

## Emily Anonymous

Despite industry's active participation in the process and prior agreements, they are working to block the rule by challenging the integrity of the process, asserting that the Department of Ecology is misinterpreting their own water quality standards, and promoting unsubstantiated claims that contradict collaboratively developed science. These talking points are inaccurate and an effort to misinform and derail overdue protections and longstanding agreements to avoid impact to their bottom line.

The proposed rule is the product of a 20 year collaborative process that follows the Adaptive Management Plan process. It is now the role of the Forest Practice Board, as a statutorily defined independent agency, to adopt the rule.

The rulemaking underway is the result of multiple formal votes by the FPB following 15 years of study. It was not a political decision nor advanced by a single agency. This rulemaking has also been long expected. Since the Forests & Fish Report in 1999, it was understood that riparian buffers would be updated based on scientific study. The rulemaking is the result of the system functioning as intended.

Industry claims that the rule will cost billions of dollars and devastate rural communities are not supported by transparent or verifiable analysis. These figures are significantly higher than the estimates produced by the State, which were developed through an open process with input from all stakeholders.

Landowner groups have not disclosed the methods or assumptions behind their inflated numbers, making the strength of the claims impossible to evaluate.

Several recent industry comments misstate science by asserting conclusions that contradict AMP findings. Landowner claims that AMP science is flawed ignoring the collaboratively designed studies and clear study conclusions. Instead, industry selectively cites or states opposing results without a transparent rationale. This approach contradicts prior agreements, undermines the credibility of the process, and asks policymakers to disregard years of collaborative research and analysis.

The responsible course is to rely on the established scientific record compiled by the State ♦ rather than claims by the regulated entity ♦ and adopt the rule.