

# US HIGHWAY 26 WILDLIFE MITIGATION STRATEGY

September 2021

Prepared for

Wyoming Game and Fish Department

Wyoming Department of Transportation

Prepared by

Julia Kintsch, ECO-resolutions







# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The US 26 Mitigation Strategy is the product of a broad partnership convened by WGFD and WYDOT to address wildlife connectivity and wildlife-vehicle collision concerns. Project partners include the Nature Conservancy of Wyoming, Grand Teton National Park, the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes, the Shoshone National Forest, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Project funding was provided by the Bureau of Land Management, Knobloch Family Foundation, the Water for Wildlife Foundation, and the Wyoming Governor's Big Game License Coalition.

Special thanks are due to Nyssa Whitford and Courtney Larson for their contributions in conducting GIS analyses and creating the maps included in this report.

Cover photo: Jon Altschuld, Chinook Landscape Architecture



#### **Technical Report Documentation Page**

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No	).	3. Recipient's Cata	alog No.
4. Title and Subtitle			5. Report Date	
US Highway 26 Wildlife Mitigat	ion Strategy		September 202	21
			6. Performing Org	ganization Code
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Orga	anization Report No.
Julia Kintsch				
9. Performing Organization Name and	Address		10. Work Unit No.	(TRAIS)
ECO-resolutions				
Golden, CO 80401			11 Contract or Gr	ant No
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Add	ress		13. Type of Repor	t and Period Covered
Wyoming Game and Fish Depar	rtment			
5400 Bishop Blvd			14 Spansoring As	ranav Codo
Cheyenne, WY 82006			14. Sponsoning Ag	Jency Code
15. Supplementary Notes				
Prepared in cooperation with t	he Wyoming Departmer	nt of Transportatio	n	
16. Abstract				
US 26 around Dubois is one of t	the most dangerous hig	nway segments in	Wyoming for both I	motorists and
wildlife in terms of wildlife-veh	icle collision (WVC) risk.	From 2015 throug	gh 2019, collisions v	vith wildlife
accounted for 74% of all vehicle	e crashes reported to lav	w enforcement. Th	ne cost of these coll	isions is estimated
at \$791,400 annually, including	property damage, accid	ent response and	cleanup costs, and	the value of the
the Wyeming Department of T	5. To address these issue	s, in 2020 the wyo	oming Game and Fis	Sn Department and
other agency tribal and non-n	rofit partners. The purp	ose of the mitigation	on assessment was	to compile and
evaluate wildlife habitat and m	ovement data WVC dat	asets and other in	of assessment was	n the
development of cost-effective	mitigation solutions for	reducing WVCs. in	nproving driver safe	tv. and
maintaining permeability for w	ildlife movement across	US 26 from milep	osts 24-73. The resu	ulting mitigation
strategy was informed by comr	nunity feedback and out	tlines a common v	ision that identifies	and prioritizes
important wildlife movement a	reas and wildlife-highwa	ay conflict zones o	n US 26 around Du	bois, with site-
specific mitigation recommend	ations identified in each	, segment. Within	the study area, two	segments were
prioritized for implementation	actions: 1) east of Dubo	is from the Wind F	River oxbow to the I	Military Vehicles
Museum, mileposts 58-64, and 2) from Stony Point to the western limits of Dubois, mileposts 48-54.				
17. Keywords		18. Distribution Stater	nent	
collisions wildlife crossings wild	wildlife-venicle			
10. Society Olacolt (of this way out)		this page)	04 No. of Dear	22 Drieg
Unclassified	Unclassifie	tnis page) d	∠1. NO. OF Pages	
Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)	Reproduction of completed	page authorized		

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE CONFLICT ON US 261
Background1
Project Partnership2
Study Area
WILDLIFE POPULATIONS AND MOVEMENT PATTERNS
Mule Deer
Elk7
Bighorn Sheep
Moose7
Pronghorn7
White-tailed deer7
WILDLIFE-VEHICLE CONFLICT AND HUMAN SAFETY7
MITIGATION STRATEGY FOR US 2612
MITIGATION ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH12
Right-of-Way Fence Survey14
Public Outreach and Participation14
Review of Potential Mitigation Measures15
MITIGATION SEGMENTS AND MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR US 2619
Segment 1: Milepost 24 – 41, Togwotee Pass to Forest Boundary
Segment 2: Milepost 41 – 48, Forest Boundary to Stony Point
Segment 3: Milepost 48 – 54, Stony Point to West City Limits
Segment 4: Milepost 54 – 56, Dubois28
Segment 5: Milepost 56 – 58, East Dubois29
Segment 6: Milepost 58 – 64.5, Longhorn Ranch to Military Vehicles Museum
Segment 7: Milepost 64.5 – 69, Military Vehicles Museum to Little Red Creek
Segment 8: Milepost 69 – 73, Little Red Creek to Dinwoody Creek
NEXT STEPS
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT
PRECONSTRUCTION WILDLIFE MONITORING
REFERENCES40
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Heat map of wildlife-vehicle collision hotspots in Wyoming	1
Figure 2. Map of established and suspected mule deer migration paths in western Wyoming	4
Figure 3. Fall and spring migration paths of mule deer wintering in the Dubois area	5
Figure 4. Mule deer collar points collected within one mile of either side of US 26	6
Figure 5. Total reported WVC carcasses per year for MP 24-73	8
Figure 6. WVC crashes and carcass reports by milepost (2015-2019)	9
Figure 7. Annual average number of WVC crash and carcass reports per milepost (2015-2019)	10
Figure 8. Total number of WVCs in the study area involving mule deer by month of the year	11
Figure 9. US 26 study area and mitigation segments.	13
Figure 10. WVC crash and carcass reports per mile overlaid with the seven mitigation segments	19
Figure 11. Bridge at MP 24.14 and associated buck and rail fencing, guard rail	21
Figure 12. Game trail through gap in wildlife fence at the bridge over the Wind River at MP 46.43	22
Figure 13. Example of woven wire fence and adjacent shrubby vegetation cover in Segment 3	24
Figure 14. Concrete-lined irrigation ditch adjacent to the ROW fence	24
Figure 15. Existing conditions influencing wildlife movements across US 26 in Segment 3	25
Figure 16. Reported WVC crashes and carcasses in Segment 6	30
Figure 17. Example of a wildlife overpass on State Highway 9 in Colorado	31
Figure 18. Mitigation concept for Segment 6	34
Figure 19. Wildlife permeable elk-post fence in Segment 7	36

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Miles of each fence type in the study area	14
Table 2. Summary of mitigation measures, their effectiveness, use and relative cost, and potential	
application for US 26	16
Table 3. Average annual cost of WVC in Segment 6	33
Table 4. Estimated cost of wildlife crossings mitigation in Segment 6.	35
Table 5. Benefit-cost analysis of wildlife crossings mitigation in Segment 6	35

# LIST OF ACRONYMS

MP	Milepost
ROW	Right-of-way
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
WVC	Wildlife-vehicle collision
WRR	Wind River Reservation
WGFD	Wyoming Game and Fish Department
WYDOT	Wyoming Department of Transportation

# WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE CONFLICT ON US 26

#### BACKGROUND

Mule deer populations across the western states have generally declined over the last 30 years. Since 1990, mule deer populations in Wyoming have declined approximately 36% due to various factors including weather, habitat, competition, predation, and disease. In addition, the number of mule deer killed each year by vehicles represents approximately 2-4% of the population. In response, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) created the Wyoming Mule Deer Initiative, an effort to stop the decline and work towards growing the herds again (Mule Deer Working Group 2018). The Mule Deer Initiative specifically identifies coordination with the Wyoming Department of Transportation (WYDOT) and other entities to minimize barriers and improve wildlife passage across roads as one of its strategies to maintain healthy mule deer populations.

In April 2017, the WYDOT and WGFD jointly hosted the Wyoming's Wildlife and Roadways Summit, which convened state agencies, non-governmental organizations, members of the public, and other stakeholders to address the conflict that arises where migrating and wintering wildlife intersect with the state's road network. Following the Summit, the cooperating agencies formed the Wyoming Wildlife and Roadways Initiative Implementation Team and produced a <u>Road Map</u>. The Road Map summarizes the issues raised during the Summit and provides recommendations for improving collaborative partnerships to build capacity and implement more projects with the objective of reducing wildlife-vehicle collisions (WVC), increasing motorist safety, and maintaining or reestablishing wildlife migrations and habitat connectivity in Wyoming. Through a subsequent prioritization process, US 26/287 (hereafter US 26) around Dubois from Stoney Point to Dinwoody Creek (mileposts 48-73) emerged as one of the

top priorities in the state (Fig. 1).

Figure 1. Heat map of wildlife-vehicle collision hotspots in Wyoming based on kernel density analysis (2015-2019 crash and carcass data). Orange circled area is the Dubois US 26 hotspot (map created by C. Riginos, The Nature Conservancy).



The Dubois mule deer herd is an identified priority herd in the Wyoming State Action Plan (WGFD 2020) and the WVC mortality rate on US 26 has been a recognized concern for many years. US 26 runs northwest to southeast along the Wind River, which provides habitat for resident, migratory and wintering mule deer. During the fall and winter months, mule deer make regular movements across Highway 26 during migration and as they settle into winter range and are frequently subject to WVCs. Bighorn sheep, elk, white-tailed deer, moose, and pronghorn also use this landscape and are occasionally involved in WVCs on US 26.

Despite low traffic volumes, WVCs are the leading cause of motor vehicle crashes in this corridor. From 2015 through 2019, WVCs accounted for 74% of all vehicle crashes between MP 48-73. Each year, on average, there are 28 WVC crashes reported to law enforcement and an additional 131 recorded WVC carcasses removed from this section of roadway. The annual cost of these collisions is estimated at \$791,400 including property damage, accident response and cleanup costs, and the value of the wildlife killed in these collisions<sup>1</sup>. *Consequently, this stretch of US 26 is one of the most dangerous and costly in the state in terms of WVC risk.* 

These issues along US 26 are broadly recognized by the public as well as by WYDOT, WGFD, the Wind River Reservation (WRR), and other state and federal agencies and non-governmental organizations. The need for a mitigation assessment was determined by WGFD and WYDOT to develop a more comprehensive strategy for maintaining long-term habitat connectivity for wintering and migrating wildlife across the highway while reducing WVCs. Overall, mitigation along this highway segment is challenged by both the ecological and human context of the landscape including, mixed public and private land ownership; diverse land uses along the highway corridor; multiple private driveway access points along the highway; a riparian corridor, which parallels the highway and serves as an attractant for wildlife; and concerns about restricting wildlife movements seasonally and daily.

#### **PROJECT PARTNERSHIP**

The US 26 Mitigation Strategy is the product of a broad partnership convened by WGFD and WYDOT to address wildlife connectivity and WVC concerns. Project partners include The Nature Conservancy of Wyoming (TNC), Grand Teton National Park, the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes, the Shoshone National Forest, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. Additional project funding was provided by the Knobloch Family Foundation, the Water for Wildlife Foundation, and the Wyoming Governor's Big Game License Coalition.

This partnership was critical to the development of a comprehensive and well-considered mitigation strategy. Project partners engaged in multiple meetings throughout the mitigation assessment and strategy development processes, and provided critical data, local expertise, and insight.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Crash costs based on the cost of a property damage only WVC (\$5,500) and the value of the wildlife species killed in collisions with vehicles (based on restitution values established by the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, 2003).

#### STUDY AREA

US 26 is a two-lane highway with a posted speed limit of 70 mph west of Dubois and 65 mph east of Dubois. The highway runs parallel to the Wind River, crossing the river in several places. Wintering wildlife are common throughout the valley, on lower elevation slopes and along the river corridor, including narrow strips of habitat and fields between the river and the highway.

The identified priority area is a 33-mile segment from milepost (MP) 40-73. For the purposes of the mitigation assessment, the study area was extended farther west to MP 24 to encompass migration routes and summer range on Togwotee Pass. While this portion of US 26 experiences a much lower rate of WVC conflict, this area is important for many of the mule deer that winter around the Dubois area.

While high traffic volumes create barriers to wildlife movement, roads with low to moderate traffic volumes are generally the most dangerous for wildlife-vehicle collisions as the animal's perceived risk is not as high and they continue to attempt crossing (Seiler 2003). Riginos et al. (2018) determined that mule deer require a minimum of a 60 second gap between vehicles to perform a safe crossing. With daily traffic volumes averaging approximately 1,800 vehicles per day, this segment of US 26 sees, on average, one vehicle every 48 seconds. Through the fall and winter months, following the summer tourist season, mule deer concentrations along the highway corridor are at their highest. During this timeframe traffic volume decreases to 1,100 vehicles per day, which equates to an average of 46 vehicles per hour or about one vehicle every 79 seconds. While this average vehicle spacing is greater than the threshold identified by Riginos et al. (2018), it is still within the nexus of high concentrations of mule deer and moderately low traffic volumes where incidence of WVCs is the highest. Once an animal steps onto the road, the risk of colliding with vehicles increases with traffic volume, vehicle speed, road width, and the presence of obstacles such as roadside barriers, fencing or terrain features (Seiler 2003).

Most of the lands adjacent to the highway corridor throughout the study area are privately owned, with parcels ranging in size from residential lots and ranchettes to large ranches. The western portion of the study area is within the Shoshone National Forest, while the eastern extent is encompassed within the boundaries of the WRR. Other federal and state land managers in this landscape include the Bureau of Land Management, Wyoming State Trust Lands, and WGFD Habitat Management Areas. In addition, there are several large ranches held in conservation easement by TNC or the Jackson Hole Land Trust. There are multiple road and driveway access points on US 26 throughout the study area.

## WILDLIFE POPULATIONS AND MOVEMENT PATTERNS

#### MULE DEER

The landscape around Dubois provides habitat for resident, migratory and wintering mule deer. During the fall and early winter during the rut (late November through early December), mule deer make daily movements across Highway 26, prior to settling into winter range in the adjacent hills on either side of the valley. Some mule deer establish winter home ranges that are bisected by US 26 and thus interact with the highway daily through the winter months. The higher elevation portions of the study area around Togwotee Pass are mapped as mule deer summer range and include migration routes. University

of Wyoming, tribal and National Park Service collaring studies have documented migratory movements through this area by animals that winter around Dubois and on the WRR.

