



Written Public Comment

Name	Topic
Marc Hudson	Pacific Forest Trust comments on the staff recommendations
Joe Buttafuoco	The Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) comments and suggestions for the Land Acquisition grant program modernization process
Joe Buttafuoco	Comments from the Oregon Land Justice Project Council



PACIFIC FOREST TRUST

Private Forests. Public Treasures.

June 9th, 2026

Re: Public Comments as to the Land Acquisition Modernization Program
Recommendations for the OWEB Acquisition and Restoration Committee

To the members of the Acquisition & Restoration Committee and OWEB staff,

We thank you for your time and focus on improving the Land Acquisition Program. We believe there are many improvements amongst the preferred options laid out before the committee and we applaud the staff for their work coming to those recommendations. For our purposes today we are only commenting on those recommendations for which we do feel there is some work to be done prior to conclusion. We have organized those comments according to the topics as provided in the Recommendations document.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY REFERENCE TO "SIGNIFICANT HABITATS FOR NATIVE FISH AND WILDLIFE"

We support the proposal to adapt the current definition of significant habitats from the 2004 Ecological Priorities Document to the 2026 State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP). We may add to this that any state or federally registered species recovery plans should also be considered as equal to the SWAP, as they clearly meet the constitutional requirement of providing guidance as to the protection of “significant habitat for native fish and wildlife” and often provide more specificity to the needs of a singular species than the SWAP plan itself.

AREAS OF IMPACT ON PORTION(S) OF THE PROTECTED PROPERTY

We support the inclusion of an area of impact designation as an eligibility consideration, though we believe that the question of whether it will need its own CE language will be a case-by-case question as to whether or not a general area of impact language will be needed, as compared to specific development zone restrictions, trail management restrictions, etc.

Further, we would like to advocate on behalf of OWEB’s own DEI-EJ policy and its focus on equitable distribution of resources. Managing land, or even paying taxes on



it, are not free. Unless a landowner has outside financial resources, it's often not possible for them to hold that land without some form of revenue coming from the property, and that often entails some form of impact, even if it's marginal. PFT is working with several landowners who are engaging in sustainable though impacting business practices on a limited portion of the property specifically so that they can avoid having to impact the remainder. For these landowners, not including the area of impact in the conservation easement isn't rational, as the sustainable management of the conservation areas is tied to ongoing use of the area of impact.

The key question not asked in the Recommendations document, or the corollary memo specific to Areas of Impact, is how is the area of impact supporting the area of conservation? If the Area of Impact contains, for example, a nature center and parking lot which is part of a non-profits economic model for fundraising for the maintenance of the whole property, then the area of impact is serving OWEB and the Land Acquisition Program's mission. Similarly for conservation easements, if farming, ranching or other extractive impacts are done on a limited area of the property, or done in a limited fashion, supports its conservation elsewhere, it should qualify. If, however, it is a non-de minimus area or scale of impact with no supporting role, it shouldn't be included for funding. We propose that the evaluation criteria be that the Area of Impact be economically, educationally or culturally is supporting the area of conservation, and that the area of conservation still be predominant (>50%) and significant according to the definition for significant habitats for native fish wildlife. Though 50% seems like a high area of impact, we do believe low-intensity impacts may be acceptable on broader areas, resources depending, and in other cases higher intensity impacts should be more confined.

Again, we reinforce the need for this perspective according to OWEB's DEI-EJ policy as precluding the possibility of areas of impact is tantamount to saying that only the wealthiest non-profits, or the wealthiest landowners, should be owners of those properties.

DESCRIPTION OF RESTORED CONDITIONS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS INCORPORATIONS

We have combined these recommendations from two topics because in both cases, we believe the key difference is in the perceived role of different conservation



easements documents included in the acquisitions process. As is common in the land trust community, the conservation easement is a contract document which sets the principles and specific prohibitions which will govern the property, and the management plan is an explanatory document provided by landowners which establishes how the land will be used within the guardrails of what the conservation easement allows. Management plans are referenced for purposes of noticing and approval but not incorporated. The Baseline Documentation Report records the condition of the property at the time the conservation easement is executed, and is incorporated into the document, being legally inseverable. Monitoring reports record the land use change as it occurs on the property over time.

