Regions 4, 5, and 6 Workshops

May 29, 2019—Missoula, Montana (ID and MT corridors)

May 31, 2019—Rock Springs, Wyoming (WY corridors)

June 4, 2019—Reno, Nevada (CA and NV corridors)

June 6, 2019—Redmond, Oregon (OR and WA corridors)

Purpose of the Workshops

- Provided transparency regarding the agencies' process
- Opportunity to present challenges in reviewing the energy corridors:
  - e.g., challenge to identify potential revisions, deletions, and additions while:
    - facilitating maximum utility for future infrastructure
    - minimizing adverse environmental impacts
    - identifying new energy generation sites
- Forum for robust discussion among stakeholders with diverse interests and varied backgrounds

Workshop Agendas

Each workshop was held from 9am to 3pm, and included the following sessions:

-Welcome, Introductions, Workshop Orientation, and Ground-Rules
-Breakout Session 1
- Corridor 1
- Corridor 2

Report Out Session 1
-Breakout Session 2
- Corridor 3
- Corridor 4

Report Out Session 2
-Conclusion/Adjourn

Who attended?

- Federal government agencies
- Tribal representatives
- State and local government agencies
- Industry representatives
- Non-governmental organizations (e.g., environmental and conservation groups)

For complete list of participating organizations, see Summary of Regions 4, 5, and 6 Workshops document on West-wide Energy Corridor Information Center website: www.corridoreis.anl.gov

Group Breakout Sessions

Agencies sought information on:

- Opportunities to re-align along existing infrastructure, recently authorized transmission and pipeline projects, or locally designated corridors;
- Tradeoffs between the designated corridor and any potential corridor revisions identified by stakeholders or the Agencies;
- Recent or potential future development;
- Energy demand in the area to identify need for potential corridor additions; and
- Revisions or additions to Interagency Operating Procedures (IOPs).

Corridors Addressed

Corridors were discussed if they met at least one of four criteria:

1. The Agencies identified a potential revision, deletion, or addition for the corridor in the revised corridor abstracts;

2. The corridor is a corridor of concern identified in the Settlement Agreement;

3. The corridor has numerous environmental concerns along its route; or

4. The Agencies received stakeholder input about this corridor recommending a corridor revision, deletion, or addition.

Within individual breakout groups, stakeholders were also encouraged to raise concerns they had about additional corridors not listed in the agenda.

Corridors Discussed During Stakeholder Workshops

Missoula, MT	Rock Springs, WY	Reno, NV	Redmond, OR
Corridor 229-254	Corridor 121-221	Corridor 18-23	Corridor 230-248
Corridor 229-254(S)	Corridor 121-220	Corridor 16-24	Corridor 4-247
Corridor 36-228	Corridor 220-221	Corridor 18-224	Corridor 102-105
Corridor 36-226	Corridor 218-240	Corridor 16-104	Corridor 7-24
Corridor 49-112	Corridor 121-240	Corridor 17-35	Corridor 7-11
	Corridor 73-133	Potential Addition-Ruby Pipeline	Potential Addition-Ruby Pipeline

Examples of potential corridor revisions identified in workshops:

- Revise corridor to avoid private land parcels or to include more contiguous federal land.
- Revise corridor to better align with recently authorized transmission or pipeline projects.
- Revise corridor to avoid specially designated areas or other environmental concerns.
- Revise corridor to avoid tribal lands.
- Revise corridor to better align or collocate with existing infrastructure.
- Revise corridor to avoid challenging terrain or unstable soils.
- Widen corridor to accommodate future development.
- Narrow corridor to avoid resource concerns (National Historic Trails, rivers).
- Change corridor's mode (multi-modal, underground-only, electric-only, or upgrade-only) to limit future development or to allow great flexibility for future energy projects.
- Add lands to the corridor that were acquired after the corridor was designated.

Examples of potential corridor deletions identified in workshops:

- Delete corridor because of environmental concerns (wildlife habitat, Greater Sage-grouse habitat, Wilderness Study Area).
- Delete corridor because there is no existing infrastructure within the corridor and there would be significant environmental impacts if the corridor were to be developed.
- Delete corridor because of unstable soils and challenging terrain.

Examples of potential corridor additions identified in workshops:

- Add a corridor to provide transmission connection to renewable energy development.
- Add a corridor along a newly authorized transmission line or pipeline route.
- Add a corridor to replace another corridor recommended for deletion.