In 2016, researchers at the Wyoming Migration Initiative (WMI), TNC, and WGFD began a collaring study of mule deer migrations in the eastern portion of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, including the Dubois herd (Fig. 2). Forty-eight mule deer from the Dubois Herd were collared for varying lengths of time from 2016-2019 (Anderson 2021). While this study is still underway and movement models are not yet available, data from this study were made available for the mitigation assessment. An interactive map of the 2016 spring migration documented by this study, including the Dubois Herd, is available for viewing on the <u>Wyoming Migration Initiative website</u>.



Figure 2. Map of established and suspected mule deer migration paths in western Wyoming. The Dubois herd is one of five herds that is part of a multi-year collaring study to better understand migration movements in this region. The map depicts the general migration paths of mule deer that winter around Dubois. Map courtesy of the Wyoming Migration Initiative.

Mule deer that winter in or migrate through the study area constitute a single, larger population with portions of their ranges managed by different jurisdictions. For example, winter range around Dubois is composed of public and privately owned lands as well as the adjacent WRR. Deer that winter in the



Wind River valley generally migrate west to higher elevation summer ranges around Togwotee Pass and the southern Absaroka Mountains, in the Gros Ventre, or as far as Grand Teton National Park (Fig. 3).

Figure 3. Fall and spring migration paths of mule deer wintering in the Dubois area, based on 63 deer collared by WMI/TNC/WGFD, WRR, and the National Park Service, 2016-2019.

Collar datasets confirm that the fall migration is more dispersed, spatially and temporally, and appeared to be more dependent on environmental conditions, while the timing of the spring migration was much more consistent from year to year (Anderson, 2021). Figure 4 displays the seasonal variation in mule deer activity within one mile of the highway by date, based on the locations of 57 collared animals from 2016-2019 (based on data from WMI/TNC/WGFD and WRR). From left to right, this graph demonstrates that mule deer activity around US 26 is lowest during the mid-winter months of January and February; beginning in March, through early June, mule deer activity adjacent to the highway increases through the spring migration; near-highway activity decreases again during the summer months; and in October, activity levels increase again concurrent with the fall migration, with a peak in November. These seasonal fluctuations in near-highway activity are reflected in the WVC data.



Figure 4. Mule deer collar points collected within one mile of either side of US 26 by day of the year.

# Εικ

The Spring Mountain elk herd is a sub-population of the Wiggins Fork Elk herd that generally occupies habitat along the north side of US 26 throughout the study area. Cross-highway migratory movements occur primarily around Elk Ridge (MP 36-40) and above the Brooks Lake Creek/Wind River confluence around MP 32.5.

## **BIGHORN SHEEP**

Bighorn sheep activity is concentrated in the Red Rocks portion of the study area, around Little Red Canyon. WGFD collar data demonstrates that this herd remains primarily on the south side of US 26, but regularly crosses US 26 to access the Wind River and the vegetation and/or salt along the roadway, particularly during the fall and winter months.

## Moose

The moose population along the highway corridor and the Wind River has decreased substantially over the past 20 years and moose-vehicle collisions are rare. However, when these collisions occur, they are of particular concern due to the size of these animals and high potential for motorist injury. WGFD management objectives call for increased moose numbers in this population. An artifact of any future increase in moose numbers would likely be an increased potential for collisions. Many of the strategies presented in this plan would also serve to mitigate potential future increases in moose-vehicle collisions.

# PRONGHORN

There are year-round, resident pronghorn in the upper Wind River Valley but vehicle collisions with pronghorn are relatively rare compared to collisions with mule deer. Pronghorn are much less numerous than mule deer; are more active diurnally; and are not as closely associated with the Wind River and the parallel highway as mule deer. As a result, pronghorn interact much less with US 26 than wintering mule deer that have home ranges overlapping the highway.

## WHITE-TAILED DEER

White-tailed deer numbers have increased throughout the upper Wind River Valley over recent decades. White-tailed deer along the Wind River are year-round residents, and while the population size is increasing, it remains much smaller than the mule deer population. Accordingly, vehicle collisions with white-tailed deer are much less common than with mule deer. White-tailed deer also have more linear home ranges along the Wind River in contrast to mule deer that may cross the highway multiple times each day to access a different portion of their home range.

# WILDLIFE-VEHICLE CONFLICT AND HUMAN SAFETY

Wildlife-vehicle collision data are compiled from law enforcement accident reports (crash data) and carcass reports from WYDOT Maintenance patrols. Wildlife-vehicle collisions are widely recognized as being underreported to law enforcement when an accident results in little or no damage to the vehicle and its occupant, or for other reasons. To supplement reported crashes, carcass reports capture WVCs that were generally not reported to law enforcement but where the animal must be removed from the road or road shoulder. Animals that were hit but managed to exit the road before dying are not

captured in these reports. Research in UT (Olson 2013) and Colorado (Kintsch et al. 2021) found that roadside carcass counts were over 5 times higher than the number of reported crashes and over 1.5 times higher than the number of carcasses reported by maintenance patrols. While the degree of underreporting on US 26 may vary from these other study locations, WVC rates captured in crash and carcass reports almost certainly underestimate the scope of the problem on US 26.

Despite these limitations, WVC crash and carcass datasets are useful for capturing spatial and temporal patterns in WVCs. Project partners at The Nature Conservancy cleaned and reviewed the crash and carcass datasets to eliminate duplicative records captured in both datasets. The combined WVC dataset offer a more comprehensive picture of the spatial distribution and magnitude of WVC conflict as well as seasonal patterns and changes over time.

From 2015-2019, a total of 187 WVC crashes were reported to law enforcement in the study area from MP 24-73. Deer were involved in 91% of these accidents; other species involved in WVC crashes included elk, pronghorn, and moose. Carcass reports document 714 WVCs during this timeframe and describe a similar pattern: 90% of carcass pickups were mule deer; 7% white-tailed deer; and the remainder were elk, pronghorn, moose, or bighorn sheep. WVC carcass reports have generally increased over time in the study segment (MP 24-73) from 59 WVCs in 2009 to 134 in 2019, with some annual variation (Fig. 5). The highest number of carcasses were reported in 2016 (184) and 2014 (174). While some of this increase may be due to increased reporting effort over that timeframe, these trends match the increase in WVCs observed statewide.



Figure 5. Total reported WVC carcasses per year for MP 24-73.

WVCs occur throughout the study area, but the highest frequencies of WVCs are in the eastern portion of the study area: from 2015-2019, 88% of all WVCs occurred between MP 48-72 (Fig 6). While collisions involving mule deer occur throughout the study area, collisions with other species are more localized. White-tailed deer WVCs are concentrated on either side of Dubois, from MP 51-53 and MP 58-69. WVCs involving elk occur primarily in the western half of the study area, with a small spike at MP 58.



Figure 6. WVC crashes and carcass reports by milepost (2015-2019). Dubois is between MP 54-56; Stony Point is at MP 49; and summit of Togwotee Pass is around MP 26.

Pronghorn WVCs are concentrated at the eastern end of the study area, between MP 70-73. Only one bighorn sheep WVC was recorded during the analysis timeframe at MP 69, Little Red Creek; however, this is a known bighorn sheep crossing area and multiple collisions involving bighorn sheep have been document over the years, including multiple individuals hit by a single semi-truck.

In the eastern portion of the study area (MP 48-72) there were, on average, 6.1 combined WVC crashes and carcasses recorded per mile per year. As traffic volumes increase, the number of WVCs is also expected to increase (Riginos et al. 2016). Huijser et al. (2009) note that wildlife crossings mitigation can create net public benefits in terms of cost savings to society along road segments with 5.1 WVCs per mile per year. In the US 26 study area, multiple one-mile segments exceed this threshold (Fig. 7). Overall, fewer WVCs occur within the Dubois town limits, where traffic speeds are lower, and in the western portion of the study area, where mule deer are dispersed in summer range or where they cross US 26 only twice per year, during spring and fall migrations.



Figure 7. Annual average number of WVC crash and carcass reports per milepost, based on five years of data (2015-2019). At 5.1 WVCs per mile per year (orange line), the annual savings from reduced collisions equals the annualized cost of constructing and maintaining wildlife crossings.

Most WVCs involving mule deer occur during the fall and early winter (Fig 8). From 2015-2019, across the study area, WVCs are highest from October through March, with a large spike in November, corresponding with the arrival of migratory mule deer on winter range and rutting season, during which both buck and doe movements into the highway are less predictable. WVCs are lowest during the summer months, reflecting the lower concentration of resident animals present year-round. In the higher elevation western portion of the study area, around Togwotee Pass, collisions with mule deer are restricted to the late spring through early fall (May – October), when deer are migrating or present on summer range.



Figure 8. Total number of WVCs in the study area involving mule deer by month of the year from 2015 through 2019.

# MITIGATION STRATEGY FOR US 26

# MITIGATION ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH

The objective of the mitigation assessment was to compile and evaluate wildlife habitat and movement data, WVC datasets, and other information to inform the development of cost-effective mitigation solutions for reducing WVCs, improving driver safety, and maintaining permeability for wildlife movement across US 26 from mileposts (MP) 24-73. The study area was divided into seven segments defined by similar land use, ownership, and wildlife use of the landscape (Fig. 9). The development of a mitigation strategy for this corridor was iterative and included multiple site visits, reviews, and refinements based on input from the project partners, and a public review and comment process. The resulting mitigation strategy outlines a common vision that identifies and prioritizes important wildlife movement areas and wildlife-highway conflict zones on US 26 around Dubois, with site-specific mitigation recommendations identified in each segment.

The mitigation assessment was conducted in the following steps:

- 1. Biological assessment based on available data and expertise, including wildlife habitat and collar data, spatial and temporal analysis of wildlife-vehicle collisions (based on crash data and carcass reports), traffic volumes, speed limits, and land use, and land ownership data.
- 2. Site assessment to evaluate wildlife movement patterns and potential mitigation strategies along the study corridor based on wildlife habitat, local WVC patterns, land ownership and land use, and terrain relative to the roadway. The site assessment included:
  - An analysis of deer movement patterns relative to the highway, including features that promote or inhibit movement, and the identification of major crossing zones and highway conflict areas.
  - A survey of existing road infrastructure, including bridges, stock passes, and other culverts. These were evaluated for their potential to function as crossing structures for mule deer and other wildlife using methods described in Kintsch and Cramer 2011. See <u>Appendix A</u> for a list of surveyed locations and the evaluation of a structure's potential functionality for deer and other wildlife passage.
  - A review of potential mitigation strategies in each study area segment, such as wildlife crossing structures, enhancements to existing transportation infrastructure, right-of-way fence removal or replacement, vegetation removal, signage, and other strategies.
  - The identification of additional opportunities and challenges for implementing different types of mitigation along the study corridor, such as landowner concerns or creating new barriers to wildlife movement that could inadvertently decrease permeability.
- 3. General recommendations applicable to an entire segment and site-specific mitigation recommendations were developed for each study area segment. During this process, two adjacent segments were combined as similar mitigation strategies were recommended for both segments. Mitigation recommendations for each segment were based on wildlife movement needs, WVC rates, cost-effectiveness, implementation feasibility, and were informed by the latest research on wildlife connectivity and WVC reduction strategies used in other locations.



Figure 9. US 26 study area and mitigation segments.

4. Partner and public review and comment of mitigation recommendations was conducted throughout the assessment process, including two public meetings, which helped inform the development of mitigation recommendations. These reviews were essential in ensuring that the final mitigation strategy is feasible and reflects on-the-ground conditions while providing a comprehensive and cost-effective approach to reducing WVCs and maintaining wildlife movements and access to habitats along US 26.

# RIGHT-OF-WAY FENCE SURVEY

Right-of-way fencing is present along both sides of US 26 throughout much of the study area. Fence types vary, often from one property line to the next. WYDOT conducted a survey of ROW fencing in the study area, identifying 14 different fence types. These fence types were then reclassified with respect to their permeability for wildlife, in particular mule deer and elk, to evaluate the influence of ROW fencing on wildlife movement and WVC patterns. Table 1 lists the miles of fencing by fence type in the study area. As most of the lands in the fence survey are privately owned, both the majority of barrier fencing, and the majority of wildlife permeable fencing is on private lands. At the eastern extent of the study area, all fencing on the Wind River Reservation is either semi-permeable or wildlife permeable.

Table 1. Miles of each fence type in the study area. The fence survey was conducted on both sides of the highway from MP 47.6 to MP 70 and did not include the town of Dubois.

Fence Type	Description	Miles of Fence
Woven Wire Barrier Fence	Woven wire fence topped with one or more barbed strands	9.8
Other Barrier Fence	Includes buck and rail fence, 8'-high privacy fence, and other high or impenetrable fence types	1.4
Semi-permeable Fence	3 or 4-strand barbed wire fence	10.1
Wildlife Permeable	2 or 3-strand barbed wire fence with smooth bottom wire raised 16" off the ground; some with wood top rail	17.8
No fence	No right-of-way fence	23.1

## PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION

Two public meetings were held during the development of the mitigation strategy, in December 2020 and April 2021. The goal of the December 2020 meeting was to follow up on a previous public meeting in 2017, where the issue of WVCs on US 26 was discussed, and to present the development of a mitigation strategy as the next step towards addressing this issue. The project team established the need for a mitigation strategy to proactively identify how targeted mitigation investments can have the greatest impact on reducing WVCs while maintaining wildlife connectivity. The project team presented initial findings and concepts and solicited public feedback.

The second public meeting was held on April 27, 2021, following the development of the draft mitigation strategy. The goal of this meeting was to present the detailed mitigation strategy and solicit feedback for incorporation into the final mitigation strategy.

Public comments and responses to these comments from both meetings are presented in Appendix B.

#### **REVIEW OF POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES**

A variety of wildlife-highway mitigation measures were discussed at both the December 2017 and the December 2020 public meetings and were further evaluated by the project team (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of mitigation measures, their effectiveness, use and relative cost, and potential application for US 26.

