

Summary of Western States Analyses and Efforts for Crossings and Connectivity

Kylie Paul

June 2023



Contact Information

Kylie Paul

Center for Large Landscape Conservation

kylie@largelandscapes.org

Please contact the author with any additional resources or examples that can be included in future iterations of this document.

largelandscapes.org



Table of Contents

Introduction 2

Recent Efforts and Policies 2

Statewide Analyses 3

State Efforts 8

Local, Regional, and State Crossing and Connectivity Identification Studies..... 10

Introduction

In this document, we compile policies, analyses, and efforts related to connectivity and crossings issues, focusing on eleven states in the western conterminous United States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. These states reflect the Department of Interior's Secretarial Order 3362, which addresses conserving, enhancing, restoring, or improving the condition of priority big game winter range and migration corridor habitat in eleven Western states.¹

Recent Efforts and Policies

While the science and practice of transportation ecology has been advancing steadily globally over the last decades, several actions have spurred the practice and related policies in the U.S. in recent years, particularly in the West. Several are highlighted here:

In 2008, the Western Governors' Association (WGA) formed a Wildlife Council to develop policies and tools to identify key wildlife corridors and crucial wildlife habitat. The Council considered how 16 western state wildlife agencies could be more innovative and collaborative in information-sharing. In 2013, WGA launched a west-wide Crucial Habitat Assessment Tool (CHAT), and many western states created their own similar tools. The CHAT initiative was phased out in 2023. WGA reaffirmed its commitment to wildlife corridors and habitat conservation through policy resolutions in 2019² and 2021.³

Several states have hosted multi-stakeholder summits (see Table 2, described below) bringing together state departments of transportation and fish and game agencies, along with partners. These summits have led to important next steps for transportation ecology, including working groups, analyses that combine transportation and wildlife concerns, and priority setting.

Department of Interior Secretarial Order 3362 catalyzed significant research⁴ in big game migration with focus on habitat conservation and management. It also identified habitat fragmentation by roads as a priority to address. As a result of the Order, each western state identified its top five priority big game winter range and migration corridors in a required Action Plan.

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior. 2018. Improving habitat quality in western big game winter range and migration corridors. Secretarial Order 3362. https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/so_3362_migration.pdf

²https://www.trcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/WGA_Wildlife_Migration_Corridors_and_Habitat-Res-6-12-19.pdf

³ <https://westgov.org/images/files/WGA-PR-2021-04-Species-Conservation-and-the-ESA.pdf>

⁴ Kauffman, M., et al. 2022. Ungulate Migrations of the Western United States, Volume 3. Scientific Investigations Report 2022-5088. 114 pp. <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20225088>

The federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) (once enacted at the end of 2021), created unprecedented funding opportunities for projects that reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions and improve habitat connectivity. The Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program is a \$350 million-dollar competitive grant program that offers the first-ever dedicated federal funds for crossings projects.⁵ In addition to the Pilot Program, projects that improve habitat connectivity and reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions are eligible for a wide range of federal transportation programs under the BIL. Expanded eligibility means billions of additional federal dollars are available.

Many state policies are catalyzing habitat connectivity and wildlife crossing projects, as well.⁶ For example, the states of California, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah have enacted wildlife crossings and/or connectivity legislation. Further, the governors of Colorado, Nevada, Washington, and Wyoming have enacted executive orders protecting wildlife movement or migration.^{7,8}

Statewide Analyses

Western state transportation and wildlife agencies have increasingly carried out analyses to identify priority areas and road segments for wildlife mitigation measures.

Table 1 includes each state's most recent studies and reports on wildlife-vehicle conflict and/or connectivity at a statewide scale. Some identify and prioritize mitigation locations based primarily on concerns for human safety by focusing on the locations of wildlife-vehicle collisions. Others include emphasis on wildlife conservation through examination of ecological connectivity and other factors. In addition, some states analyze connectivity more broadly without a direct focus on transportation concerns.

Additional studies focus on particular regions within a state; these are included as a list by state in the final section of this document.

⁵ <https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programs/wildlife-crossings>

⁶ Breuer, A., B. Hance, R. Callahan, R. Ament, Z. Wurtzebach, and A. Wearn. 2022. Ecological connectivity policy compendium: U.S. policies to conserve ecological connectivity, 2007-2021. Center for Large Landscape Conservation: Bozeman, MT, U.S. doi.org/10.53847/KBWT3277

⁷ <https://largelandscapes.org/news/state-xing-legislation/>

⁸ <https://www.ncelenviro.org/issue/wildlife-connectivity-and-crossings/>

Table 1. Existing statewide wildlife-vehicle conflict and/or connectivity studies

