

**From:** Donna Bleiler [<mailto:donnajbleiler@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 29, 2015 12:34 AM  
**To:** Reiley Beth  
**Subject:** SJM 10 National Heritage Area

Members of the Senate Environment & Natural Resources Committee:

I wish to give testimony against SJM 10. As a defender of property rights, I am concerned that this bill is a wolf in sheep skins.

The Heritage Area proposed has far reaching boundaries, and it has definite consequences for folks who reside within them. What happens when a Heritage Area bill passes is that a management entity is tasked with drawing boundaries around a particular region (out of Oregon's control) and then coming up with a management plan for the area. When Heritage Areas are established, it invites them to oversee our land use decisions.

Once a Heritage Area is accepted by the federal government, it includes inventories of all property within the boundaries that the Park Service and Green groups want preserved, managed, or acquired because of their so-called national historic significance. What they do is go to local boards and local legislators and deem insignificant and harm to properties in the Heritage Area and urge laws be made to receive federal money. When Heritage Areas come to regions, it invites groups in to oversee our land use decisions - taking control away from Oregon and local communities.

The bill also requests appropriate funds necessary to restore and open the Willamette Falls Locks to once again bring upriver navigation and commerce to the communities along the Willamette River. However, The locks are owned and operated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and served primarily pleasure boats. The deterioration of the locks resulted in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reclassifying the locks as being in a "non-operational status," out of concern that any further operation of the locks could lead to a failure of the locks, posing a safety risk to the public.

It is a confusing point that the appropriation request in the bill does not mention that the locks are owned by the US Army Corps of Engineers and misleads the public on the restoration of commerce that didn't exist. Perhaps it could create commerce, and if that were the case, wouldn't they step up with the funds? At any case, it should be truthfully presented and should be a separate issue and not tied with a request for a National Heritage Area. The locks have already been recognized as historical when added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974.

By including the fund request to a National Heritage Area request it gives the

appearance of bribing the federal government for an exchange, and Oregonians are the losers.

When citizens are joining together with other western states to get the federal government to give back control of forests to the state, we should learn that once we give up control, we lose our rights.

I ask you to read this article on what has happened in other National Heritage Areas.

<http://prfamerica.org/speeches/10th/NatlHeritageAreas-AppearInnocent.html>

As a defender of property rights, I ask you to not support this bill, but I would support an amendment to just request for funds to restore the locks.

Donna Bleiler  
State Coordinator  
As A Mom