Guidance for Stakeholder Review of the Section 368 Corridor Abstracts

The Agencies have developed corridor abstracts to facilitate stakeholder engagement during the Regional Reviews and are seeking stakeholder feedback on the abstracts to ensure a complete and current understanding as possible for each corridor, prior to developing any corridor recommendations.

Background: As agreed upon in the 2012 settlement agreement, the Agencies are initiating Regional Reviews of the energy corridors to provide recommendations for corridor modifications that will be considered for implementation by the BLM and FS during agency land-use planning processes. The Regional Reviews will be guided by corridor siting principles from the 2012 settlement agreement, to ensure that:

- Corridors are thoughtfully sited to provide maximum utility and minimum impact to the environment;
- Corridors promote efficient use of landscape for necessary development;
- Appropriate and acceptable uses are defined for specific corridors; and
- Corridors provide connectivity to renewable energy generation to the maximum extent possible, while also considering other generation, in order to balance the renewable sources and to ensure the safety and reliability of electricity transmission.

Overview of Corridor Abstracts: Each corridor abstract describes the corridor location and rationale for corridor designation, lists previously-identified concerns for the corridor, including stakeholder responses to the Request for Information (RFI) in 2014, provides an analysis of GIS data regarding placement of existing or planned infrastructure within the corridor and other physical, jurisdictional, and resource-specific overlaps with the corridor, and provides the results of an initial analysis of corridor concerns and opportunities by the BLM and FS.

When a concern was identified, the BLM and FS staff evaluated whether:

1) The identified concern is considered to be a constraint to future development within the corridor, and if so,
2) How the constraint might be addressed or eliminated.

The concern is not considered a constraint to development in the corridor if the BLM and FS staff identified that it is addressable through implementation of IOPs, standard stipulations, or other measures at the agencies' discretion.

If the concern is considered a constraint to development in the corridor, the constraint will be addressed through recommendations for:

- Corridor modification of width or placement;
- Corridor deletion; or potentially
- Corridor addition elsewhere.

Recommendations for specific corridor additions, deletions, or modifications (also shorthanded as "adds, edits, deletes") are not included in this review, but *stakeholders are encouraged to provide recommendations during this review*. Stakeholders will have the opportunity in early 2017 to review and comment on the Agencies' recommendations that will be based on the analysis currently presented and stakeholder input.

Web-based Section 368 Corridor Mapping Tool: This tool provides an interactive map of the designated corridors, and many other geospatial layers, including aerial imagery, jurisdictions, reference, specially designated areas, habitat, potentially incompatible land uses, and other data useful for analyzing the corridors. The content will change over time, and we welcome your recommendations for additional data. If you can provide additional GIS data, please upload it along with your input or provide the URL. Tools to access the corridor abstracts and existing comments by location, and to enter comments for specific locations are under development. Access the mapping tool at: http://bogi.evs.anl.gov/section368/portal.

Corridor Abstract Input Guidance: The Agencies are seeking input on the entire corridor abstract, but particularly the corridor analysis table, including:

- Additional concerns not identified in the corridor analysis table
- Additional GIS data
- Input on the review and analysis of concerns, and identification of constraints
- Input on whether or not the corridor abstracts provide sufficient analysis to recommend corridor modifications that will achieve the siting principles listed above
- Recommendations for corridor additions, deletions, or modifications

Corridor Number

Alternate Name

Introduction

Description of the corridor, including:

- Geographical location,
- Jurisdiction for federally-designated portions of the corridor,
- Corridor width,
- Corridor use (is it designated as a multi-modal corridor or restricted to certain uses),
- Corridor length (distance and designated centerline miles) and corridor area,
- County(ies) and office(s)/forest(s), and
- Priority Region(s).

Corridor Rationale and Current Uses

Rationale for corridor designation, including:

- Organizations suggesting routes in the vicinity of the corridor during scoping for the WWEC PEIS,
- Current infrastructure in the corridor,
- Planned transmission lines from Platts data, and
- Current ROW applications indicated in the Corridor Study.