State	Document name	Description
Arizona	<u>Arizona Statewide Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict Study</u> <i>Williams et al. 2021</i>	Identified and analyzed crash/collision hotspots. Other transportation and ecological factors were examined at those crash hotspots for a prioritization analysis using wildlife movement data, habitat maps, threatened species locations and habitat, and other factors and including wildlife linkages from Arizona's Wildlife Linkage Assessment (2006) and other efforts. Considered estimated costs of mitigation recommendations during prioritization.
	<u>Arizona's Wildlife Linkages Assessment</u> <i>Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup 2006</i>	Identified potential linkage zones important to Arizona's wildlife and natural ecosystems. Identified large blocks of protected habitat, the potential wildlife movement corridors through and between them, the factors that could possibly disrupt these linkage zones and opportunities for conservation.
California	<u>Large Mammal-Vehicle Collision Hot Spot Analyses</u> <i>Huijser and Begley 2019</i>	Identified deer-vehicle crash and mule deer carcass hot spots based on a statewide analysis (crash data only) and analyses per Caltrans district (crash and carcass data). Hot spots were then prioritized based on parameters related to human safety, biological conservation, and economics. Includes economics analysis.
	<u>California Wildlife Barriers 2020</u> <i>CDFW 2020</i>	First attempt to collate an initial suite of priority wildlife movement barriers across the state. CDFW staff identified linear segments of infrastructure that currently present barriers to wildlife populations. Each identified linear segment then evaluated using 10 criteria and the degree to which the criteria applied to the segment under review. Each Region identified and mapped their top ten priorities for mitigation. There was an updated version in 2022 but it is not available to the public.
	<u>Statewide Terrestrial Connectivity Map</u> <i>CDFW 2019</i>	Shows statewide overview of essential corridors and linkages that have been mapped in California across multiple studies across time.
	<u>California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project</u> <i>Spencer et al. 2010</i>	Statewide assessment of essential habitat connectivity using the best available science, data sets, spatial analyses and modeling techniques. The goal was to identify large remaining blocks of intact habitat or natural landscape and model linkages between them that need to be maintained, particularly as corridors for wildlife.
Colorado	<u>Western Slope Colorado Wildlife Prioritization Study</u> <i>Kintsch et al. 2019</i>	Created WVC risk model to estimate relationship between roadway and road-adjacent attributes (tree cover, traffic volume and speed, winter range herd density) and relative WVC risk based on accident and carcass locations. Prioritized model results by weighting prioritization criteria, largely influenced by

State	Document name	Description
	<u>Eastern Slope and Plains Wildlife Prioritization Study</u> <i>Kintsch et al. 2022</i>	WVC safety needs but also considers wildlife movement (mule deer, elk) needs during winter and migration periods. Included cost-benefit analysis.
Idaho	<u>Methodology for Prioritizing Appropriate Mitigation Actions to Reduce Wildlife-Vehicle Collisions on Idaho Highways</u> <i>Cramer et al. 2014</i>	Set up a prioritization process to identify priority WVC problem road segments and identify actions to reduce WVC in those locations. Was applied in a pilot test to identify high WVC hotspot areas in several Districts.
Montana	<u>Montana Wildlife and Transportation Partnership (MWTP) Planning Tool Summary Report</u> <i>MWTP Data and Information Working Group 2023</i>	MDT, FWP, and partners. Online planning tool evaluating highway segments of interest based on wildlife-vehicle conflicts and important areas for wildlife movement and conservation. Provides coarse scale information to assist stakeholders and the interested public in working collaboratively to identify potential conservation efforts for mitigation measures.
Nevada	<u>Prioritization of Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict in Nevada</u> <i>Cramer and McGinty 2018</i>	Identified areas of animal-vehicle conflict of highest priority where NDOT can create mitigation alternatives to reduce these collisions and make roads safer for travelers. Identified top hotspot locations using the crash data. Included livestock analyses. Also identified priority locations using GIS modeling of safety and ecological data to identify areas of potential animal-vehicle conflict, where wildlife and livestock presence near roads is predicted based on many factors including wildlife habitat and corridor maps.
	<u>Wildlife Connectivity Plan</u> <i>(in development as of 5/23)</i>	From Executive Order 2021-18. Nevada Department of Wildlife will identify migratory corridors of ungulates and other key species, delineate migration corridors supported by existing and ongoing scientific research, accumulate and provide wildlife movement information, evaluate threats and needs across species and habitats, recommend conservation strategies, actions and policies, and establish actions for MOU with NDOT within 12 months of completion. Expected completion 12/23.
New Mexico	<u>New Mexico Wildlife Corridors Action Plan</u> <i>Cramer et al. 2022</i>	Identified statewide priority areas for wildlife mitigation based on WVC hotspots using crash data and prioritized them with additional transportation, ecological, and feasibility factors; and wildlife corridors via linkage modeling using GPS locational data, telemetry and other movement data, past habitat and corridor modeling, and input from agencies, stakeholders, and the public. Developed range of recommendations for each potential project area based on field visits. Included cost-benefit analysis.

