

And I guess it's a technical point but I'm wondering if at some point we should just go ahead and have a water litigation fund that it could be used for rather than having to come back later and saying, well, we didn't have anything for Kansas and how are we going to deal with that.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, I...I suppose that is technically more accurate. I would defer to Senator Beutler in this case if he thought that that was...if we needed to get more appropriate here. I guess we actually never know exactly where the issues are going to come from and what they're going to be. Whether you need to specify a fund more directly, I don't know.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Beutler, would you...could you respond to that? I know you could, but would you respond to that?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah. Senator, I have mixed feelings in the area too,...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...and I don't know how it is that you can predict exactly what those litigation expenses would be. Certainly, we will have continuing litigation expenses with Wyoming for a couple of years. It is possible that we would have them with Kansas, but I...it is unpredictable what will happen. We are hoping we can work things out with Kansas without spending money on a lot of lawyers. Whether that will be possible depends on a sequence of events that may or may not occur. So I just can't be very helpful on that. I can't see doing anything different than what the Senator has done, basically.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay, I appreciate that...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I do have a little enlightenment on that, if you'd like.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Roger, go ahead.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: It is not designated in the fund as to what it'd go for. This is for edification in the manual.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: So it is just a general litigation...