

Washington State Association of Counties (Court Stanley)

Thanks, I'm Court Stanley, I'm representing Washington State Association and Counties. And I was part of I am part of policy that went through the negotiations on this regulation and just a little bit of background on it that you know the rock studies that when they came out they were good they're BACI studies, they have limitations but it's good science. And counties along with the rest of the caucuses agreed that action needed to be taken. So after the NP Work group we entered negotiations in policy. Counties put out a proposal that was never given any traction. Ecology was hesitant to accept it. Industry was a bit late getting in their proposal but was talked about and I don't remember if Westside tribes ever put a proposal together.

Through negotiations we finally agreed that we would not reach agreement and it ended up with majority minority prescriptions and counties decided to side with the minority even though both all caucuses agreed on scenario 2.

As we all know that the board voted only to bring majority forward to CR 102. And I think it was based on the NP groups negotiating team that they were based on the constraint that buffers could not exceed 0.3 degrees. It was a limit. This kicked out a bunch of several creative solutions to the problem because of the assumption of water temperature that weren't tested. And additionally, the costs and benefits for each of the alternatives were never considered during negotiations. That's a huge flaw. And after going through training with structured decision making and policy, economics have to be a part of each alternative before they're brought to decision makers.

So going forward the counties would propose that we need to give this back to a group of experts, policy experts, appointed by the Forest Practices Board through the adaptive management program with guidance from stream scientists. But we go through with the assumption or with the agreement the 0.3 degrees is a trigger, not a limit and we balance the impact to rural communities land-owners with the benefits to fish and water quality.

We have 4 months before the November meeting. In my wildest dream I think we could accomplish it but we need to start down that path and we need to continue to go on adaptive management where we pick the lowest cost alternative to achieve our benefits and monitor them and adapt as we go forward so thank you.