Mitigation Measure	Effectiveness	Cost	Previous Use on US 26 or Elsewhere in Wyoming	Recommended Application for US 26
SIGNAGE AND SPEED LIMITS				
Reduce speed limit	Low. May result in small reductions in speed but no associated decrease in WVCs	\$	Very low feasibility. Speed limits are set in statute.	Not recommended
Seasonal night-time reduced speed limits	Low, requires enforcement. May result in small reductions in speed but no associated decrease in WVCs	\$	Night-time speed limits tested in 2019 WY research study – determined ineffective for preventing WVCs	Being evaluated for targeted areas
Variable Message Signs (VMS)	Low-Medium. VMS most effective along short stretches of road, during targeted timeframes, and with unique messaging	\$\$	Portable VMS were used seasonally throughout winter 2019/20.	Recommend continued seasonal use in key locations (e.g., for bighorn sheep at Little Red Creek Canyon)
<b>ROADSIDE MITIGATION AND</b>	DETERRENTS			
Roadside vegetation management	Low-Medium. Includes regular mowing and vegetation clearing; use of unpalatable seed mixes to detract wildlife and improve driver sight lines	\$\$	WYDOT generally uses unpalatable seed mixes for revegetating the right- of-way	Recommend targeted vegetation clearing in right- of-way and coordination with landowners
Reflectors & other visual or noise deterrents	Low-Variable effectiveness. Wildlife habituate to light and noise deterrents, reducing effectiveness over time	\$	Wildlife warning reflectors were installed and tested on US 20 around Thermopolis and between Basin and Greybull	Not recommended
Deicers that are unappealing to wildlife	Medium, but alternative deicers use a higher concentration of sand and may have other consequences, such as sediment loading in creeks and rivers	\$\$	Yes, including in the study area, between ~MP 69.4-70.5. Requires switching deicer mix for specific areas	Recommended in targeted areas to reduce collisions with bighorn sheep

Mitigation Measure	Effectiveness	Cost	Previous Use on US 26 or Elsewhere in Wyoming	Recommended Application for US 26
Increase wildlife attractants (habitat, water sources) away from the highway	Potential effectiveness if motivation to cross the road can be eliminated. Not recommended for migratory movements	\$\$	Experimental testing of sagebrush mowing to increase herbaceous and shrub forage values outside of the ROW began in fall 2020 on US 189 south of Big Piney	Recommend exploring implementation of enhanced water source on south side of US 26 in Little Red Creek
Replace right-of-way fencing with wildlife permeable alternative and/or install gates or sections lay-down fence that are opened during peak movement periods	Medium effectiveness. Permeable fencing increases the probability of a successful fence crossing and reduces the time it takes for animals to cross a fence (Segar and Keane 2020) and the time exposed to potential WVCs	\$\$	Installed on WY 28 and WY 351 in addition to paired gates that are opened during peak movement periods. Also installing wildlife permeable fence in the project area between MP 56.5 – 68	Highly recommended in targeted areas
Roadway Lighting to improve visibility for drivers of animals on or approaching the road	Medium-Low. Lighting is most effective where driver speeds are already low and most feasible where lighting may be tied into existing lighting systems	\$\$	Lighting added at Daniel Junction on US 191 helped to reduce collisions with deer.	Recommended within the town of Dubois
WILDLIFE CROSSINGS AND W	ILDLIFE-EXCLUSION FENCING			
Overpass or Underpass with Fencing (including escape ramps and wildlife guards)	High effectiveness, well designed crossing structures can result in ≥81% reduction in WVCs and high passage rates, especially for mule deer (e.g. Kintsch et al. 2021; Sawyer and Rodgers 2015)	\$\$\$\$	Wildlife overpasses and underpasses have been successfully implemented in multiple locations in the state.	Highly recommended in targeted areas
Add wildlife exclusion fencing to existing bridges and culverts to direct wildlife to cross through these structures	High effectiveness in reducing WVCs and promoting wildlife passage (Donaldson and Elliott 2020) where there are existing structures that are functional or can be retrofit	\$\$	Planned on I-25 near Kaycee once funding is secured	Highly recommended in targeted areas

Mitigation Measure	Effectiveness	Cost	Previous Use on US 26 or Elsewhere in Wyoming	Recommended Application for US 26	
Alternating High-Low Fence Segments including escape ramps and wildlife guards) to direct wildlife to cross in locations with better visibility for drivers	Experimental. Testing to begin in CO in 2022	\$\$	No	May be recommended in select areas	
DRIVER WARNING SYSTEMS					
Continuous animal detection system (ADS) and driver warning signs	Low-Variable, depending on the system type. Evolving technologies are still experimental	\$\$\$\$	An ADS tested in Nugget Canyon was found to be ineffective (2000-2001).	Not recommended	
Wildlife Crosswalk	Variable, depending on the system type. Short detection and driver warning zone is more effective than a continuous zone	\$\$\$	Νο	Not recommended	
PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH					
Public Outreach Campaigns	Very difficult to gauge direct impact but considered an important component of a comprehensive mitigation strategy	\$	Yes, including a 2019 public meeting for US 26.	Recommended in conjunction with other components of the US 26 mitigation strategy	

# MITIGATION SEGMENTS AND MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR US 26

Mitigation recommendations were developed for each of the seven study area segments. Mitigation recommendations for each segment were based on wildlife movement patterns and needs, WVC rates (Fig. 10), land use, terrain, cost-effectiveness, and implementation feasibility, and were informed by the latest research on wildlife connectivity and WVC reduction strategies used in other locations. Several high priority segments were identified based on the need for mitigation in areas with high concentrations of wildlife and high WVCs.

The following sections review each of the study area segments from west to east. The partnership group identified Segments 3 and 6 as the highest priorities for reducing WVCs and maintaining permeability for wildlife (bolded).

- Segment 1 Togwotee Pass to Forest Boundary, MP 24-41
- Segment 2 Forest Boundary to Stony Point, MP 41-48
- Segment 3 Stony Point to West Town Limit, MP 48-54
- Segment 4 Dubois, MP 54-56
- Segment 5 East Dubois, MP 56-58
- Segment 6 Longhorn Ranch to Military Vehicles Museum, MP 58-64
- Segment 7 Military Vehicles Museum to Little Red Creek, MP 64-69
- Segment 8 Little Red Creek to Dinwoody Creek, MP 69-74



Figure 10. WVC crash and carcass reports per mile overlaid with the seven mitigation segments.

# SEGMENT 1: MILEPOST 24 – 41, TOGWOTEE PASS TO FOREST BOUNDARY

This segment encompasses the western end of the study area and lies within the Shoshone and Bridger-Teton National Forests with limited private inholdings along the highway. The higher elevation, forested habitat provides important summer range for mule deer, elk, and other wildlife, and is part of a migration route for animals that summer farther west in the northern Gros Ventre Range east of Jackson and Grand Teton National Park.

Throughout this segment, WVC rates are low at 0.5 WVC crashes and carcass reports per mile per year, with most collisions occurring in the early summer months. Mule deer collar data indicate the majority of cross-highway movements by migratory deer occur around MP 34, near Lava Mountain Lodge. WVC rates are slightly higher in the eastern portion of Segment 1 (MP 32-41) relative to the western portion of the segment (MP 24-31). There is no right-of-way (ROW) fencing through the National Forest, which promotes the free movement of wildlife across the road, except where private lands are adjacent to the highway. The low WVC rate is also, in part, due to the time of migration movements across US 26 during the fall months, when traffic volumes have fallen from their peak levels during the summer tourist season. In addition to mule deer, several moose-vehicle collisions were recently reported in this segment as well as a WVC involving a grizzly bear – all in the Brooks Lake area. Recent bear activity is a management concern and WGFD, the Forest Service, and Highway Patrol are collaborating to address roadside bear management.

The highway in this segment has already been widened and no new WYDOT projects are anticipated in this segment. There is one existing bridge at the far western end of this segment that is highly functional for deer and other wildlife passage. The bridge spans a tributary of Blackrock Creek that acts as a natural corridor for wildlife movement (Fig. 11). On the south side of the bridge, a short stretch of buck and rail fence directs wildlife to the bridge; however, deer and other wildlife also make at-grade highway crossings in this area.

#### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

**General Recommendations** 

- Continue ongoing vegetation mowing along road by WYDOT.
- Maintain existing permeability and monitor traffic volumes and WVCs over time to determine future mitigation needs.

#### Site-Specific Recommendations

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
24.14	Buried bridge over	No additional guide fencing is currently recommended	Low
	tributary of	at this structure. To minimize conflict with animals that	
	Blackrock Creek	do attempt an at-grade road crossing, extend guard rail	
		on north side of the highway ~175' to the east (to align	
		with the retaining wall on the south side of US 26) and	
		west (to align with the end of the guard rail on the	
		south side of US 26 and the cut slope on the north side).	

Guard rail does not prevent deer and other wildlife from
crossing a road but may help to discourage some at-
grade crossings. Aligning guard rail on both sides of the
highway may prevent animals (in particular, does with
fawns) from becoming partially trapped on the highway
and increasing exposure to potential WVCs.



Figure 11. Bridge at MP 24.14 and associated buck and rail fencing, guard rail. Credit: J. Altschuld

# SEGMENT 2: MILEPOST 41 – 48, FOREST BOUNDARY TO STONY POINT

This segment is largely comprised of private lands along the highway. The habitat in this area is important primarily for migratory deer, although other wildlife is also common – a local elk herd that is known to cross back and forth across the highway, and moose interactions with the highway are most common around MP 46. WVCs are low (1.3 WVCs per mile per year), with increasing WVCs recorded at the eastern end of the segment, between MP 47-48. Woven wire and barbed wire ROW fences are present through much of the segment.

Existing bridges in this segment have high potential functionality for deer and other wildlife passage, although ROW and other fencing (e.g., horse corral) adjacent to these bridges restricts wildlife movements through several of the bridges. At MP 46.43, there are gaps in the ROW fencing along the riparian corridor and wildlife have created a trail through these gaps and under the bridge (Fig. 12). A large (10'W x 10'H) box culvert at MP 44.66 is located within BLM lands on either side of the structure. This culvert has high potential functionality for deer; elk are likely to use a structure of these dimensions in a more limited fashion, as solitary animals, pairs or small groups, and the structure may not provide passage for cows with calves.



Figure 12. Game trail through gap in wildlife fence at the bridge over the Wind River at MP 46.43.

In 2021, WYDOT is replacing approximately five miles of ROW fence in this segment on both sides of the highway from MP 40.6 – 45.66. The majority (91%) of the replacement fence will be wildlife permeable and the remainder 5-strand barbed wire.

#### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

#### **General Recommendations**

- Over the long term, if barriers to wildlife movement increase or WVCs increase, consider installing short sections of wildlife exclusion fence (~0.5 mile in either direction from a structure) at all or some of the existing bridges and the box culvert to encourage wildlife use of these structures and discourage at-grade highway crossings. Fence ends should be clearly signed and located in areas with good visibility for motorists and should be designed to minimize wildlife incursions into the fenced ROW.
- Monitor moose-vehicle collisions in this segment, particularly around MP 46, and evaluate the need for targeted mitigation at this location. For example, the Wind River Bridge at MP 46.43 could be prioritized for adding shorter sections of fencing to encourage wildlife moving along the Dunoir Creek drainage where it joins the Wind River to use this existing bridge to cross under US 26.

# Site-Specific Recommendations

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
43.38	Long Creek bridge	Create wildlife pathways through the riprap and vegetation underneath the bridge on either side of the creek. This location is included in WYDOT's 2021 ROW fence replacement project – the new ROW fence around this bridge will be wildlife permeable on the north side and 5-strand barbed wire on the south side. Coordinate with adjacent landowners to improve wildlife access to the bridge, for example by installing sections of lay-down fence to provide opening during periods of peak wildlife activity.	Medium
44.6	10'W x10'H box culvert	Maintain structure for wildlife passage. This location is included in WYDOT's 2021 ROW fence replacement project – the new ROW fence through this area will be wildlife permeable on both sides of US 26.	High
45.66	Wind River bridge	Create wildlife pathways leading to and underneath the bridge on the east side of the river. WYDOT's 2021 ROW fence replacement project terminates on the west side of this bridge; the new fence on the west side of the bridge will be 5-strand barbed wire.	Medium
46.43	Wind River bridge	Retain gaps in ROW fence and clear vegetation as needed to maintain wildlife pathways on both sides of the river.	Medium

#### SEGMENT 3: MILEPOST 48 – 54, STONY POINT TO WEST CITY LIMITS

#### \*This segment is a high priority for mitigation implementation in the US 26 study area

This segment is largely comprised of private lands along US 26. Irrigated fields and haystacks in this segment attract wildlife and increase wildlife movements across the highway and the potential for WVCs. A variety of different fence types are in use though this segment, often changing at property lines (Fig. 15, next page). Most of the ROW fence in this segment is woven wire or other fencing that presents a near-complete barrier to wildlife movement, in particular fawns and calves (Fig. 13). ROW fences in this segment can act as an impediment to wildlife movement and increase the time animals spend in the ROW as they attempt a crossing, leading to increased WVCs.

Wildlife permeable fence is present only in the far western portion of the segment (MP 48-49). In this area, wildlife permeable fencing is present on both sides of the highway, reducing the likelihood of wildlife becoming trapped inside the ROW and their exposure to WVCs. Correspondingly, this portion of the segment has the lowest WVC rate (Fig. 15, inset graph).

In addition to the ROW fencing, between MP 50-54, there is an irrigation ditch that runs parallel to the highway. Along much of its length, the ditch is concrete lined and several feet wide. In many places the ditch is immediately adjacent to the ROW fence, creating an even larger impediment to wildlife movements (Fig. 14). Shrubby vegetation adjacent to US 26 provides cover for wildlife approaching the highway, adding a surprise element, and reducing motorists' ability to detect approaching wildlife and slow down. Prominent visual obstructions in this segment were mapped by WGFD in fall 2020.

