## Corridor 36-228

Twin Falls to Boise Corridor

## Corridor Purpose and Rationale

The corridor provides a pathway for energy transport from Twin Falls to Boise south of the southern boundary of the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. The corridor connects to multiple Section 368 energy corridors, creating a continuous east-west interstate corridor network across BLM- and USFSadministered lands from Oregon across Idaho. Input regarding alignment from the Idaho Power Company and Maximus USA during the WWEC PEIS suggested following this route. There has been interest in development within the corridor as well as interest in solar energy in the area. The corridor is west of the recently approved 500 kV Gateway West transmission project for most of its length and within the corridor from MP 14 to MP 30 .

## Corridor location:

Idaho (Elmore and Owyhee Co.)
BLM: Bruneau, Four Rivers, Jarbidge, and Owyhee Field Offices
Regional Review Region: Region 6

## Corridor width, length:

Width 1,000 ft in Four Rivers FO; 3,500 ft in rest
73 miles of designated corridor
107 miles of posted route, including gaps

## Designated Use:

- corridor is multi-modal

Corridor of concern (N)


## Corridor history:

- Locally designated prior to 2009 (N)
- Existing infrastructure (Y)
- A 500-kV transmission line is within and adjacent to a portion of the corridor.
- I-78 is within and adjacent to a portion of the corridor.
- Energy potential near the corridor (Y)
- 6 power plants within 5 mi (2 hydroelectric, 2 solar, 2 wind)
- 17 substations are within 5 mi of the corridor.
- Corridor changes since 2009 (N)

Figure 1. Corridor 36-228
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## Surface Management Agency

| Bureau of Land Management |
| :---: |
| Bureau of Reclamation |
| U.S. Department of Defense |
| U.S. Department of Energy |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Local |
| National Park Service |
| Other |
| State |
| Tribal |
| U.S. Forest Service |

Keys for Figures 1 and 2

Figure 2. Corridor 36-228 and nearby electric transmission lines and pipelines

## Conflict Map Analysis



Figure 3 reflects a comprehensive resource conflict assessment developed to enable the Agencies and stakeholders to visualize a corridor's proximity to environmentally sensitive areas and to evaluate options for routes with lower potential conflict. The potential conflict assessment (low, medium, high) shown in the figure is based on criteria found on the WWEC
Information Center at www.corridoreis.anl.gov. To meet the intent of the Energy Policy Act and the Settlement Agreement siting principles, corridors may be located in areas where there is potentially high resource conflict; however, where feasible, opportunity for corridor revisions should be identified in areas with potentially lower conflict.

Visit the 368 Mapper for a full view of the potential conflict map
(https://bogi.evs.anl.gov/section368/portal/)

Figure 3. Map of Conflict Areas in Vicinity of Corridor 36-228


Figure 4. Corridor 36-228, Corridor Density Map
Figure 4 shows the density of energy use to assist in evaluating corridor utility. ROWs granted prior to the corridor designation (2009) are shown in pink; ROWs granted after corridor designation are shown in blue; and pending ROWs under current review for approval are shown in turquoise. Note the ROW density shown for the corridor is only a snapshot that does not fully illustrate remaining corridor capacity. Not all ROWs have GIS data at the time this abstract was developed. BLM and USFS are currently improving their ROW GIS databases and anticipate more complete data in the near future.

## Corridor Review Table

Designated energy corridors are areas of land prioritized for energy transmission infrastructure and are intended to be predominantly managed for multiple energy transmission infrastructure lines. Other compatible uses are allowable as specified or practicable. Resource management goals and objectives should be compatible with the desired future conditions (i.e., responsible linear infrastructure development of the corridor with minimal impacts) of the energy transmission corridor. Land management objectives that do not align with desired future conditions should be avoided. The table below identifies serious concerns or issues and presents potential resolution options to better meet corridor siting principles.

