Corridor 17-35
Pyramid Lake to US 93 Corridor

Corridor Purpose and Rationale
This energy corridor connects multiple West-wide energy corridors within northeastern Nevada. Input regarding alignment from multiple organizations\(^1\) during the WWEC PEIS suggested following this route. An electric transmission line is planned to generally follow the corridor from MP 69 to MP 128 and two electric transmission lines are planned to generally follow the corridor from MP 208 to MP 300. The Region 3 portion of the corridor was evaluated in the Regions 2 and 3 regional review and are not included in this review.

Corridor location:
Nevada (Churchill, Humboldt, Pershing, and Washoe Co.)
BLM: Humboldt Field Office
Regional Review Regions: Region 3 and Region 5

Corridor width, length: (Region 5 portion)
Width 3,500 (1,000 ft between MP 143 and MP 175).
83 miles of designated corridor
143 miles of posted route, including gaps

Designated Use:
- corridor is multi-modal

Corridor of concern (Y)
Access to coal plant, impacts to GRSG habitat.

Corridor history:
- Locally designated prior to 2009 (N)
- Existing infrastructure (Y)
  - 115-, 120-, and two 345-kV transmission lines are within and adjacent to the entire length of the corridor in Region 5.
  - Three natural gas pipelines are within and adjacent to portions of the corridor.
- Energy potential near the corridor (Y)
  - Coal power plant is in corridor gap at MP 136.
  - 1 substation is within the corridor and 19 more substations are within 5 mi of the corridor.
- Corridor changes since 2009 (N)

\(^1\) American Wind Energy Association, Frontier Line, National Grid, Redding Electric Utility, Western Interconnect Transmission Paths, and Western Utility Group
Figure 2. Corridor 17-35 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE</th>
<th>MILEPOST (MP)</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California NHT and the corridor intersect - The RMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within the California NHT. The corridor crosses the NHT High Priority segment (Rye Patch Reservoir to Woolsey) near Lovestock.</td>
<td>MP 55 to MP 56, MP 60, and MP 137</td>
<td>Intersections of the corridor with the California NHT are at an angle and do not parallel the NHT. The National Trails System Act, as cited in the Comprehensive Plan for the California NHT (1999), states that the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may grant easements and ROWs 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 ROWs are related to the policy and purposes of this Act. For high potential route segments, the National Trails System Act states: Federally owned sites and segments of these trails are considered federal</td>
<td>NHT high potential segments may not be compatible with the corridor’s purpose as a preferred location for energy infrastructure. However, the corridor is collocated with existing infrastructure (several transmission lines), and there is a minimal area of intersection. It might be possible to shift or delete some small segments of the corridor at these intersection locations to avoid the NHT. Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BLM Jurisdiction: Winnemucca District Office
## CORRIDOR 17-35 REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE</th>
<th>MILEPOST (MP)¹</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Trails Feasibility Study Trail and the corridor intersect – The RMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for areas within the Study Trail.</td>
<td>MP 55 to MP 56, MP 60, and MP 137</td>
<td>Intersections of the corridor with the Four Trails Feasibility Study Trail are approximately perpendicular. The Act (Public Law 111-11; 2009) directs the Secretary of the Interior to revise the original feasibility studies of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express NHTs. BLM Manual 6280 directs the BLM to maintain the values, characteristics, and settings for which the trail is being studied or for which the trail was recommended as suitable.</td>
<td>The corridor is collocated with existing infrastructure (several transmission lines), and there is a minimal area of intersection. It might be possible to shift or delete some small segments of the corridor at these intersection locations to avoid the Study Trail. Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLM Jurisdiction:** Winnemucca District Office  
**Agency Land Use Plan:** Nevada and Northeastern California GRSG ROD and ARMPA – March 2019

| GRSG OHMA and the corridor intersect - The 2019 ARMPA states that OHMA is allocated as open for major ROWs. | MP 65 to MP 69, MP 87, MP 89 to MP 90, MP 93 to MP 97, MP 104, MP 108 to MP 110, MP 15 to MP 120, MP 125 to MP 126, and MP 129 to MP 132 | Comment on abstract: new transmission lines along this corridor will create new, fresh roads. It will also add more towers for ravens to nest in and perch on in a Sage-grouse breeding area. Corridor could be ROW avoidance areas are not compatible with the corridor’s purpose as a preferred location for infrastructure. However, collocation is preferred and the corridor is collocated with two existing transmission lines. Also, the PHMA area cannot be readily avoided because it encompasses a broad area around both sides of the | |
| GRSG PHMA (ROW avoidance area) and the corridor intersect – The 2019 ARMPA indicates that PHMA and GHMA areas are designated as major pipeline (≥24-inch diameter) ROW avoidance areas, unless the major pipeline meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined (in MD SSS 5). | MP 67 to MP 72 | |

