

clearly is not a comprehensive water plan.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would also like to speak in opposition to the motion to raise and I'd like to make a couple of preliminary comments, but I'd also then like to ask you to really pick up and read the handout that I passed out to you which is the two pages that are relevant in terms of defining what a comprehensive plan is as defined by the federal government and, of course, that's what we're talking about here. It's not just is it any comprehensive plan or is it a plan? The question is, is it a comprehensive state plan as defined by the federal government? Sometimes I don't know why I'm arguing on this particular issue because they've had at least six lobbyists working this for several months and it's a kind of a throwaway vote in the sense that you tend to think, well, why not, what harm can it do? So it's a tough issue to argue on. But I think there are two things that should be extremely important to us. One is, this Legislature deserves some respect. We spend a lot of time making thoughtful decisions in here and we work real hard to build up credibility and respect. And I suggest to you that if today you send out this resolution saying that this state has a comprehensive state water plan, we're going to lose a lot of that credibility and we're going to lose a lot of that respect because anybody who takes a thoughtful look at this will know that it doesn't even come close to meeting the federal definition of a comprehensive water plan. And they are going to use this in litigation and they are going to use it futilely. I feel very comfortable saying that and they're going to spend 150 to 200 to \$250 an hour on Washington lawyers to go in there and argue that this pitiful thing we're doing today represents a comprehensive state water plan, and they are going to lose, and then they're probably going to appeal that and spend another 100 or \$200,000 after they have already spent over \$8 million on this whole matter. At some point in time, I think Central Power has to start taking a reasonable look at what it is doing. I think the leadership has not been good on this issue and this particular resolution is evidence that it continues to be poor quality. Just pick up for a minute, if you would, the federal regulation. It's called General Policy and Interpretations, and I circled the section 2.19 called state and federal comprehensive plans, and you can see that it defines comprehensive plan for purposes of their litigation and you can see that it envisions. It says,