General Themes from Stakeholder Workshops:

Improved Engagement with Local and State Governments and Tribes

- Improve engagement with local governments:
  - when considering corridor revisions during the land use planning stage and
  - when project proponents approach the agencies with an application or potential routes.
- Improve coordination with state agencies, particularly when considering crossing or collocating energy corridors within highway rights-of way.
- Improve coordination with Tribes to improve energy corridor placement through or in the vicinity of tribal lands.

General Themes from Stakeholder Workshops:

Siting Recommendations to Improve Corridor Utility

- Locate corridors in areas that avoid sensitive resources and designations as much as possible.
- Communicate to project proponents that wider corridors provide flexibility in siting projects to minimize impacts and do not always indicate greater capacity for additional projects.
- Site corridor on public land (if possible) to reduce impacts on local communities/landowners.
- Consider whether corridor revisions could result in a spider web of infrastructure across public lands if project proponents use both the old corridors and new corridor locations.
- Recommend corridor deletion if the corridor is not in a preferred location and an alternative location and demand is not well documented.
- Explain how potential corridor revisions could impact valid existing rights, mining operations.
- Collocate infrastructure—analyze potential additional costs, separation integrity requirements, and corridor width concerns with respect to collocation; address concerns that the first transmission line or pipeline selects best location within corridor.

General Themes from Stakeholder Workshops:

Energy Demand

- Evaluate recently authorized projects - why not located within Section 368 energy corridors?
- Evaluate energy demand in Regions 4, 5, and 6:
  - recent proposals to bring energy from Wyoming through Idaho to Nevada, indicating future energy pathways.
  - interest in pipeline development to move natural gas from Rockies or Canada to export facilities on the OR coast.
- Address whether corridors should be for domestic energy transportation, rather than pathways to import/export energy to non-US destinations.
- Evaluate corridor routes using a data driven process, dependent on future energy needs.
- Consider connectivity to renewable energy development when siting corridors.
- Assess the future need for large planning corridors if an increase in distributed energy generation reduces demand for long-distance energy transmission.

General Themes from Stakeholder Workshops:

Regional Reviews Process and Planning

- Encourage use of energy corridors through better incentives in addition to predictability, guidance, NEPA tiering.
- Consider statewide or multi-state land use plan amendment(s) effort to implement corridor revisions, deletions, and additions.
- Address implementation of compensatory mitigation at the project-specific level since compensatory mitigation actions were assumed in the WWEC PEIS.
- Improve data sharing capabilities across agencies and organizations.
    - consider a clearinghouse for data, information, energy need and demand and encourage involvement from all agencies and jurisdictions.
- Address competing designations.

Next Steps

- The Agencies will review the suggestions brought forward by stakeholders and will consider these potential revisions, deletions and additions in the Regions 4, 5, and 6 Report.
- Any additional input on the Regions 4, 5, and 6 energy corridors needs to be submitted as soon as possible to be included in the Regions 4, 5, and 6 Report.
- The Regions 4, 5, and 6 Report is anticipated in Fall 2019 and comments will be requested at that time (30 day review).
- The combined report (including Regions 1-6) is anticipated in late 2019 or early 2020.

Questions?


Washington
Oregon
California
Idaho
Montana
Wyoming
Nevada
Utah
Colorado
Arizona
New Mexico
102-105
244-245
229-254A
229-254 (N)
229-254 (S)
229-254
51-204
51-205
50-51
50-203
5-291
10-246
230-248
4-247
11-103
11-228
250-251
24-228
29-36
36-228
36-112
49-112
36-226
49-202
112-226
7-11
7-24
7-8
8-104
3-8
261-262
101-263
16-104
16-24
15-104
16-17
15-17
6-15
17-18
17-35
35-111
43-111
43-44
35-43
44-239
256-257
44-110
79-216
220-221
219-220
121-220
121-240
121-221
129-221
73-129
78-138
78-255
78-85
73-138
129-218
55-240
218-240
126-218
73-133
138-143
133-142
144-275
126-133
126-258
132-133
132-276
66-209
66-259
114-241
66-212
136-139
134-136
130-131
(N)
130-274 (E)
132-139
139-277
136-277
87-277
134-139
131-134
130-131 (S)
130-274
110-114
110-233
116-206
113-114
18-224
18-23
232-233 (E)
232-233 (W)
113-116
68-116
37-39
39-113
37-232
223-224
224-225
39-231
37-223 (N)
37-223 (S)
47-231
80-273
47-68
23-106
23-25
27-225
225-231
41-47
41-46
27-266
27-41
264-265
107-268
108-267
46-270
46-269
61-207
62-211
89-271
236-237
30-52
115-208
115-238
81-272
81-213
234-235