MONTANA WILDLIFE AND TRANSPORTATION

DATA AND INFORMATION WORKGROUP

9:00am – 1:00pm, Thursday, January 13th, 2022

Meeting Notes

Purpose: Formulate recommendations to the Steering Committee on purposes of the product, intended uses, and how the product may fit into the overall processes for project selection/identification, review the status of the tool and identify remaining clean-up and production items, define beta testing parameters and directed feedback questions, coordinate January and February milestone tasks.

Objectives:

- Provide recommendations/guidance for the SC in advance of their 1/19 working meeting pertaining to the purpose of the product, initial intended uses, how product fits into project selection
- Review AJ's revised datasets and limitations and data needs/data gaps documents
- Begin discussing beta testing parameters and questions for directed feedback
- Coordinate work for January and February 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), Nick Clarke (MSWP), Brooke Shifrin (MSWP), Linnaea Schroeer (FWP)

Agenda:

1. Introduction

2. Recommendations to the SC
    a. Group reviewed and revised a strawman from Liz and Andrew for how the D&I product should be / should not be used in project selection and initial intended uses (PS document) (DI Phases and Intended Uses)
        i. Phases
            - Phase I – Broad scale
            - Phase II – Fine Scale
            - Phase III – Feasibility and project selection
        ii. Group discussed how DI Tool fits with the SC efforts in serving as a baseline for identifying projects, establishing thresholds for decisions, and how it might be used along with other criteria, in scoring during project evaluation and selection
        iii. The DI Tool represents a "scale of needs" at the statewide and possibly district levels
        iv. Group discussed the limitations of the data and how adaptive management of the tool is critical to its usefulness and relevance over time – the tool is the product of a "methodology" which is very important to understand (context)
    b. Group finalized recommendations addressing their questions posed to the SC at the December 7th meeting (DI Recommendations)
        i. The pubic, informed stakeholders, the SC are the "users"

        - SC for purpose of informing project selection and informed allocation of resources and capacity; align efforts around common goals, areas of greatest need
        - Public to assist in the identification of important project areas based on greatest need
    ii. Question about the relevance of breaking out display by geography, criteria, or percentage?
    iii. The beta testers will provide a "gut check" from the partner entities on the tool
        - Does the tool meet the needs of the audience? How is the statewide scale useful compared to the district/region scale?
    iv. Group discussed the different ways the tool can be displayed and the pros and cons of showing a "top 10 %, 25%, etc."
        - Inclusive or exclusive filter for project identification (stakeholder project identification)
        - Used as one of the relative scores, or bonus scores (SC project selection)

c. Group documented recommendations and provided guidance for the SC in advance of their January 19th working meeting
    i. The tool can be used at two decision points
        - Needs/Benefits (Phase II – public/stakeholder)
        - Scoring project proposals (Phase III – SC)
    ii. Importance vs. value at the project level
        - Importance of an area, a project
        - Value of community engagement and support
    iii. Intended Uses
        - Target audiences: Public / Stakeholders and SC
            a. Conservation Organizations (NGO's)
            b. Informed citizens and community-led groups
            c. Local governments, county planners
    iv. Layers of analysis beyond the tool
        - Keep process simple for proposal/application
        - Proponents must demonstrate a reasonable chance for success to participate
        - Balance informed with rigorously strict criteria for application to get best proposals

Outcome: Group formulated and documented recommendations to the SC for their January 19th working meeting

DI Group documented work from this meeting in refinement of the DI Recommendations and the DI Phases and Intended Uses document provided to the SC for their January 19th meeting

Other items on today's agenda were pushed to future meetings:

- Review AJ's revised datasets and limitations and data needs/data gaps documents
- Begin planning for beta testing of the mapping tool
- Review and update the latest (December) tasks and timeline document, coordinate the work for the January/February milestone tasks