Wildlife-vehicle collisions occur at a rate of 5.5 WVCs per mile per year in this segment. The highway is flat and runs straight through this segment, generally offering drivers good sight lines. Still, the high concentration of deer and other wildlife in this portion of the study area, in conjunction with the ROW fencing and vegetation cover adjacent to the highway where approaching wildlife can surprise motorists all contribute to the high frequency of WVCs. WVCs occur year-round, but are highest in the fall, winter, and spring months, and a spike in conjunction with the fall migration in October and November.



Figure 13. Example of woven wire fence and adjacent shrubby vegetation cover in Segment 3.



Figure 14. Concrete-lined irrigation ditch adjacent to the ROW fence, which, in conjunction, creates a substantial barrier for wildlife.



Figure 15. Existing conditions influencing wildlife movements across US 26 in Segment 3, West of Dubois (MP 48-54), including right-of -way fence types, small culverts (stock passes with some potential functionality for wildlife passage), sections of an irrigation ditch paralleling US 26, and roadside vegetation obstructions. Inset graph depicts wildlife-vehicle collisions by half-mile through the segment.

There are several medium-sized culverts (7-10') in this segment that offer potential functionality for wildlife passage. Most of these culverts are actively used stock passes, and in several cases, gates or fencing immediately in front of a culvert entrance prevents wildlife access to the culvert. In addition, domestic animal activity may limit the functionality of these stock passes for wildlife.

#### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

#### **General Recommendations**

- Coordinate with landowners to identify targeted areas where the ROW fencing may be replaced with wildlife permeable fence types on both sides of the highway.
- Regarding the irrigation ditch between MP 50-54:
  - Coordinate with NRCS to determine whether inactive portions of the ditch may be removed or replaced with a pipe in berm. In some places the ditch does provide water for downstream uses.
- Identify opportunities to coordinate with landowners in areas where forage improvements could help keep wildlife on one side of the highway and lessen the need for them to move back and forth across the highway.
- Consider installing dual speed limit signs from October through May. This technology is currently being tested near Cody; if it is determined to be sufficiently reliable and can be shown to help decrease WVCs, then it may offer a complementary mitigation option for this segment.

#### Site-Specific Recommendations

The following mitigation measures are recommended to decrease barriers to wildlife movement, wildlife attractants, and obstructions to driver visibility along US 26 that increase the likelihood of WVC. In addition, opportunities for wildlife passage could be improved at five small culvert locations (stock passes). These culverts are approximately 8-10' wide and high and may be functional for limited deer passage provided that the entryways are not blocked by gates or fencing. Smaller stock passes ( $\leq 6$ ') are unlikely to pass deer but may be used by other species, such as black bear, bobcat, coyote, fox, and other medium and small species.

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
50-53	ROW fence barriers	Coordinate with adjacent landowners to replace ROW fence with wildlife permeable fence types on both sides of the highway	High
Various	Haystacks near highway	WGFD coordinate with landowners to move haystacks away from the highway and install 8'-high fences around the haystacks to reduce wildlife attractants near US 26.	High
Various	Vegetation obstructions adjacent to highway	Coordinate with landowners to remove vegetation adjacent to the highway that creates a visual obstruction and interferes with motorists' ability to detect approaching wildlife.	High

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
49.3	Small culverts (see	Coordinate with landowners at five small culvert	High
52.04	Appendix A for	locations to explore opportunities for improving	
52.48	location details)	functionality for wildlife passage, including relocating	
52.78		gates and fencing away from the culvert entrances to	
53.3		permit wildlife access and prevent domestic animal	
		access to the culverts except when livestock are being	
		moved from one pasture to another. Where culverts are	
		improved for wildlife passage, retain existing wildlife	
		ROW fence types for approximately one to two-tenths	
		mile in either direction of the culvert.	

# SEGMENT 4: MILEPOST 54 – 56, DUBOIS

Segment 4 is defined by the town of Dubois. Despite low in-town speed limits (30mph), WVCs continue to occur in this segment at a rate of 1.6 WVCs per mile per year.

#### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

**General Recommendations** 

- Approach the town of Dubois about partnering to improve roadway lighting by converting the existing lighting to LED and expanding the roadway lighting east to approximately MP 56.5.
- Coordinate with the town to continue discouraging the feeding of deer.

#### Site-Specific Recommendations

• There are no site-specific mitigation recommendations in this segment.

# SEGMENT 5: MILEPOST 56 – 58, EAST DUBOIS

This segment encompasses the eastern end of Dubois, including residences, commercial and industrial development, including a gravel pit. Despite the high level of development and human activity, there is substantial wildlife activity, resulting in 93 recorded deer-vehicle collisions over a five-year period (2015-2019). This segment has the highest WVC rate in the study area (9.3 WVCs per mile per year).

There are several existing structures in this segment with the potential to pass deer and other wildlife. These include a bridge over the Wind River and two stock passes.

## **Mitigation Recommendations:**

#### **General Recommendations**

With a high WVC rate and several existing structures that could be improved for wildlife passage, a mitigation solution involving crossing structures and wildlife fencing is warranted in this segment. However, such structural mitigation is complicated by commercial and residential development along US 26. Wildlife guards (i.e., specially designed double cattle guards) would be needed at every driveway and access road and, while these mitigation features are important in helping to prevent wildlife incursions into a fenced highway, they are not 100% effective. With so many wildlife guards required in this two-mile segment (~17), the overall effectiveness of the fencing would be reduced and could increase the risk of animals becoming trapped inside the fenced ROW. For these reasons, this type of mitigation is not currently recommended in this segment.

Wildlife-permeable ROW fence was installed along much of the segment in 2020. This fence replacement is expected to reduce the roadside barriers to wildlife movement and may help to reduce WVCs. The removal of roadside vegetation that can obstruct motorist visibility of approaching wildlife is also recommended and should be pursued in coordination with landowners. Other mitigation solutions may also be considered as these technologies advance.

#### Site-Specific Recommendations

While wildlife exclusion fencing is not recommended for this segment at this time, increasing wildlife access and the functionality of the existing structures in this segment for wildlife passage may help to encourage wildlife use of these structures and decrease some at-grade wildlife movements.

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
56.97	Wind River bridge	Coordinate with adjacent landowners to improve wildlife access to bridge and enhance wildlife paths under the bridge on both sides of the river.	Medium
57.17	11'6"W x7'H corrugated metal arch culvert	Coordinate with adjacent landowners to replace setback fencing and gates from culvert entrances and replace the gate on the south side with a wildlife permeable alternative. Add natural substrate.	Medium
57.5	7'5" diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert	Maintain functionality for wildlife. Add and maintain natural substrate through culvert.	Medium

# **SEGMENT 6: MILEPOST 58 – 64.5, LONGHORN RANCH TO MILITARY VEHICLES MUSEUM** \*This segment is a high priority for mitigation implementation in the US 26 study area

This segment is comprised primarily of agricultural and pasture lands with some residential development, particularly around Red Hills. There are several large ranches with conservation easements between the South Fork of Torrey Creek and the Military Vehicles Museum (~MP 60.6-64) on the south side of the highway. With an annual average of 8.7 WVCs per mile per year, this segment has the second highest rate of WVCs in the study area, including the mile segment with the highest peak in WVCs at MP 61/61.5 (Fig. 16).

This segment is in the heart of mule deer winter range. Irrigated fields on either side of US 26 and the Wind River are attractants for wildlife arriving on winter range. During the fall and early winter in particular, mule deer make daily movements across US 26, prior to settling into winter range in the adjacent hills on either side of the valley. Correspondingly, 51% of all WVCs in this segment occur during the three-month period of November through January. Few WVCs occur during the summer months (7%), with the remainder recorded in the spring and fall.



Figure 16. Reported WVC crashes and carcasses in Segment 6 from 2015-2019. MP 58 is at Longhorn Ranch/Kingfisher Road, east of Dubois; Red Hills Road is a MP 61.5, and MP 64 is adjacent to the Military Vehicles Museum. Note, only ½ mile of MP 64 is included in this segment.

There are multiple existing bridges and culverts in this segment, many of which are potentially functional for wildlife passage (see <u>Appendix A</u>). Enhancements to this existing infrastructure offers a major opportunity for WVC mitigation efforts in this segment. ROW fencing is present throughout the segment, but unlike the fencing west of Dubois (Segment 3), much of the ROW fencing in this segment is permeable or semi-permeable to wildlife.
### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

**General Recommendations** 

Due to the high rate of WVCs and the presence of several existing large bridges and culverts with potential functionality for wildlife passage, this segment is recommended for a comprehensive system of wildlife crossings and fencing mitigation. While costly, this type of mitigation has a demonstrated effectiveness – in some cases decreasing WVCs by 90% (e.g., Kintsch et al. 2021; Sawyer and Rodgers 2015) – and it is expected that these investments would have a major impact on reducing WVCs while maintaining connectivity for wildlife in this segment.

#### Site-Specific Recommendations

Potential locations for new wildlife crossing structures (Fig. 17) were evaluated based on several considerations, 1) building off the existing infrastructure and optimizing spacing such that wildlife have an opportunity to cross US 26 every 1-2 miles; 2) land use compatibility; and 3) terrain and construction feasibility. For this mitigation assessment, WYDOT conducted preliminary engineering reviews of four potential crossing structure locations. The proposed structure dimensions are preliminary and will be refined through future design processes. Alternative locations may also be feasible and should continue to be evaluated for the greatest benefit to wildlife and cost-effectiveness. The following table lists recommendations for enhancing wildlife passage at existing bridges and culverts as well as recommendations for new wildlife crossing structures (light gray rows). Eight-foot-high wildlife fencing connecting the existing and new structures would guide animals to these safe crossing locations and help to prevent WVCs on US 26 and would extend from the Wind River bridge near the east end of Dubois (MP 56.97) to east of the Military Vehicles Tank Museum (MP 64.1). The east fence end should be sited and designed to discourage wildlife from entering the fenced ROW and at a location with good visibility for motorists to prevent WVCs at the fence end. In Arizona, a wildlife crosswalk and driver warning system installed at a fence end was successful in meeting these objectives (Gagnon et al. 2018).



Figure 17. Example of a wildlife overpass on State Highway 9 in Colorado. This system of 2 wildlife crossing overpasses and 5 underpasses with wildlife fencing along 10.3 miles of highway was successful in reducing WVCs by over 90%. Credit: J. Richter

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
58.6	Fill slope adjacent to Wind River oxbow	Construct a bridge or arch underpass approximately 30'W x 14'H x 48'L. Excavation will be required at the south culvert entrance. Alternatively, a wildlife overpass could be constructed at a cut slope adjacent to this location.	High
59.2	Jakey's Fork bridge	Clear pathways through riparian vegetation along both riverbanks	High
59.5	Cut slope at top of hill	Construct an overpass approximately 75'W x 85'L. The topography at this location lends itself to a wildlife overpass. Overpasses can be highly functional for a variety of wildlife including elk, pronghorn, and large herds of deer.	High
59.95	11'6"W x 7'H corrugated metal arch culvert	Maintain functionality for wildlife, including sediment through the bottom of the culvert.	High
60.41	South Fork Torrey Creek bridge	Create wildlife pathways under the bridge through the riprap and vegetation.	High
61.5	Small fill slope near Red Hills Road	Construct a bridge or large culvert approximately 30'W x 14'H x 48'L. Some excavation will be required at the south culvert entrance to achieve this culvert opening.	High
62.9		Construct a bridge or large culvert approximately 30'W x 14'H x 48'L. Some excavation will be required at the south culvert entrance. A crossing structure at this location will require coordination with the adjacent river access to minimize wildlife disturbance at the crossing structure.	High
63.7	Wind River bridge	Coordinate with adjacent landowners to improve wildlife access to bridge, remove old fencing, and enhance wildlife paths on both sides of the river.	High

Wildlife guards at interchanges and driveways as well as escape ramps are important components of a wildlife crossing system with continuous fencing. These mitigation features help prevent wildlife breaches into the fenced ROW and offer an escape route when an animal does become trapped on the highway side of the fence. Wildlife guards must be installed at all road and driveway access points. Wildlife guards are specialized double cattle guards designed to prevent hooved animals from walking across and are too long for animals to jump. Well-designed guards have been shown to be ≥80% effective in preventing deer, elk, and other ungulates from entering into a fenced ROW (Flower 2016; Kintsch et al. 2021). In some locations with low levels of use, such as field access points, tall gates may be used instead of wildlife guards, provided that the gates remain closed except when in use. Areas with a high number of driveway access points complicate the fence alignment and increase the number of wildlife guards needed; these considerations will need to be addressed in the next phase of design and implementation of this mitigation strategy.

With the construction of 8'-high wildlife exclusion fence along the highway, wildlife must be able to access safe crossing locations at existing and new bridges and culverts. Lateral fencing demarking property lines and pasture boundaries can impede wildlife movements across the landscape, including access to crossing structures. Throughout this segment, fence lines on properties adjacent to US 26 run perpendicular to the ROW fence line and may impede wildlife movement to crossing structure locations. Information on fence locations will be used to identify areas where coordination with landowners is needed to ensure that fence lines on private properties do not prevent wildlife from accessing new or existing safe crossing locations, while protecting landowner needs.

A schematic of the mitigation concept for this segment is presented in Figure 18. While the recommended mitigation strategies have benefits throughout the segment, due to funding availability, it is expected that mitigation construction may need to be phased. At this time, the recommended phasing is to construct the western portion of the segment first, from Longhorn Ranch to Torrey Creek (MP 58-61.5), as this section involves fewer landowners and greater construction feasibility based on the terrain adjacent to the highway. However, this phasing may be adjusted according to funding availability and other circumstances.

### Benefit-Cost Analysis of Wildlife Crossings Mitigation

A high-level benefit-cost analysis was conducted to calculate the number of years until the benefits of mitigation would exceed the cost of investing in wildlife crossings mitigation in this segment. The annual average cost of WVCs in Segment 6 is \$280,100 based on WVC accidents reported to law enforcement and carcass reports compiled by WYDOT Maintenance (Table 3). This number also represents the potential cost savings that could be derived from a reduction in WVCs. However, this calculation does not include WVCs in which the animal is not killed immediately and dies beyond the road or road shoulder. While the number of additional carcasses may be over 5 times higher than the number of reported crashes and over 1.5 times higher than the number of carcasses reported by maintenance patrols (Kintsch et al. 2021; Olson 2013), the extent of this underreporting on US 26 is uncertain and these incidents could not be included in this analysis of the costs of WVCs.