The preliminary information below is provided to facilitate further discussion and input prior to developing potential revisions, deletions, or additions.

| CORRIDOR 36-228 REVIEW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE | MILEPOST <br> $(\mathrm{MP})^{1}$ | STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ${ }^{2}$ |
| BLM Jurisdiction: Jarbidge Field Office <br> Agency Land Use Plan: Jarbidge RMP (2015) |  |  |  |
| Oregon NHT is parallel to the corridor but does not intersect the corridor. <br> The segment of the Oregon NHT near the corridor is listed as High Potential (North Trail). | MP 0 to MP 22 and MP 32 | The National Trails System Act, as cited in the Comprehensive Plan for the California NHT (1999) ${ }^{3}$, states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements and rights-of-way upon, over, under, across, or along any component of the national trails system in accordance with the laws applicable to the national forest system, provided that any conditions contained in such easements and rights-of-way are related to the policy and purposes of this Act. <br> For high potential route segments, the National Trails System Act states: Federally owned sites and segments of these trails are considered federal protection components and should receive special attention by managing agencies to enhance their trail-related values. | The corridor does not intersect the NHT (corridor is 0.7 to over 5 mi from the NHT); however, the NHT could be within the viewshed. <br> Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor. |


| CORRIDOR 36-228 REVIEW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE | MILEPOST (MP) ${ }^{1}$ | STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ${ }^{2}$ |
| BLM Jurisdiction: Four Rivers Field Office <br> Agency Land Use Plan: Kuna MFP (1983) and Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP and ROD (2008) |  |  |  |
| Oregon NHT is parallel to the corridor but does not intersect the corridor. <br> The segment of the Oregon NHT near the corridor is listed as High Potential (North Trail). | MP 23 to MP 31, MP 32 to MP 34, MP 75 to MP 76, and MP 78 to MP 83 | The National Trails System Act, as cited in the Comprehensive Plan for the California NHT (1999) ${ }^{3}$, states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements and rights-of-way upon, over, under, across, or along any component of the national trails system in accordance with the laws applicable to the national forest system, provided that any conditions contained in such easements and rights-of-way are related to the policy and purposes of this Act. <br> For high potential route segments, the National Trails System Act states: Federally owned sites and segments of these trails are considered federal protection components and should receive special attention by managing agencies to enhance their trail-related values. | The corridor does not intersect the NHT (over 1 mi between the NHT and the corridor); however, the NHT could be within the viewshed. <br> Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor. |
| Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA and the corridor intersect - Major utilities within the NCA will be restricted to two identified corridors, including Corridor 36-228. | MP 23 to MP 32, MP 74 to MP 78, MP 83 to MP 85, and MP 86 to MP 89 | PL 103-64: allows for diverse appropriate uses of lands in the area to the extent consistent with the maintenance and enhancement of raptor populations and habitats and protection and sound management of other resources and values of the area. <br> Comment on abstract: Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA | The corridor has a reduced width in some locations to minimize potential impacts to nesting raptors in the Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. From MP 31 to MP 94, the Agencies could consider re-routing the corridor along the Gateway West alternative 9E to avoid crossing the NCA from MP 74 to MP 78 and from MP 83 to MP 94. The Agencies should review whether or not the corridor should remain designated through the NCA from MP 23 to MP 31. |


| CORRIDOR 36-228 REVIEW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE | MILEPOST (MP) ${ }^{1}$ | STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | overlaps 3,279 acres of the corridor (MP 24 to MP 33, MP 75 to MP 78 , and MP 83 to MP 89. <br> Comment on abstract: delete corridor. <br> Comment on abstract: re-route to Snake River Birds of Prey NCA/CJ Strike Reservoir IBA. If rerouting around the NCA is not feasible, reroute to collocate with existing and proposed transmission lines. |  |
| Owyhee Front SRMA and the corridor intersect The RMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within SRMAs. | MP 74 to MP 78, MP 83 to MP 85, and MP 86 to MP 89 |  | The corridor appears to best meet the siting principles. There are no management prescriptions preventing future development within the corridor, and the corridor cannot be readily re-routed to avoid the SRMA. |
| BLM Jurisdiction: Bruneau Field Office Agency Land Use Plan: Bruneau MFP (1983) |  |  |  |
| Oregon NHT is parallel to the corridor but does not intersect the corridor. <br> The segment of the Oregon NHT near the corridor is listed as High Potential (North Trail). | MP 37 to MP 64 | The National Trails System Act, as cited in the Comprehensive Plan for the California NHT (1999) ${ }^{3}$, states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements and rights-of-way upon, over, under, across, or along any component of the national trails system in accordance with the laws applicable to the national forest system, provided that any conditions contained in such easements and rights-of-way are related to the policy and purposes of this Act. <br> For high potential route segments, the National Trails System Act states: | The corridor does not intersect the NHT (1 mi or more between the HNT and the corridor); however, the NHT could be within the viewshed. <br> Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor. |


