

**MONTANA WILDLIFE AND TRANSPORTATION**  
DATA AND INFORMATION WORKGROUP MEETING SUMMARY  
9:00am – 1:00pm, Thursday, November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021  
Meeting Notes

**Purpose:** Prepare for presentation to the Steering Committee (SC) on December 7<sup>th</sup>, review the draft write-ups for the story map, initiate discussion about potential uses and limitations of the product, and coordinate work for November and December milestone tasks.

**Objectives:**

- Prepare for presentation to the SC on December 7<sup>th</sup>
- Review and identify needed revisions for the draft write-ups for the story map
- Identify next steps and timeframe for finalization of data clean-up and organization
- Initiate discussion about the purpose and limitations of the product
- Coordinate work for the November and December milestone tasks

**Attendees:**

- D&I Work Group: Andrew Jakes (MSWP), Liz Fairbanks (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), Hannah Jaicks (MSWP), Brooke Shifrin (MSWP)

**Agenda:**

1. Introduction
2. Prepared for presentation to the SC on December 7<sup>th</sup>, including documenting questions seeking guidance from the SC.
  - a. Consider and prepare different options for display (e.g. top 10, top 5% statewide, top 5% by district/region, summary map display, other)
    - Brian will prepare different options for display (e.g. top 2.5%, top 5%, top 10% statewide, top 5% by MDT district for discussion)
      - Being able to compare between maps is helpful for understanding differences. Brian will also prepare a dashboard to demonstrate capabilities to drill down into the data for more advanced users. For the SC presentation, he will talk through and display the storymap. Justin will present on the five NACs, including ranking and weighting.
      - Approach for December 7 presentation—this is our product and how we got here (individual NAC maps, and final rollup map), explain the NACs, these are some options, these are our questions for you/the SC.
      - Defining these thresholds for what to display is somewhat arbitrary but it will be important to ensure results are as inclusive as possible if this product is intended to be a first filter on where to direct resources and focus on areas of greatest need
  - b. Formulate recommendations for which layers/types of layers should be included as base layers in the tool.

- Base layers discussed and to be used include: MDT reference markers – linked to Google Street view, cadastral parcels, active rail, buildings, PLSS, hydrography, traffic, posted speed limits (outside incorporated areas), landownership (public v private), MDT state maintained routes.
  - Conservation easements and bridges should be added.
  - Land cover is interesting to display, but areas of greatest need tend to pop out better with this turned off, maybe more useful at smaller scales.
  - Will not include planned or active projects—large number of projects and many scopes (pavement preservation) are not conducive to inclusion of wildlife accommodations.
  - No “crossing structures” layer is currently available; MDT is currently working on it. Discuss timelines, roles and responsibilities, next steps for production and roll-out
- c. Discuss timelines, roles and responsibilities, next steps for production and roll-out
  - Brian will work on the display options, including statewide and district example, and possibly dashboard example
  - Adam will update the spreadsheet with surface width and ensure all values are property populated.
  - Adam and Brian will continue to “clean up” the data
- d. Determine and document recommendations for deliberation by the SC
- e. Determined “asks” for guidance or additional input from the SC.
  - The group identified the following questions for guidance from the SC:
    - Is there final approval on the five NACs, including the scoring and weighting?
    - Define a threshold and appropriate spatial unit to best define areas of greatest need.
    - What display options meet the majority (80-90%) of the user / audience needs? (e.g. statewide, by district, by region, top 2.5, 5 or top 10%?, base layers, etc.) Dashboard or possible V2.0 options can allow for further analysis of data by higher end users.
    - What are the initial intended uses for this product? What information needs to be available to the public vs behind the scenes?
    - How do you envision this product (areas of greatest need) contributing to the overall process for project selection?
    - How will the SC want to use the tool to integrate local communities and all of the other criteria?
    - Who are the audience and what is available to each? SC, public, agencies, partners, stakeholders, community groups – this might need to be a V2.0 if we want a separate private version? Is this V1.0 product able to be shared publicly?
    - What are your expectations for shelf life of V1.0? What if new information becomes available? What should the frequency of updates be?
    - What is the communication strategy for rolling this out to the public?
  - PIT crew will send a draft of the questions for D&I group to review and finalize for inclusion in the SC agenda for December 7th meeting

Outcome: Finalized preparations for the presentation of the draft product to the SC on December 7<sup>th</sup>, including the identification of any remaining items and leads for completion of those items prior to the meeting.

The group landed on a rough outline for the presentation (which Brian and Justin will lead/others can weigh in):

- Walk through each criteria
    - Important to discuss weighting/how we got here
  - Present analysis results
  - Show write ups/criteria maps
    - Spend a little more time on criteria 5 since there hasn't been as much discussion on this one
  - Overview of limitations - mention potential for dashboard w/o diving into the weeds
  - Return to final analysis map and show different display options
    - Top 2.5%
    - Top 5%
    - Top 10%
    - Top 5% by district?
      - These thresholds are intended to narrow down the possibilities to focus people- areas of greatest need but maintain inclusivity based on purpose of this product in the overall process of project selection
3. Reviewed the draft write-ups for the story map
- a. Reviewed and discussed the draft write-ups prepared by members.
    - The group talked through the language in the storymap. Each section needs to tell what data sources were used and how they were used to determine the score. The language needs to be at an appropriate comprehension level and free from jargon and acronyms.
  - b. Determine preferred level of detail, style, and other items to ensure appropriate content and consistency
    - Write-ups should capture three main points
      - What are we looking at?
      - What data were used / what factors were considered to generate this?
      - Describe the process and how this piece was used in the overall analysis to get the results we are looking at?
    - Discuss and agree on any needed revisions.
      - Each author will redraft their sections according to the agreed-upon content.
      - Group agreed to revise their respective sections by December 2<sup>nd</sup>

Outcome: Group agreed on steps to get to preferred level of detail, style and other items to ensure appropriate content and consistency of write-ups and determine any needed revisions. See above section.