Cost Type	Quantity (2015-2019)	Unit Cost	Cost
Property Damage Accident <sup>1</sup>	47	\$5,500	\$258,500
Wildlife Value: Elk <sup>2</sup>	4	\$6,000	\$24,000
Wildlife Value: Deer <sup>2</sup>	278	\$4,000	\$1,112,000
Wildlife Value: Pronghorn <sup>2</sup>	2	\$3,000	\$6,000
Total Cost (2015-2019) \$1,400,500			
Average Annual Cost			\$280,100

#### Table 3. Average annual cost of WVC in Segment 6.

<sup>1</sup>Most WVCs result in property damage only. No injury or human fatality accidents were reported in this segment during this timeframe.

<sup>2</sup>Wildlife values are based on restitution values set in statute.



Figure 18. Mitigation concept for Segment 6, Longhorn Ranch to the Military Vehicles Museum (MP 58-64.5).

The cost of wildlife crossings mitigation in Segment 6, as described herein and depicted in Figure 18 is approximately \$6.7 million (Table 4). Based on these costs and cost savings, the costs of the mitigation would be realized within 27-29 years (Table 5). As the lifespan of a wildlife crossings is at least 75 years, these mitigation investments offer ongoing benefits far beyond the initial payoff period. This is a highend estimate that does not include increases in the cost of crashes and the value of wildlife over time or discounted costs over the life of the crossing structures. In addition, this benefit-cost analysis does not include other unquantifiable benefits or passive values such as wildlife population health or the ecosystem values of connectivity.

Table 4. Estimated cost of wildlife crossings mitigation in Segment 6. This estimate includes four escape ramps per mile and wildlife guards at all access roads and driveways; some field access points may be mitigated with a gate rather than a guard.

Mitigation Item	Specifications	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost
Bridge Underpass	30'W x 12-14'H x 48'L opening	3	\$500,000	\$750,000
Bridge Overpass	75'W x 85'L	1	\$1,434,375	\$1,434,375
Wildlife Exclusion Fence	8' high wire mesh with wood posts	6.5 lane miles	\$126,720	\$823,680
Escape Ramp	3:1 slope	26	\$10,000	\$260,000
Wildlife Guard	18' wide	12	\$16,000	\$192,000
Wildlife Guard	24' wide	11	\$18,000	\$198,000
Wildlife Guard	30' wide	2	\$30,000	\$60,000
		Mi	tigation Subtotal	\$4,468,055
Total Mitigation Cost including Contingencies, Construction Engineering, and Indirect Charges				\$6,001,045
	\$750,000			
	\$6,751,045			

Table 5. Benefit-cost analysis of wildlife crossings mitigation in Segment 6. Crash reduction factor is the estimated effectiveness of the mitigation in reducing WVCs. Because it is unlikely that any mitigation system will result in 100% reduction in WVCs, benefit-cost was calculated with a crash reduction factor of 83% and 90%, based on research from other locations.

Annual Cost of WVC	\$280,100	
Mitigation Cost	\$6,751,045	
Crash Reduction Factor	83% 90%	
Years until Benefits Exceed Costs of Mitigation	29.0	26.8

## SEGMENT 7: MILEPOST 64.5 – 69, MILITARY VEHICLES MUSEUM TO LITTLE RED CREEK

While WVCs are lower in this segment than in Segment 5, WVCs still occur at a rate of 5.5 WVC per mile per year. Irrigated fields as well as the river corridor itself attract wildlife, resulting in deer movements back and forth across US 26. These movements may be influenced by agricultural practices, for example, in one case, a newly irrigated field may be helping to decrease wildlife activity on the highway as more animals remain in and around the field with less of a need to move back and forth across the highway. On the other hand, such practices may entice wildlife to cross the highway to access fields and pasture with improved forage. The highway through this segment is mostly straight with little tree or shrub cover adjacent to the highway. These conditions ought to offer good sight lines for motorists to detect and be able to respond to wildlife that may be approaching the highway, but due to the magnitude of

deer activity in this segment, WVCs remain frequent.

There are few existing bridges or culverts in this segment. However, a long span bridge across the Wind River at MP 66.91 offers high potential functionality for wildlife passage. The ROW fence around this area is an elk-post/top-rail variety with a smooth bottom wire 16" above the ground level and a wood rail across the top that makes the top of the fence much more visible for wildlife jumping over the fence and reduces the likelihood of leg entanglement (Fig. 19).



Figure 19. Wildlife permeable elk-post fence in Segment 7.

### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

**General Recommendations** 

- Identify opportunities to coordinate with landowners in areas where forage improvements could help keep wildlife on one side of the highway and lessen the need for them to move back and forth across the highway.
- Continue to monitor WVC rates and, as technologies improve, evaluate this segment for a wildlife detection and driver warning system.

### Site-Specific Recommendations

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
66.91	Wind River bridge	Create pathways along both riverbanks through rocks and riparian vegetation and remove debris under bridge to improve wildlife access. Consider installing a short section of wildlife exclusion fence (~0.5 mile in either direction from a structure) to encourage wildlife use of the bridge and discourage at-grade highway crossings. Fence ends should be clearly signed and located in areas with good visibility for motorists and should be designed to minimize wildlife incursions into the fenced ROW.	Medium

## SEGMENT 8: MILEPOST 69 – 73, LITTLE RED CREEK TO DINWOODY CREEK

This segment is within the Wind River Reservation, although many of the properties immediately adjacent to the highway are privately owned. The Wind River and its associated riparian habitat runs parallel to the highway and serves as a wildlife attractant. Sagebrush habitat is interspersed with agricultural fields and pasture on both sides of the highway. Wildlife-vehicle collisions remain high through this segment, at a rate of 4.9 WVCs per mile per year.

There are multiple bridges and culverts in this segment that have potential functionality for wildlife passage (<u>Appendix A</u>).

### **Mitigation Recommendations:**

### **General Recommendations**

- Coordinate with the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes to develop a long-term plan for improving habitat and making natural water sources on the south side of US 26 in Little Red Creek more available to wildlife to lessen the need for wildlife, in particular bighorn sheep, to cross US 26 to access the Wind River.
- Throughout the segment, replace barbed-wire ROW fencing with wildlife permeable fence.
- The following mitigation options are recommended for further evaluation in terms of feasibility, reliability, and benefit-cost:
  - Install short sections of wildlife exclusion fence (~0.5 mile in either direction from a structure) at existing bridges and culverts to encourage wildlife use of these structures and discourage at-grade highway crossings. Fence ends should be clearly signed and located in areas with good visibility for motorists and should be designed to minimize wildlife incursions into the fenced ROW.
  - Install a wildlife detection and driver warning system through the segment. Current technologies are expensive and insufficiently reliable; however, with ongoing testing, continued improvements, and increased cost efficiencies, this type of mitigation may become a viable alternative.

### Site-Specific Recommendations

Milepost	Location Description	Mitigation Recommendation	Priority
69.94	Little Red Creek	Create pathways for wildlife through the thick	Medium
	bridge	vegetation on either side of the bridge.	
70.49	Red Creek bridge	Replace wire bank armoring and barbed wire fencing in front of the bridge entrances to improve wildlife passage.	Medium
73.28	Dinwoody Creek	Create pathways for wildlife through the thick riparian vegetation and replace barbed wire fencing in front of the bridge entrances to improve wildlife passage.	Medium

# NEXT STEPS

### PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Public involvement is essential for the implementation and success of the US 26 mitigation strategy. Public meetings were held on December 8, 2020, and April 27, 2021, to assess the public's perceptions of WVCs and associated issues on US 26, and to receive feedback on the draft mitigation strategy. Input from both public meetings was used to help inform this assessment and the vision for a mitigated and connected landscape. Input, comments, and suggestions from both public meetings were addressed and incorporated into this mitigation strategy, or they were recognized in <u>Appendix B</u> with a response why the suggestion or comment wasn't included.

From this point, a suite of public outreach materials will be developed. The objectives of continued public engagement following the completion of this mitigation strategy are to: 1) communicate the vision for reducing WVCs and maintaining connectivity for wildlife on US 26 to the public, local, state and federal decision-makers, and potential funders; 2) set the stage for ongoing collaboration with the Dubois community to ensure that local interests, needs and concerns continue to be addressed during the evolution and implementation of the migration strategy; and 3) build broad public ownership and support for this wildlife mitigation strategy and its implementation.

### PRECONSTRUCTION WILDLIFE MONITORING

Preconstruction wildlife monitoring using motion-triggered cameras is recommended at select locations to further inform and refine the mitigation strategy, in particular,

- Existing bridges and box culverts to measure current levels of wildlife activity and use at these locations. Recommended monitoring locations include:
  - Segment 2 (Forest Boundary to Stoney Point)
    - Box culvert at MP 44.6
  - Segment 3 (Stoney Point to West City Limits)
    - Double box culvert at MP 49.3
  - Segment 5 (East Dubois to Tank Museum)
    - Wind River bridge at MP 56.97
    - Pipe culvert at MP 57.5
    - Arch culvert at MP 59.95
    - South Fork Torrey Creek bridge at MP 60.41
  - Segment 7 (Little Red Creek to Dinwoody Creek)
    - All bridge and small culvert locations (6)
- Potential new crossing structure locations. Preconstruction camera monitoring is used to capture a snapshot of the wildlife activity near the highway at future crossing locations. These data can help in identifying species that approached the highway prior to mitigation construction, though it cannot measure the frequency of cross-highway movements.

• At select locations along the ROW fence line in Segment 4 (Stoney Point to West City Limits). The purpose of camera monitoring along the fence line is to observe how wildlife respond to the existing ROW barrier fence types. Monitoring should be targeted to known WVC hotspots with high levels of near-highway deer activity as observed by WGFD biologists.

Monitoring during the fall through spring months would be most valuable for evaluating migratory and wintering mule deer responses to the existing infrastructure, while year-round monitoring would contribute additional insight into wildlife responses to the infrastructure by resident big game herds and other species.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, G. 2021. Dubois mule deer movement/migration study, March 2016 to March 2019. Draft Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Lander, WY.

Donaldson, B.M. and K.E.M. Elliot. 2020. Enhancing existing isolated underpasses with fencing to decrease wildlife crashes and increase habitat connectivity. Report No. FHWA/VTRC 20-R28. Virginia Department of Transportation, Richmond, VA.

Flower, J.P. 2016. Emerging Technology to Exclude Wildlife from Roads: Electrified Pavement and Deer Guards in Utah, USA. All Graduate Theses and Dissertations. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/4944

Gagnon, J.W., N.L. Dodd, S.C. Sprague, K.S. Ogren, C.D. Lodberger, and R.E. Schweinsburg. 2018. Animalactivated highway crosswalk: long-term impact on elk-vehicle collisions, vehicle speeds, and motorist braking response. Human Dimensions of Wildlife. DOI: 10.1080/10871209.2019.1551586

Huijser, M.P., J.W. Duffield, A.P. Clevenger, R.J. Ament, and P. McGowen. 2009. Cost-benefit analysis of mitigation measures aimed at reducing collisions with large ungulates in the United States and Canada: a decision-support tool. Ecology and Society 14 (2): 15.

Kintsch, J. and P. Cramer. 2011. Permeability of existing structure for terrestrial wildlife. Report No. WA-RD 777.1. Washington Department of Transportation. Olympia, WA.

Kintsch, J., P. Cramer, P. Singer, and M. Cowardin. 2021. State Highway 9 wildlife crossings monitoring. Report No. CDOT-2021-01. Applied Research and Innovation Branch, Colorado Department of Transportation. Denver, CO.

Mule Deer Working Group. 2018. The Wyoming Mule Deer Initiative. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, WY, USA.

Olson, D. D. 2013. Assessing vehicle-related mortality of mule deer in Utah. PhD Dissertation, Graduate School of Utah State University. Paper 1994.

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. Report No. FHWA-WY-16/10F. Wyoming Department of Transportation, Cheyenne, WY.

Riginos, C., C. Smith, E. Fairbank, E. Hansen, and P. Hallsten. 2018. Traffic thresholds in deer roadcrossing behavior. Report No. WY-1807F. Wyoming Department of Transportation, Cheyenne, WY, USA.

Segar J. and A. Keane. 2020. Species and demographic responses to wildlife-friendly fencing on ungulate crossing success and behavior. Conservation Science and Practice. DOI: 10.1111/csp2.285

Seiler, A. 2003. The toll of the automobile: Wildlife and roads in Sweden. Doctoral Thesis. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden.

Wyoming Game and Fish Commission. 2003. Restitution values for wildlife. Policy Number VII L. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, WY.

Wyoming Game and Fish Commission. 2020. 2020 Wyoming action plan for implementation of Department of the Interior Secretarial Order 3362: "Improving Habitat Quality in Western Big-Game Winter Range and Migration Corridors". Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, WY.

## APPENDICES

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

# APPENDIX A

## WILDLIFE SURVEY OF EXISTING BRIDGES AND CULVERTS ON US 26

The following table includes all medium and large sized bridges and culverts in the study area. Drainage culverts 6' in diameter and smaller with intermittent water flows were not surveyed, although they may offer potential functionality as wildlife passages for medium and small bodied species. Functionality for wildlife passage was primarily assessed with respect to mule deer, although deer and other wildlife may be unlikely to use structures without the installation of wildlife exclusion fencing to guide animals to the structure locations and prevent at-grade crossings of the roadway.

