



changes without first completing monitoring studies will move away from the process of letting sound science determine best management practices as it relates to the Forest Practices Act.

I understand that we are recommending an expensive option, but every time we consider making changes to the Forest Practices Act, we need to make sure we are basing our changes on sound science. Sound science is expensive and requires a public investment, and if we want the Forest Practices Act to continue to be the standard for science based rules, we need to do it right. If this rigorous science leads us to a rule change, it will be received much more positively if we can show that good and thorough science got us there. If cost is considered an obstacle, please communicate that to the public. Our legislature has been very creative in finding funds for critical projects and I'm sure all your stakeholders would unite and lobby them for the best science possible to make sure we do this right.

**If the board decides to propose monitoring studies**, water quality temperature and desired future conditions are appropriate areas of emphasis. Water quality temperature science helps us have confidence from our EPA and DEQ partners and desired future conditions studies will help guide us to long term health of our riparian management areas. Areas of emphasis in the desired future conditions studies could be shade and large woody debris.

Your regional advisory committees want to be a resource to you. We have representation from the forest industry, small woodland owners and members of the public at large. Please continue to include us as you move forward with these and other questions. By rule, we are your resource to provide clarity, technical feasibility, and practicality on rule changes. Thank you for your time today and for the opportunity to share our suggestions with you.