguards designed to protect public health and the environment from toxic coal ash. Every year more than 140 million tons of coal ash—the toxic byproduct of burning coal that’s laden with arsenic, lead, and other heavy metals—is created and stored in more than 1,300 impoundments across the country, many of which have leached dangerous chemicals into water Americans count on. [House Vote 418, 7/25/13; League of Conservation Voters, 2013 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner voted for legislation that would undermine the Clean Water Act and endanger streams and wetlands that Americans rely on for drinking water. [House Vote 311, 7/9/13; House Vote 345, 7/10/13; League of Conservation Voters, 2013 National Environmental Scorecard]</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Gardner voted for a dirty policy rider that would allow mining companies to continue polluting mountain streams with toxic waste from mountaintop removal activities. [House Vote 312, 7/9/13; League of Conservation Voters, 2013 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner voted to allow indefinite delay of Mercury and Air Toxics standards for power plants. Gardner voted for H.R. 2401, the Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation Act of 2011 (TRAIN Act), which would allow for the indefinite delay of two life-saving clean air safeguards (the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for power plants), meaning tens of thousands of lives would be lost and hundreds of thousands more asthma attacks would occur from increased air pollution. [House Vote 741, 9/23/11; League of Conservation Voters, 2011 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner voted to block standards to clean up mercury and other toxic air pollution from cement plants. Gardner voted for H.R. 2681, the so-called Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act of 2011, which would toss out already-finalized standards to clean up mercury and other toxic air pollution from cement plants, the second largest industrial emitters of mercury pollution, which can impair a child's ability to think, talk, read, write, and learn. The bill would delay a new set of standards for at least four and a half years while eliminating any deadline by which cement plants are required to comply with the standards. Every year the standards are delayed would mean an additional 2,500 premature deaths due to cement plants' harmful emissions. [House Vote 764, 10/6/11; League of Conservation Voters, 2011 National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner voted to let power plants emit unlimited amounts of dangerous carbon pollution. Gardner voted for H.R. 3826, the so-called Electricity Security and Affordability Act, which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from limiting carbon</p>
--	--	---

		<p>emissions from power plants, the nation’s largest source of the pollution driving climate change. The devastating impacts of climate change are occurring right outside our windows in the form of more frequent and severe weather events like droughts, wildfires, floods, and storms. Climate change also threatens public health by increasing smog, which triggers asthma attacks and is especially dangerous for children and those with heart or lung disease. The U.S. already places limits on mercury, arsenic, particulate matter, lead and other pollution from power plants, but this extreme legislation would ensure that power plants remain free to release unlimited amounts of carbon pollution into our air. [House Vote 106, 3/6/14; League of Conservation Voters, 2014 Recent Votes]</p>
<p>Then she strolls to another TV showing Gardner arguing with Eli Stokols. House bill graphic, zoom into his name and circle the word: Co-Sponsor</p> <p>Source: H.R. 1091; FactCheck.org, 8/15/14</p>	<p>And Gardner is still supporting a bill that could ban common forms of birth control and threaten in vitro fertilization.</p>	<p>Gardner is a co-sponsor of the Life at Conception Act. [H.R. 1091]</p> <p>KDVR Fox 31: In debate, Gardner “sought once more to downplay his continued support” for federal personhood bill. KDVR Fox 31 reported, “In Tuesday night’s Denver Post debate, GOP Senate candidate Cory Gardner sought once more to downplay his continued support for the federal Life at Conception Act, which nearly everyone but Gardner agrees is tantamount to the Colorado personhood measure Gardner disavowed earlier this year. ... The House and Senate Life at Conception Acts, which are virtually identical, could threaten some common forms of birth control, as [Sen. Mark] Udall and Democrats have pointed out — just as it could provide a new legal challenge to overturn Roe v. Wade, as National Right to Life and [Sen. Rand] Paul promise it would — but that would all depend on the courts.” [KDVR Fox 31, 10/8/14]</p> <p>Gardner claimed “there is no federal personhood bill.” The Huffington Post reported, “Rep. Cory Gardner (R-Colo.), who is running for Senate, continues to insist that he doesn’t consider the fetal personhood bill he cosponsored to be a fetal personhood bill. In a preview of an interview with reporter Eli Stokols set to air Sunday on Fox 31 Denver,</p>