Current Uses, including:

- Changes in power generation or demand near the corridor since publication of the WWEC PEIS,
- Other recent authorized use or LUP amendment actions that may impact the full usefulness of the corridor, and
- Details from WECC analysis of congestion of existing transmission lines in the vicinity of the corridor will be added if available.

Corridor of Concern Status

As a part of the Settlement Agreement, the Plaintiffs identified 36 of the 119 corridors as “corridors of concern” because of environmental concerns such as special status species habitat, proximity to specially sensitive areas, designated areas, impacts on water or cultural resources, and proximity and benefit to coal-fired generating stations. If the corridor is a Corridor of Concern, this section will list the concerns identified in the Settlement Agreement. These concerns will also be highlighted in yellow in the corridor analysis table below.

Corridor Analysis

The corridor analysis table identifies the most important concerns affecting the corridor, the location of the concerns within the corridor, and the results of an initial analysis of the concerns by the Agencies..

The boxes of concerns are checked if they are known to apply to the corridor. Included in the table is an explanation of the concerns and their location by milepost (MP). GIS data have been used to identify potential pinch points, spacing concerns, and environmental concerns (e.g., proximity to specially designated areas, special status species habitat, potentially incompatible land uses, etc.). The BLM and/or FS field offices have reviewed each concern and identified whether or not it should be considered a constraint. A definition of each topical area is provided in the sample table below.

☐ **Energy Planning Opportunities**
- ☐Appropriate and acceptable uses
- ☐WWEC Purpose (e.g., renewable energy
- ☐Transmission capacity

☐ **Energy Planning Concerns**
- ☐Physical barrier
- ☐Jurisdictional concern
- ☐Corridor alignment and spacing
- ☐Transmission capacity

☐ **Land Management Responsibilities and Environmental Concerns**
- ☐Acoustics
- ☐Air quality
- ☐Climate change
- ☐Cultural resources
- ☐Ecological resources
- ☐Environmental Justice
- ☐Hydrological resources
- ☐Lands and Realty
- ☐Lands with wilderness characteristics
- ☐Livestock Grazing
- ☐Paleontology
- ☐Public Access and Recreation
- ☐Socioeconomics
- ☐Soils/erosion
- ☐Specially designated areas
- ☐Tribal concerns
- ☐Visual resources
- ☐Wild horses and burros

☐**Interagency Operating Procedures**

ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary Concern	Length of Affected Corridor (by Milepost [MP])	Source/Context	BLM/FS Review and Analysis
ENERGY PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES							
An analysis of how current energy infrastructure meets energy development needs, including recent renewable energy development and areas of future possible development, and whether there is capacity for growth available for additional energy projects to make use of the corridors.							
Appropriate and Acceptable Uses							
Sec 368(e) Specifications of Corridor- corridor designated shall at a minimum, specify the centerline, width, and compatible uses of the corridor 1. What ancillary uses are currently permitted? Roads, substations, other? 2. What conflicting uses, if any, have been permitted since designation? 3. What non-energy uses are compatible with the corridor? Is there is availability for additional transmission capacity on existing lines?							
WWEC Purpose							
WWEC purpose: designated for oil, gas, and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities, ensure ongoing identification of additional corridors, expedite applications to construct or modify oil, gas, elec. transmission/distribution within such corridors, taking into account prior environmental reviews from designation of such corridors, take into account need for upgraded and new electric transmission/distribution to improve reliability, relieve congestion, enhance capability of national grid to deliver electricity. 1. What transmission projects have been authorized since designation? 2. Any pending applications?							

ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary Concern	Length of Affected Corridor (by Milepost [MP])	Source/Context	BLM/FS Review and Analysis
3. Any electric distribution line upgrades or new projects authorized? 4. Any changes to the corridor since designation? 5. Has there been interest in transmission routes by utilities that does not align with the Section 368 corridor locations? Have ROW authorizations or ROW applications considered siting infrastructure in a manner that uses space efficiently (i.e. parallel to centerline, restricting non-linear ROWs, etc.).How does the corridor meet the purpose of promoting renewable energy development in the West? Has there been renewable energy development in close proximity to the corridor?							
Transmission and Pipeline Capacity Opportunities							
Do existing lines within the corridor have available energy capacity for locating additional energy infrastructure?							
ENERGY PLANNING CONCERNS							
These are non-environmental issues or concerns with corridor locations, corridor alignment and the lands they cross. How is current energy infrastructure situated within the corridors and what is the capacity for additional energy projects?							
Location-Specific Physical Barrier							
For example, mountainous terrain, bottlenecks, or other physical barriers that prevent a project from following a designated corridor.							
Jurisdictional Concern							
Jurisdictional concern: 1. Lack of coordination among Federal agencies, resulting in a corridor that is designated by one agency but not another and that is therefore non-continuous across Federal lands and potentially less desirable or unusable. 2. Corridors that cross State or private land may have limited development potential. For example, if a corridor's length is interconnected with private land, developers may not want to both acquire easements and federal ROWs. Gaps in Section 368 corridor routes across State or private lands, or terminating in these locations, make them unattractive to applicants. The applicants would have to perform additional analyses for land not included in the Section 368 corridors. This removes the benefit of the Section 368 corridors to applicants (e.g., expedited permitting process). 3. The routing of corridors to avoid tribal lands can result in less direct corridors that require crossing additional miles of Federal and other land ownership or inefficient corridor alignment. 4. A corridor that ends in a specially designated area, private, or other non-Federal lands, or ends without a connection or hub is unattractive to an applicant. 5. Conflict between BLM and State and local landowners, especially for large-scale projects that involve many BLM offices and local jurisdictions. 6. Disposals – will past or future disposals impact the corridor? 7. Are there any other boundary issues affecting the corridor?							
Corridor Alignment and Spacing							
Corridor and current infrastructure within the corridor are not well aligned. Optimal use would be parallel to centerline and at minimum required distance per existing power reliability rating and safety requirements. Can identify when existing infrastructure was authorized, as alignment of existing lines may have predated 368 designations, resulting in a less than optimal alignment, or lines may have predated change in distance requirements.: 1. Pinch points 2. Energy projects that meander across the corridor, preventing the co-location of other lines 3. Need for additional space between new projects and existing utilities to ensure power reliability rating and/or to meet safety requirements 4. Intrusion of non-linear facilities (e.g., solar ROWs)							
Transmission and Pipeline Capacity Concerns							
Do existing lines within the corridor have available energy capacity? An energy planning concern regarding capacity would be transmission lines that are congested or close to capacity.							

ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary Concern	Length of Affected Corridor (by Milepost [MP])	Source/Context	BLM/FS Review and Analysis
LAND MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS							
Environmental and land use planning concerns related to the corridors identified through GIS analysis or through previous comments.							
Acoustics							
Air Quality							
Climate Change							
Cultural Resources							
Ecology: Special Status Plant Species							
Ecology: Vegetation							
Ecology: Invasive and Noxious Weeds							
Ecology: Xero-Riparian Areas							
Ecology: Special Status Animal Species							
Ecology: Migratory Birds							
Ecology: Terrestrial Wildlife, Big Game, Non-Migratory Birds, and Aquatic Biota							
Environmental Justice							
Hydrology: Surface Water							
Hydrology: Groundwater							
Lands and Realty: Rights-of-Way and General Land Use (including lands with special legislation, like SNPLMA)							
Lands and Realty: Military and Civilian Aviation							
Lands and Realty: Minerals **(Mining Claims)**							

ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary Concern	Length of Affected Corridor (by Milepost [MP])	Source/Context	BLM/FS Review and Analysis
Lands and Realty: Transportation							
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics							
Livestock Grazing							
Paleontology							
Public Access and Recreation							
Socioeconomics							
Soils/Erosion							
Specially Designated Areas							
Tribal Concerns							
Visual Resources							
Wild Horses and Burros							
INTERAGENCY OPERATING PROCEDURES (IOPS, OR BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES)							
Comments or issues related to the IOPs and possible permitting requirements pertaining to a specific corridor – may include recommendations for new IOPs to address specific corridor concerns or adjustments to existing IOPs listed in the BLM and FS RODs for the WWEC PEIS.							