---

¹ Milepost (MP) refers to the numerical distance along a designated route or area.  
² Potential resolutions based on siting principle analysis consider the compatibility and potential adjustments needed to align with existing infrastructure, environmental considerations, and overall strategic goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES or CONCERNS TO EXAMINE</th>
<th>MILEPOST (MP)¹</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ARMPA also states that co-locating new infrastructure within or next to existing infrastructure is a priority when PHMA and GHMA areas cannot be avoided.</td>
<td>MP 67, MP 71 to MP 73, MP 87 to MP 96, MP 104 to MP 117, and MP 126 to MP 129</td>
<td>revised from MP 64 to MP 74 to follow the Lovelock-Unionville road, routed even further south near the open pit gold mine, or go around the southern end of the Humboldt Range.</td>
<td>corridor. It might be possible to re-route the corridor to avoid PHMA, however, the corridor would not be collocated along existing energy infrastructure. Required Design Features in the 2019 ROD/ARMPA documents would be implemented to minimize impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSG GHMA (ROW avoidance area) and the corridor intersect – The 2019 ARMPA indicates that PHMA and GHMA areas are designated as major pipeline (≥24-inch diameter) ROW avoidance areas, unless the major pipeline meets one of the allocation exception criteria outlined (in MD SSS 5). The ARMPA also states that co-locating new infrastructure within or next to existing infrastructure is a priority when PHMA and GHMA areas cannot be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on abstract: MP 87 to MP 96, MP 104 to MP 115. Corridor passes between two large lek areas and very close to one of them. Adding more transmission lines or upgrading the existing one would negatively impact Sage-grouse. The towers would also provide perches and nesting places for ravens that predate on sage grouse nests. Even though there is an existing transmission line, new lines could be routed around the sage grouse habitat and avoid some of these conflicts. Also consider burying transmission lines. However, it is unknown how buried electrical lines will impact Sage-grouse nesting.</td>
<td>ROW avoidance areas are not compatible with the corridor’s purpose as a preferred location for infrastructure. However, collocation is preferred and the corridor is generally collocated with one to two existing transmission lines. At a few locations (e.g., MP 67) there may be opportunity to shift the corridor to avoid the GHMA. In other locations (e.g., MP 103 to MP 117), the GHMA encompasses areas on both sides of the corridor and could not readily be avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.

Corridor Revision:
- Using Google Earth, the road scar of the existing transmission line crossing the Humboldt Range is not prominent. It could be because the natural vegetation has already grown over the road or because the road is rarely traveled. Putting in new transmission lines along this corridor will create new, fresh roads. It will also add more towers for ravens to nest in and perch on in a sage grouse breeding area. Corridor 17-35 at MP 64 to MP 74 could follow the Lovelock-Unionville road, be moved even further south near the open pit gold mine or go around the southern end of the Humboldt Range (comment on abstract).

Analysis: Collocation is preferred and at this location the corridor is collocated with an existing 345-kV transmission line.

Topography and Terrain:
- The corridor crosses mountainous areas.

Analysis: Topography could be a factor when pursuing a project proposal. The Agencies could consider potential adjustments to the corridor to avoid terrain concerns.

Jurisdictional Concerns:
- There are pinch points with in the corridor where it passes through developed towns such as Elko, Carlin, and Wells where there will be little to no space available to construct new infrastructure.

Analysis: Section 368 energy corridors are only designated on BLM- and USFS-administered lands. It is possible that future infrastructure could potentially be selectively located within the corridor to minimize intersections with private land and towns.

- The California NHT crosses private lands within the corridor path at MP 133.

Analysis: Section 368 energy corridors cannot be designated on private land. If future development was located along the private land segments, the future transmission line or pipeline would cross rather than parallel the NHT (minimizing impact on trail values). Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor.

Military and Civilian Aviation:
- MTR – VR and the corridor intersect from MP 16 to MP 22 and MP 71 to MP 82.
- MTR – IR and the corridor intersect from MP 17 to MP 22 and MP 132 to MP 141.
- MTR – Slow-speed Route and the corridor intersect from MP 77 to MP 115.
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; BMP = best management practice; DoD = Department of Defense; FO = Field Office; GHMA = general habitat management area; GIS = geographic information system; GRSG = Greater Sage-grouse; IOP = interagency operating procedure; IR = instrument route; MP = milepost; MTR = Military Training Route; NHT = National Historic Trail; NST = National Scenic Trail; OHMA = other habitat management area; 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; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; VR = visual route; VRM = visual resource management; WWEC = West-wide Energy Corridor.