

I have watched the majority of testimony over the last two days and admire those that have spoken passionately from both sides of the issue.

What has become abundantly clear to me is that the legislature is attempting to create a solution to a problem that does not exist. I would look to other states, mainly in the western part of the country, such as Colorado, that have gone down this route and the absolute mess it has created in their management of wildlife.

Pat Barry, a friend of mine, CEO of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, and the former Commissioner of the VT Fish and Wildlife, will speak to this I'm sure.

Your committee talks about not reading into "intent", but to the language of the law, however, it is difficult not to in this case. Other states that have gone down this route have not been successful.

The last point I'll make in voicing my opposition to this bill, is the term "non-consumptive". Your committee is wrestling with that terminology. You are having a hard time finding it, because it doesn't exist. Someone who doesn't hunt, fish or trap is still a consumer of wildlife resources. It is part of being alive on this planet.

I would recommend that we do not need new legislation demolishing a successful system and adding more bureaucracy. If anything, hopefully the Fish and Wildlife Board and the Governor who appoints them, has become through this process more aware that the public is seeking more diverse voices on that board.

Thank you for your time and the work you do,

Levi Doria

Ripton, VT