

Summary of Regions 2&3 Stakeholder Workshops

May 31—June 13, 2018

In order to improve stakeholder engagement within the energy corridor regional review process, the agencies coordinated stakeholder workshops, which were held in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Phoenix, Arizona; Reno, Nevada; Grand Junction, Colorado; and Richfield, Utah. The purpose of the workshops was to provide transparency regarding the agencies process and challenges in reviewing the energy corridors and identifying potential revisions, deletions, and additions, which facilitate a maximum amount of utility for future infrastructure while also minimizing adverse environmental impacts. The workshops provided a forum to have robust discussion among stakeholders with diverse interests and varied backgrounds. This was productive in seeking the balance between the need to plan for a reliable western energy grid as well as to maintain landscapes with highly valued resources. The workshops all began with an introduction and orientation by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and/or the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), a solicitation of general interests and introduction from stakeholders. The main focus of the workshops were two breakout sessions during which specific corridors were presented to discuss opportunities for revising, deleting, or adding corridors within the west-wide energy corridor network. Each breakout session focused on individual corridors and sought information from stakeholders on issues such as:

- Opportunities to re-align the corridor along existing infrastructure or locally designated corridors to avoid areas of conflict and reduce impacts;
- Tradeoffs between the designated corridor and any potential corridor revisions identified by stakeholders or the Agencies;
- Recent or potential future development within the area; and
- Revisions or additions to Interagency Operating Procedures (IOPs).

Each breakout group used corridor abstracts and the interactive [Corridor Mapper](#) to engage stakeholders and facilitate discussion. The outcomes differed between each breakout session but included identification of potential corridor revisions; potential corridor additions and future energy needs; potential revisions to IOPs; suggestions to be considered during future land use planning; and suggestions for potential future Section 368 energy corridor policy.

Lastly, the agencies discussed the next steps in the process and closed-out the workshop with an emphasis to contact Jeremy Bluma, BLM National Project Manager if further discussion was desired on items not able to be covered at the workshop.

Overall, the workshops enabled the agencies to gain stakeholders' insights on addressing both the challenges and opportunities in managing the west-wide energy corridor network. The agencies are thoughtfully reviewing the information from the workshops in addition to the previous stakeholder feedback and are compiling a report on the management of energy corridors in these two regions. Recommendations from stakeholders on corridor revisions, deletions and additions were recorded and will be considered in the Draft Report for Regions 2 and 3 (targeted release of early fall 2018). The Regions 2 and 3 Section 368 energy corridors discussed in the workshops are listed in the table below. The ideas and recommendations gathered from the stakeholder workshops will be applied to all corridors where the agencies believe it is viable and appropriate. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to review and comment on all corridor revisions, deletions, and additions when the draft report is released.

Corridors Discussed During Stakeholder Workshops

Albuquerque, NM	Phoenix, AZ	Reno, NV	Grand Junction, CO	Richfield, UT
Corridor 81-272	Corridor 113-116	Corridor 232-233	Corridor 130-274	Corridor 66-212
Corridor 81-213	Corridor 30-52	Corridor 17-35	Corridor 132-133	Corridor 113-114
Corridor 89-271	Corridor 62-211	Corridor 44-110	Corridor 126-133	Corridor 126-218
Corridor 80-273	Corridor 61-207	Corridor 44-239	Corridor 87-277	Corridor 110-114
Potential corridor addition: Lucky Corridor		Potential corridor additions: TransWest Express Connector from Dry Lake Valley North SEZ	Potential corridor addition: : Tri-State	Potential corridor addition: Cross-Tie Transmission Project
		Potential deletion: 232-233E	Potential partial deletion: 130-274	

In addition to specific recommendations for corridor revisions, a number of issues common to all Section 368 energy corridors were discussed and are listed below. Issue topics included: improved coordination; incentives for industry to use corridors; general siting recommendations to improve corridor utility; regional reviews process and planning; and IOPs.

General Themes from Stakeholder Workshops

Improved Coordination

- Tribes expressed desire for improved early consultation and coordination to assist in preliminary energy infrastructure routing and design to provide important cultural information to assist proponent(s) and agency(s) in avoiding crossing and or impacting sacred sites, traditional cultural properties and other important areas.
- State and local governments expressed interest in having agencies engage with them earlier and more consistently in order to better coordinate land management planning between federal state and local plans and priorities.
- There is a common interest to enhance coordination with Department of Defense to ensure land use management is compatible with all agencies missions (e.g., White Sands Missile Range, Utah Test and Training Range, National Defense Authorization Act moratorium)
- Agencies were encouraged to enhance coordination with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for energy infrastructure technical expertise (engineering, transmission/pipeline design)

Incentives to Encourage Corridor Use by the Energy Industry

It was suggested that the agencies further encourage and incentivize corridor use by allowing a streamlined application and NEPA review process as well as develop additional IOPs to enhance consistency between agencies to reduce application processing timeframes.

