

If you look at a Contract with America and the changes happening in the Congress today, they're talking about doing more and more risk assessment on environmental policies to try and determine whether or not the risk averted is worth the expense of the environmental regulations put in place. They're looking at taking government and they want to change it into being more businesslike, so that laws and taxes and programs and regulations and everything that we talk about in terms of government, they want to try talking about what is the cost, what is the benefit, is it worth doing. Well, that's exactly what we're talking about here and it is something that we do more than just here. Actually, we haven't even started doing it here. We've talked about it, we've analyzed 775, but we...this is the first time that we've decided to use the cost-benefit question prior to deciding whether or not to go forward with tax breaks. That has been something I've advocated for a long time, because you can answer the question back that we got when 775 passed. Remember the fire storm that occurred over that, the people were angry and the bottom line was that revenue loss was there, and yes, so we're going to get the money back but everybody knew it wasn't the case, and everybody was unhappy. This way if you have the cost-benefit you review it and you know you're going to come out ahead, you can assure the public, you keep away from the controversy, you can answer the concerns that are there. That's what Senator Warner is talking about and that's what I think we need to be doing. And again that concept is not isolated. When Senator Wehrbein, back there in Appropriations and all the folks that put in all the hours reviewing all of the budgets that we have in state government, they're trying to make not essentially a cost-benefit ratio and everything, but they're trying to evaluate carefully, weighing the costs, weighing the benefits, is this something we want to do versus something else. We only have so much money. And the appropriations process is in a sense a cost-benefit analysis working through how much we spend and trying to decide how best to spend that money. Well, 775 is costing us \$65 million a year, it's going to cost us \$800 million, at least at this point, or more when it's all said and done. But we don't spend the time doing the cost-benefit analysis before they come in. We accept, if they meet the standards they come in and off they go with the tax credits. This is a change from that. This is saying, hey, let's wait and look at this before hand and evaluate it as if it's an expenditure and know whether it's an expenditure we want to make, whether the return on it is worth the expenditure. Conceptually it isn't whacky, it isn't out of