Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Assessing project feasibility

Don Skaar
Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Helena, MT

RI/FS process

- Methodical/linear approach to problem identification and solving
- Seeks in part to quantify uncertainty and risk
- Process can be exploited

Components of feasibility

- Implementability
- Cost
- Support (other responsible parties, public)
- Short-term effectiveness
- Permanence
- Politcal will

	Factors increasing uncertainty of success	Factors increasing risk of failure
Implementability	Data gaps in fish abundance and distribution, private landowner access and cooperation	Short time frame, inadequate manpower, size of system.
Cost	Longevity of project, unforseen mitigation responsibilities, means of access	Multiple jurisdictions, permitting entities
Public Support	Unknown opponents or issues	Poor outreach, inadequately addressing concerns, not reducing outrage
Short-term effectiveness (Immediate success)	Lack of money, manpower or time necessary to confirm success.	Habitat complexity, resistant fish species, lack of clear lines of authority (ICS).
Permanence	Open systems for fish movement	Sabotage, poor barrier design,
Political will	Changing administrations, poor alignment with agency goals	Longevity of project, power of opponents

Ways to reduce uncertainty and risk with public support

- Find out who they are, what they do, where they live. Talk to them
- Selling the project
- Recognizing the connection between pollutants and outrage

Selling it to the public

- Convince them there is a problem
  - Clearly define the problem
  - Good characterization of alternatives
- Convince them you are the one to fix the problem
- Listen and respond to their concerns

Recognize the connection between pollution and public outrage

- Is my exposure to the hazard voluntary or coerced?
- Is it fair, from the perspective of risks and benefits?
- Is it dreaded?
- Is it morally relevant?
- Is it natural or industrial?
- Probability vs. magnitude