SCRIPT:	THE FACTS:
Attorney General Ken Salazar has fought to protect our land, water and people. He won the longest jail term against an environmental polluter in our history	Salazar Won 17-Year Prison Term, \$100K Fine For Dry Cleaning Waste Polluter, Toughest Environmental Criminal Sentence In Colorado History and First Environmental Racketeering Case In Colorado History On July 8, 2002, Salazar announced that California businessman Hormoz Pourat, 44, was sentenced to 17 years in prison and fined \$100,000 for illegally dumping hazardous drycleaning wasted collected from more than 240 dry cleaners in Denver and Lakewood over a five-year period. Specifically, Pourat and his brother Homayoun were convicted of mislabeling containers of the liquid solvent perchloroethylene, a chemical known to depress the central nervous system and cause liver and kidney damage in humans and animals, in order to allow it to be buried rather than incinerated or distilled, as required by federal law. The chemicals, sent to California for recycling, were then relabeled and shipped back to Colorado before being sent to hazardous waste landfills in Idaho and Nevada, filling possibly thousands of cardboard boxes with the solvents threatening to eat through the protective lining and leak into groundwater. Salazar said it was the toughest sentence ever imposed for an environmental crime in Colorado and the longest prison term in CO history for an environmental crime, and one prosecutor in the AGs office noted that chemical's corrosive nature and risk of it getting into groundwater made it "a ticking time bomb." The sentence exceeded by three years the 1999 sentence handed down against Thoro executive Richard Newman, which at the time was thought to be the longest in state history. Pourat also plead guilty to racketeering, which Salazar noted made the case the first environmental racketeering case in Colorado history. (Denver Post, 7/9/02; RMN, 7/9/02; AP, 7/8/02, 10/16/03)
wrote the law to create Great Outdoors, Colorado	Salazar Helped Create GOCO, Served As First Chairman Salazar wrote the constitutional amendment that created Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO), a voter-approved proposal that used lottery funds for parks, open space and recreation. Salazar also served as GOCO's first chairman. (Rocky Mountain News, 3/16/04)

... protected Colorado's water from out of state interests.

1998: Kansas Sues Nebraska For Violations Of 1943 Republican River Compact, CO Joins To Protect Entitlement

In 1998, Kansas sued Nebraska over a Republican River compact from 1943 providing Nebraska 49 percent of the water, Kansas 40 percent and Colorado 11 percent. Kansas accused Nebraska of breaching the compact when it allowed the development and use of thousands of water wells linked to the Republican River and its tributaries. Nebraska countered that groundwater use was not covered by the compact. (AP, 10/28/03)

Salazar Announced A Partial Settlement To The Three State Dispute Over The Republican River

On August 28, 2001 Salazar announced that a dispute over the Republican River was partially settled. According to the Rocky Mountain News, "The river starts in northeastern Colorado, wanders into Kansas, then into Nebraska and back through Kansas. A joint compact that expired in 1994 parceled out the flows." Kansas started the legal action because the level of the Republican River was significantly lower the second time it entered Kansas, the state said that wells in Colorado and Nebraska were to blame for the low levels. Colorado alleged that it was the wells in Nebraska that lowered the Republican. While the dispute was partially settled, the remaining claims were to be settled by a specially appointed water master for the U.S. Supreme Court, similar to the one that ruled in the Arkansas River Compact case. The trial on the remnants of the case was to start March 1, 2003. (Rocky Mountain News, 8/29/01)

Kansas Won Record \$28.9M In Damages From CO For Arkansas River Claims, Reduced From Initial \$52.8M Sought – A 45 Percent Cut

On December 3, 2002, a special master in the Arkansas River dispute between Colorado and Kansas ruled that Colorado only had to pay \$28.9 million in damages (the master ruled that interest could only accrue since 1985, when Kansas filed its legal claim), a reduction from Kansas' initially-sought damages of \$52.8 million. The \$23.9 million reduction in damages represented a more than 45 percent reduction. However, the \$28.9 million was slated at the time to be the largest amount of money ever paid in an interstate water dispute. (Denver Post, 12/4/02)

\$28.9M Also Down From Kansas Claim Of \$320M And Special Master Recommendation Of \$38M After Salazar Argued Against Kansas' Interest Calculations

The \$28.9 million judgment against Colorado regarding the Arkansas River dispute was also a reduction from a one-time Kansas claim of \$320 million, and a 2000 recommendation by special master Arthur L. Littleworth of \$38 million. However, Salazar protested the \$38 million finding, arguing that Kansas should only be able to collect interest on its damages from 1985 forward. (Denver Post, 12/4/02)

Salazar Reached Settlement Over Rio Grande And Gunnison Water Suits, Ending 21-Year \$10M Legal Fight