		<p>Gardner says three times that ‘there is no federal personhood bill,’ when asked why he remains a cosponsor of the Life At Conception Act, which would grant full legal rights to fetuses from the moment of fertilization. Gardner, who disavowed his prior support for fetal personhood at the state level, attempted in the interview to differentiate between state-based ballot initiatives and the federal legislation. ... A Gardner spokesman told The Denver Post in July that he considers the federal bill a symbolic measure, though the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has said that such bills could have the effect of banning some common forms of contraception, along with outlawing abortion.” [Huffington Post, 9/30/14; Fox 31, Colorado Politics: From the Source, 9/26/14]</p> <p>Gardner’s personhood claims received FactCheck.org’s “Whopper of the Week.” Politico reported, “FACTCHECK.ORG WHOPPER OF THE WEEK: Rep. Cory Gardner, the Republican Senate candidate in Colorado, grabs this week’s honor for insisting ‘there is no federal personhood bill.’ Gardner is a co-sponsor of the Life Begins at Conception Act. The bill would extend ‘equal protection for the right to life’ under the 14th amendment to each ‘preborn human person,’ and defines ‘human person’ from the ‘moment of fertilization.’ It has been described as a ‘personhood’ bill by other cosponsors and anti-abortion groups. During an interview that aired Sunday on a Denver TV station, Gardner was asked why he remains a cosponsor of the federal personhood bill if he no longer supports the state personhood ballot initiative. Gardner repeatedly claimed there isn’t a federal personhood bill. We disagree, as we said in an earlier article called, ‘A Fight Over Birth Control in Colorado.’” [Politico, 10/3/14]</p> <p>FactCheck.org: Gardner “still backs a federal personhood bill, which contains the same language that would make a ban of some contraception a possibility .” According to FactCheck.org, “Gardner says he has changed his mind and no longer supports the Colorado</p>
--	--	---

initiative, precisely because it could ban common forms of birth control. But he still backs a federal personhood bill, which contains the same language that would make a ban of some contraception a possibility. ... Gardner announced his change of position eight months after he had signed on as a co-sponsor to the federal ‘Life at Conception Act,’ which would extend ‘equal protection for the right to life’ under the 14th amendment to the ‘preborn’ from the ‘moment of fertilization.’ That language — giving the rights of a person to the fertilized egg — is exactly what raises the question of what such a measure would mean for some forms of birth control. Yet Gardner’s campaign told us he was not withdrawing his support for the federal legislation. Spokesman Alex Siciliano told us by email: ‘The federal proposal in question simply states that life begins at conception, as most pro-life Americans believe, with no change to contraception laws.’ We don’t see how the Colorado initiative and the federal bill, which supporters in Congress describe as a ‘personhood’ measure, are different on this point. ... As for his change of position, voters in Colorado should know Gardner still supports a federal bill that would prompt the same concerns over birth control as the state measure he says he rejects on the same grounds.” FactCheck.org, 8/15/14]

Denver Fox affiliate: Gardner supported “a federal attempt to establish personhood.” In an online article, KDVR Fox 31 in Denver reported, “In 2007, Gardner, then a state representative, sponsored SB 143, which sought to outlaw all abortions with the exception of cases that is ‘designed to protect the death of a pregnant mother, if the physician makes reasonable medical efforts under the circumstances to preserve both the life of the mother and the life of her unborn child in a manner consistent with conventional medical practice.’ And in 2012 and 2013 as a member of Congress, Gardner supported The Life Begins at Conception Act, a federal attempt to establish personhood.” KDVR FOX31 Denver, 3/24/14]