State	Document name	Description
Oregon	<u>Oregon Wildlife Connectivity Implementation Plan</u> <i>ODFW 2023</i>	Plan outlines eight priority actions for wildlife habitat connectivity, including the Action Plan and OCAMP, described below.
	Oregon Wildlife Corridor Action Plan (in development as of 5/23) <i>ODFW and ODOT</i>	Connectivity legislation passed in Oregon (House Bill 2834 Signed by Governor Brown 2019) requires ODFW to create a Wildlife Corridor Action Plan. The bill also directed ODOT to establish a program to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions in areas where wildlife corridors identified in the Wildlife Corridor Action Plan intersect with proposed or existing public roads. Not yet available to public as of 5/2023.
	<u>Oregon Connectivity Assessment and Mapping Project (OCAMP)</u> <i>ODFW 2022</i>	Analyzed and mapped statewide wildlife habitat connectivity at fine resolutions for 54 species, to link landscapes for wildlife by identifying current wildlife habitat connectivity throughout the state for a wide diversity of species, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. Species' connectivity models compiled to highlight Priority Wildlife Connectivity Areas (PWCAs)– areas with the highest overall value for facilitating wildlife movement.
	<u>Research Project Work Plan for Habitat Connectivity Assessment and Mapping for Prioritization of Wildlife Crossing Projects 2019</u> (in development as of 5/23) <i>de Rivera et al. 2019</i>	Describes efforts to further develop ODOT's wildlife passage program to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions and to incorporate corridors into design options for road projects with potential to threaten connectivity. Aims to integrate collision mapping data together with wildlife corridor models, predicted traffic models, and climate resiliency mapping to identify wildlife-vehicle collision hotspots and ODOT priorities for wildlife crossing improvements. Technical report expected summer 2023.
Utah	<u>Identification of wildlife-vehicle conflict priority hotspots in Utah</u> <i>Cramer et al. 2019</i>	Identified top-ranked locations of WVCs, based on areas of the greatest number of reported wildlife-related crashes and carcasses reported along roads. Examined those locations in relation to available data on wildlife movements and use of habitat near and across Utah roads. Includes examination of costs.
	<u>Wildlife connectivity across Utah's highways</u> <i>West 2007</i>	Utah DOT held workshop in 2004 to identify highway sections that disrupt wildlife connectivity. 64 zones were identified and prioritized based on expert opinion. Possible mitigation solutions were included.

State	Document name	Description
Washington	<u>Washington Connected Landscapes Project: Statewide Analysis.</u> <i>Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group 2010</i>	WSDOT, WDFW, and other stakeholders. Nearly-statewide habitat connectivity assessment that identified areas where wildlife require movement across highways. Produced maps depicting linkage networks, including areas of suitable habitat and the best remaining linkages connecting them. Derived from two modeling approaches: focal species approach producing linkage networks for 16 representative species, and landscape integrity approach producing networks of lands exhibiting high degrees of landscape integrity and relatively intact natural areas with low levels of human modification.
Wyoming	<u>Framework for Prioritizing Projects to Reduce Negative Road-Wildlife Interactions</u> <i>Wyoming's Wildlife and Roadways Initiative Implementation Team 2019</i>	Wyoming Wildlife and Roadways Initiative. At 2017 Summit, 240 potential mitigation project locations were brainstormed. From those locations, priorities developed by each WYDOT District, then used these regional lists as a basis to develop statewide priorities based on human safety and biological considerations, and factors related to cost, effectiveness and feasibility.
	<u>Planning-Support for Mitigation of Wildlife–Vehicle Collisions and Highway Impacts on Migration Routes in Wyoming</u> <i>Riginos et al. 2016</i>	WYDOT and FHWA commissioned consultants. Hotspot analysis of deer-vehicle collisions (DVC) using crash and carcass data from 2008-2013, statewide. Via model, examined overlap with traffic volume, deer winter-use areas, modeled migration habitat value, cropland, and migration corridors derived from GPS-collared mule deer. Identified 27 DVC hotspots that should be prioritized and made recommendations for specific mitigations at those locations.

State Efforts

In addition to the analyses listed in Table 1, states have developed other important measures to address wildlife crossing needs in collaboration with stakeholders.⁹ These measures are summarized Table 2. Activities include wildlife and transportation summits, memoranda of understanding or agreement (MOU or MOA) between transportation and wildlife agencies to work together on wildlife and transportation issues, statewide stakeholder partnerships, and interactive websites for wildlife and transportation priority locations or roadkill reporting.

Table 2 is not an exhaustive list as it only includes statewide efforts. Some states have held regional meetings instead of statewide summits. In most states, local or regional partnerships exist, such as the Southern Oregon Wildlife Crossing Coalition.¹⁰



⁹ Cramer, P., J. Kintsch, J. Gagnon, N. Dodd, T. Brennan, L. Loftus-Otway, K. Andrews, P. Basting, L. Frazier, and L. Sielecki. 2022. Strategic integration of wildlife mitigation into transportation procedures: A manual for agencies and partners. Transportation Pooled Fund Study, TPF-5(358). Nevada Department of Transportation, Carson City, NV. www.wildlifeconnectivity.org/s/700-18-803-Final-Report-Manual.pdf

¹⁰ <https://www.myowf.org/sowcc>

Table 2. Other statewide transportation and wildlife-related efforts, including whether a state has: held a summit, developed an agreement or memorandum (MOA/MOU) between transportation and wildlife agencies on wildlife and transportation issues (not including fish/culverts), created a statewide partnership of agencies and others, and/or created an interactive website for wildlife and transportation priority locations.