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
	S	egment 1 – Togwotee Pass to Forest Boundary	
24.14	Buried bridge over unnamed draw. Short stretch of buck and rail fence on south side of highway directs wildlife towards bridge. Farther east, there is a long, high retaining wall along the south side of US 26.	Signs of deer use under bridge, but deer tracks and game trails observed on sides slopes indicate that wildlife also make cross at-grade at this location.	
32.48	Brooks Lake Creek Culvert	Concrete box culvert with perennial stream not suitable for terrestrial wildlife passage.	no image
		Segment 2 – Forests Boundary to Stoney Point	
41.05	7'7" diameter pipe culvert with flat concrete floor. Barbed wire ROW fence on both sides of structure.	Potential functionality for wildlife passage by medium sized mammals; deer are unlikely to use unless wildlife fencing prevented at-grade crossings.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
41.42	6' diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert. Barbed wire ROW fence on both sides of structure.	Potential functionality for wildlife passage by medium sized mammals. Structure is not functional for deer passage.	
43.38	Long Creek span bridge. Recently replaced riprap under bridge. Creek flows into Wind River on south side. ROW fence extends down to riverbanks.	Deer and elk passage deterred by riprap banks, riparian vegetation, and ROW fencing.	
44.6	10'W x 10'H concrete box culvert. Barbed wire ROW fence on both sides of structure. BLM lands on both sides of culvert.	Structure is suitable for deer passage and species such as black bear, mountain lion, bobcat, fox, and coyote. Deer and other wildlife use of culvert is unlikely without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings. Elk are unlikely to use this structure.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
45.66	Large span bridge over Wind River.	Bridge spans riparian banks. A horse corral abuts the bridge and the river on the southwest side of the bride, limiting wildlife movement along that bank.	
46.43	Large span bridge over Wind River. Old highway bridge to south.	Gaps in ROW fence provide wildlife access. Wildlife pathways through fencing and under bridge. Structure has high functionality for wildlife passage.	
47.6	10' diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert. Stock pass leading into corrals on either side of US 26.	Structure is not suitable for wildlife passage due to adjacent fencing which prevents wildlife access.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
47.8	11'5" diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert. Pipe is skewed relative to the roadway. Drains wetland on north side and drops into Wind River at outlet on south side.	Structure is not suitable for wildlife passage.	
49.3	Double box culvert. Each chamber	Segment 3 – Stony Point to West City Limits Structure is suitable for limited deer passage	
	is 8'W x 8'H opening.	and species such as black bear, mountain lion, bobcat, fox, and coyote. Woven wire ROW fence is present along this section of highway and runs over the top of the culvert, allowing wildlife access to the culvert. Wildlife functionality could be improved by installing short segments of 8'-high wildlife fencing to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	
52.04	7'7" diameter concrete pipe culvert with concrete apron and wing walls. Stock pass with ROW fencing running over the top of the north side culvert entrance; south side drops immediately into Wind River.	Culvert size limits functionality for deer passage but could function as a crossing structure for other medium and small mammals. Fencing and gate in front of the south side culvert entrance prevent wildlife access.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos	
52.48	10'W x 10'H concrete box culvert. Stock pass with ROW fencing running over the top of the north side culvert entrance; at south side buck and rail fence guides livestock to pasture. Metal gate across south side entrance.	Hay pile on the south side of the culvert is a likely wildlife attractant. Structure is suitable for deer passage and species such as black bear, mountain lion, bobcat, fox, and coyote. However, fencing and gate in front of the south side culvert entrance prevent wildlife access.		
52.78	7'7" concrete pipe with concrete apron and wing walls. Stock pass with ROW fencing running over the top of the north side culvert entrance. Metal gate across south side entrance and double woven wire fence line to guide livestock.	Culvert size limits functionality for deer passage but could function as a crossing structure for other medium and small mammals. Fencing and gate in front of the south side culvert entrance prevent wildlife access.		
53.3	7'7" concrete pipe with concrete apron and wing walls. Stock pass with ROW fencing running over the top of both culvert entrances. Culvert is located just beyond the western town limit.	Culvert size limits functionality for deer passage but could function as a crossing structure for other medium and small mammals. Open access to both culvert entrances allows wildlife passage, but woven wire pasture fencing likely limits wildlife access into this area.		
Segment 4 – Downtown Dubois				
ivo briages	s or culverts were surveyed in this segn	Segment 5 - East Dubeis to Tank Museum		
56.97	Large span bridge over Wind River.	Structure is suitable for deer and other	no image	
	At east end of Dubois. Adjacent	wildlife passage, but homes, human activity,		
	homes, barn and horse corral. Some riparian cover.	and fencing limit wildlife access to structure.		

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
57.17	11'6"W x 7'H corrugated metal arch culvert with limited sediment on culvert floor. Adjacent to Wind River bridge. Pasture both sides. ROW fence in front of both structure entrances replaced with wildlife-friendly fence in 2020/21. Metal gate on south side.	Structure could be improved for wildlife passage by adding natural substrate to culvert floor and replacing a metal gate with a wildlife permeable alternative. Adjacent land uses (homes, horse pasture) limit the functionality of this structure for wildlife passage.	
57.5	7'5" diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert with some sediment buildup on culvert floor. Gravel pit to south east; cattle on north side. ROW fence in front of both structure entrances replaced with wildlife-friendly fence in 2020/21.	Anecdotally, this structure is known to see some use by deer. In general, deer and other wildlife are unlikely to use this culvert without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings. ROW fencing in front of the structure entrances at this location is wildlife permeable.	
59.2	Bridge over Jakey's Fork. Bridge spans heavily vegetated riparian banks.	Thick riparian vegetation and horse corral on northwest side limit wildlife access. Bridge spans heavily vegetated riparian banks. Deer and other wildlife use of culvert is unlikely without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
59.95	11'6"W x 7'H corrugated metal arch culvert with sediment buildup on culvert floor. Private ranch on both sides of US 26. ROW fence in front of both structure entrances replaced with wildlife-friendly fence in 2020/21.	Structure is potentially functional for deer and other wildlife with the addition of wildlife fencing to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings. ROW fencing in front of the structure entrances at this location is wildlife permeable.	
60.34	North Fork Torrey Creek. Bridge does not span riparian banks.	Structure is not suitable for wildlife passage.	
60.41	South Fork Torrey Creek. Bridge spans riprap banks	Structure could be improved for wildlife passage by creating dry pathways for deer and other wildlife through the riprap banks, although deer and other wildlife use is unlikely without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings. ROW fencing in this portion of the segment is wildlife permeable.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
63.67	Span bridge over Wind River. Long span with thick willows along riparian banks. Large ranch property with a conservation easement to south; horse corral on north side of bridge.	Old and new fencing along riparian corridor (outside of WYDOT ROW) impedes wildlife access to bridge.	
	Segn	nent 6 – Tank Museum to Little Red Creek Cany	on
65.96	7'5" diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert. Horse pasture on north side.	Culvert size limits functionality for deer passage but could function as a crossing structure for other medium and small mammals. Open access to both culvert entrances allows wildlife passage. Wildlife use of culvert is unlikely without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	
66.91	Long span bridge over Wind River. Thick riparian vegetation along riverbanks. Wildlife-friendly elk post ROW fencing on both sides of bridge.	Bridge offers potential functionality for deer and other wildlife passage but access is limited by thick vegetation cover, rocks and other debris along riparian banks.	

Milenost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
	Segm	ent 7 – Little Red Creek Canyon to Dinwoody Cre	eek
69.42	Bridge over Little Red Canyon Creek. Creek feeds into Wind River immediately to north. No ROW fence across north side of bridge; barbed wire ROW across south side.	Thick tree and shrub cover nearly obscure bridge entrances and limits functionality for wildlife passage.	
69.94	8' diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert with concrete bottom. Open access to both culvert entrances.	Structure is suitable for limited deer passage and species such as black bear, mountain lion, bobcat, fox, and coyote. Deer and other wildlife use of culvert is unlikely without wildlife fence to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	
70.49	Bridge over Red Creek. Short bridge span over small creek. Barbed wire ROW fence.	Wire/stone bank armoring and barbed wire ROW fence impedes wildlife passage.	

Milepost	Location Description	Wildlife Functionality	Photos
71.06	11'W x 7'H corrugated metal arch culvert with concrete bottom. Open access to both culvert entrances.	Structure is potentially functional for deer and other wildlife with the addition of wildlife fencing to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	
72.25	12' diameter corrugated metal pipe culvert with concrete bottom. Open access to both culvert entrances.	Structure is potentially functional for deer and other wildlife with the addition of wildlife fencing to guide animals to the structure and prevent at-grade crossings.	
73.28	Dinwoody Creek. Rocky riverbanks with thick riparian vegetation. Homes to west. Barbed wire ROW fence.	Barbed wire ROW fence impedes wildlife access to structure.	

# APPENDIX B Public Meeting Comments and Responses

## MEETING #1 – DECEMBER 8, 2020

This meeting was a follow-up to an initial public meeting held in December 2017 during which the issue of wildlife conflict on US 26 was first presented, and participants shared their perspectives and ideas for addressing the problem. The goal of this follow-up meeting was to establish the need for a wildlife mitigation strategy for US 26 to proactively identify how targeted mitigation investments can have the greatest impact on reducing WVCs while preserving wildlife connectivity. At this meeting, the project team presented initial findings and concepts, and solicited public feedback. Public comments and responses to these comments are documented below. Additional information is available on the WGFD project website.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
GENERAL COMMENTS		
As a resident of Lander, I frequently drive through this area, and actually had a collision with a mule deer at the red bluffs area south of Dubois a few years ago (\$12,000 in damage). I also gave a ride to a couple from Colorado who hit a deer in the very same spot a couple years later. I enjoyed being able to sit in and listen to the data and ideas.	N/A	Thank you for attending, listening in, and taking the time to give us feedback.
I will not be able to participate in the December 8 virtual meeting but wish to offer the following thoughts. The issue of deer and vehicle collisions is a great concern of mine. I have lived along Highway 26/287 for many decades at the Spring Ranch, Jack Anderson Ranch, M-J Ranch, and Grazing Association Ranch. Today my wife and I own property bordering the highway. My point is that I have witnessed the annual slaughter of deer on this portion of the highway for many years. The number of collisions, the cost, the waste, and the danger to humans continues to increase as the number and speed of traffic has increased. I understand we cannot prevent all wildlife/vehicle collisions, but we can do a better job of reducing the carnage.	N/A	We acknowledge that many members of the public have this concern and appreciate your comments.
I was surprised by the statistics and also surprised at the very minimal effectiveness of inexpensive solutions such as reduction in speed limit.	N/A	Thank you for attending, listening in, and taking the time to give us feedback.
We appreciate you wanting to maintain the herd numbers - but how many are being killed by autos?	N/A	The carcass and collision data that have been collected show 188 large mammals in 2020, 182 large mammals in 2019. This does not include those that are not found or picked up.
Why does it cost over \$5,000 per deer?	N/A	This number was calculated using average insurance claim cost for these types of collisions as well as the restitution cost (the cost to the State of Wyoming to grow one of these animals). For example, WYDOT estimates the average costs per reported deer-vehicle collision are \$11,600 in injury and property damage costs, and WGFD estimates the economic

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
		value of each killed mule deer is \$4,000. Since nearly 6,000 deer-vehicle collisions occur in Wyoming each year, this means that deer-vehicle collisions total approximately \$24- 29 million per year in Wyoming in injury and damage costs and an additional \$20-23 million per year in wildlife costs (Riginos et al. 2016). Collision numbers also indicate roads are having a substantial impact on Wyoming's large mammals. The number of dead animals due to WVCs alone is cause for concern. For mule deer the number of animals killed by vehicles represents approximately 2-4% of the total population each year.
Given the problem across most of the Rocky Mountains, are the states cross coordinating strategies. In addition, would a multi- state movement gain support for federal grants?	N/A	For the most part, states are working independently on mitigation projects within their state boundaries; however, in areas such as the WY/CO border, where herds are known to cross into both states, some conversations have been initiated to discuss multi-state mitigation projects. Western states and non-profit organizations that represent multiple western states are seeking new funding sources for mitigation projects through the Transportation Bill and the Wildlife Corridors Act. Secretarial Order 3362, signed in 2017, directs all agencies in the Department of the Interior to work with state wildlife agencies to conserve big game habitat, in particular migration corridors and winter range, and provides some funding for research and mitigation.
With regards to the comment of interagency coordination. Has anyone coordinate with Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) for emerging technology development that this project would serve as vetting measure (that means free Passive IR type equipment) for a limited amount of time.	N/A	While we are not engaging with the DTRA. There is work being done to evaluate wildlife detection systems as part of the mitigation plan.
Is there a plan to address the increasing whitetail populations and have their impacts to mule deer movement behavior been evaluated?	N/A	Hunting seasons to provide opportunity to harvest white- tailed deer are evaluated each year by WGFD Biologists and Wardens. Season proposals are based on evaluations of deer numbers or trends, management goals or objectives,