4. Group identified next steps and timeframe for finalization of the write-ups, data clean-up/organization, metadata analysis, application migration, base layers, display, etc.
  - a. Brian reported on progress made in data cleanup/organization, simplifying, and making metadata user-friendly.
    - Brian and Adam will finish data clean-up for pop-ups.
  - b. Brian and Adam lead discussion and make recommendations for classifying and naming the data. Group agreed on naming and classification strategy.

- Analysis results need to be rescaled so that each classification represents a more intuitive range of values and the display pop up for each road segment needs to be more user friendly.
- c. Brian and Adam will continue to work on the following items, with help from others as needed:
  - Write-up revisions
  - Data clean-up and organization
  - Metadata analysis and user-friendly display
  - Base layers
  - Product display options
  - Other related items

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

5. Group initiated discussion about potential uses and limitations of the product
  - a. Group discussed and documented initial ideas for:
    - How the product should be used/should not be used.
      - The group wants the storymap to tell the overall story and then allow for access to more in-depth information via link to the report or other supporting documentation.
      - The tool identifies a heat map of areas of greatest need based on the five NACs. It's important that the product tell the actual story and not be manipulated by other interests to skew results in support of a specific project idea.
      - Tool will always default back to the official version and cannot be changed by end users.
    - Developing and displaying guidance for users.
      - The group discussed the goal of making use of the tool applicable for 80-90% of the users.
        - Users likely to be the steering committee, the public, agency staff, partners, stakeholders, and community groups.
    - Potential initial uses of the product - working through the draft potential uses document from Teams (PS).
      - Paul has posted this draft in the Team.
    - What can/should be made public and what can/should not?
      - Group believes data used is OK for the public to view and use. Should be no need for internal and public versions.
      - Gabe will verify that the crash data in the tool is not protected information.
  - b. Group will document preliminary recommendations for the SC

Outcome: Group reviewed draft language from Andrew on limitations of the product. Andrew will refine and reorganize the limitations and data shortcomings write up under each NAC. He will get next version draft back to Brian. Brian and Adam will continue work to finalize.

6. Group reviewed the revised tasks and timeline document and coordinated the work for future 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
  - Andrew provided a first draft of this document.
  - The group discussed simplifying and organizing by data source and data owner.
  - The group was asked to provide any source websites as identified.
  - Andrew will revise and provide a second draft for discussion at the next meeting.
- d. Document data needs and gaps (AJ) – November
  - Andrew provided a first draft of this document.
  - Andrew asked the group to review document and homework and include comments and organizational suggestions.
  - Add NAC data sets.
  - Integrate the needs/gaps into the other document – data limitations.
  - Andrew will revise and provide a second draft for discussion at the next meeting.
- e. Clean up naming and metadata (back) and create story map documentation (front) (BA, AM TBD) – November
  - Brian and Adam are continuing to work on this
- f. Present draft final product to SC on December 7th (All) – December
- g. Draft list of initial intended uses for the product (e.g.SC/public) (PS) – December
  - Paul provided first draft on Teams
- h. *Beta test with MDT, FWP, and MSWP staff (AM, BA, ALL) – January/February*
  - Prepare webinar for everyone on how to use the tool and then follow-up for feedback (within each entity).
    - Group discussed possibilities of a single introductory/instructional webinar and options for entity-specific instruction
    - Feedback session expected to garner better results at the entity level rather than a combined single event for all.
- i. *Public release of tool still planned for April/May2022.*
- j. *Final report proposed due in May/June 2022.*

Outcome: Group revisited all tasks and dates on the timeline and planned for finishing them.

## 7. Next Meeting

- a. Group want to accomplish the following at the December 9.
  - Debrief on SC presentation and meeting
  - Review Andrew’s next version of data limitations and data needs/gaps documents
  - Review and finalize revised storymap write-ups
  - Revisit timeline and next steps – based on guidance from the SC
  - Discuss potential initial uses and of the tool
- b. Group’s homework between now and December 9.
  - PIT crew to get 11/18 meeting notes out to group
  - PIT crew to polish and prioritize questions for the SC with quick turnaround review by D&I group
  - Authors of storymap sections to revise by **December 2nd**
  - **December 7th** SC meeting:
    - Brian to develop dashboard for SC meeting
    - Brian to prepare display options to present for SC meeting, including a district example
    - Justin to review NAC criteria and ranking/weighting to present for SC meeting

- Brian and Adam to continue data clean-up work
- Gabe to verify assumption that crash data in tool is OK for public consumption
- Andrew to refine and reorganize limitations and needs/gaps write-ups, provide to Brian
- Members to provide websites for data sources on Data Limitations document and comments/organizational suggestions on Data Needs and Gaps document
- PIT crew to develop agenda for SC meeting

Outcome: Next steps and agenda agreed to for next meeting

8. Close at 1:00 pm