Corridor 73-133
Wamsutter to Maybell Corridor

Corridor Purpose and Rationale
The corridor provides a north-south pathway from Wyoming into Colorado. The corridor connects multiple Section 368 energy corridors on both the north and south ends, creating a continuous corridor network across southern Wyoming and western Colorado across BLM- and USFS-administered lands. Input regarding alignment from National Grid and the Western Utility Group during the WWEC PEIS suggested following this route. The corridor is being considered for the Zephyr Transmission Line Project. TransWest Express and Energy Gateway South are located east of and parallel to the corridor in a new 3,500-ft Wamsutter-Powder Rim locally designated corridor that was designated in the TransWest Express ROD. TransWest Express and Energy Gateway South intersect and cross the corridor at MP 44. Two additional natural gas pipelines are planned within and adjacent to the Wyoming portion of the corridor from MP 0 to MP 46. The Region 3 portion of the corridor (MP 46 to MP 82) was evaluated during the Regions 2 and 3 regional review.

Corridor location:
Wyoming (Sweetwater Co.)
BLM: Rawlins Field Office
Regional Review Regions: Region 3 and Region 4

Corridor width, length (Region 4 portion):
Width 3,500 ft
38 miles of designated corridor
46 miles to posted route, including gaps

Designated Use:
- corridor is underground only

Figure 1. Corridor 73-133
Figure 2. Corridor 73-133 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. Corridor 73-133, 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.

<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><strong>BLM Jurisdiction:</strong> Rawlins Field Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Land Use Plan:</strong> Rawlins RMP (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Trails Feasibility Study Trail and the corridor intersect – The RMP states that actions resulting in linear crossings of the trails will occur in previously disturbed areas and will be managed in accordance with BMPs.</td>
<td>MP 13 to MP 14 (Overland Trail) and MP 42 to MP 43 (Cherokee Trail)</td>
<td>Several pipelines occur within the corridor where it and the trail intersect. 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 intersection here appears to best meet the siting principles. Existing infrastructure, minimal areas of intersection and the absence of more preferable alternatives suggest that the corridor cannot be relocated to a more preferred area for development. Additionally the corridor is designated underground only to reduce visual impacts. 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:** Rawlins Field Office             |                |                                                  |                                                          |
| **Agency Land Use Plan:** Wyoming GRSG ROD and ARMPA – March 2019 |                |                                                  |                                                          |
| GRSG GHMA and the corridor intersect - The 2019 ROD/ARMPA indicates that collocating new infrastructure within existing ROWs and maintaining and upgrading ROWs is preferred over the creation of new ROWs or the construction of new facilities in all management areas. Existing designated | MP 0 to MP 46 |                                                  |                                                          |
|                                                        |                |                                                  |                                                          |

¹ MP: Milepost

² IOP: Initial Operating Plan

GRSG GHMA and the corridor intersect - The 2019 ROD/ARMPA indicates that collocating new infrastructure within existing ROWs and maintaining and upgrading ROWs is preferred over the creation of new ROWs or the construction of new facilities in all management areas. Existing designated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP 0 to MP 46</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The location appears to best meet the siting principles. This is an underground only corridor, and collocation of future ROWs with the existing pipelines will minimize disturbance of GHMA. The GHMA encompasses a broad area surrounding the corridor which cannot be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CORRIDOR 73-133 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 ANALYSIS ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridors, including Section 368 energy corridors, will remain open in all habitat management areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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, shown below. The information below is provided to facilitate further discussion during stakeholder review.

#### Potential Corridor Revisions:
- Consider one alternate route instead of two parallel corridors: Corridor 73-133 and Corridor 138-143 (comment on abstract).

**Analysis:** Corridors 73-133 and 138-143 both follow existing infrastructure. Corridor 73-133 is designated underground only and the Region 3 portion of Corridor 138-143 is designated electric only, allowing for both pipeline and transmission line energy transport between Colorado and Wyoming. The Agencies could consider upgrading the 3,500-ft Wamsutter-Powder Rim locally designated utility corridor along the authorized TransWest Express route to a Section 368 energy corridor (electric-only).

#### Lands with wilderness characteristics:
- Rotten Springs lands with wilderness characteristics overlaps 173 acres of the corridor (MP 40), opportunity to avoid Rotten Springs lands with wilderness characteristics by adjusting east (comment on abstract).

**Analysis:** The corridor could be reduced in width between MP 40 and MP 41 or moved to the east to avoid the Rotten Springs lands with wilderness characteristics. However, the lands with wilderness characteristics is adjacent to a gas pipeline that already runs through the corridor. The corridor is also designated underground only which would limit visual impacts.
Abstract Acronyms and Abbreviations
ARMPA = Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment; BLM = Bureau of Land Management; BMP = best management practice; GHMA = general habitat management area; GIS = geographic information system; GRSG = Greater Sage-grouse; IOP = interagency operating procedure; MP = milepost; NHT = National Historic Trail; NST = National Scenic Trail; PEIS = Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement; RFI = request for information; RMP = resource management plan; ROD = Record of Decision; ROW = right-of-way; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; WWEC = West-wide Energy Corridor.