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Upper Deschutes Advisory Group
Revisiting the Upper Deschutes State Scenic Waterway

- Check in -

Session 3 highlights
Crowdsourcing update
Public meetings review
Session 4 agenda
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Session 3 highlights

- Previewed initial Crowdsourcing assessment and took recommendations
- Continued discussions using the Values-Rules Assessment (VRA) matrix
- Explored clarity and understanding of each Outstandingly Remarkable Value (Values)
- Explored clarity and understanding or OAR-based rules for sub-segment 4G
- Previewed approach leading up to three upcoming public meetings
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Crowdsourcing update

- Through February 15, 2017 we’ve received/reviewed = 161 responses
- Received/yet to be reviewed, approximately 140 responses
- Review includes assessment to identify trend category and major points of emphasis
- Many respondents now submit input to all three Crowdsourcing prompts
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Trend Categories

- Process Concerns
- Increasing Development
- Limiting Development
- Advocating Protections
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Process Concerns

- Violate public meeting laws
- UDAG a ridiculous circus
- Do not take private lands
- Intensity of river use & access
- Regulations abuse
- Values managed differently
- Manipulate the law
- Usurp the will of the voters
- Government corruption
- Ignoring experienced people
- Lack of transparency
- Bogus crowdsourcing method
- Review excludes homeowners
- Most impacted by review
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Limiting Development

- Keep wild & scenic very local: 0
- Safety a principal concern: 5
- Additional access not needed: 10
- Demand does not equal need: 15
- Already unlimited recreation: 20
- Negative scenic impacts: 25
- Destruction of fish habitat: 30
- Due to environmental impacts: 35
- Against proposed bridge: 40
- Other: 45
- Total: 50

UDAG S4.08
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Public meetings review

- Three meetings held on February 16, 17, and 23, 2017 at Bend-area public schools
- Approximately 175 people total attended these meetings
- Information sheets provided included an overview, website directions, and Values & Rules
- Public Meetings Facilitation Record written and posted to the OPRD website
- Sound and recordings of each meeting were adequate, not high-fidelity digital clarity
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Session 4 agenda

Focal points:  - Values-Rules Assessment (VRA) revisited
               - Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) feedback

Open Forums1/2:  - Rule-Resource linkages
                   - Rule-Protection options

Linking points:  - Interim report highlights
Upper Deschutes Advisory Group
Revisiting the Upper Deschutes State Scenic Waterway

- Focal Points -

Values-Rules Assessment (VRA) Revisited

Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) Feedback
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Values-Rules Assessment (VRA) Revisited

### Upper Deschutes State Scenic Waterway

#### Values - Rules Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good site</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1F</td>
<td>1G</td>
<td>1H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Riparian</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>3E</td>
<td>3F</td>
<td>3G</td>
<td>3H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vegetation</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>4E</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>4G</td>
<td>4H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wildlife</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5C</td>
<td>5D</td>
<td>5E</td>
<td>5F</td>
<td>5G</td>
<td>5H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scenic</td>
<td>7A</td>
<td>7B</td>
<td>7C</td>
<td>7D</td>
<td>7E</td>
<td>7F</td>
<td>7G</td>
<td>7H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recreation</td>
<td>8A</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td>8C</td>
<td>8D</td>
<td>8E</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8G</td>
<td>8H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key

- **Strong Role**
- **Weak Role**
- **No Role**
- **Unknown Role**
- **Divided Role**
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Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV) Feedback

1. Are all values clear or unclear?
- Names are clear; many descriptions are not clear.
- Some adequate, but Hydrologic, Fishery, Vegetation, and others not so.
- Values are clearly specified in law.

2. Are there any intangible, community-based values that conflict or confuse the discussion?
- Yes, but no balance amongst Values.
- Maybe, perhaps irrigation related due to farming needs, other activities such as hunting at odds with rules.
- No other Values to muddy discussion.

3. Do we need to review the relevance of Values due to changed intensity of river use and access?
- Intense use = strong protection.
- Mostly yes, Hydrologic needs for water more relevant than use of water; Scenic vs. Recreational Values clash.
- All Values are not equal: ‘...highest and best uses...’ are recreation, fish, wildlife.
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- Open Forum 1 -

Rule-Resource Linkages
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Instructions

- This is a team exercise; self organize into 3-4 individuals per team
- Discuss each rule, in turn; write your input on the large flip chart paper
- Identify resources linked to the monitoring, management, or enforcement of each rule
- Resources can include, but not be limited to:

  Material, Money, People, Programs/Services, or other Assets
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- Break -
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- Open Forum 2 -

Rule-Protection Options
Upper Deschutes Advisory Group
Revisiting the Upper Deschutes State Scenic Waterway

Instructions
- This is an individual exercise; the group will participate together later
- Think in terms of ‘Current’ and ‘New’ rules; write your ideas on the colored stick-notes
- Write down ideas about ‘Current’ rules you feel would improve or clarify that rule’s intent
- Write down ideas about ‘New’ rules you feel are needed, suggesting that rule’s intent
- Once complete, bring forward your notes and prepare to ‘affinitize’ the results
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- Linking Point -

Interim Report highlights
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*Interim Report Highlights*

- DRAFT report provided to OPRD March 8, 2017
- Format included:
  - Executive Summary
  - Background
  - Stakeholder Engagement
  - Public Engagement
  - Key Issues
  - Next Steps
  - Challenges
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Interim Report Highlights

- Primary intent was to detail the process being used thus far
- Secondary intent was to introduce key issues and challenges
  - Key Issues: *Change, Balance, Values, Rules*
  - Challenges: *Group dynamics, public perceptions, plan interpretations*
- Final report now due by May 5, 2017
- Intent will be to provide detail on key issues and make recommendations
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- Check Out -

Conclusions and Scheduling