| CORRIDOR 36-228 REVIEW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MILEPOST } \\ & (\mathrm{MP})^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | Federally owned sites and segments of these trails are considered federal protection components and should receive special attention by managing agencies to enhance their trail-related values. |  |
| VRM Class II area and the corridor intersect -The MFP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within VRM Class II areas. The objective of VRM Class II designation is to retain the existing character of the landscape. | MP 63 to MP 64 |  | Areas with the VRM Class II designation may not be compatible with future overhead transmission line development in an area without existing infrastructure. In order to best meet the siting principles, a change in the VRM class could be considered. A shift in the corridor to the southwest could avoid the isolated VRM Class II area, but would intrude further into GRSG IHMA. |
| BLM Jurisdiction: Owyhee Field Office <br> Agency Land Use Plan: Owyhee RMP (1999) and Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP and ROD (2008) |  |  |  |
| Oregon NHT is parallel to the corridor but does not intersect the corridor. <br> The segment of the Oregon NHT near the corridor is listed as High Potential (North Trail). | MP 64 to MP 74, MP 78 to MP 83, MP 90 to MP 107 | The National Trails System Act, as cited in the Comprehensive Plan for the California NHT (1999) ${ }^{3}$, states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements and rights-of-way upon, over, under, across, or along any component of the national trails system in accordance with the laws applicable to the national forest system, provided that any conditions contained in such easements and rights-of-way are related to the policy and purposes of this Act. <br> For high potential route segments, the National Trails System Act states: Federally owned sites and segments of these trails are considered federal protection components and should receive special attention by managing | The corridor does not intersect the NHT ( 0.7 to over 5 mi between the HNT and the corridor); however, the NHT is within the viewshed. <br> Agencies could consider new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor. |


| CORRIDOR 36-228 REVIEW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MILEPOST } \\ & (\mathrm{MP})^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | agencies to enhance their trail-related values. |  |
| Owyhee Front SRMA and the corridor intersect The RMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within SRMAs. | MP 65 to MP 74, MP 78 to MP 83, MP 85 to MP 86, and MP 90 to MP 105 |  | The corridor appears to best meet the siting principles. There are no management prescriptions preventing future development within the corridor, and options to shift this corridor to federal lands outside the SRMA are limited. |
| Squaw Creek Addition SRMA and the corridor intersect - The RMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within SRMAs. | MP 105 to MP 107 |  | The corridor appears to best meet the siting principles. There are no management prescriptions preventing future development within the corridor, and options to shift this corridor to federal lands outside the SRMA are limited. The corridor is collocated with proposed Boardman to Hemingway Selected Route. |
| BLM Jurisdiction: Owyee Field Office <br> Agency Land Use Plan: Idaho GRSG ROD and ARMPA - March 2019 |  |  |  |
| GRSG IHMA (ROW avoidance area) and the corridor intersect - The 2019 ARMPA states that existing designated corridors will remain Open in all habitat management areas. Collocating new infrastructure within existing ROWs and maintaining and upgrading ROWs is preferred over the creation of new ROWs. Collocation in designated corridors can be built within the existing corridor or adjacent to the existing corridor. | MP 65 to MP 66, MP 69 to MP 74, MP 84 to MP 105 | RFI comment: use full mitigation hierarchy to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts within 4 mi of important GRSG breeding areas. | ROW avoidance areas are not compatible with the corridor's purpose as a preferred location for infrastructure. Although the corridor is located at the edge of the IHMA habitat, the opportunity shift this corridor to federal lands outside of the IHMA is limited. In some location (e.g., MP 70 to MP 74) the Agencies could consider shifting the corridor to the northeast to avoid the IHMA without impacting other resources such as the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA. <br> The corridor has a reduced width where it intersects the NCA and this may limit infrastructure development. |
| GRSG GHMA and the corridor intersect - The 2019 ARMPA states that existing designated corridors in GHMA will remain open to utility ROWs. Collocating new infrastructure within existing ROWs and maintaining and upgrading ROWs is preferred over the creation of new ROWs. Collocation in designated corridors can be built within the existing corridor or adjacent to the existing corridor. | MP 75 to MP 82 | RFI comment: use full mitigation hierarchy to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts within 4 mi of important GRSG breeding areas. | Although the corridor is located at the edge of the GHMA habitat, the opportunity to shift this corridor to federal lands outside of the GHMA is limited. GHMA areas are open to utility ROWs. <br> The corridor has a reduced width where it intersects the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA that may limit infrastructure development. |