State	Summit	MOA or MOU	Statewide group with agencies and others	Interactive public mapping or reporting website
Arizona	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
California	N/A	N/A	N/A	- Habitat Connectivity Viewer - Roadkill Observation System
Colorado	2017 , <i>upcoming 2023</i>	2019	- CO Wildlife and Transportation Alliance	- Crossing structures
Idaho	N/A	2015	N/A	- Roadkill reported locations - Roadkill/Wildlife Salvage Report
Montana	2018	2019	- MT Wildlife and Transportation Partnership - Montana Migration Coalition	- Areas of greatest need
Nevada	2019	<i>upcoming</i>	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	2022	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oregon	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Utah	N/A	2020 ¹¹	- Utah Wildlife Migration Initiative - Utah Wildlife Connectivity Working Group	- Existing crossing structures - Utah Roadkill Reporter
Washington	N/A	N/A	- WA Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group	- Existing crossing structures
Wyoming	2017 , ¹² 2021	N/A	- Wyoming Wildlife and Roadways Initiative	- Priority projects - Migration corridors

¹¹ Cramer, P., J. Kintsch, J. Gagnon, N. Dodd, T. Brennan, L. Loftus-Otway, K. Andrews, P. Basting, L. Frazier, and L. Sielecki. 2022. Strategic integration of wildlife mitigation into transportation procedures: A manual for agencies and partners. Transportation Pooled Fund Study, TPF-5(358). Nevada Department of Transportation, Carson City, NV. www.wildlifeconnectivity.org/s/700-18-803-Final-Report-Manual.pdf

¹² Lutz, D., K. Keel, C. Riginos, H. Copeland, B. Rudd, and A. Withroder. 2017. Wyoming's Wildlife and Roadways Initiative – A Roadmap Forward. Wyoming Game and Fish Department and Wyoming Department of Transportation. Cheyenne, WY

Local, Regional, and State Crossing and Connectivity Identification Studies

Here we provide numerous references for local, regional, and state efforts that identify areas important for wildlife crossings and connectivity. References that are multistate or west-wide in scope are also included.

Arizona

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2012. The Pima County wildlife connectivity assessment: Report on stakeholder input. Phoenix, Arizona, USA.

www.azgfd.gov/w_c/documents/PimaCountyWildlifeConnectivityAssessment.pdf

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2013. The Yavapai County Wildlife Connectivity Assessment: Report on Stakeholder Input. Phoenix, AZ.

https://gis.pima.gov/data/layers/link_bar/docs/YavapaiCoWildlifeConnectivityAssessment_FINAL.pdf

Beier, P., D. Majka, and E. Garding. 2007 and 2008. Linkage design reports for numerous locations.

<http://corridordesign.org/linkages/arizona>

Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup. 2006. Arizona's wildlife linkages assessment. Arizona Wildlife Linkages Workgroup, Phoenix, AZ. <https://azdot.gov/business/environmental-planning/programs/wildlife-linkages>

Williams, T., N. Dodd, P. Cramer, S. Kundur, M. Gomez, and J. Rybczynski. 2021. Arizona statewide wildlife-vehicle conflict study. For Arizona Department of Transportation.

<https://azdot.gov/planning/transportation-studies/completed-transportation-studies/wildlife-vehicle-conflict-study>

California

Buttrick, S., K. Popper, B. McRae, B. Unnasch, M. Schindel, A. Jones, and J. Platt. 2015. Identifying Resilient Terrestrial Landscapes in the Pacific Northwest Conserving Nature's Stage: Pacific Northwest and Northern California. Final Report to the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation. The Nature Conservancy, Portland, OR. <http://nature.ly/resilienceNW>.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Priority Wildlife Movement Barrier Locations by Region 2022.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2020. California wildlife barriers.

<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=178511>

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2019. California terrestrial habitat connectivity map. <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Science-Institute/Habitat-Connectivity#56328970-terrestrial-habitat-connectivity>

Frost, E. 2018. A review and synthesis of ecological connectivity assessments relevant to the Cascade-Siskiyou landscape in Southwest Oregon and adjacent California. Prepared for Selberg Institute by Wildwood Consulting. <https://docslib.org/doc/8749056/a-review-and-synthesis-of-ecological-connectivity-assessments-relevant-to-the-cascade-siskiyou-landscape-in-southwest-oregon>

Gallo, JA, J. Strittholt, G. Joseph, H. Rustigian-Romsos, R. Degagne, J. Brice, and A. Prisbrey. 2019. Mapping Habitat Connectivity Priority Areas that are Climate-wise and Multi-scale, for Three Regions of California. Conservation Biology Institute. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.7477532>

Huijser, M.P. and J.S. Begley. 2019. Large mammal-vehicle collision hot spot analyses, California, USA. Report 4W6693. Western Transportation Institute, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA. www.mphetc.com/files/ugd/9d46fb_8e519386f37943b3ac1f746f6e57e70d.pdf

Jennings, M., E. Conlisk, E. Haeuser, D. Foote, and R. Lewison. 2019. Climate Resilient Connectivity for the South Coast Ecoregion of California. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Krause, C., M. Gogol-Prokurat, and S. Bisrat. 2015. Wildlife connectivity across the northern Sierra Nevada foothills. Technical report to the California Wildlife Conservation Board on the northern Sierra Nevada foothills fine-scale connectivity analysis. Prepared by CDFW's Biogeographic Data Branch Conservation Analysis Unit.

