MONTANA WILDLIFE AND TRANSPORTATION

DATA AND INFORMATION WORKGROUP

9:00am – 1:00pm, Thursday, December 9th, 2021

Meeting Notes

Purpose: Debrief on presentation to the Steering Committee on December 7th, review the revised write-ups for the story map, review and discuss the revised datasets and limitations and data needs/data gaps documents, discuss potential initial uses of the tool, determine next steps and timeline based on SC guidance, and coordinate work for December and January milestone tasks.

Objectives:

- Debrief on SC presentation and feedback received
- Review and finalize revised storymap write-ups
- Review AJ's revised datasets and limitations and data needs/data gaps documents
- Determine next steps and revisit timeline based on guidance from the SC
- Discuss potential initial uses and of the tool
- Coordinate work for December and January milestone tasks

Attendees:

- D&I Work Group: Andrew Jakes (MSWP), Liz Fairbank (MSWP), Gabe Priebe (MDT), Paul Sturm (MDT), Brian Andersen (MDT), Adam Messer (FWP), Justin Gude (FWP)
- Planning and Implementation Team (PIT Crew): Deb Wambach (MDT), Barb Beck (FWP), Nick Clarke (MSWP), Brooke Shifrin (MSWP)

Agenda:

1. Introduction

2. Debrief on presentation to the Committee on December 7th
    a. Documented guidance received from SC including answers to D&I questions provided to the SC
        i. The D&I group was in general agreement that they were hoping for more guidance from the SC but appreciated that the SC did not see any fatal flaws and supported moving forward with plans for beta testing the product.
        ii. The D&I group concluded that they should make their own decisions on many of the questions posed to the SC and own their role as experts. They will make recommendations to the SC about how the tool should and should not be used accordingly.
        iii. The SC did endorse the 5 criteria and weighting.
        iv. The group discussed what they heard in the SC discussion and agreed that the conversation was trending toward a desire to have only one version of the tool for release that could potentially energize work throughout the state.
            - This approach provides transparency and ensures all users are using the same data to inform decisions
            - There is a desire for partners and stakeholders to have access to a dashboard the allows for more customization and analysis of the data
        v. The SC still needs to determine how the D&I product fits into project selection

vi. It will be critical to ensure there are focused questions for feedback + guidance as part of the beta testing roll out.

b. Discussed next steps, timelines, and roles and responsibilities for production and roll-out
    i. The group agreed that they should provide guidance/recommendations around how the tool could fit into a framework for project selection and what else is needed in that process.
    ii. The criteria pyramid is a useful starting point for developing these recommendations.
    iii. See notes in agenda item 6 for tasks and timelines.

Outcome: Discussed guidance received and documented feedback from the SC on the product and the questions posed at the December 7th meeting. Determined next steps, timelines, and leads for production and roll-out of the product.

3. Reviewed and finalized the revised draft write-ups for the story map
    a. Reviewed and discussed the revised write-ups prepared by members
        i. Group walked through each write up and adjusted language.
    b. Confirmed consistency in content, style, and presentation
        i. Group modified content in a couple places to ensure consistency in style and presentation across the write ups.
    c. Make any last revisions, finalize, and provide to Brian for production.
        i. Group agreed that they are all ok with the write ups.
        ii. Criterion 5 needs to be reviewed by MDT legal counsel.
    d. PIT Crew will review all 5 write ups and provide edits for overall consistency and include any recommendations from MDT legal counsel

Outcome: Group finalized storymap write-ups and provided to Brian for production.

4. Review AJ's revised datasets and limitations and data needs/data gaps documents
    a. Andrew needs to revise the documents
        i. Group to review and discuss the revised documents at next meeting
        ii. Determine any needed revisions and best layout for this information
        iii. Identify leads for any remaining items associated with these tasks
    b. Group needs to determine how these documents are to be incorporated into product documentation and guidance

Outcome: Andrew will revise the initial drafts of these documents. Group will identify next steps, leads, and timeframe for finalization of data limitations and data needs/data gaps documentation at the next meeting.

5. Determined next steps and revisited timeline based on guidance from the SC
    a. Group will identify next steps and timeframe for finalization of the write-ups, data clean-up/organization, metadata analysis, application migration, base layers, display, etc.

i. Brian presented a first stab at a simple dashboard which the group liked. The group agreed that it would be helpful to identify a specific question/recommendation for the SC regarding dashboard availability to the public based on where the D&I group lands with guidance around how the product should/shouldn't be used.