${ }^{1}$ Mileposts are rounded to the nearest mile.
${ }^{2}$ Siting Principles include: Corridors are thoughtfully sited to provide maximum utility and minimum impact on 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. Projects proposed in the corridor would be reviewed during their ROW application review process and would adhere to Federal laws, regulations, and policy.
${ }^{3}$ Full Title: Comprehensive Management and Use Plan / Final Environmental Impact Statement - California National Historic Trail and Pony Express National Historic Trail. Management and Use Plan Update/Final Environmental Impact Statement - Oregon National Historic Trail and Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trail.

## Additional Compatibility Concerns

The issues and concerns listed below are not explicitly addressed through agency land use plans or are too general in nature to be addressed without further clarification. Although difficult to quantify, the concerns listed have potential to affect future use and/or development within this designated corridor. The Agencies have provided a preliminary general analysis. The information below is provided to facilitate further discussion during stakeholder review.

## Jurisdictional Concerns:

- Bruneau Dunes State park intersects the corridor at MP 27.

Analysis: Section 368 energy corridors are only designated on BLM and USFS-administered land. Opportunity to shift this corridor onto federally administered lands is limited.

- Corridor intersects with state and private lands in various locations between MP 36 and MP 55.
- Owyhee County can only support a corridor routing that places the corridor either completely on federal lands or uses a route where the private lands impacted are only those on which the private land owner will willingly provide a right of way (comment on abstract).

Analysis: The Agencies could consider slight corridor adjustments to better collocate with existing infrastructure and increase the amount of federally administered land within the corridor. The Agencies could also consider re-routing the corridor to the south to avoid private lands, following alternative 9 E for Gateway West for a portion of the corridor and connect to Corridor 36-228 at MP 94.

## Specially Designated Areas:

- The Oregon NHT is located perpendicular to the corridor within a corridor gap on private land.

Analysis: Although not within the BLM jurisdiction, the presence of the NHT could make it difficult to place future infrastructure in or near the corridor.

## Ecology:

- LEPA habitat (Lepidium papilliferum ("slickspot peppergrass")) habitat.

Analysis: The corridor does not intersect critical habitat. Section 7 consultation with USFWS would be commensurate with agency determination of potential effect on threatened or endangered species.

## Military and Civilian Aviation:

- SUA and the corridor intersect from MP 11 to MP 14 and MP 26 to MP 31.

Analysis: Adherence to existing IOP regarding coordination with DoD would be required. Agencies could consider a revision to the existing IOP to include height restrictions for corridors in the vicinity of DoD training routes.

## Abstract Acronyms and Abbreviations

ARMPA = Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment; BLM = Bureau of Land Management; DoD = Department of Defense; GHMA = general habitat management areas; GIS = geographic information system; GRSG = Greater Sage-grouse; IHMA = important habitat management area; IOP = interagency operating procedure; MFP = Management Framework Plan; MP = milepost; NCA = National Conservation Area; NHT = National Historic Trail; NST = National Scenic Trail; PEIS = Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement; PHMA = priority habitat management area; RFI = request for information; RMP = resource management plan; ROD = Record of Decision; ROW = right-of-way; SRMA = Special Recreation Management Area; SUA = special use airspace; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; VRM = visual resource management; WWEC = West-wide Energy Corridor.