Penrod, K., P. Beier, E. Garding, and C. Cabañero. 2012. A Linkage Network for the California Deserts. Produced for the Bureau of Land Management and The Wildlands Conservancy. Produced by Science and Collaboration for Connected Wildlands and Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona <http://oak.ucc.nau.edu/pb1/>

Penrod, K., P. E. Garding, C. Paulman, P. Beier, S. Weiss, N. Schaefer, R. Branciforte and K. Gaffney. 2013. Critical Linkages: Bay Area & Beyond. Produced by Science & Collaboration for Connected Wildlands in collaboration with the Bay Area Open Space Council's Conservation Lands Network www.bayarealands.org/next-steps/linkages.php

Penrod, K. 2020. Northeast California Connectivity Symposium Summary Report. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Pew Charitable Trusts. Prepared by Science & Collaboration for Connected Wildlands. www.scwildlands.org/reports/NE_CA_Wildlife_Connectivity_Symposium.pdf

Penrod, K., T. Smith, C. Lacey, and C. Stanley. 2021. Greater I-10 Linkage Implementation Workshop Summary Report. Prepared by Science & Collaboration for Connected Wildlands and The Nature Conservancy. www.scwildlands.org/reports/GreaterI-10WorkshopSummaryReport_FINAL.pdf

Riley, S.P., T. Smith, and T.W. Vickers. 2018. Assessment of Wildlife Crossing Sites for the Interstate 15 and Highway 101 Freeways in Southern California.

Shilling, F., D. Waetjen, and G. Porter. 2021. From Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict to Solutions for California Wildlife & Drivers/ <https://wildlifecrossing.net/california>

Shilling, F. M., A. Collins, T. Longcore, and W. Vickers. 2020. Understanding Behavioral Responses of Wildlife to Traffic to Improve Mitigation Planning. UC Davis: National Center for Sustainable Transportation. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7922/G29S1P9Q>

South Coast Wildlands (SC Wildlands). 2008. South Coast Missing Linkages: A wildland network for the south coast ecogregion. Produced in cooperation with partners in the South Coast Missing Linkages Initiative. <http://www.scwildlands.org/reports/SCMLRegionalReport.pdf>

Spencer, W.D., P. Beier, K. Penrod, K. Winters, C. Paulman, H. Rustigian-Romsos, J. Strittholt, M. Parisi, and A. Pettler. 2010. California essential habitat connectivity project: a strategy for conserving a connected California. Prepared for California Department of Transportation, California Department of Fish and Game, and Federal Highways Administration.
<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18366&inline>

The Nature Conservancy. 2020. Going with the Flow: Towards a Climate Resilient and Connected Wildlife and Transportation Network. Resilient and Connected Landscapes (conservationgateway.org).
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/24f7d4874a354d5585bace8116a3cedb>

Colorado

Cooley, C. P., A. Holland, M. Cowardin, M. Flenner, T. Balzer, J. Stiver, E. Slezak, B. Marette, D. Neumann, T. Elm and J. Holst. 2020. Status report: Big game winter range and migration corridors. Colorado Parks and Wildlife.
<https://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/Hunting/BigGame/2020BigGameWinterRangeandMigrationCorridorsReport.pdf>

Crooks, K., C. Haas, S. Baruch-Mordo, K. Middledorf, S. Magle, T. Shenk, K. Wilson, and D. Theobald. 2008. Roads and connectivity in Colorado: animal-vehicle collisions, wildlife mitigation structures, and lynx-roadway interactions. No. CDOT-2008-4.
www.codot.gov/programs/research/pdfs/2008/lynx.pdf

Crooks, K., D. Theobald, S. Baruch-Mordo, M. Sherburne, J. Norman, and K. Wilson. 2006. Highway corridor wildlife mitigation/habitat connectivity study - Phase I report: Biological prioritization of highway segments in Colorado based on landscape connectivity. Colorado Department of Transportation. Final Report.

Kintsch, J., P. Basting, M. McClure, and J.O. Clarke. 2019. Western slope wildlife prioritization study. Report to Applied Innovation and Research Branch Colorado Department of Transportation, Denver, CO, USA. www.codot.gov/programs/research/pdfs/2019/WSWPS

Kintsch, J., P. Basting, T. Smithson, and G. Woolley. 2022. Eastern slope and plains wildlife prioritization study. Report to Colorado Department of Transportation and Colorado Parks and Wildlife. Denver, CO, USA. www.codot.gov/programs/research/pdfs/2022/wildlife-prioritization/eswps-report

Kintsch, J. and P. Singer. 2018. Eagle County Safe Passages for Wildlife: Phase II Wildlife Connectivity Assessment. Report to Eagle County Government, Sustainable Communities Department. https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/county_Colorado-Eagle-County-Safe-Passages-for-Wildlife-Final-Report.pdf

Kintsch, J. 2005. Linking Colorado's Landscape: A statewide assessment of wildlife linkages. Report from Southern Rockies Ecosystem Project. https://conservationcorridor.org/cpb/Southern_Rockies_Ecosystem_Project_2005.pdf

Idaho

Cramer, P., S. Gifford, B. Crabb, C. McGinty, D. Ramsey, F. Shilling, J. Kintsch, S. Jacobson, and K. Gunson. 2014. Methodology for prioritizing appropriate mitigation actions to reduce wildlife-vehicle collisions on Idaho highways. Report for Idaho Transportation Department, Boise, Idaho. Report No. FHWA-ID-14-229. <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/28515>