b. Brian reported on progress made in data cleanup/organization, simplifying, and making metadata user-friendly
    i. This is an ongoing work in progress for Brian and Adam
c. Brian and Adam will lead discussion and make recommendations for classifying and naming the data. Group will agree on naming and classification strategy.
    i. No discussion
d. Group identified next steps, leads, and timeframe for finalization of:
    i. Write-up revisions
        - Group completed during the meeting; pending MDT legal review of criterion 5
    ii. Data clean-up and organization
        - Ongoing work for Brian and Adam
    iii. Metadata analysis and user-friendly display
        - Ongoing work for Brian and Adam
    iv. Base layers
        - Ongoing work for Brian and Adam
    v. Product display options
        - This item is connected to the group discussion about how the product should and shouldn't be used and recommendations that will be developed for the SC. This will be the focus of the next D&I working group meeting.
    vi. Other related items
        - Group will make recommendations for beta testing guidance/instructions and desired feedback
        - Group will consider access permissions

<u>Outcome:</u> Group identified next steps, leads, and timeframe for finalization of data clean-up, organization, and display items.

6. Group initiated discussion about potential uses and limitations of the product
    a. Group discussed and documented initial ideas for:
        i. The purpose and intended use of the product
        ii. How the product should be used/should not be used and limitations of the product
            - Group discussed that this product is a high-level, broad scale, first tier filter
        iii. Developing and displaying guidance for users
            - Group discussed that there is a need to differentiate between guidance and instructions. What is the difference? Are both needed, timing?
        iv. Potential uses of the product - working through the draft potential uses document from Teams (PS)

- Group discussed that this should be integrated into the exercise identified in 6b below.

v. What can/should be made public and what can/should not
- Group trending toward single version of the tool for all users. There was recognition that beta testing may help inform this question.

b. Group will document preliminary recommendations for the Committee
i. Group agreed that it would be useful to spend the next D&I meeting talking through purposes of the product, intended uses, and how the product may fit into the overall processes for project selection/identification.
ii. Having a straw man to work from could be useful. Group agreed that Andrew and Liz would develop a first draft using the criteria pyramid as a starting point. What else is needed in the pyramid? How and where does the D&I product intersect with the pyramid and what are the recommendations for use at the various phases?
- Deb agreed to clean up the pyramid and share with Liz and Andrew.
- Strawman developed by Liz and Andrew should attempt to integrate some of the thinking from the intended uses document.

iii. Group adjusted January meeting date to occur prior to the second January SC working meeting (1/19), to allow for development of D&I recommendations and guidance in advance of that SC working meeting.
iv. Group discussed that it will be important to also develop recommendations/parameters/guidance/instructions/and directed feedback (survey) questions for beta testing to share with the SC.
- The beta testers within each entity will need to be identified
- It may be the case that each entity (MDT/FWP/MSWP) will need to develop questions for beta testing and then those could be integrated and refined.
- FWP has proposed developing a training webinar for the beta testing

Outcome: Group discussed potential uses and limitations of the product and documented next steps for initial recommendations for consideration by the Committee

7. Reviewed the latest (October) tasks and timeline document, made revisions as needed based on SC feedback, and coordinated the work for the December/January milestone tasks
   a. *Final draft spreadsheet of all criteria and datasets (AM, BA) - October*
   b. *Refine application to include all components (AM, BA) - October*
   c. *Document all datasets and limitations (AJ) - November*
   d. *Document data needs and gaps (AJ) - November*
   e. *Clean up naming and metadata (back) and create story map documentation (front) (BA, AM TBD) – November*
   f. *Present draft final product to Committee on December 7th (All) – December*

g. Draft list of initial intended uses for the product (e.g. Committee/public) (PS) – December
    i. Group moved this task above beta test in the task and timeline document since it is beginning sooner.
h. Methodology write-up (JG, AM, BA) – January 2022
i. Beta test with MDT, FWP, and MSWP staff (AM, BA, ALL) – January/February

Outcome: Task and Timeline document was revised to version December 2021. Group will determine if any items remain unfinished from October and November and make a plan to finish them. Group will revise timeline and tasks documented as needed based on SC feedback. Group will coordinate and make progress on December/January milestone tasks, make plans and identify others to assist in completion of those tasks, and begin planning for beta-testing within member entities.

8. Next Meeting
    a. What does the group want to accomplish at the January 27 meeting?
        i. Group rescheduled this meeting for **January 13**
        ii. Group will focus on reviewing and discussing a strawman from Liz and Andrew for how the D&I product should be used in project selection and work to identify recommendations/guidance for the SC in advance of their 1/19 working meeting.
        iii. Group will begin discussing beta testing parameters and questions.

    b. What is the group's homework between now and January 13? Will that be accomplished individually, in small groups, or some other way?
        i. Liz and Andrew develop strawman for use of D&I product in project selection
        ii. Consider beta testing questions in following four categories and bring to meeting:
            - Entity specific
            - Steering Committee
            - GIS
            - D&I
        iii. Brian and Adam wrap up data cleanup, etc.

Outcome: Agreed on next steps and agenda for next meeting

9. Closed at 12:30 pm.