

26 April 2021

Senator Jeff Golden, Chair
Senate Committee On Natural Resources and Wildfire Recovery

RE: PASS HB2068 WITHOUT AMENDMENT

I am a career biologist from John Day with over 30 years professional experience in the management of fish and wildlife and the habitats upon which they depend. I have been involved in Oregon's LOP program (from policy to on-the-ground implementation) since its inception and have testified many times on the benefits of the program in general as well as needed reforms.

It's very simple to gauge the conservation and public access merits of Oregon's LOP program, especially in contrast to the similar programs from our neighboring states. Nearly without debate, **the program warrants permanent status and I urge you to pass HB2068 as originally submitted.** However, the -2 amendment, which would prohibit landowners from receiving any financial consideration from the transfer of an LOP tag, **deserves no consideration.**

Although such an amendment may appeal to someone without any depth of knowledge or experience in wildlife management, in reality, it is a seriously flawed, emotional suggestion that proposes to institutionalize prejudice against private property owners and become a direct impediment to conservation.

Monetization of natural resources, including wildlife, has been repeatedly demonstrated through published study to directly result in the conservation of those resources along with improvements in the socio-cultural and economic well being of the beneficiaries thereby helping to ensure the sustainability of private conservation of public resources. In addition to the conservation benefit, data shows that market approaches to recreational access to private land not only increases public access but reduces exploitation and crowding of public land. This amendment is ridiculous in its ignorance of these well-established facts.

It is even more egregious in its demand to institutionalize discrimination against a single class of citizens--who largely shoulder the burdens of conserving public resources--by the very same individuals and organizations who are the largest beneficiaries of the commoditization of wildlife. Literally billions of dollars each year benefit outdoor industries, state wildlife agencies, sportsmen and nonprofit wildlife organizations. Prohibiting landowners from being the only group not to benefit from those expenditures is analogous to outlawing economically disadvantaged or POC communities from sharing in Oregon's economic prosperity.

I thought we had progressed beyond such outright hatred and bigotry in Oregon?

Regardless, entertaining such an arbitrary and capricious amendment in such a frivolous fashion demeans the efforts of the legislature, ODFW, landowners, sportsmen, conservationists, and researchers who have spent decades successfully developing and instituting a program to help ensure the long-term viability of Oregon's wildlife and productive, private land ownership and resource stewardship.

To undo those accomplishments on a whim is unacceptable; to do so to satisfy the true motivations behind the proposed amendment is outrageous.

Sincerely,

/s/ Shaun W Robertson

Shaun W. Robertson