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
		and public input. Based on research to date there is very little indication white-tailed deer impact mule deer populations. WGFD is not aware of any impact of white- tailed deer on mule deer movement behavior.
PLEASE provide more information on hunting timeframes and any extensions of the timeframe.	N/A	Hunting seasons dates and limitations are evaluated annually. In the Dubois area hunting seasons for elk and deer are generally during the month of October. Some seasons, for example for cow elk, provide extended hunting opportunity into November and December.
The cost of about \$750,000 per year to the State of Wyoming was mentioned in the article mentioning this meeting tonight? Where did that number come from? Actual dollars cost to the State? Or was it cost to drivers and insurance companies for those collisions? My assumption is that most animal / vehicles collisions were with doe or fawn deer.	N/A	Crash costs were calculated are based on the cost of a property damage only WVC (\$5,500) and the value of the wildlife species killed in collisions with vehicles (based on restitution values established by the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, 2003).
Deer collar points – if one deer stays close to the road would reports as multiple points? i.e. how do you get 20,000?	N/A	Collars for this study were set to collect locations every 2 hours. Deer collared for a 2-year period would thus have a maximum of around 8,700 location points. This was by design so we could get detailed information about migratory paths when animals were moving fast. That of course means that once deer settled in areas near the highway in late October, their location was recorded up to 12 times per day. This was true for the rest of the year as well so the proportion of points near the highway is representative of the total time they reside near the highway on an annual basis.
Has there been any notable increase in collisions since the speed limit was increased several years ago?	N/A	There has not been an increase in collisions. While the speed limit did increase, the driving speed did not change.
I also noticed the area between Lander and Hudson on Wyoming 789 ranks higher than many areas for wildlife vs. motor vehicle collisions and I know of numerous deer and at least two moose killed in this area. I drive on a portion of this segment regularly and I can attest that the dynamic messaging	N/A	WGFD and WYDOT will continue to work on other locations identified.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
signs are minimally effective and my knee-jerk reaction has been to reduce the speed limit, but I see now that this would not be a good solution. Once the solution is underway in Dubois I would like to see the segment of Wyoming Highway 789 between Hudson and Lander addressed to find solutions and I would be happy to help in some way.		
MITIGATION STRATEGIES QUESTIONS & COMMENTS		
Can you relocate any captures animals? In Florida they have had great success with highway fencing on both sides of highway and use of crossovers rarely see a crash incident. may want to contact your counterparts to discuss. They area where i see this approach is near highway 29 and the Naples section	No	Mule deer are the primary concern with wildlife vehicle collisions in the Dubois area. It has been demonstrated, throughout the West, mule deer relocation efforts are not very successful. Mule deer are very, very tied to the habitats, migration routes, and even individual plants they have learned to rely on. They come back to same winter ranges, summer ranges and use the same migration paths every year. They learned to do this as fawns from their mothers. When they are relocated to a foreign landscape they are literally lost and their chances of survival are quite low.
Finally, at one of the WGFD and WDOT public meetings, it was suggested that high-fencing and wildlife overpasses and underpasses be retrofitted between Dinwoody and the forest boundary. I scoffed at this idea at first, but after reflection and witnessing the ever-increasing traffic and collisions, I now believe this proposal should be examined. According to the cost of collisions at \$746,000 per year, high-fencing, overpasses and underpasses would pay for themselves. How much traffic will use this highway fifty years from now?	Yes	Vehicle volume will increase over the years and be dependent on future development.
We recently drove home from southern Utah visiting family. From St. George to Salt Lake City about 350 miles of I-15. There are sections of that Interstate that have 10-12 foot sheep-tight fence on both sides, with underpasses constructed specifically for wildlife, as well as what I call 'get out of jail free' ramps leading from the highway side where they could jump out of	N/A	We have not contacted Utah about that specific project but we are using some of their state's data to inform mitigations in this plan.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
the highway area. UDOT has taken advantage of roads that already pass under I-25 to allow animals to use those by way of strategically placed high fencing. Specifically, there is an extensive project currently underway around mile marker 148 (measured from the Nevada border North). New high 10-12 foot high sheep-tight fencing with the ramps out of the Interstate placed frequently along the project. Has WYDOT or the G&F contacted Utah for specifics on that project? Numbers of animals? Numbers of collisions / damages / human injuries? Cost per mile of the fencing, or ramps, etc.?? Cost of underpasses? Funding sources?		
Has it been demonstrated that existing stock passages are effective? They appear to have lower ceilings and are dark.	N/A	Some of the larger stock passes (e.g., 10'x10') may be functional for limited deer passage provided that the entryways are not blocked by gates or fencing. Smaller stock passes (≤6') are unlikely to pass deer but may be used by other species, such as black bear, bobcat, coyote, fox, and other medium and small species.
Does WYDOT have future highway construction projects/bridge replacements proposed in this area that wildlife crossings could be a part of to reduce mobilization/construction costs?	Yes	WYDOT does not have planned upcoming projects to replace any structures. As needs arise on infrastructure WYDOT will research options to incorporate wildlife crossings.
Other than the bridges across the Wind River, have any engineers with Game and Fish or WYDOT looked at high density crossing areas that would allow for underpasses or overpasses.	Yes	Yes, new wildlife crossing structures in targeted locations are one of the mitigation strategies being considered.
How long does it take to construct an overpass?	Yes	A wildlife overpass can be constructed in one construction season. Projects with multiple crossing structures and other transportation improvements may require construction over multiple years.
How long do these overpasses or underpasses last before needing significant maintenance?	Yes	The lifespan of a crossing structure is 75 years or more, requiring little maintenance during that timeframe. Fencing lasts 20 or more years and requires more regular maintenance to prevent and repair holes or gaps.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
Perhaps you or G&F is familiar with what was tried around Thermopolis and between Basin and Greybull with the red reflectors? Are the results of the study and the results available?	No	The results of the reflectors were very minimal. In fact, at one point white canvas bags were placed over the reflectors to cover them. The White bags were as effective as the reflectors. WYDOT is no longer installing these red reflectors
Why did they put barbed wire around Pete's Pond, which is public land and a meeting place for the deer?	N/A	The fencing around Pete's pond is being reviewed by WYDOT for areas to remove or modify. The fence was placed to comply with state fence out requirements and before it is removed WYDOT needs to assure that livestock will not reach the highway due to the absence of the
Today I watched a herd of Bighorns stuck on the highway at Pete's Pond because only the baby could get past the barbed wire fence. I did not get an answer from WDOT last night on why this fence is in existence. Would you care to see the video I made of the sheep today, which explains my concern?	N/A	See above response.
Lynn Stewart with DAWGS said there is fencing on the east side of Pete's pond because it is private property on that side	N/A	Thank you for your comment.
and 2) Consider solar signage displaying speed limit and approaching vehicle speed (like used in Teton National Park),	No	WYDOT does not install the radar feedback signs. They allow other agencies such as Towns or Counties to install and maintain them. Ongoing studies continue to research how effective these signs are when not moved from location to location.
Session was well planned and staffed with G&F experts to answer a wide range of questions. This started the process of engaging and informing the public of the challenges and potential solutions to lessen highway death of wildlife. Additional thoughts are: 1. Engage highway patrol's enforcement (at least periodically) if day/night speed limits are established,	Yes	The Wyoming Highway Patrol has been short staffed over the last years. Luckily, they have been able to get a trooper in the Dubois area recently. They are engaged in this effort.
During the 1970's, winter and nighttime traffic was much less than today. Night vehicle traffic was virtually non-existent, folks stayed home after dark. Society has changed and today from my window I observe constant traffic 24 hours a day, seven	N/A	This is not solely a visitor/tourist issue. Speed studies report all vehicles. More locals drive these areas then visitors. Commonly we see communities blaming others when in

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
days a week. 18-wheeled truck traffic greatly increased following the Togwotee Pass highway reconstruction. Daily I watch the speed of vehicles on the highway and can fairly accurately tell which are locals (those driving around 50 MPH) and those who are outsiders (those driving 70 - 80 MPH). Most folks pay attention, but many times I have watched in horror as speeding vehicles race past deer standing on the road and never even touch their vehicle's brakes.		reality the majority of the local drivers are driving as fast if not faster.
I favor a different day time and nighttime speed limit. The speed limit needs to be strictly enforced. I favor more warning signs including the radar-activated flashing signs that tell motorists their speed.	Not at this time	WYDOT does not install the radar feedback signs. They allow other agencies such as Towns or Counties to install and maintain them. Ongoing studies continue to research how effective these signs are when not moved from location to location. WYDOT has engaged in day and nighttime speed. Through studies it has been shown that metal static signs are not effective in reducing speeds. WYDOT does have electronic speed limit sign that change depending on the time of day. We are actively studying this technology to determine its effectiveness.
I drove from Veo, UT to Enterprise, UT recently. One of the things they have done is to paint the word DEER across the lane at the location where the collisions occur. I lost count at 15+ in the roughly 25 mile drive! Never has my attention been drawn to a deer problem by a 'wildlife on road' sign along the side of the road in WY like it was to a large lane-filling DEER painted on the roadway	No	WYDOT will reach out to UDOT to explore possibilities. Our concern is many drivers view these large signs as debris on the road and swerve to avoid it. On a 65+ MPH road this can be very dangerous for motorists. Follow-up with UDOT confirmed that these in-road messages are unsanctioned and not recommended.
Second, more aggressive signage must be installed here. We have heard of painting "DEER" on the road at every deer collision location, in both day and night high visibility paint. We believe that this would definitely get the attention of out-of- state and commercial drivers to the danger of these two segments of road.	No	WYDOT will reach out to UDOT to explore possibilities. Our concern is many drivers view these large signs as debris on the road and swerve to avoid it. On a 65+ MPH road this can be very dangerous for motorists. Signage in general by itself is not highly effective. Follow-up with UDOT confirmed that these in-road messages are unsanctioned and not recommended.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
Mitigation strategies - habitat enhancements distant from the highway designed to attract deer was mentioned in the 2017 meeting but not mentioned tonight. The Fish and Stark meadows attract 100's of deer. Can we work with landowners to implement such habitat improvements to attract deer away from highways.	Yes	This is a good suggestion. WGFD will continue to evaluate habitat enhancement projects to improve conditions for wildlife including mule deer. Such projects will need to be carefully planned so they do not increase wildlife movement across the highway and increase collisions.
If acceptable with landowner(s) at Red Rocks, would it be possible to install a solar watering system in addition to planting unpalatable grasses along the roadside. Though I haven't seen deer, I've observed bighorns crossing the road, jumping the fence along the river and proceeding to drinking in the river. Lots of deer are observed about a mile east of this location.	Yes	Keep in mind the largest 'landowners' along this section of highway are the Shoshone and Arapaho tribes.
Another mitigative measure mentioned in 2017, was the use foliage detractants - i.e. sprays - adjacent to the highway. These detractants work best in arid environments similar to Dubois where it doesn't have to be reapplied due to precipitation. This mitigative measure was not mentioned tonight. Has it been considered no longer feasible?	No	The implementation of widespread (time and space) spraying of a deterrent is not feasible. the amount of spray needed and the reapplication rate does not allow it to be a viable option. Also it could have other impacts to humans and pets.
The detractant sprays do not kill vegetation they just make it unattractive - i.e. tastes bad due to pepper components. The vegetation remains. No erosion issue with them.	No	
Follow-up on detractants: I followed through with a visited with my friend, Dr. Bill Andelt (now retired), who conducted research on foliage repellents at CSU. He had the following points: Eggs – they had good luck with mixing a spray of 1 pt egg to 4 pts water. This became an olfactory repellent – he thinks due to the presence of fatty acids which are also present in carnivore feces. Or maybe deer/elk just don't like the smell of eggs once they age. The "spray" provided avoidance after the equivalent of 4" of rain and lasted over a several month period. Again, this	Νο	

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
to mix yourself. Capsaicin – mix at 1/100 pts and worked well. Mix of 1/10 pts. worked really well!!! Holds up well to rain (4 inch equivalent of rain) and lasts several months. Available commercially. Serves as a taste repellent. Deer/elk would take a bite and spit it out. Not an olfactory repellent. Thus, they would still pass through a given area but not hang around and forage. Note: I used a sample from Andelt in Jackson for moose and ornamental browsing (aspen). The landowner observed moose taking a couple of bites, spitting it out, walking to the neighbors aspen to browse and not returning the rest of the winter. Given the level of ornamental damage in the Jackson area, I thought about launching a side business. Never got around to it – could have been rich!!! Sooo, probably limited use of repellants for the Dubois hwy issues unless one wanted to keep deer/elk from passing through a site-specific area.		
First, I am not in favor of the planting of unpalatable plants, especially grasses. They can spread and may create a cheat grass-like, problem.	Yes	WYDOT does already plant unpalatable species in the right- of-way during reclamation of construction projects to deter animals from foraging next to the road. WYDOT uses native types of nonpalatable species; no invasive species are used.
My other comment is what may help drivers to be alerted to deer entering the highway. A few years ago, in the dark, in just the right circumstance, where the highway dropped slightly away, in the distance, I noticed one of the delineator reflectors, on top of the post, blinking off and on, which got my attention. In a second, I noticed deer coming onto the highway. With the highway dropping away behind them it put them high enough to line up with the reflector behind them. By that blinking of the reflector, which got my attention, it gave me time to slow down and avoid the deer. My thought was, that if there was another reflector lower on the post, where crossing deer would cut its	Not at this time	This Idea will be discussed for feasibility. The delineator poles have to meet certain standards by federal regulations. More research will be done.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
reflection, this would alert the driver of something entering the highway. Another though, would be to paint the entire post, use reflecting paint. Although, that may make it harder to see deer right next to the highway. With a little education to get drivers to be looking for this blink, blink of the reflectors, either of these would be a low-cost way to get drivers attention.		
Third, we have noted that the establishment of a large Bison pasture south of Highway 26, immediately east of the National Museum of Military Vehicles and south of the Upper Wind River. This large pasture was constructed by Mr. Dan Starks utilizing deer friendly fencing, eliminating invasive grass species, and re-introducing historic and native species such as Buffalo Grass. This pasture has access to excellent ground cover, water (the Wind River), and nutritious fodder, all attractive to Mule Deer. This pasture has attracted large numbers of Mule Deer SOUTH of the highway and the Wind River, removing them from Highway 26. This is a conservation success, and the Wyoming Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, and local ranchers and property owners should be encouraged to implement similar measures, which will significantly reduce the incidence of Mule Deer crossing Highway 26, or loitering on its shoulders.	N/A	WGFD will continue to evaluate habitat enhancement projects to improve conditions for wildlife including mule deer. Such projects will need to be carefully planned so they do not increase wildlife movement across the highway and increase collisions.
A late season doe fawn hunting season may help	No	It is true a late season deer hunt would be an effective way to reduce the overall deer population. It is also true that fewer deer would subsequently result in reduced wildlife/vehicle collisions. However, this is not compatible with wildlife management objectives for the area and a significant population reduction would likely result in substantial public dissatisfaction. Keep in mind that a large reduction in wintering deer throughout the upper Wind River valley would drastically reduce hunting opportunities for sportsmen not only around Dubois but all the way to Jackson Hole and south to the Hogback drainage. Since

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
		many of the deer in this population stage for spring and fall migration along the Wind River and U.S. Highway 26 there would still be large numbers of deer along the highway even if the population was drastically reduced through late fall hunting seasons. The population has been relatively stable for the past decade and is slightly below the WGFD's population objective currently.
FUNDING QUESTIONS & COMMENTS		
Future WDOT road construction and reconstruction must factor in the cost of wildlife/vehicle collision mitigation in the total costs. Wildlife concerns should not be an after-thought to new roads and increased collisions.	Yes	WYDOT takes in to account the needs of each section of road and weighs them in a cost benefit analysis and premeasured warrants. Any savings by reducing collisions is not seen by WYDOT but by society and the taxpayer. WYDOT is charged with wisely and effectively using tax dollars in the betterment of the public. Wildlife concerns are part of every design process of a major construction project.
Could tolls for driving on US 26 meet the financial constraint	No	No. Tolling every vehicle on the highway would not come close to paying for the wildlife needs.
Some funding should be available from auto insurance companies	N/A	Insurance companies lack a financial incentive for funding mitigation projects because they pass the cost of wildlife- vehicle collisions on to their customers in the form of rate increases. There may be some incentive to support projects at the local level through sponsorship or other tactics that earn companies positive marketing and community goodwill.
and 3) Insurance companies deal in statistics and cost/profits so when approaching them for financial assistance show them why it would be cost effective to support whatever solution is being proposed AND tell them you will post their company name on the initiative (bridge, underpass, signage, etc.). Also state that as leaders in their industry you will get local, state and nation press on the company's participation for saving wildlife, and people lives and helping to avoid costly accidents.	N/A	See above

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
isn't there funding for wildlife crossings from the sale of conservation license plates?	N/A	These funds are being used throughout the state to aid in wildlife projects. as of December 2020 \$390,000.00 had been raised by this initiative.
Great projects all around! Is there a fundraising campaign? Also, has an account been established to pool donations to these projects?	N/A	Currently no, but once the mitigation strategy is completed in summer 2021, we will begin working on education, outreach, and fundraising to implement the strategy.