The way OWEB has and is proposing to use these documents confuses their appropriate roles from the land trust perspective. Though many OWEB acquisition projects include restoration which finish post-acquisition, we do not believe that it is any more appropriate to update the Baseline Documentation Report post-restoration than it would be to amend the conservation easement. Monitoring reports exist to document land use change and are also required to be retained in perpetuity. Though the post-restoration monitoring report may need to be a special format monitoring report, there's no reason it cannot be, and that the condition described in the monitoring report can't be an enforceable condition, once achieved. The post-restoration condition frankly just isn't a baseline condition, though it may be an enforceable condition triggered by action on the land. Conservation easements often contain terms which change the nature of the landowner's rights once certain conditions are met, or reserved rights used. Descriptions of Restored Conditions frankly aren't different in law, and for simplicity's sake should not require extraordinary documentary processes.

Similarly, the question is not whether the conservation easement should be reliant on the management plan, the question is reliant *for what*. Normally, management plans are explanatory documents used for notice and approval wherein the landowner is providing the plan for land use to ensure compliance with the conservation easement. They are not contract agreements in and of themselves, nor are they incorporated extensions of the conservation easement agreements creating their own contract terms. To do so confuses the role of the management plan by making a contract out of an informational document. The management plan should



be inclusive of the restoration activities, and if there is a need for temporary contracts for OWEB to ensure the restoration OWEB paid for happens, then we should have independent restoration agreements, as OWEB often has for lands it is funding to restore absent conservation easements.

APPLICATION EVALUATION

Technical Review Team

We appreciate the difficulty of OWEB's position in selecting technical review teams. Having regional committees can result in potentially uneven treatment of applications from region to region. Having a statewide committee runs the risk of regional knowledge gaps as it's impossible to assemble a committee which has universal knowledge in all areas, and ecologies, of the state. However, we do believe that a statewide committee with appropriate local consultations should provide the fairest evaluations for all applicants.

The actual problem, as we see it, are problems in the perceptions of fairness given the potential anonymity of the review team. We know that review team members for comparable statewide review teams have been anonymous due to a concern over lobbying reviewers. We have doubts that it will be possible to ever create a fully trusted process which is anonymous. Further, we do not find keeping the names and expertise of individuals who are advising a state agency on the expenditure of millions of dollars a year anonymous to be right. If lobbying is an issue, then a statement that applicants who seek to influence reviewers about an application during the period of review will be disqualified should be considered.

Soundness Review

Performing a soundness review on a property that the reviewer has never visited or discussed with the applicant or the landowner is hard. We have witnessed mistakes and due to no faults of the reviewer, they're easy to make, but can result in an unfair review of an application. The refinement we would like to propose to this section is that applicants be allowed to see the outcome of the soundness review prior to final projects ranking, so that any mistakes in the review process may be addressed prior to a ranking decision is made. Otherwise, they are forced to dispute the inaccuracies in front of the Board.



PACIFIC FOREST TRUST

Private Forests. Public Treasures.

Thank you for your consideration and your time,

Marc Hudson

Conservation Director

Pacific Forest Trust

2540 NE MLJ Jr Blvd, Portland, OR 97212

mhudson@pacificforest.org



COALITION OF OREGON LAND TRUSTS

2540 NE MLK JR BLVD, PORTLAND, OR 97212 • 503-719-4732 • OREGONLANDTRUSTS.ORG

June 9, 2026

To: OWEB Acquisitions & Restoration Committee

From: The Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT)

RE: Multiple Uses and Proposed Solutions

Members of the OWEB Acquisition, Restoration & Emerging Issues Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony for the June ARE Committee Meeting. After more than 18 months of ARE Committee meetings, listening sessions, and internal working groups, we want to begin by thanking OWEB Board, staff, leadership and this Committee for your continued dedication and partnership throughout this process.

The Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) represents 32 member land trusts, soil and water conservation districts, and conservation organizations working across the state to protect our habitat and natural spaces—for all people, forever. The value of the land acquisitions grant program for COLT members and their work across the state cannot be overstated.