Cramer, P. 2016. Safety Solutions for Wildlife-Vehicle Collisions on Idaho's US 20 and SH 87. Report for Idaho Transportation Department, Boise, Idaho. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/60baf2ed8791194056e335f8/t/6311181585566f705cc3b917/1662064811927/ITD_Wildlife_Safety_Soltns_US20_SR87_Final_Report_2017.pdf

Huijser, M.P., A.V. Kociolek, L. Oechsli and D. E. Galarus. 2008. Wildlife data collection and potential highway mitigation along State Highway 75, Blaine County, Idaho. Report 4W1403B, Western Transportation Institute – Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA. https://www.mphetc.com/files/ugd/9d46fb_519077b47ac74d6f9519b8d23a81eb25.pdf

McClure, M. L., and R.J. Ament. 2014. Where people and wildlife intersect: Prioritizing mitigation of road impacts on wildlife corridors. Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Bozeman, MT, USA. <https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Where-People-Wildlife-Intersect-Prioritizing-Mitigation.pdf>

Montana

Adams, P.J., M.P. Huijser and S.C. Getty. 2023. An assessment of existing and potential future mitigation measures related to grizzly bears along US Highway 93, Flathead Indian Reservation, Montana, USA. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Pablo, Montana, USA.

https://www.mphetc.com/files/ugd/9d46fb_a2a83ae097794257bb23df021a51fca5.pdf

Ament, R., P. McGowen, M. McClure, A. Rutherford, C. Ellis and J. Grebenc. 2014. Highway mitigation for wildlife in northwest Montana. Sonoran Institute, Northern Rockies Office, Bozeman, MT.

https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Highway-Mitigation-Wildlife-NW-Montana_1.pdf

Craighead, L., A. Craighead, L. Oechsli, and A.V. Kociolek. 2010. Bozeman Pass post-fencing wildlife monitoring. No. FHWA/MT-10-006/8173. Montana. Dept. of Transportation.

<https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/20349>

Cramer, P., R. Hamlin, and K.E. Gunson. 2014. Montana US Highway 93 South wildlife crossings research. MDT # HWY –308445-RP. 2013 Annual progress report. Montana Department of Transportation, Helena, Montana, USA.

Cramer, P., R. Hamlin, and K.E. Gunson. 2015. Montana US Highway 93 South wildlife crossings research. MDT # HWY –308445-RP. 2014 Annual progress report. Montana Department of Transportation, Helena, Montana, USA.

Creech, T., M. McClure, and R. Callahan. 2016. High-risk zones for ungulate-vehicle collisions during Montana's fall migration season. Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Bozeman, Montana, USA.

<https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/High-Risk-Zones-Ungulate-Vehicle-Collisions-Montana-Fall-Migration.pdf>

Fairbank, E.R., A.R. Callahan, T. Creech, M.P. Huijser, and R. Ament. 2019. Blackfeet Nation animal-vehicle collision reduction master plan. Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Bozeman, MT, USA.

<https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Blackfeet-Nation-Animal-Vehicle-Collision-Reduction-Master-Plan.pdf>

Huijser, M.P., W. Camel-Means, E.R. Fairbank, J.P. Purdum, T.D.H. Allen, A.R. Hardy, J. Graham, J.S. Begley, P. Basting and D. Becker. 2016a. US 93 North post-construction wildlife-vehicle collision and wildlife crossing monitoring on the Flathead Indian Reservation between Evaro and Polson, Montana. FHWA/MT-16-009/8208. Western Transportation Institute – Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA. www.mphetc.com/files/ugd/9d46fb_77ebf7dec9694c0493cd94af4eff63e4.pdf

Huijser, M.P. and J.S. Begley. 2016. Wildlife Mitigation Opportunities along U.S. Hwy 2, Northwestern Montana. Western Transportation Institute – Montana State University, Bozeman,

Montana, USA. https://westerntransportationinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/4W5362_final-report-hwy-2-mt-160112.pdf

Huijser, M. P., K.E. Gunson, and C. Abrams. 2006. Animal-vehicle collisions and habitat connectivity along Montana Highway 83 in the Seeley-Swan Valley, Montana: a Reconnaissance. No. FHWA/MT-06-002/8177. Montana. Dept. of Transportation. https://westerntransportationinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/425569_Final_Report.pdf

Kociolek, A., L. Craighead, A. Craighead, and B. Brock. 2016. Evaluating wildlife mortality hotspots, habitat connectivity and potential accommodation along US 287 and MT 87 in the Madison Valley, Montana. No. Project Summary Report 8217-001. Montana. Dept. of Transportation. <https://rosap.nhtl.bts.gov/view/dot/31845>

McClure, M. L., and R.J. Ament. 2014. Where people and wildlife intersect: Prioritizing mitigation of road impacts on wildlife corridors. Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Bozeman, MT, USA. <https://largelandscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Where-People-Wildlife-Intersect-Prioritizing-Mitigation.pdf>

MWTP 2023. Montana Wildlife and Transportation Partnership (MWTP) Data and Information Work Group Planning Tool Summary Report. www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/Planning/MWT/MWTP-Program/Planning-Tool-Summary-Report.pdf