## MEETING #2 – APRIL 27, 2020

The goal for this meeting was to present the draft mitigation strategy for US 26 to receive public feedback for incorporation into the final mitigation strategy. Public comments and responses to these comments are documented below.
Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
GENERAL COMMENTS		
During the time frame presented, 714 carcasses were found by and picked up by WYDOT maintenance crews. New research in the Canadian Rockies show that found roadkill carcasses should be increased by a factor of 2.8 to account for all animals that are hit by vehicles and not found. So nearly 2000 animals may have been hit and killed during your time frame.	N/A	WVC carcasses are widely understood to be underreported. Acknowledge different correction factors have been published - have to be cautious how these might be applied. What is the range of correction factors that might be applicable here?
My wife and I live at 6246 US Highway 26, and work daily at the National Museum of Military Vehicles, 6419 US Highway 26. We live, and on a daily basis drive, on the study section of Highway 26 east of Dubois. The deer collision issue in this area is significant. This year in particular the number of deer collisions is markedly greater. Additionally, the quantity of Highway 26 traffic, and in particular the speed and aggressiveness of drivers, is markedly increased this year. I should note that as a former U.S. Army Forward Observer, I received professional training in estimating the speed of vehicles. I conservatively estimate that, even at night, most vehicles are transiting this segment of Highway 26 at between 70-85 miles per hour. Out-of-state drivers and commercial truckers are the worst and most typical offenders, but I have seen multiple Fremont County drivers who should know better also speeding. We were extremely encouraged by the Study results presented in the December 8, 2020 meeting, and wholeheartedly endorse the recommendations presented at this program.	N/A	Thank you for your comment.
On the maps shown in the presentation, showing public/state land would be helpful. Can you please send me an updated map so I can provide additional input based on the proposed locations? Or a shp file for the proposed projects would be most helpful.	N/A	Maps showing the extent of public lands in the study area are included in the final mitigation strategy. A shapefile of the proposed mitigation locations is not currently available for distribution.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
Some of the cattle culvert crossings looked long, dark, and narrow. Have you had recorded success with wildlife deer entering those "spooky" passes?	N/A	Stock passes on US 26 have not been monitored for wildlife passage, although they may be in the future. Research from other locations indicates that some of the larger stock passes (e.g., 10'x10') may be functional for limited deer passage provided that the entryways are not blocked by gates or fencing. Smaller stock passes (≤6') are unlikely to pass deer but may be used by other species, such as black bear, bobcat, coyote, fox, and other medium and small species.
Also, do culverts get drifted in with snow?		Smaller culverts can get drifted in, but during a typical winter, the country from Stoney Point to the WRR boundary generally has minimal snow accumulation (thus the high number of animals wintering in the area). Culverts are unlikely to be drifted in to the point they were unusable except on rare occasions.
Deer effectively use underpasses. What is the advantage to the overpass proposed in section 6?	N/A	Mule deer use both underpasses and overpasses. However, a diversity of structure types will provide deer and other wildlife with different options for safely crossing US 26. The location of the overpass is congruent with a ridgeline where there is a large road cut, making this an optimal location to construct an overpass reconnecting this ridgeline.
Can lighting be added to the stock passages?	No	Artificially lighting is not recommended for encouraging wildlife use of culverts.
I am disappointed to see that WYDOT is not considering using nighttime reduced speed limits in this area. I watched a video from a dash cam of a couple traveling at 80 mph on I-80 east of Evanston in the dark. The elk they struck was "on them" instantly with no time to react. They were overdriving their headlights big time. Their vehicle after impact went into a spin with lots of screaming by the female passenger. Speed kills but they were lucky. I am not sure why they teach those things about reaction time and travel distance at faster speeds, braking distance at faster speeds, and over driving ones' headlights in driver's education and defensive driving, if they are going to	Νο	WYDOT has engaged in evaluating the effectiveness of day and nighttime speed limits. A recently completed study in Wyoming determined that static signs with reduced nighttime speed limits from dusk to dawn resulted in minimal reductions in speed (3-5 mph) and did not result in a reduction in WVCs (Riginos et al. 2019). WYDOT does have electronic speed limit sign that change depending on the time of day. We are actively studying this technology to determine its effectiveness.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
apply it this area to improve safety for motorists and wildlife. Yeah I get it that it is hard to enforce, but some people will abide by the reduce night time speed limits and some is better than none. How difficult and expensive can it be to put up one more sign on the speed limit sign posts?		
First, the Highway speed from the Red Rock location (Eastern periphery of the study area) into Dubois must be immediately reduced to 55 mph in daytime and 45mph at night. This is not without precedent- Highway 26 in Grand Teton Park maintains a 55mph daytime and 45mph nighttime speed limit, as does US 191 in the vicinity of Pinedale, for the identical reason. 65 mph for 24-hours a day is recklessly fast. We recognize that the Wyoming State Legislature must pass legislation to change this speed limit, but this must be strongly urged as a priority for the Legislature in the 2021 Legislative sessions.	No	See above response.
As a component of this, we were greatly disappointed that no representatives of either the Wyoming Highway Patrol or Fremont County Sheriff attended the December 8th meeting. Law enforcement must rigorously enforce the speed limit both east and west of Dubois. We have lived and worked here for three years, and I have NEVER seen a speed enforcement action by either the Wyoming Highway Patrol or Fremont County Sheriff in this area. Without rigorous and meaningful law enforcement, the speed limit can be 10 mph or 1,000 mph, but in truth there IS NO speed limit.	N/A	The Wyoming Highway Patrol has been short staffed over the last years. Luckily, they have been able to get a trooper in the Dubois area recently. They are engaged in this effort.
More aggressive signage must be installed here. We have heard of painting "DEER" on the road at every deer collision location, in both day and night high visibility paint. We believe that this would definitely get the attention of out-of-state and commercial drivers to the danger of these two segments of road.	No	Our concern is many drivers view these large signs as debris on the road and swerve to avoid it. On a 65+ MPH road this can be very dangerous for motorists. Follow-up with UDOT confirmed that these in-road messages are unsanctioned and not recommended.
In regard to the added benefits of the overpass usage for antelope and sheep, what percentage of the WVCs or carcass	N/A	Bighorn sheep and pronghorn WVCs in the area of the overpass are very low. Bighorn are primarily in the eastern end of the study area. The overpass will support safe passage primarily for

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
pick-up in the area are associated with antelope and bighorn sheep?		mule deer, but also pronghorn, elk, and other wildlife in its vicinity.
How often do mule deer jump over guide fences and how could people prevent that	N/A	8'-high wildlife fence is designed to prevent mule deer from being able to jump over it.
As far as I know the last two bighorn sheep killed at the Red Rocks curve were not hit head on by the trucker but were run over by the rear wheels. Likely, because the sheep were very close to the road and "bolted" like they sometimes do when spooked or frightened and ran up on the road surface and under the truck in front of the rear wheels. I had made a suggestion during our field visit to that site to help keep sheep from getting so close to the edge of the road was to place a pre-emergent /sterilant herbicide along the road edge for about 20 to 30 wide strip to prevent anything from growing there and attracting sheep within that zone in this area. I saw discussion about WYDOT using and requiring unpalatable species planting after construction and reconstruction in the draft mitigation strategies plan but I suggest that not having anything growing in those shallow sloped areas along this area of the highway would keep bighorns farther from the road edge here.	N/A	Removing all vegetation from the road edge is likely to cause other issues with erosions, sedimentation, and weeds. Erosion or drop-offs at the pavement edge can cause safety issues and undermine the roadway; in short the benefits do not outweigh these costs in terms of roadway integrity and driver safety.
Is there any way for barbed wire fencing along HWY 26 at Red Rocks and east of Dubois (45 mph area just past Wind River bridge heading into town) to be removed, reduced or somehow to mitigate for bighorn sheep crossings and death along these stretches of highway? Mule deer fatalities also occur in this town area where a buckrail fence used to allow animals to jump and young to go through fencing. Thank you!	Yes	Replacing impermeable fence types with wildlife-permeable alternatives is recommended in many of the segments in this mitigation strategy. In Segment 5, East Dubois, much of the barbed-wire right-of-way fence was replaced with wildlife- permeable fence in 2020.
Start with reducing the speed limit 55MPH. 24 HRS/Day	No	Speed limits are set in statute.
The section just east of Stoney Pt constantly has mulies on it and many get hit there – I'd suggest targeting efforts there, plus it's public land. Another hotspot is just east of Red Barn Ln where they constantly get hit.	Yes	The segment east of Stoney Point including around Red Barn Lane is in Segment 3, which has been identified as a high priority for implementing mitigation efforts.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
It would be helpful to recognize the population increase of whitetail deer and how this could affect this issue with more WT on the road or displacing mulies (I've seen this occurring on/near my property) and it's important to plan for future conditions – not just today	N/A	The population has been relatively stable for the past decade and is slightly below the WGFD's population objective currently.
There are some current landowners that would be amendable to exploring projects on their land however they won't be around forever, so I'd encourage you to start those conversations sooner than later and I'm happy to help. I've talked to a few people and they said no one has reached out yet. Additionally, there is a lot of great local knowledge in the community that seems like it could be taken more advantage of to get specific spots where the hotspots are. Along those lines – a public meeting soon would be helpful. Most of the old timers here aren't going to get on a zoom meeting but will show up in person.	Yes	Two public meetings were held during the development of the mitigation strategy to solicit public input. Due to COVID-19, these meetings could only be held online during this timeframe. Landowner and community member participation will be crucial as this project moves forward. Individual contacts will be made as specific mitigation projects are further developed, and both WGFD and WYDOT will be meeting with landowners to discuss options and impacts along with gleaning local knowledge.
I suggest getting rid of the variable messaging signs – they don't seem to work and offer a false sense of addressing the issue. Same goes with changing the speed limit – it's been shown to be ineffective, so I recommend not wasting time on pursuing it. People are hitting deer in town going 30/40 mph.	No	Portable variable message signs when deployed correctly help alert drivers of roadway conditions including wildlife presence in the area. These signs are a quick way to get a message to drivers and make them aware of the conditions they will encounter. Unfortunately, signage alone in any form does not necessarily create change in all drivers' behavior
I've offered to help with setting up trail cams for this and please let me know if this is something you would be interested in exploring. I believe this would provide more benefits than just great wildlife data, specifically community engagement.	Yes	Trail cameras will be important for pre-construction monitoring and post-construction, as mitigation projects are implemented. Offers from the public to volunteer their time and equipment will be useful.
Segment 3 and 6 are both very high priority. Between increased travelers and semis, they roar through these areas, the deer do not stand a chance. Many times especially in the early mornings and evenings vehicles are traveling at speeds way above the 70mph. A decreased speed limit is crucial and necessary, along with it would be increased enforcement of the speed limits in these areas! Fencing and tunnels would help. Action in these	N/A	This is not solely a visitor/tourist issue. Speed studies report all vehicles. More locals drive these areas then visitors. Commonly we see communities blaming others when in reality the majority of the local drivers are driving as fast if not faster. Mitigation recommendations in Segment 6 call for wildlife crossing structures in conjunction with 8'-high wildlife exclusion fencing.

Question/Comment	Implement?	Comments/Response
areas is pertinent. I watch from my business and house daily in disgust at the higher traffic and speeding in these areas.		
FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES QUESTIONS & COMMENTS		
In general, are landowners open to cooperating? Thanks for thinking about all wildlife.	N/A	Yes, landowners contacted to date are generally supportive, but we have more outreach and contacts to make. These contacts will be made as specific mitigation projects are further developed.
Would you start with smaller and more manageable projects first?	N/A	We will focus first on Segments 6 and 3, which are the two areas identified as priorities in this Mitigation Strategy, where mitigation investments will have the greatest impacts on reducing WVC and maintaining connectivity for wildlife. However, we also support pursuing other mitigation actions as those opportunities arise or where other groups/landowners can take the initiative.
Is the Wyldlife Fund a partner? Or working on a fund-raising effort?	Yes	The Wyldlife Fund has reached out to us and offered their support. We will further engage them as we develop our outreach and fundraising strategy.
Excellent presentation. Thank you all for hard work. Maybe we could use CARES money or the new infrastructure bill funding! :)	N/A	Thank you for your comment.
It would be helpful at some point to have a schedule of funding needs how much is needed and when to move the process forward.	Yes	Once the mitigation strategy is completed we will develop costs for the highest priority segments and work towards fundraising for these priorities.