Multiple Uses / Additional Benefits

We appreciate OWEB's willingness to approach multiple uses on conserved lands with creativity and flexibility. Projects such as Trout Creek Ranch, Canyon Creek Ranch and Secret Valley Ranch demonstrate how OWEB has successfully advanced its ecological protection goals while accommodating working lands uses in



22 MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS: Blue Mountain Land Trust • Center for Natural Lands Management • Columbia Land Trust
Deschutes Land Trust • Ducks Unlimited • Forest Park Conservancy • Friends of the Columbia Gorge Land Trust
Greenbelt Land Trust • Lower Nehalem Community Trust • McKenzie River Trust
North Coast Land Conservancy • Oregon Agricultural Trust • Oregon Desert Land Trust

Pacific Forest Trust • Southern Oregon Land Conservancy • The Conservation Fund • The Nature Conservancy in Oregon
Trust for Public Land • The Wetlands Conservancy • Wallowa Land Trust • Western Rivers Conservancy • Wild Rivers Land Trust

10 ASSOCIATE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS: Bird Alliance of Oregon • Black Oregon Land Trust • Cerro Gordo Land Conservancy •
Clackamas Soil & Water Conservation District • East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District • Helvetia Community Association
Tualatin Soil & Water Conservation District • View the Future • Willamette River Preservation Trust •
Yamhill Soil & Water Conservation District

appropriate areas, recognizing that conservation outcomes can often be achieved alongside public access, cultural use, and working lands operations.

Human connection to conservation lands is central to long-term social support for, and the ecological sustainability of, habitat conservation. We encourage OWEB to consider the more commonly used terms “multiple use” or “additional benefits” rather than “other use” for general references, while still using the helpful and precise terms “working lands,” “public access,” and “cultural use” for specific references.

Over the past several decades, conservation science and conservation organizations have increasingly recognized that human use and conservation are not inherently opposing goals. And research has demonstrated that, when thoughtfully managed, multiple uses/additional benefits can coexist with—and often strengthen—long term conservation outcomes. *Please refer to submitted testimony from the Oregon Land Justice Project Council (OLJP) that is specific to cultural access and use.*

OWEB’s recent strategic plan highlights the importance of people on the land, “people who connect with their watershed care for their watershed” and OWEB’s impact to “engage Oregonians according to their unique connection with the land - whether cultural, spiritual, economic or recreation - to increase their understanding of the impact of their everyday actions on the health of their watersheds.”

OWEB and the Department of Fish and Wildlife recently developed attributes to guide Oregon’s agencies toward investing in resilient lands and waters across the state. Those attributes also recognize the value of people on the land, that “people and the environment are resilient together through place-based relationships.”

Our interest in this topic is not to guide OWEB away from fulfilling its constitutional mandate to invest in the long-term protection of significant fish and wildlife habitat. Instead, we hope this discussion can help establish a more explicit philosophy and clearer guidance for evaluating multiple uses/additional benefits on conserved lands. This guidance will give applicants confidence in designing projects and allow the Board to evaluate projects consistently.

Proposed Solutions

Land trusts share OWEB’s commitment to protecting conservation values and seek solutions that maximize ecological potential while responding to community needs and interests. We support multiple uses on properties when they are thoughtfully designed and pose manageable impacts to the property’s habitat values.

We echo the recommendation within the memo that OWEB rely on a trust-based relationship with Indigenous Tribes and cultural uses. Regarding the other questions



posed in the memo, we look forward to working with OWEB and the ARE Committee on recommendations for working lands and recreation.

For land trusts, questions about multiple uses/additional benefits (recreation, working lands, cultural access) come up early in the applicant's project assessment and planning process. Public access in particular, typically arises from an expressed community interest. Determining whether and how multiple uses fit a project is a strategic decision that informs project design.

But conservation projects are long-term efforts that exist in complex and dynamic ecosystems, and it is often impossible to make all decisions regarding future uses in perpetuity at the time of application. Site conditions, community needs, and management approaches may evolve over time.

Rather than focusing on a single decision point, we encourage OWEB to establish clear and consistent "multiple use/additional benefits" expectations that apply throughout the project life cycle, from application review through post-award and long-term stewardship.

We also support the recommendation within the staff report of a "middle" approach where independent third parties are engaged in the discussion on allowable levels of multiple uses, and recommend the Committee consider adding additional expertise to the Technical Review Teams (TRT) for applications proposing multiple uses/additional benefits.

We recognize that not every use will be appropriate on every property, and that habitat conservation values must remain the primary consideration for Measure 76 investments. But as OWEB's program requires significant match for a property acquisition, land trusts are also often assembling funding from various partners—federal, state, local, and philanthropic—to protect a single property. The ability to accommodate recreation, cultural or working lands components can help leverage outside investment and get projects over the finish line that provide conservation and community benefit.

In conclusion, we encourage the Committee to consider developing a clearer set of principles for evaluating multiple uses/additional benefits, grounded in conservation outcomes. Our land trusts look forward to assisting with these discussions, helping to inform appropriate thresholds and principles.

