

Questions submitted by POWER  
to be Answered by all four UGRWCD Candidates  
on May 9, 2000

1. The soon-to-be-signed subordination agreement between the Upper Gunnison and the BOR **does not** provide Gunnison Valley users, regardless of the priority of their decrees, with call protection against senior down-stream users such as the Uncompahgre Water Users and the Redlands Canal/Dam.

Why do you think the UGRWCD failed to include down-stream call protection in the subordination agreement and what will you do, if elected, to make call protection a reality for Gunnison Valley users in the future?

2. It has been argued that further attempts to divert Western Slope water to the Front Range are on the brink of provoking Arizona, California, and Nevada to demand a revision of the Colorado River Compact both as a way of recovering further losses to the eastern Colorado and as a way of gaining more Colorado River water for themselves.

What is your take on this argument and how might you incorporate it into UGRWCD business if you are elected?

3. Through the eyes of a business owner or developer in Parker or Arapaho County--someone who believes that his or her economic survival depends upon growth on the Front Range--the Gunnison Valley's opposition to diverting any of its water east is a dog-in-the-manger snarl--an effort to avoid sharing a resource it can not possibly consume by itself.

What do you think is the best possible way to answer someone who sees the trans-mountain controversy from this perspective and what, if anything, will you urge the UGRWCD to do by way of addressing this point of view in the Colorado Legislature and in the media?