		<p>American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists: So-called “personhood” legislation could ban regular forms of birth control like the IUD and the birth control pill. According to a statement from the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, “Although the individual wording in these proposed measures varies from state to state, they all attempt to give full legal rights to a fertilized egg by defining ‘personhood’ from the moment of fertilization, before conception (ie, pregnancy/ implantation) has occurred. This would have wide-reaching harmful implications for the practice of medicine and on women’s access to contraception, fertility treatments, pregnancy termination, and other essential medical procedures. These ‘personhood’ proposals, as acknowledged by proponents, would make condoms, natural family planning, and spermicides the only legally allowed forms of birth control. Thus, some of the most effective and reliable forms of contraception, such as oral contraceptives, intrauterine devices (IUDs), and other forms of FDA-approved hormonal contraceptives could be banned in states that adopt ‘personhood’ measures.” [American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 2/10/2012]</p> <p>FactCheck.org: Personhood measures “also raise questions about what they would mean for in vitro fertilization.” According to FactCheck.org, “These [state and federal personhood] measures don’t say that common birth control methods would be banned, nor do they even say that abortion would be banned, though proponents have said that ending abortion, along with curtailing stem cell research and limiting how in vitro fertilization is practiced, are the main goals. ... Personhood measures also raise questions about what they would mean for in vitro fertilization, which often involves creating more than one embryo in an effort to help a woman conceive — the American Society for Reproductive Medicine has been against personhood initiatives — and the “morning-after pill,” which is essentially a high dose of birth control pills that delays ovulation.” [FactCheck.org, 8/15/14]</p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Gardner’s wind energy ad touted a failed measure:</u></p> <p>Gardner in TV ad: “I co-wrote the law to launch our state’s green energy industry.” [Gardner campaign ad, “Next Generation Energy,” 9/1/14]</p> <p>Associated Press: Gardner touted a “failed measure” as supposed proof that he helped “launch Colorado’s green-energy economy.” In an article titled “Senate candidate Cory Gardner touts a failed measure,” the Associated Press reported: “GOP Senate candidate Cory Gardner, framed by sunflowers and wind turbines, tells voters in a campaign ad this week that he co-wrote a law to launch Colorado’s green-energy economy. He leaves out that the law was repealed five years later, deemed useless for not enabling a single project. ... The Clean Energy Development Authority, which was set up by the law, was intended to assist in the financing of clean-energy projects such as improvements to electricity transmission lines. ... But the authority had financing caveats that made it toothless, said Tom Plant, who oversaw the authority from its creation until 2011 as head of the Governor’s Energy Office. ... The authority never had a staff and did little but gather once a year to report to the legislature that it had made no progress. By 2012 the authority was scrapped, part of a larger makeover of the Energy Office, now called the Colorado Energy Office.” [Associated Press, 9/4/14]</p>
<p>Scorecard images. Super: League of Conservation Voters Scorecard: 4% Pro-Environment Votes Super: Planned Parenthood Action Fund Scorecard: 0%</p>	<p>That’s why non-partisan groups give Cory Gardner failing grades.</p>	<p>Gardner received a 4% on the 2013 LCV Scorecard and has a 9% Lifetime LCV Score. As of October 4, Gardner has also cast an anti-environment vote on all 24 votes that LCV has scored on its 2014 “Recent Votes” online scorecard. [League of Conservation Voters, National Environmental Scorecard]</p> <p>Gardner has a 0% Score on the Planned Parenthood Action Fund Scorecard. [Planned Parenthood Action Fund, 2014 Congressional Scorecard]</p>
<p>Woman walks up to camera.</p>	<p>Cory Gardner isn’t telling the whole</p>	

LCV
Cory Gardner – “Score”
10/14/14

	truth.	
PAID FOR BY THE LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, WWW.LCV.ORG, AND NOT AUTHORIZED BY ANY CANDIDATE OR CANDIDATE’S COMMITTEE. THE LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THIS ADVERTISING.	The League of Conservation Voters is responsible for the content of this advertising.	