

MWTP SC – WORKING MEETING NOTES

September 23, 2024

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- a. Rob Stapley, MDT Rail, Transit, Planning Division Administrator- **Rob added to Teams channel.**
- b. Approve Notes 7/15/24 - **approved**
- c. Assign Notetaker - **Shane**
- d. Add new agenda topics - **none**
- e. Attendance: **ST, BA, DW, DK, TM, SB, KP, RS**

II. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Debrief from August meeting
 - i. **KP- What are next steps, if any?**
 - 1. **DK- MDT not a big fan of project prioritization – against its use by others as leverage to force MDT to build, might discourage applicants from applying if not on the list. TM agrees, discussed that the Partnership has not had the appetite for this for its life so far.**
 - 2. **KP- This can help for long range planning of Conservation Easements, acquisition, efficiency, etc. SB agrees with the long-term planning. What is statewide goal and achievable metrics? As justifiable reasoning for MSWP participation.**
 - 3. **DW- Planning Tool is robust evaluation of these aspects (5 NACs). Someone could provide summary of the data of the highest scores according to Tool. FWP has sent SO 3362 Plan to Director. Mentions highways, could use this in summary information.**
 - 4. **TM- What has changed to make desire for prioritization?**
 - a. **KP- may help with capacity issue.**
 - 5. **ST- How do we rectify Partnership priorities vs. private applicant priorities?**
 - a. **KP- CO has example.**
 - b. **SB- this is the result of the process we built, not necessarily how it has to remain.**
 - 6. **DW- proposes a deeper look into the Planning Tool and evaluation of its utility to meet the needs of a prioritization plan. (MSWP)**
 - a. **KP- Could be basic or more advanced, depending on level of effort. Agency buy in would be beneficial.**
 - b. **DW- start with a preferred method (options) for the Planning Tool to meet these needs.**
 - c. **DK- struggling with what is the need.**
 - ii. Summary of other western state wildlife/transportation partnership approaches (MSWP)

1. KP- summary of 12 western states “Partnerships” that exist.
 2. KP- Summary of what these states used as planning tool and prioritization plans.
 3. DW- What do the other state agencies have for ‘skin in the game’?
 - a. Financial, role, coordination, etc.
- b. November 2024 application cycle
- i. Call for applications
 1. How do we justify restricting applicants from applying if does not fit ‘our criteria’? Moving the Goal. Changing the game.
 - a. KP- homework- ask MSWP and Conservation Groups of interest in projects. MSWP meeting on 26th.
 2. Proposal- for near future – May is big projects (FS), Nov is smaller projects (no FS, or minor FS).
 - a. Would need a press release, announcement on website.
 3. Proposal- Dictate how much money is available in FY for FS in press release. Applicants then fill out budget worksheet for determination if app should be submitted.
 4. SB- need to eval guidance documents about FS money availability.
 5. ST- Backlog of FS projects question.
 - a. Never intended to have backlog. Applicants must re-submit in next cycle.
 - ii. Decision for Applicant guidance
 1. TM- would like to be clear on expectations
 2. DK- good either way
 3. SB- accept all, to allow good projects to hit the ground running in May at FS time.
 4. KP- Be sure we are clear on available FS funding, ask for all
 5. MDT ST – develop language on FY, and funding limitation, following KP idea.
 - iii. Communication Plan
 1. Comms Plan updated in April, cleaned up and available on Teams
 2. Schedule of deliverables
 - a. Updated in April, cleaned up and available on Teams
 3. Subscription List Announcements – drafts ready
 - a. Get Ready - [DRAFT MWTP Nov24 Email to Contacts.docx](#)
 - b. Nov Cycle Open - [DRAFT MWTP Nov24 Cycle Open - PressRelease.docx](#)
 - iv. Feasibility studies
 1. Funding
 - a. Fiscal Year is Oct 1- Sept 30. If FS launches after Oct 1. When MDT programs the project determines FY.
 - b. FY24 – Sixmile
 - c. FY25 – Dome Mtn
 - i. Assuming 3-400k, may not have \$ avail for Nov cycle

- ii. No estimate for Dome FS, TM need to request Consult Services.
- 2. Capacity
 - a. Can MDT replicate what CLLC did for Mouth of the Canyon?
 - i. DK- good idea, hard to progress
 - ii. DW- Is this a path forward?
 - 1. DK- going to take time for this to be accepted.
 - b. Dependent on the success of Mouth of Canyon FS.
 - i. DK- there are pros/cons, speed of implementation, could have been improved by QAQC by MDT.
 - ii. TM- FS evaluation was “light”. Missing components, but got the job done and is moving forward. DW agrees.
 - c. KP- Can “design (FS) standards and expectations” help this process?
- 3. MDT Team/Consultants
 - a. What would MDT District cross integration look like?
 - i. DK- Not likely to happen.

III. NB ACTION ITEMS

- a. MSWP- Take deeper look into the Planning Tool and evaluation of preferred method (options) for its utility to meet the needs of a prioritization plan.
- b. MSWP- KP- summary of 12 western states “Partnerships” that exist.
- c. MSWP- KP- Summary of what these states used as planning tool and prioritization plans. What do the other state agencies have for ‘skin in the game’?
 - i. Financial, role, coordination, etc.
- d. KP- ask MSWP and Conservation Groups of interest in projects. MSWP meeting on 26th.
- e. MDT- ST – develop language for public announcements on fiscal year, and funding limitation, following KP idea (II.b.ii).

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Data sharing- **not discussed**

V. OB ACTION ITEMS

VI. UPDATES

- a. D&I Group – Planning Tool
 - i. Routine updates – **D&I Group is evaluating data layers for current status to be completed by end of year**
 - ii. 5-year revision (2025)- **update to document for SC approval**
 - 1. **DK- interest in landownership layer, CE layer**
- b. Updates to application guidance docs- **ST working on**
 - i. **SB- Website link is broken.**

- c. Updates to application forms- **ST working on**
- d. Templates for “Go” Letters- **ST done**
- e. MSWP webinar – Tips for Applicants- **MSWP will discuss at meeting**

VII. NEXT MEETINGS

- a. October 24, 1-3pm
- b. **November 20, 9:30-11am**
- c. **Discussion on Go/NoGo Meeting only being email.**
 - i. **Decided to hold meeting.**