**MWTSC**

**Meeting Notes June 13th, 2022**

1. Introductions (Dwane/all 5 min)
    a. Intro any new people.

2. Approve 5/19/22 meeting notes (Dwane 5 min)
        i. Minutes approved with one minor edit.

3. Revised Flow Chart (Dwane 10 min)
    a. Review
    b. Approve
        i. Not updated in time for review at this meeting. Will be updated for review at next meeting.
        ii. Consider "phases" within the flowchart based on scoring discussions below

4. Reconciled Scoring Criteria & Application. (Deb 10 min)
    a. Review
    b. Finalize and approve
        i. Deb W. presented the two documents side by side and discussed the consistencies.
        ii. Discussion about the complexity of the application, scoring criteria and the need for a guidance document.
        iii. General approval of the scoring criteria and application given, but pending final approval, minor edits based on drafting of the guidance document.
        iv. Biggest concern is in regard to section VI and the complexity of that work.
        v. Document needs to clearly define what parts of VI are required and to what level that work needs to be performed based on project scope/scale
        vi. Add "preliminary" into header to better clarify intent or relativity of the level of data needed.

5. Scoring Value discussion. (Dwane 20 min) – Need to continue discussion at next meeting
    a. Value to be assigned for the respective areas and why
        See italicized note on Draft Application.
        i. Deb W. explained section of document.
        ii. It is more critical to deliver clear concise answers as to why an application was or was not selected than it is defending a numerical score.
        iii. Discussion about examples where a high scoring application may have major issues such as lack of community support or conversely, a lower scoring application may demonstrate community/landowner support and be more appropriate to move forward despite the lower score.
        iv. How do we want to score, consensus scoring/consensus average scoring - can scoring change based on a committee discussion – yes if consensus is required.
        v. Does the proponent present the proposal at the 3rd blue box or is it just a paper application (paper application).

vi. If application is rejected at the first or second green diamond - is it allowed to come back in the same cycle? Or does it need to be resubmitted at a later time? Project and cycle dependent?
vii. Discussion on whether or not to score or thumbs up/thumbs down at the first diamond, either needs to include a good justification on of why an application is or isn't moving forward.
viii. Need a definition of the score values – in general.
    1. 0 – didn't answer question.
    2. 5 - answered everything with no unanswered questions.
    3. Use only 0, 3 & 5 scores only.
        a. Update document – community ponds scoring example
ix. Go/no go at first green diamond
x. Proposed score at the second green diamond.
    1. Committee will discuss scores and adjust as appropriate to arrive at consensus or consensus average score for project. Again need to determine and document which applications are moving forward and why or why not.

6. Application Attachment Review (Dwane 20 min) – Did not discuss; move to next meeting
    a. Required or optional
    b. Do we have them all
    c. Budget Template (Future Fisheries example)
    d. Approve?

7. Guidance Document Development (Dwane 20 min)
    a. Who and When (build strawman)
        i. Asked MSWP to take first stab at a draft strawman document.
        ii. MSWP members in agreement with the proposal.
            1. With the understanding that they may have follow-up questions for members of the PIT Crew and/or the SC.

8. Next meeting agenda? (Dwane 10 min)
    a. Topics

9. Closing comments – Everyone (5 minutes or as time allows).