Corridor 78-138

Rawlins Corridor

Corridor Purpose and Rationale

The corridor provides an east-west pathway just south of Rawlins, Wyoming. The corridor connects multiple corridors to the east and west, creating a continuous east-west corridor network through southern Wyoming across BLM- and USFS-administered lands. Input regarding alignment from multiple organizations\(^1\) during the WWEC PEIS suggested following this route. Several planned transmission lines ranging from 230 to 1,000-kV generally follow the path of the corridor. The recently authorized TransWest Express transmission line project is within the corridor for 29 miles. The recently authorized Energy Gateway South and Energy Gateway West transmission line projects are within the corridor for 26 miles and are within 5 miles of the corridor for the remainder of its length. Energy potential near the corridor may be limited, particularly if already planned projects locate within the corridor.

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

Corridor width, length:
Width 3,500 ft
25 miles of designated corridor
80 miles of posted route, including gaps

Designated Use:
• corridor is multi-modal

Corridor of concern (N)

---

\(^1\) American Wind Energy Association, National Grid, PacifiCorp, Rocky Mountain Area Transmission Study, Western Utility Group, and Wyoming Natural Gas Pipeline Authority
Figure 2. Corridor 78-138 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 78-138, 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)</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER INPUT and OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RESOLUTIONS BASED ON SITING PRINCIPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 55</td>
<td>A number of existing and planned transmission lines and pipelines within and adjacent to the corridor intersect the Study Trail including the Gateway South Preferred Route and Gateway West Route. 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. While the corridor cannot be re-routed to avoid the Study Trail, the location appears to best meet the siting principles because the corridor intersects the Study Trail perpendicularly and the corridor is collocated with existing infrastructure (many transmission lines and pipelines). Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Divide NST SRMA and the corridor intersect – The RMP states that SRMAs are avoidance area for linear utilities. However, the corridor is located within a previously designated corridor.</td>
<td>MP 56</td>
<td>The Continental Divide NST Comprehensive Plan was finalized in 2009. The NST is managed according to the National Trails Act. A number of existing and planned transmission lines and pipelines ROW avoidance areas are not compatible with the corridor’s purpose as a preferred location for infrastructure. While the corridor cannot be re-routed to avoid the SRMA, the corridor is collocated with existing and proposed infrastructure and the SRMA crosses the corridor perpendicularly (minimizing impacts).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CORRIDOR 78-138 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>within and adjacent to the corridor intersect the linear SRMA including the Gateway South Preferred Route and Gateway West Route.</td>
<td>MP 66 to MP 68</td>
<td>A number of existing and planned transmission lines and pipelines within and adjacent to the corridor intersect the linear WHMA including the Gateway South Preferred Route and Gateway West Route.</td>
<td>Agencies could consider a new IOP for NSTs and NHTs to enhance BMPs for proposed development within the energy corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rim-Daley WHMA and corridor intersect – The LMP does not prescribe ROW avoidance or exclusions for WHMAs within designated energy corridors, although the area is to be managed to protect crucial winter habitat for Pronghorn and nesting habitat for raptors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The corridor intersection here appears to best meet the siting principles. While the corridor cannot be re-routed to avoid the WHMA, the corridor is collocated with existing and proposed infrastructure and the WHMA crosses the corridor perpendicularly (minimizing impacts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **BLM Jurisdiction:** Rawlins Field Office  
**Agency Land Use Plan:** TransWest Express Transmission Project ROD; Rawlins FO ARMPA (Dec 2016) | | | |
| Through the TransWest Express Transmission Project ROD, Corridor 78-138 (Rawlins-Wamsutter Corridor) is expanded from 3,500 ft to 7,000 ft for all utilities from MP 51 to MP 78. Exceptions to resource stipulations within the designated corridor may be granted if measures of avoidance or minimization are not feasible. Minimum separation distance from existing transmission is required in GRSG core areas. All possible measures will be taken to avoid conflicts with other existing and proposed uses (utility and otherwise) within the designated corridor. | MP 51 to MP 78 | | Section 368 energy corridors are priority areas open to ROWS to maximize energy transmission while minimizing impacts on other resources. |
| The ROD also designated the new Wamsutter-Powder Rim corridor running from north to south along the western Sweetwater/Carbon County line for 81 miles (approximately from the northern to southern boundary of Sweetwater County). The new corridor has a width of 3,500 ft for all utilities. | | | |
| **BLM Jurisdiction:** Rawlins Field Office  
**Agency Land Use Plan:** Wyoming GRSG ROD and ARMPA – March 2019 | | | |
<p>| GRSG GHMA and the corridor intersect – The 2019 ROD/ARMP indicates that collocating new infrastructure within existing ROWs and maintaining | MP 0 to MP 4 and MP 31 to MP 69 | | The location appears to best meet the siting principles because collocation is preferred and the corridor is collocated with an existing transmission line. The GHMA |</p>
<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>and upgrading ROWs is preferred over the creation of new ROWs or the construction of new facilities in all management areas. Existing designated corridors, including Section 368 energy corridors, will remain open in all habitat management areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>encompasses a broad area surrounding the corridor which cannot be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSG PHMA (ROW avoidance area) and the corridor intersect – The 2019 ROD/ARMP 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 corridors, including Section 368 energy corridors, will remain open in all habitat management areas.</td>
<td>MP 4 to MP 31 and MP 69 to MP 80</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROW avoidance areas are not compatible with the corridor’s purpose as a preferred location for infrastructure. However, the corridor is collocated with an existing transmission line. The PHMA encompasses a broad area surrounding the corridor which cannot 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 provided a preliminary general analysis. The information below is provided to facilitate further discussion during stakeholder review.

Potential Corridor Revisions:
- Relocate the corridor from MP 48 to MP 52 by shifting the corridor to follow WPCI ROW 6 then south 1 mi. to WPCI ROW 2 corridor (comment on abstract).

Analysis: The corridor does not follow existing infrastructure between MP 44 and 51 and this segment could be shifted east to follow the proposed WPCI corridors or the existing PacifiCorp transmission line.
Cultural:

- The Historic Lincoln Highway could be a concern in the Rawlins FO.

*Analysis:* Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of an undertaking on cultural resources.

**Abstract Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ACEC = Area Critical Environmental Concern; ARMPA = Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment; BLM = Bureau of Land Management; BMP = best management practice; FO = field office; 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; 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; USFS = U.S. Forest Service; WHMA = Wildlife Habitat Management Area; WPCI = Wyoming Pipeline Corridor Initiative; WWEC = West-wide Energy Corridor.