

## Section 368 Energy Corridors Regional Review Webinar

September 29, 2016: 9:00-10:30 a.m. Pacific  
Participant Dial-In: 1-888-850-4523; Passcode 242705  
Documents Posted: <http://corridoreis.anl.gov/>

### Webinar Participant Instructions:

1. Please type your full name and organization (if any) into the Attendees list.
2. Participants will be muted while the presentation is ongoing. To unmute, dial \*6. Please re-mute phone when you are not speaking and do not put your phone on hold.
3. We will address questions periodically. If you have a comment or question, type it into the Chat box. Alternatively click on “Raise Hand” and we will recognize individuals to speak.

Thank you for joining this webinar!




# **Sec. 368 Energy Corridors Regional Reviews**

## **Webinar Agenda**

- ***Welcome and Introductions***
- ***Overview of Periodic Regional Reviews***
- ***Demonstrations: Web Site, Web-based Input Form, Mapping Tool and Corridor Abstracts***
- ***Questions & Answers***
- ***Wrap-up***






***Section 368 Energy Corridors  
Energy Policy Act of 2005***

***Initiation of Periodic Regional Reviews***

***James Gazewood, National Project Manager  
Georgeann Smale, Sec. 368 Program Lead  
BLM Washington Office***



***Section 368  
West-wide Energy Corridors***



## **Presentation Outline**

- ❑ *Background: The Section 368 Energy Corridors*
- ❑ *Three Year Schedule to Conduct the Six Regional Reviews*
- ❑ *Overview of a Regional Review: The Two Public Input Phases*
- ❑ *Our End Product: Land Use Plan Recommendations*
- ❑ *Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input*
- ❑ *BLM & USFS Desire for Robust Stakeholder Engagement*







# Background: Section 368 Energy Corridors

## Established under the 2005 Energy Policy Act:

- ✓ **Energy Corridors in AZ, CA, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA and WY**
- ✓ **For BLM: 5,000 Miles / 92 Land Use Plan Amendments**
- ✓ **For USFS: 990 Miles / 38 Land Use Plan Amendments**




# Background: Section 368 Energy Corridors






# The Six Regional Reviews to be Conducted



# Six Regional Reviews to be Conducted – *Region 1 Corridors*





# Three+ Year Schedule: For Phased Reviews of Regions 1 - 6


No	Regional Review	Start	Finish	2016				2017				2018				2019			
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
1	S. CA, S. NV, W. AZ	May 2016	February 2017	■															
2	E. AZ, NM, S. CO	January 2017	September 2017					■											
3	N. CO, UT, E. NV, NW. AZ	August 2017	March 2017									■							
4	WY, E. MT	February 2018	October 2018													■			
5	N. CA, W. NV	September 2018	April 2019													■			
6	W. MT, ID, OR, WA	March 2019	November 2019													■			



## Three+ Year Schedule: For Phased Reviews of Regions 1 - 6

No	Regional Review	Start	Finish	2016				2017				2018				2019			
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
1	S. CA, S. NV, W. AZ	May 2016	February 2017	█															
2	E. AZ, NM, S. CO	January 2017	September 2017					█											
3	N. CO, UT, E. NV, NW. AZ	August 2017	March 2017									█							
4	WY, E. MT	February 2018	October 2018									█							
5	N. CA, W. NV	September 2018	April 2019													█			
6	W. MT, ID, OR, WA	March 2019	November 2019													█			

## Overview of a Regional Review: The Two Public Input Phases





## Our End Product: Land Use Plan Recommendations

- ✓ *Provide Recommendations to Add, Alter or Delete Corridors to be Carried out through Subsequent Land Use Planning Actions*
  - ✓ *Reviews are not NEPA-based. NEPA occurs during LUP Action*
  - ✓ *Stakeholder Input during Reviews will result in Recommendations for Potential Land Use Plan Amendments*
  - ✓ *Recognize Corridor Influence from Ongoing LUP Action*
    - *For BLM Nevada, Ongoing Las Vegas RMP Corridor Work is a Good Example*
    - *For BLM California, the DRECP Did Not Address Corridors – Placed Constraints*
  - ✓ *Recently Authorized or Pending Major Transmission / Pipeline Project Applications will Provide Insight on Further Corridor Additions or Alterations*
  - ❖ *Reviews Provide Geospatial-based Corridor Siting Information Intended to Best Meet Future BLM and USFS Planning Needs*



# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ Developing Corridor Abstracts to Document Known Concerns

### Corridor 30-52

*Palo Verde - Palm Springs*

#### Introduction

Corridor 30-52 extends west-east along Interstate 10 (I-10) from Palm Springs in southern California to the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station and the western suburbs of Phoenix in central Arizona. Federally-designated portions of this corridor are entirely on BLM-administered land, with a 10,560-ft width over most of its extent in California, and 5,280 ft-width in Arizona. It is designated as a multi-modal corridor that can accommodate both electrical transmission and pipeline projects. The corridor spans a 199.7-mile distance, with 97.7 designated centerline miles. The designated area is 949,793 acres/148.4 square miles. This corridor is in Riverside County in California, and La Paz and Maricopa Counties in Arizona. BLM jurisdictions include the California Desert District in California and the Lake Havasu, Lower Sonoran, Hassayampa, and Yuma Field Offices in Arizona. This corridor is primarily in Priority Region 1, but extends into Priority Region 2 between mileposts (MP) 174.0 and 199.7.




Figure 1. Corridor 30-52 (Key for Figures 1-3 can be found on the last page of the abstract)





# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ *Developing Corridor Abstracts to Document Known Concerns*

Co  
Palo  
Intr  
Corri  
weste  
most  
pipeli  
corrid  
the La  
betwe




Figure 2. West portion of Corridor 30-52, including existing energy infrastructure




# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ Developing Corridor Abstracts to Document Known Concerns

Co  
Palo

Intr  
Corri  
weste  
most  
pipeli  
corrid  
the La  
betwe



Figure

### Corridor Rationale

During scoping for the WWEC PEIS, routes generally following this route were suggested by the American Wind Energy Association; New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department; and the Western Utility Group. Current infrastructure occupying parts of the corridor includes I-10, transmission lines operated by the Metropolitan Water District (230 kV), and the Southern California Edison Company (115 to 500 kV); and natural gas pipelines operated by El Paso, and Southern California Gas Company. Southern California Edison Company recently completed a 500-kV project within parts of the corridor in California between the Devers and Colorado River substations.

Within the California Desert District, the BLM Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office has received 24 ROW applications using Corridor 30-52 since publication of the PEIS. Two of the applications were entirely in the corridor, while the others were partly within it.

Several new applications were filed for energy storage or production within the corridor and adjacent to substations that are between 5 and 25 Megawatts. Given that many of the utility companies are on target or exceeding their target for providing a percentage of the energy portfolio with renewable energy, not many new, large power purchase agreements are being issued. However, the utility companies are going out with smaller PPAs, which have modified the types of projects being proposed on public lands.

Five major transmission lines and several major natural gas pipelines run through the corridor. Many of the energy production projects along the I-10 and Riverside East Solar Energy Zone have generation-tie lines that use the corridors, which create congestion near the major substations (Red Bluff and Colorado River). This congestion is compounded by the Mecca Hills and Orcopia Wilderness and Joshua Tree National Park reducing the size of and potential for increasing the size of the corridor.

### Corridor of Concern Status

This corridor was not identified in the Settlement Agreement as a Corridor of Concern.

### Corridor Analysis

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Energy Planning Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appropriate and acceptable uses</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WWEC Purpose (e.g., renewable energy)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transmission and pipeline capacity opportunity</li> </ul> </li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Energy Planning Concerns</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Physical barrier</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jurisdictional concern</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corridor alignment and spacing</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transmission and pipeline capacity concern</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Land Management Responsibilities and Environmental Concerns</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Acoustics</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air quality</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Climate change</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Cultural resources</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecological resources</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Environmental justice</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrological resources</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lands and Realty</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lands with wilderness characteristics</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Grazing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Paleontology</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Access and Recreation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Socioeconomics</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Soils/erosion</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specially designated areas</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal concerns</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual resources</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Wild horses and burros</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Interagency Operating Procedures</b></li> </ul>
--	---	---





# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ Developing Corridor Abstracts to Document Known Concerns

Co  
Palo

Intr

Corri

weste


most

pipeli

corrid

the La

betwe



Figure

Corri

During

Miner

lines o

El Paso

betwe

Within

the PE

Severa

Given

many

of proj

Five m

Riversi

River).

increa

Corri

This co

Corri

ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary Concern/Opportunity	Length of Affected Corridor (by Milepost[MP])	Source/Context	BLM/FS Review and Analysis
<b>ENERGY PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES</b>							
<i>Appropriate and Acceptable Uses</i>							
30-52 .001	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	The Riverside East Solar Energy Zone (SEZ) overlaps the corridor	MP 60.1 to 99.8	GIS Analysis	Opportunity
<i>WWEC Purpose</i>							
30-52 .002	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	Nearest transmission corridor for facilitating development in the Riverside East SEZ in California	MP 60.1 to 99.8	GIS Analysis	Opportunity - Most of the projects are aligned along I-10 including two major substations.
30-52 .003	BLM	Yuma FO, AZ	Yuma, AZ	Nearest transmission corridor for facilitating development in the Brenda SEZ in Arizona	2.7 miles from SEZ between MP 150.2 and 154.3	GIS Analysis	Opportunity
<b>ENERGY PLANNING CONCERNS</b>							
<i>Location-Specific Physical Barrier</i>							
30-52 .004	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	There is a bottleneck around the San Gorgonio Pass where it has been challenging in the past to site additional transmission.	San Gorgonio Pass is west of the corridor and the corridor was not designated in the pass	RFI/This corridor should be developed only if a technological solution is found to placing additional transmission infrastructure through the San Gorgonio Pass. Routing transmission anywhere else in the area would significantly impact the existing natural and biological resources;  GIS Analysis/Confirms bottleneck	Yes, this is a constraint. The San Gorgonio Pass area is constrained for additional development. There are two national monuments on either side of the interstate, so there is not much room to site a transmission line elsewhere through the pass. Future planning efforts would have to consider major re-routing alternatives for analysis to make this end-portion of the corridor viable for transmission of energy further west.
30-52 .005	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	Transmission infrastructure	MP 0.0 to 99.8	RFI/Large amount of existing transmission infrastructure.	Not a constraint. There is room for additional projects. However, recommend future land use plans present analysis of alternatives to allow future growth (widening)



# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ Developing Corridor Abstracts to Document Known Concerns

**Corridor Abstracts will be used to:**

- **Ensure Stakeholder Understanding of Known Corridor Concerns / Opportunities**
- **Focus Stakeholder Corridor Input to Specific Mileposts or Line Segments**
- **Document Our Analysis with the Geospatial Data for Final Corridor Recommendations**


ID	Agency	Agency Jurisdiction	County	Primary	Corridor (by	Analysis
<b>ENERGY PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES</b>						
<i>Appropriate and Acceptable Uses</i>						
30-52 .001	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	Transmission infrastructure overlaps the corridor		
<b>WWEC Purpose</b>						
30-52 .002	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	Corridor for facilitating development in the California		
30-52 .003	BLM	Yuma FO, AZ	Yuma, AZ	Nearest transmission development in the	2.7 miles from SEZ 154.3	
<b>ENERGY PLANNING CONCERNS</b>						
<i>Location-Specific Physical Barrier</i>						
30-52 .004	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	There is a bottleneck around the San Gorgonio Pass where it has been challenging in the past to site additional transmission.	San Gorgonio Pass is west of the corridor and the corridor was not designated in the pass	RFI/This corridor should be developed only if a technological solution is found to placing additional transmission infrastructure through the San Gorgonio Pass. Routing transmission anywhere else in the area would significantly impact the existing natural and biological resources;  GIS Analysis/Confirms bottleneck
30-52 .005	BLM	California Desert District, CA	Riverside, CA	Transmission infrastructure	MP 0.0 to 99.8	Yes, this is a constraint. The San Gorgonio Pass area is constrained for additional development. There are two national monuments on either side of the interstate, so there is not much room to site a transmission line elsewhere through the pass. Future planning efforts would have to consider major re-routing alternatives for analysis to make this end-portion of the corridor viable for transmission of energy further west.
						Not a constraint. There is room for additional projects. However, recommend future land use plans present analysis of alternatives to allow future growth (widening)





# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ *Standing-up a Sec. 368 Energy Corridor Internet Mapper Tool*



# Tools to Facilitate Stakeholder Understanding & Critical Input

## ✓ *Standing-up a Sec. 368 Energy Corridor Internet Mapper Tool*

**Section 368 Energy Corridor Mapping Tool**

Disclaimer  
Privacy/Security

Reports Print View Abstract

Max Zoom Back Forward Pan Mode Zoom Box Zoom In Zoom Out Info Measure Bookmarks

Find a place...

Search for layers by name

By Group

- Boundary
- BLM Development Areas
- Cultural Resource Areas
- Ecological Resource Areas
- Energy Corridor
- Hydrography
- Land Management Information
- Potential Incompatible Land Uses
- Specially Designated Areas
- Visual Resource Areas

Layers

- Overlays
  - Priority Region
  - Sec. 368 Corridor Milepost
  - Sec. 368 Corridor Label
  - Sec. 368 Designated Corridor Centerline
  - Sec. 368 Designated Corridor
  - Surface Management Agency Jurisdiction
- Bureau of Land Management
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Department of Defense
- Department of Energy
- Local

**Corridor Mapping Tool will be used to:**

- **Ensure Stakeholder Understanding of Known Corridor Concerns / Opportunities**
- **Facilitate Stakeholder Online Corridor Input to Specific Mileposts or Line Segments**
- **Leverage Our Developed Geospatial Data for the Final Corridor Recommendations**
- ❖ **Identify Corridor Adds, Edits or Deletes to Minimize Constraints and Maximize Opportunities**




# **BLM & USFS Desire for Robust Stakeholder Engagement**

- ✓ **Initiated Formal Region 1 Stakeholder Notification with**
  - ✓ **Governors of AZ, CA and NV**
  - ✓ **County Commissioners**
  - ✓ **Tribes and BIA**
  - ✓ **BLM Resource Advisory Councils**
  - ✓ **Settlement Plaintiff's / NGOs**
  - ✓ **Western Electrical Coordinating Council (WECC) [2024/2026 Study Program Spatial Assessment] and the California RETI 2.0 Project**
- **Initiating Contact with**
  - **The Department of Defense**
  - **Industry: Utilities, Transmission / Pipeline Companies, Power Project Generators & Regional Transmission Planning Entities**
  - **The General Public**






# Region 1 Stakeholder Input Schedule: Phases I & II



# Region 1 Stakeholder Input Schedule: Phases I & II



❖ **The Same Stakeholder Input Process will be Used for Regions 2-6**



# Sec. 368 Energy Corridor - Information Resources

## Points of Contact:

- **Georgeann Smale, Sec. 368 Program Lead, BLM WO [gsmale@blm.gov](mailto:gsmale@blm.gov)**
- **Jim Gazewood, Project Mgr., Regional Reviews Project, BLM WO [jgazewoo@blm.gov](mailto:jgazewoo@blm.gov)**
- **Stephen Fusilier, Branch Chief, Rights-of-Way, BLM WO [sfusilie@blm.gov](mailto:sfusilie@blm.gov)**
- **Lucas Lucero, Senior Advisor to AD-300, BLM WO [llucero@blm.gov](mailto:llucero@blm.gov)**
- **Reggie, Woodruff, Lands Program Manager, USFS WO [rwoodruff@fs.fed.us](mailto:rwoodruff@fs.fed.us)**

## Corridor Study Release / 368 Information:

- <http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/energy/transmission.html>
- [www.blm.gov/so/st/en/prog/energy/transmission.html](http://www.blm.gov/so/st/en/prog/energy/transmission.html)

## Section 368 Comments to:

- [blm wo 368corridors@blm.gov](mailto:blm_wo_368corridors@blm.gov)

## West-wide Energy Corridors Information Center Website:

- <http://www.corridoreis.anl.gov>





# ***Questions or Comments?***