Measure 76 Land Acquisition Program

When we began this work, COLT members identified a few high-level outcomes we hoped this process would achieve, including that the program leads with a culture of



trust, partnership and transparency. We appreciate the immense level of work represented in the Land Acquisition Modernization Program Recommendations memo. We have outlined our areas of support below, along with areas where we feel additional recommendations would be helpful towards reaching land trust goals.

Proposed Solutions

Overall, we support OWEB's preferred solutions outlined in the Program Recommendations memo, and appreciate the significant time, thought and collaboration that have gone into developing these recommendations. While we are generally aligned with the preferred options, there are several areas where additional discussions would be valuable to ensure the recommendations are implemented effectively. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with OWEB through an internal-external working group to further refine these recommendations.

Throughout the OWEB Solutions Document, solutions are characterized in terms of "risk." We believe that in most cases, a more accurate term is "impact" or "effect." Framing program improvements in terms of risk implies loss and damage to desired outcomes rather than the potential for improvement and gain that we together are seeking from this process. We request that OWEB consider using positive or neutral language such as "impact" and "opportunity."

Conservation Easements

- If conservation easements continue to be the title restriction of choice for OWEB, investigate additional flexibility when/if the conservation easement creates barriers for transferring land to Tribes.
- When revising the conservation easement template, recognize cultural values as a complementary conservation purpose. This is consistent with Oregon's [conservation easement statute](#), which identifies preserving the "historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural aspects of real property" as a qualifying conservation purpose.
- We applaud OWEB staff for moving away from bifurcating projects into artificial "good condition" and "highly degraded" bins. Applicants should be able to demonstrate the significance of a project by describing its conservation values, context, and long-term conservation outcomes, including any likely to result from anticipated restoration actions. This change will eliminate ongoing confusion about the relationship between "desired future conditions," "description of restored conditions," "intended future conditions," and "intended ecological outcomes" and how these terms are integrated into the application, grant agreement, conservation easement, baseline, and management plan.
- We are unconvinced of the value or necessity of updating the baseline documentation to capture every future restoration action. A simple statement



in the CE that future habitat improvements are automatically included within the CE's protection, along with a monitoring report documenting the restored conditions, would be more than adequate to protect improved conditions (e.g., The parties agree that this list (of conservation values) is not exhaustive and additional habitats, species, or other conservation values may exist now or in the future on the property.).

Significant Habitats

- We question the value of defining “significant habitat” and “lower thresholds of ecological function.” Rather than placing projects in artificial boxes, we encourage the program to allow applicants to demonstrate significance with reference to OWEB’s 2004 conservation acquisition principles and the other sources mentioned in the solutions document.
- Consistent with the preferred option under *Constitutional and statutory reference to “significant habitats for native fish and wildlife,”* remove the 2004 Ecological Priorities for Land Acquisition guidance and replace it with a document that includes OWEB’s well-founded conservation acquisition principles and refers to the other habitat guidance documents, including the 2026 State Wildlife Action Plan and other local, regional, Tribal, and federal conservation plans.

Application & Due Diligence

- Create a Statewide Technical Review Team: We generally support adding objectivity and consistency into the ecological review process via creation of a statewide team but would like to work with OWEB on the structure and membership criteria to ensure OWEB receives appropriate regional input on ecological value. The Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP) uses a similar approach and this has sometimes failed to adequately capture regional information or values. Under any structure, applicants should retain the option, but not the obligation, to add regional experts to the team to ensure the review team evaluates projects in context.
- Due Diligence & Soundness Review: We recommend an opportunity for applicants to review preliminary soundness conclusions before staff scores are finalized. Allow applicants to participate in conversations with the Department of Justice (DOJ) when risks are identified during project soundness reviews.
- The “low hanging fruit” process made great progress last year in streamlining the land acquisition grant application. We suggest convening a similar effort focused on the application revisions needed to implement OWEB staff’s preferred option under *Description of Restored Conditions (DRCs) at time of grant agreement and in CE.* Applicants should be allowed to describe project benefits, including any anticipated from envisioned restoration actions,



without having to choose whether the project falls into overly simplistic “good condition” or “highly degraded” bins.