Peck, C.P., F.T. Van Manen, C.M. Costello, M.A. Haroldson, L.A. Landenburger, L.L Roberts, D.D. Bjornlie, and R.D. Mace. 2017. Potential paths for male-mediated gene flow to and from an isolated grizzly bear population. *Ecosphere* 8(10). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1969>

Nevada

Cramer, P. and C. McGinty. 2018. Prioritization of Wildlife-Vehicle Conflict in Nevada. Final Report to Nevada Department of Transportation. 604-16-03. <https://www.dot.nv.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/16038/636820992282700000>

Nevada Department of Transportation. Safety Overpasses/Underpasses. <https://www.dot.nv.gov/safety/roadway-safety-improvements/wildlife-safety-overpasses-underpasses>

New Mexico

Cramer, P., J.L. Cartron, K. Calhoun, J. Gagnon, M. Haverland, M. Watson, S. Cushman, H.Y. Wan, J. Kutz, J. Romero, T. Brennan, J. Walther, C. Loberger, H. Nelson, T. Botkin, and J. Hirsch. 2022. New

Mexico wildlife corridors action plan. New Mexico Department of Transportation and New Mexico Department of Game & Fish. <https://wildlifeactionplan.nmdotprojects.org/>

Loberger, C. D., J. W. Gagnon, H. D. Nelson, C. A. Beach, and S. C. Sprague. 2021. Determining the effectiveness of wildlife-vehicle collision mitigation projects: Phase I Final Report. For New Mexico Department of Transportation. <https://www.dot.state.nm.us/content/nmdot/en/Research.html>

Oregon

Buttrick, S., K. Popper, B. McRae, B. Unnasch, M. Schindel, A. Jones, and J. Platt. 2015. Identifying Resilient Terrestrial Landscapes in the Pacific Northwest Conserving Nature's Stage: Pacific Northwest and Northern California. Final Report to the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation. The Nature Conservancy, Portland, OR. <http://nature.ly/resilienceNW>.

Cascades to Coast Landscape Collaborative. 2022. Coastal Northwest Landscape Conservation Mapper. <https://www.ctoclc.org/conservationresources> and <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=a3c518e00ccf488db8cc0c8cd4646bce>

de Rivera, C. M. Lafrenz, and D. Taylor-Rodriguez. 2019. Research project work plan for habitat connectivity assessment and mapping for prioritization of wildlife crossing projects. For ODOT and FHWA. www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/ResearchDocuments/spr836wp.pdf

Frost, E. 2018. A review and synthesis of ecological connectivity assessments relevant to the Cascade-Siskiyou landscape in Southwest Oregon and adjacent California. Prepared for Selberg Institute by Wildwood Consulting. <https://docslib.org/doc/8749056/a-review-and-synthesis-of-ecological-connectivity-assessments-relevant-to-the-cascade-siskiyou-landscape-in-southwest-oregon>

Hatch, A., S. Wray, S. Jacobsen, M. Trask, and K. Roberts. 2008. Oregon Wildlife Linkage Project Final Report. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Salem, OR. https://www.dfw.state.or.us/conservationstrategy/docs/Linkages_Report_Final_2009.pdf

McRae, B., K. Popper, A. Jones, M. Schinde, S. Buttrick., K. Hall, R. Unnasch, and J. Platt. 2016. Conserving Nature's Stage: Mapping Omnidirectional Connectivity for Resilient Terrestrial Landscapes in the Pacific Northwest. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4158.6166>

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). 2019. Oregon Connectivity Assessment and Mapping Project: Implementation Plan. Salem, OR. <https://oregonconservationstrategy.org/media/OCAMP-Implementation-Plan.pdf>

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). 2022. Oregon Connectivity Assessment and Mapping Project (OCAMP). <https://oregonconservationstrategy.org/success-story/the-oregon-connectivity-assessment-and-mapping-project-ocamp/>

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). 2023. Oregon Wildlife Connectivity Implementation Plan. https://oregonconservationstrategy.org/media/Oregon-Wildlife-Connectivity-Implementation-Plan-FINAL_1.13.2023.pdf

River Design Group and Samara Group. 2022. Southern Oregon Wildlife Crossing Project Conceptual Design Report. Prepared for Southern Oregon Wildlife Crossing Coalition. www.myowf.org/files/ugd/17768a_4ae841680f3b4bc6802d822c2905fe4a.pdf

Utah

Cramer, P., E. Vasquez, and A. Jones. 2019. Identification of wildlife-vehicle conflict priority hotspots in Utah. Final Report to Utah Department of Transportation. <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/56388>

West, P. 2007. Wildlife connectivity across Utah's highways. No. UT-06.09. Utah. Dept. of Transportation. <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/39791>

Washington

Cascades to Coast Landscape Collaborative. 2022. Coastal Northwest Landscape Conservation Mapper. <https://www.ctocl.org/conservationresources> and <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=a3c518e00ccf488db8cc0c8cd4646bce>

McRae, B., K. Popper, A. Jones, M. Schinde, S. Buttrick., K. Hall, R. Unnasch, and J. Platt. 2016. Conserving Nature's Stage: Mapping Omnidirectional Connectivity for Resilient Terrestrial Landscapes in the Pacific Northwest. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4158.6166>

