

MWTP SC – WORKING MEETING NOTES

November 5, 2025

I) INTRODUCTIONS

- A) Approve Notes 08/20/25 **Approved**
- B) Assign Notetaker **DR**
- C) New Agenda Topics **None added**,
 - 1) **FWP SC - Marina is leaving FWP, intends to fill slot with same position when hired.**
- D) Attendance: (delete missing)
 - 1) Steering Committee: **DR, TM, KP, KM**
 - 2) PIT Crew: **DW, NC, ST** D&I: **CB, BK, LF, PS, JG**

II) NEW BUSINESS

- A) Clean problem statement feedback or approval
 - Group discussion on MDT edits, agreed on “align and activate” to replace “coalescing and catalyzing”. Changed “project” to “concept” since not at project level design. Added “scale” to ...reasonable number, scale, and distribution of focal areas... Scale example - Paradise Valley we are not building 60 miles of wildlife crossings. The focal areas will be broken down into concept level MP 41.1 is a grizzly bear crossing candidate, 35.1 is a candidate for elk crossing, etc.**
 - ...time bound commitments for “project” funding... agreed to leave “project” as referenced here.**
 - TM-general thoughts, focal areas are equal to 1-7 mile areas. Concept-level does not involve any investigative design component.**
 - All SC voted YES to accept final changes to problem statement as presented on screen by ST. Doc was saved to Teams channel following meeting, [linked here](#)**

B) Planning Tool updates from D&I Work Group

- 1) NAC5 – alternatives evaluation and recommendations **can we adjust NAC5 – Alternative recommendations? BK D&I looked at surface width, adjacent linear features, speed limit, ADT and found traffic drives NAC5 and interstate pops red. Leaning into individual criteria much more impactful than changing NAC5. Experts ranked these data sets. Data is data it will not spit**

out 10 to 50 projects and we are done. Tool has limitations and we will need to investigate problem areas on a finer scale. Biologist, collar data, etc.

In December we could look at interstate separately due to high cost and impact and maybe focus on top 5 or 10 and then also look at other corridors. Planning tool created by experts and it is robust, but it will not sift out priorities. Next step, local impact, local analysis to prioritize. This gets subjective and into feasibility, this may include land protections, terrain, and finding willing donors. NAC5 will point to interstate with adjacent RR which are some of the more challenging areas to address. We will need to consider this in our prioritization. All SC Voted Yes to keep NAC5 as is.

- 2) Consideration of subsequent “feasibility” criteria to get to prioritization including EO/local staff input **AGREED**
- 3) SC weighting of all NACs relative to each other **Higher number means lower value of criteria, they can be equal to others. Next relative score must be 0 to 100 total relative to each other. The existing weights got changed by D&I due to adding new data sets. Existing weights are based on averages of all D&I members. SC personal and agency thoughts/values and consideration on criteria is what we will weigh. SC to complete this by next Monday, November 10th.**
- 4) Next steps – By January meeting
 - (i) Create “feasibility” criteria – refer to project selection criteria
 - (ii) D&I group will run tool with new NAC weights and run different scenarios for top x, %, etc. In meeting December 11th.
 - (iii) Results and alternatives will be presented to SC at January working meeting **Kylie – reminder to SC to review how other states have established prioritization. Great examples in the report. This will be a good reference for this discussion.**

C) Finalize a 2026-2027 Workplan - [REVISED Draft 2026-27 Workplan](#)

- 1) Develop and maintain a tracking process for projects that have been approved
 - (i) US 191 Mouth of Gallatin Canyon – identify and pursue funding sources by _____
 - (ii) I-90 Six mile – complete feasibility study by **August 2026 (from feasibility study)**
 - (a) Develop project funding strategy/etc.
 - (iii) Hwy 89 Dome Mountain – complete feasibility study by **June 2027**

- (a) Develop project funding strategy/etc.
- (iv) US 191 North of Big Sky – resolve HOA issues, complete feasibility study (CLLC/Jacobs) by _____
- (a) Develop project funding strategy/etc.

Review and revise 26/27 Workplan and be ready by our December meeting. SC Agreed.

- 2) Identify, prioritize, and implement priority wildlife accommodation projects
 - (i) Stepwise process for project program (open year-round, review/select April-June)
 - (ii) MWTP Prioritization
- 3) Develop a project funding plan to identify, coordinate, proactively and regularly pursue funding and resources to design and implement projects on an agreed upon schedule
- 4) Develop and Implement a Targeted Outreach Plan to communicate with various landowner and grass-root groups, NGOs, local government
- 5) Implement remaining pertinent recommendations from the Summit Report (pages 8-11). Track implemented recommendations.
 - (i) Themes:
 - (a) Working Together
 - (b) Planning
 - (c) Policy and Legislation
 - (d) Priorities, Data Collection, and Information Sharing
 - (e) Education and Outreach
 - (f) Funding
- 6) MWTP leadership voice at 2027 legislature?
- 7) Determine the direction for the partnership over the next 5 years

III) NEW BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

- All SC Review REVISED Draft 2026-27 Workplan
- D&I updates to Planning Tool Summary Report and Help Guide **pending our changes to NAC weighting and other updates.**
- ST Make the updates to PT more prominent on the MWTP webpage – **converting elk crossing picture to direct link to Planning Tool to promote the tool and hopefully get more engagement.**
- PIT - Need to update application guidance documents to reflect change(s)
 - Annual cycle changes – **target April submittal and June selection.**

- Communication Plan can be updated to reflect changes to cycles and MWTP outreach and engagement **include Work Plan items and prioritization process work.**
- Want to show progress with HB 932 and HB 855 money ahead of 2027 session – find something “shovel-ready” to spend it on **find shovel ready project for funds, funding is being collected now and will transfer \$500K July 1, 2026. This account can build a balance to match federal funds if needed. Kylie pointed out allocating as we go may be a better approach to show the need for these funds. Nick consider “committed to project XYZ”.**
 - Is Cougar Creek ADS an option for this? MDT to consider. **ADS was taken out due to lack of funding last year. WTI had plans and were seeking grant funding. Need to verify if WTI could leverage this as match. Consider other options for this funding. FWP needs to have discussion at leadership on final decision on where this funding goes.**

IV) OLD BUSINESS

V) OLD BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

- A) MSWP to develop list of community contacts for targeted outreach on wildlife & transportation issues, MWTP project program, etc. – see 4/29 notes on this topic – **DA/KP/SB**
- B) Communications Plan and Schedule of Deliverables, 2025 update – **ST**
- C) Post past meeting minutes and agendas – **ST**
- D) Website page for current projects and updates – **ST**
 - 1) Active Projects tab with links and short summaries

VI) UPDATES

- A) Current Active Projects
 - 1) I-90 Sixmile Creek Underpass – Huson
 - 2) US-89 Dome Mountain
 - 3) US-191 Mouth of the Canyon
 - 4) US-191 North of Big Sky

VII) NEXT MEETINGS

- A) 12/5/25 – SC Working Meeting
 - 1) 1000-1200p – Virtual
- B) Schedule 2026 SC Working Meetings

- 1) Nick to send out poll – monthly through June 2026
- C) January (2nd week) – Application Go/No Go (if needed)
 - 1) Nick to send out poll – could combine with Jan SC working meeting
- D) February – Consensus Scoring (if needed)
 - 1) Nick to send out poll – could combine with Feb SC working meeting