On March 15, 2000, Salazar and the US Department of Justice ended a 21-year lawsuit by signing a 190-page settlement regarding water rights related to 303 stream segments in the Rio Grande National Forest and Gunnison National Forest across six counties: Alamosa, Conejos, Hinsdale, Mineral, Rio Grande, and Saguache. The settlement was reached after studies indicated that the streams contained enough water to sustain both wildlife in and around the streams and agricultural demands in the counties. During the lawsuit, the state spent over \$10 million in legal costs. Assistant U.S. Attorney General Lois Schiffer called the agreement "a great truce in the water wars." (Rocky Mountain News, 3/16/00)

<u>DP</u> editorial: "Hats Off To Salazar" On Rio Grande National Forest and Gunnison National Forest Water Rights Conflict Settlement

In a March 17, 2000 editorial, the <u>Denver Post</u> lauded the settlement in the US Forest Service-San Luis Valley 21-year conflict over water rights related to 303 stream segments in the Rio Grande National Forest and Gunnison National Forest across six counties: Alamosa, Conejos, Hinsdale, Mineral, Rio Grande, and Saguache. The <u>Post</u> wrote, "The agreement puts a halt to further litigation and protects the rights of farmers and ranchers while protecting in-stream water for the forest, environment and recreation. ... Hats off to Salazar and the parties to the settlement, which will save the owners of water rights as well as taxpayers time and money in litigation. (editorial, <u>Denver Post</u>, 3/17/00)

An extraordinary record of accomplishment.

So what are these attack ads against Ken Salazar?

"Slime..." "sleazy..." "slur..."

Ken Salazar for Senate: Experience money can't buy

SALAZAR: I'm Ken Salazar and I approve this message.

Denver Post Called AJS Ad "Slime", "Sleazy" and Made Of "Untruths"

In an editorial subtitled "Untruths leveled in attack on Salazar," the <u>Denver Post</u> wrote of AJS' August 2004 anti-Salazar ad: "Now some slime has oozed into Colorado's Senate race, too ... We've been hoping to see Colorado politics in a more positive light, but one independent group, out-of-staters who support Pete Coors, has fired its first sleazy shot in the U.S. Senate race. ... [W]e think Coors should step up and convince the Americans for Job Security, whoever they are, that this ad isn't accurate and it should be pulled from circulation. The Colorado Senate race is destined to draw national attention; after all, control of the Senate is at stake. And surely, negative ads will be part of the equation. But we look forward to a fair fight in which no one is making up their own facts." (editorial, <u>Denver Post</u>, 08/25/04)

<u>RMN</u> Editorial Called AJS Ad A "Slur," Noted That "The Group [AJS] Has Chosen Instead To Press a Charge That Is Utterly Without Merit"

In an editorial entitled "The Summitville Slur, Second Edition," the <u>Rocky Mountain News</u> said, "not only did the mine receive its permit years before Salazar arrived on the scene, its environmental impact stemmed for the most part from construction defects also dating from before Salazar's tenure as a regulator. As we said in '98, Salazar was no more responsible for the Summitville disaster than he was for the oil spill by the Exxon Valdez. ... We're denouncing the ad by Americans for Job Security because it's false, not because it's negative ... The problem is the group has chosen instead to press a charge that is utterly without merit, in an ad that should be withdrawn." (editorial, Rocky Mountain News, 8/25/04)

<u>GJDS</u> Editorial: "The Ads Are So Palpably Wrong They Are As Laughable As They Are Reprehensible"

In an August 26, 2004 editorial the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel said of an ad ran by Americans for Job Security against Ken Salazar, "To blame Ken Salazar for environmental problems at the Summitville Mine is akin to blaming untouchable FBI Agent Elliot Ness for the crimes of Al Capone." The Sentinel went on to say, "The ads are so palpably wrong they are as laughable as they are reprehensible. Unfortunately, the ads might seem believable to some voters unfamiliar with the Summitville fiasco so Salazar is of necessity fighting back." (editorial, Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, 8/26/04)

<u>Durango Herald</u> Editorial: "It Is Hard To Find Opponents Stupid Enough To Try To Smear A Man With An Impeccable Reputation With Allegations That Have Already Been Proven To Be Complete Lies," Called AJS Ad "Toxic Lies"

In an August 26, 2004 Durango Herald editorial titled, "Anti-Salazar ads leach toxic lies into campaign" the <u>Herald</u> said, "It is hard to find opponents stupid enough to try to smear a man with an impeccable reputation with allegations that have already been proven to be complete lies. Nonetheless, a group called Americans for Job Security is attempting exactly that...the group is funding television ads blaming Salazar for allowing and subsequently mishandling the Summitville mine disaster. The charge is neither new nor accurate." (editorial, <u>Durango Herald</u>, 8/26/04)