Finally, our conversations over the last 18 months have highlighted again and again the limits to program effectiveness born from inadequate staff capacity. We support more participation in the general land acquisition grant program by staff in the specialty programs that have been added in recent years, from OAHP to Drinking Water Protection. COLT will continue to advocate before the legislature on behalf of additional FTE and other budget support. The more we can exhibit a collaborative, community conservation-based approach to program development, with demonstrated flexibility on particular projects around the state, the better we expect that advocacy to be received.

We know this work is far from complete. A responsive, flexible and impactful grant program will require consistent and ongoing communication, feedback, and partnership among OWEB and grantees. We look forward to continued partnership.

Sincerely,



Joe Buttafuoco
Executive Director
Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT)





COALITION OF OREGON LAND TRUSTS

2540 NE MLK JR BLVD, PORTLAND, OR 97212 • 503-719-4732 • OREGONLANDTRUSTS.ORG

June 9, 2026

To: OWEB Acquisitions, Restoration, and Emerging Issues (ARE) Committee

From: Oregon Land Justice Project Council

Thank you for the opportunity to share some comments as this Committee continues its work to modernize the Measure 76 land acquisitions program.

The Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) is a membership organization representing 32 land trusts, soil and water conservation districts, and conservation organizations working across Oregon to protect our habitat and natural spaces – for all people, forever. Collectively, our members have protected more than 782,860 acres of land across our state.

We want to acknowledge up front that COLT and its members do not speak for Tribes and that this testimony is based on our own experiences, relationships, and learning. The goal of this testimony is to share information about the Oregon Land Justice Project (OLJP) and land trust efforts to partner in support of the goals of Tribes and how these efforts can inform your discussion today regarding other uses on M76 conserved lands. The barriers to Tribal participation in the program shared in the December Tribal panel are relevant to land trusts, due to the growing partnerships between land trusts and Tribes.

Indigenous people have cultivated place-based knowledge over millenia that informs their land stewardship and ensures healthy habitats. There is a connection between the health of the land and the revitalization of Indigenous cultures. The Oregon Land Justice Project works to promote both. The conservation values that are the basis for our shared work in Oregon exist due to Indigenous peoples' long term care of landscapes since time immemorial.



24 MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS: Blue Mountain Land Trust • Center for Natural Lands Management • Columbia Land Trust
Deschutes Land Trust • Ducks Unlimited • Forest Park Conservancy • Friends of the Columbia Gorge Land Trust
Greenbelt Land Trust • Klamath Lake Land Trust • Lower Nehalem Community Trust • McKenzie River Trust
North Coast Land Conservancy • Northwest Rangeland Trust • Oregon Agricultural Trust • Oregon Desert Land Trust
Pacific Forest Trust • Southern Oregon Land Conservancy • The Conservation Fund • The Nature Conservancy in Oregon

The Trust for Public Land • The Wetlands Conservancy • Wallowa Land Trust • Western Rivers Conservancy • Wild Rivers Land Trust
8 ASSOCIATE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS: Black Oregon Land Trust • Cerro Gordo Land Conservancy • Clackamas Soil & Water
Conservation District • East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District • Helvetia Community Association
Tualatin Soil & Water Conservation District • View the Future • Yamhill Soil & Water Conservation District

Our coalition views cultural values and conservation values as mutually supporting each other, and hopes the Committee can consider how OWEB's program can support and strengthen Tribal cultural access, use, and stewardship of conserved lands while ensuring that appropriate infrastructure and accommodations are available to support Tribal elders and community members in connecting with these places. Ultimately, we believe that conservation will be more effective and durable over the long term when we center the first stewards of these lands.

COLT's Oregon Land Justice Project

COLT initiated the Oregon Land Justice Project (OLJP) in 2019. The effort is grounded in the belief that Tribes and conservation groups, like land trusts, share common values. The conservation community has a responsibility to redefine what conservation accomplishes and who it serves. Specifically, we are motivated to be authentic partners to Indigenous communities who still care for land under Indigenous value systems. A goal of OLJP is to plant the seeds for growing strong, equitable relationships that bring the people together to advance a common interest: protecting and healing the land. That can be best accomplished through restoring Indigenous stewardship. We believe that Land Back is not only about returning land to Tribes but also includes providing access, co-management, place renaming or many other methods that help Tribes to reconnect land to culture, language, and other lifeways.

Launched in 2023, the OLJP Council works to operationalize the Oregon Land Justice Project vision through service. Composed of 14 land trust staff from across the state, the Council coordinates and maximizes our community's collective resources, knowledge, and relationships. This includes actively supporting and providing capacity for land access projects in response to requests from Tribes. Beyond this core group other land trusts are also partnering with Tribes on land protection and care.

