

## 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

<b>Albuquerque, NM</b>	<b>Phoenix, AZ</b>	<b>Reno, NV</b>	<b>Grand Junction, CO</b>	<b>Richfield, UT</b>
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