Myers, W.L., W.Y. Chang, S.S. Germaine, W.M. VanderHaegen, and T.E. Owens. 2008. An analysis of deer and elk-vehicle collision sites along state highways in Washington State. Olympia, Wash., Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. <https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/01551/wdfw01551.pdf>

Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group. 2022. Washington Connected Landscapes Project: Cascades to Coast Analysis. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Washington State Department of Transportation, Olympia, WA. https://waconnected.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/DRAFTReport_20220719.pdf

Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group. 2010. Washington Connected Landscapes Project: Statewide Analysis. Washington Departments of Fish and Wildlife, and Transportation, Olympia, WA. <https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01324>

Wyoming

Huijser, M.P., C. Riginos, M. Blank, R. Ament, J.S. Begley, and E.R. Jenne. 2018. Teton County wildlife master plan. Western Transportation Institute, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA. <https://westerntransportationinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/4W6376-Huijser-et-al-Report-Teton-County-20180531-LR.pdf>

Riginos C. 2022. Impact of roadways on wildlife in Wyoming: long-term and recent trends. The Nature Conservancy, Lander, WY. <https://www.nature.org/content/dam/tnc/nature/en/documents/wyoming-impacts-of-roads-on-wildlife.pdf>

Riginos, C., C. Smith, E.R. Fairbank, E. Hansen, and P. Hallsten. 2018. Traffic thresholds in deer road-crossing behavior. No. WY-1807F. Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative for Wyoming Department of Transportation. <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/58648>

Riginos, C., H. Copeland, C. Smith, H. Sawyer, K. Krasnow, and T. Hart. 2016. Planning-support for mitigation of wildlife–vehicle collisions and highway impacts on migration routes in Wyoming. FHWA-WY-16/10F. Wyoming Department of Transportation, Cheyenne, WY. <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/34185>

Wyoming's Wildlife and Roadways Initiative Implementation Team. 2019. A framework for prioritizing projects to reduce negative wildlife-roadway interactions. Wyoming Game and Fish Department and Wyoming Department of Transportation. <https://wgfd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=ef666ba292b74c56a339efc10fca5332>

Wyoming Wildlife and Roadways Initiative website. <https://wgfd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=ef666ba292b74c56a339efc10fca5332>

Multi-State or West-wide

Kauffman, M., B. Lowrey, J. Berg, S. Bergen, D. Brimeyer, P. Burke, T. Cufaude, J.W. Cain III, J. Cole, A. Courtemanch, M. Cowardin, J. Cunningham, M. DeVivo, J. Diamond, O. Duvuvuei, J. Fattebert, J. Ennis, D. Finley, J. Fort, G. Fralick, E. Freeman, J. Gagnon, J. Garcia, E. Gelzer, M. Graham, J. Gray, E. Greenspan, L. Embere Hall, C. Hendricks, A. Holland, B. Holmes, K. Huggler, M.A. Hurley, E. Jeffreys,

A. Johnson, L. Knox, K. Krasnow, Z. Lockyer, H. Manninen, M. McDonald, J.L. McKee, J. Meacham, J. Merkle, B. Moore, T.W. Mong, C. Nielsen, B. Oates, K. Olsen, D. Olson, L. Olson, M. Pieron, J. Powell, A. Prince, K. Proffitt, C. Reddell, C. Riginos, R. Ritson, S. Robatcek, S. Roberts, H. Sawyer, C. Schroeder, J. Shapiro, N. Simpson, S. Sprague, A. Steingisser, N. Tatman, B. Turnock, C. Wallace, and L. Wolf. 2022. Ungulate Migrations of the Western United States, Volume 3. Scientific Investigations Report 2022-5088. 114 pp. <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20225088>

Kauffman, M., B. Lowrey, J. Beck, J. Berg, S. Bergen, J. Berger, J. Cain, S. Dewey, J. Diamond, O. Duvuvuei, J. Fattebert, J. Gagnon, J. Garcia, E. Greenspan, E. Hall, G. Harper, S. Harter, Stan, K. Hersey, P. Hnilicka, M. Hurley, L. Knox, A. Lawson, E. Maichak, J. Meacham, J. Merkle, A. Middleton, D. Olson, L. Olson, C. Reddell, B. Robb, G. Rozman, H. Sawyer, C. Schroeder, B. Scurlock, J. Short, S. Sprague, A. Steingisser, and N. Tatman. 2022. Ungulate migrations of the western United States, Volume 2: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2022–5008, 160 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20225008>

Kauffman, M.J., Copeland, H.E., Berg, J., Bergen, S., Cole, E., Cuzzocreo, M., Dewey, S., Fattebert, J., Gagnon, Gelzer, E., Geremia, C., Graves, T., Hersey, K., Hurley, M., Kaiser, J., Meacham, J., Merkle, J., Middleton, A., Nuñez, T., Oates, B., Olson, D., Olson, L., Sawyer, H., Schroeder, C., Sprague, S., Steingisser, A., and Thonhoff, M., 2020a, Ungulate migrations of the western United States, volume 1: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2020–5101, 119 p. <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20205101>

Paul, K., J. Faselt, M. Bell, M.P. Huijser, D. Theobald, A. Keeley, and R. Ament. 2023. West-wide study to identify important highway locations for wildlife crossings. Center for Large Landscape Conservation, Western Transportation Institute – Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. <https://largelandscapes.org/west-wide-study/>