General Siting Concerns and Recommendations to Improve Corridor Utility:

- Avoid creating isolated parcels that may prevent habitat connectivity and wildlife migration or may reduce property values.

- Support tie-in for renewable energy from potential generation areas to align supply with demand centers
- Local-level collaboration to navigate private land conflicts relative to corridor gaps.
- Consider electrical substation locations, which influence infrastructure routes when reviewing corridor placement.
- Consider upgrading existing energy transmission lines rather than adding entirely new lines.
- Consider nearby existing corridors and potential for braiding or widening to include those too.
- Consider minor corridor realignment along existing infrastructure to increase potential capacity for future infrastructure and minimize impact.
- Colocation of utilities is generally preferred, including minimizing redundant maintenance or access roads.
- Wider corridors can provide more flexibility.
- In areas with visual concerns, perhaps limit transmission voltage to under 500 kV.
- Colocation of pipelines and electric transmission lines and separation distances.

Regional Reviews Process/Planning

- Statewide plan amendments to adjust energy/utility corridors to maximize utility and minimize environmental impacts (e.g., Arizona BLM).
- Need to consider impacts on communities, particularly in checkerboard pattern land ownership areas and tribal lands. Notification for citizens along the routes.
- Open process for determining corridor need (future generation/transmission planning).
- Consider conservation easements.

Interagency Operating Procedures (IOPs)

- Consistent approach (BLM and USFS) for treatment of resource concerns; pre-load proponents with information so they can come to an agency with an application knowing best management practices and focus discussions on what they can do to mitigate a project.
- National Historic Trails/National Scenic Trails.
- Wildlife connectivity, migration.
- Roadless areas.

List of Participating Organizations

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Acoma Tribal Historic Preservation Office
 BIA-SWRO
 Common Ground Community Trust
 Representative for Congressman Steve Pearce
 Crestwood
 Edgewood Soil & Water Conservation District
 Kirtland Air Force Base
 Land Owners of Union County
 Las Placitas Association
 Lucky Corridor
 Luna County Government
 Modrall Sperling
 New Amsterdam Global Solutions

New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department
New Mexico State Land Office
New Mexico Wildlife Federation
NMGCO
NMOGA
Northern Arapaho
National Trails Intermountain Region-National Park Service
Representative for U.S. Senator Tom Udall
Oxy
Pueblo of San Felipe
Sandoval County Commission
Santa Clara Pueblo
Tesuque Pueblo
The Wilderness Society
Representative for U.S. Representative Lujan Grisha
XTO Energy
U.S. Forest Service
Rio Grande Valley Broadband of the Great Old Broads for Wilderness
Bureau of Land Management

Phoenix, Arizona

Arizona Public Service Company
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
Audubon Arizona
Defenders of Wildlife
EPNG
SMG
Sonoran Institute
SWPG
Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Forest Service

Reno, Nevada

First Solar
National Park Service
Nevada Department of Wildlife
Nevada Governor's Office of Energy
Nevada Wilderness
Southwest Gas Corporation & Paiute Pipeline
The Wilderness Society
Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Forest Service

Grand Junction, Colorado

Canyon Fuel Company
Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Representative for Colorado State Senator
Defenders of Wildlife
Invenergy

Great Old Broads for Wilderness
Gunnison County
Mesa County
National Park Service
NTS Groups, CEA
PacifiCorp
San Miguel County government
Representative for Senator Bennett
Southwest Colorado Board of Grazing Advisors
The Wilderness Society
Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association
Union County Land Owners Group
Vegetation Management West, LP
Representative for U.S. Senator Cory Gardner
Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Forest Service

Richfield, Utah

Sevier County Commission
Representative for Congresswoman Mia Love
Defenders of Wildlife
Emery County
Environmental Planning Group, LLC
First Solar
LDS Church History Department
Magnum Development
Millard County
National Park Service
Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office
Sierra Club
The Wilderness Society
Transcon Environmental
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Utah Statewide Archaeological Society
Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Forest Service