Through 2025, members have worked on the return of over 25,510 acres of land in Oregon to Tribes. In addition, there are 33 properties with some form of co-management with Tribes and over 119,000 acres open to Tribal use. Some of COLT's member land trusts have also worked with Tribes and Indigenous community groups to provide opportunities for the harvest and stewardship of culturally important plants. This past month, the Wallowa Land Trust hosted its seventh annual root gathering event which welcomes back Indigenous families to their ancestral Homelands in Wallowa County to harvest First Foods and traditional medicines on privately owned lands. This is one example of several partnerships between land trusts and Indigenous land stewards that are helping to heal the land and the people.

We expect this work to grow and we hope that OWEB can be a strong funding partner and support this important work. The Measure 76 land acquisition program has the potential to support cultural use of protected properties. We see the current modernization effort as an opportunity to make the program more responsive to



Tribal needs and improve the stewardship and ecology of land acquisition projects funded by OWEB.

We have reviewed the recommendations proposed in the staff report prepared for this meeting. We have not fully considered the implications of all of the recommendations presented in the report, but implementing the proposed changes would be a big step in the right direction. We encourage OWEB to rely on trust-based relationships when lands have been returned to federally recognized Tribes through the Measure 76 land acquisition program. We also appreciate the recommendation for greater flexibility in considering infrastructure that would allow for more opportunities for Indigenous stewards to take care of the land, such as restrooms, seating areas or shelters. We encourage OWEB to extend this flexibility to non-Tribal landowners as well.

We recommend that OWEB staff and Board consider taking the following actions:

- **Change language in OWEB's conservation easement template to recognize cultural values as a conservation purpose.** This is consistent with Oregon State statute about what qualifies as a conservation easement. [ORS \$\beta\$ 271.715\(1\)](#) lists "preserving the historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural aspects of real property" as a conservation purpose.
- Reduce barriers within the Land Acquisition program to Tribal participation through programmatic changes and more engagement with Tribes.
- Explore how conservation easements impact Tribal sovereignty, the ability to move land from fee to trust, and look for ways to mitigate these barriers.
- Explore alternative methods of ensuring consistency with OWEB's program and Oregon statutes that are not as prohibitive to cultural practices as conservation easements.
- Explore less restrictive language in whichever protective mechanism OWEB chooses, which will assure that the use of the property is consistent with the goals of the land acquisition program without creating barriers to cultural use.

OWEB's commitment to be bold and innovative in their programming, as outlined in OWEB's Strategic Plan, is a laudable goal. We encourage OWEB to be bold and innovative in modernizing the land acquisition program. COLT will remain a partner in exploring these issues and finding ways to address them. Ultimately, we want to see the Land Acquisition program benefit the important conservation work of both land trusts and Tribes and for the state to increase funding investments in this program. We are in the midst of a biodiversity and climate crisis. The acquisition,



protection and restoration of ecologically and culturally important lands directly address these threats. It is crucial at this pivotal time to build a conservation movement that honors Tribal sovereignty and realizes the interconnectedness of Indigenous people and the lands we all love and care for.

Thank you for considering this testimony.

Respectfully yours, the Oregon Land Justice Council,

Sincerely,



Joe Buttafuoco
Executive Director, Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts



Anna-Liza Victory (Cherokee Nation)
Oregon Land Justice Project Manager, Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts

Gabe Sheoships

Gabe Sheoships (Cayuse/Walla Walla)
Executive Director, Friends of the Columbia Gorge



Steve Wise
Executive Director, Southern Oregon Land Conservancy



Joe Moll
Executive Director, McKenzie River Trust



Katie Ryan
COLT Board Chair & Executive Director, The Wetlands Conservancy



Jessica McDonald
Executive Director, Greenbelt Land Trust



Anya Tyson
Sagebrush Sea Program Director, The Nature Conservancy of Oregon



Kathleen Ackley
Executive Director, Wallowa Land Trust



Katie Voelke
Executive Director, North Coast Land Conservancy



Rika Ayotte
Executive Director, Deschutes Land Trust



Marti Martino
Executive Director, Blue Mountain Land Trust



Kelley Beamer
Executive Director, East Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District



Max Beeken
Conservation Director, Wild Rivers Land Trust

