

# **U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

## **National Electric Transmission Congestion Report and Final National Corridor Designations**

### **Frequently Asked Questions**

October 2, 2007

#### **1. What is a National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor?**

Section 216(a) of the Federal Power Act (created by section 1221(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) directs DOE to identify transmission congestion and constraint problems. In addition, section 216(a) authorizes the Secretary, in his discretion, to designate geographic areas where transmission congestion or constraints adversely affect consumers as National Interest Electric Transmission Corridors (National Corridors).

A National Corridor designation itself does not preempt State authority or any State actions. The designation does not constitute a determination that transmission must, or even should, be built; it is not a proposal to build a transmission facility and it does not direct anyone to make a proposal to build additional transmission facilities. Furthermore, a National Corridor is not a siting decision, nor does it dictate the route of a proposed transmission project. The National Corridor designation serves to spotlight the congestion or constraint problems adversely affecting consumers in the area and under certain circumstances could provide FERC with limited siting authority pursuant to FPA 216(b).

#### **2. What is the significance of DOE's October 2 report? What effects will it have?**

These designations serve as an important indication by the federal government that, at a regional level, a significant transmission constraint or congestion problem exists – one that is adversely affecting consumers and that has advanced to the point where we have a national interest in alleviating it. In other words, the federal government is not dictating how the states, regions, transmission providers or electric utilities should meet their energy challenges. It is a way of focusing attention on the areas of the country that are most congested – and whose consumers stand to benefit most from alleviation of it.

On a more specific level, the designation of a National Corridor is a necessary first step in providing the federal government – through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission – siting authority that supplements existing state authority. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 provides a potential siting venue at FERC for transmission facility proposals within a National Corridor. In practice, this will mean that if an applicant does not receive approval from a State to site a proposed new transmission facility within a National Corridor, the applicant may then apply to FERC for a permit and authorization to construct the facility. If FERC accepts the application, before it would

issue a permit, it would conduct a full National Environmental Policy Act review and consider alternatives. Such a federal permit would empower the project developer to exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire necessary property rights to build the facilities. However, that authority could only be exercised if the developer could not acquire the property by negotiation, and even then would not apply to property owned by the United States or a State, such as a national or State park.

### **3. When do these orders become effective?**

The orders will become effective upon the date of their publication in the *Federal Register*. Under section 313 of the Federal Power Act, parties to the order may then apply for rehearing within thirty days. A filing of an application for rehearing does not, unless specifically ordered by the Department, operate as a stay of an order.

### **4. Are the boundaries of the National Corridors in the report different from those DOE presented earlier in draft form?**

The boundaries of the Mid-Atlantic Area National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor are unchanged from the draft National Corridor DOE published in the *Federal Register* on May 7, 2007.

Note: In DOE's May 7 notice, certain counties were inadvertently omitted from the narrative list of counties covered by the draft Mid-Atlantic Area National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor, but those counties were shown on the May 7 map as included in the draft National Corridor. All such counties are included in the National Corridor now designated by DOE.

The boundaries of the Southwest Area National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor are the same as in the May 7 draft, except that Clark County, Nevada, is no longer included in the National Corridor. The Department decided not to include Clark County because the county is not a major source of potential generation for the Critical Congestion Area, or an area containing a transmission constraint separating the Critical Congestion Area from an identified potential generation source.

The Department notes, however, that the area around Las Vegas (which is in Clark County) is experiencing rapid economic growth and associated growth in electricity demand. This growth could result in congestion that may at some future date warrant expansion of the Southwest Area National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor or the designation of additional National Corridors in the area.

### **5. How did DOE determine the boundaries for the National Corridors?**

DOE concluded that a source-and-sink approach was the most appropriate means for determining a general area to be included in a National Corridor. Such an approach is consistent with the common usage of "corridor" as an area linking two other areas. Such an approach also is consistent

with the physical properties of the electrical grid, because a transmission line into a congested or constrained load area will not benefit that load unless the line connects with a source of power that could help to serve the load.

In general terms, the geographic extent of the sink area in a National Corridor is determined by the geographic distribution of the consumers adversely affected by the congestion or constraints – in other words, the location of load “downstream” of the limiting transmission constraints. With regard to the source area(s) used to develop the National Corridor designations, the Department identified areas with substantial amounts of existing underutilized generation capacity as well as areas with potential for substantial development of renewable generation.

After DOE identified the sink and source areas (and a general area for the envisioned National Corridor), it sought to determine specific, readily identifiable, boundaries for the draft Corridor. Specific boundaries are consistent with the plain meaning of the statutory term “geographic area,” and they also provide greater clarity and ease of administration to those entities concerned with whether a particular project or land area would be encompassed within a National Corridor.

To determine specific boundaries for the two National Corridors, DOE decided to rely on county boundaries. That is, if part of a county is included in the general source-to-sink area, that entire county is within the National Corridor, and the outer perimeter of the group of affected counties is the boundary for the Corridor as a whole.

DOE acknowledges that determining the exact perimeters for a National Corridor under a source-and-sink approach is more of an art than a science, and there will rarely be a clear reason to draw a boundary in one place as opposed to some number of miles to the left or right. In addition, DOE recognized the need to draw National Corridor boundaries so that they can encompass a range of potential projects and a range of potential routes. Further, the Department did not attempt to interpret State laws on siting preferences. The determination of the best route for a specific project will be made by siting authorities, who are better positioned to make such a determination.

**6. DOE received over 2500 comments, and affirms that it read and considered them all very carefully. Yet the National Corridors in the order are essentially the same as presented in draft form, save for the exclusion of one county in Nevada. Why should people believe DOE’s statements about giving their comments serious consideration?**

DOE’s October 2 report is a long document, chiefly because it methodically explains the commenters’ principal concerns and arguments, and then presents DOE’s reasoning in responding to them. Thus, the content of the report confirms that DOE considered the comments carefully.

**7. Does the designation of National Corridors increase the likelihood that private property owners will be subjected to the exercise of eminent domain?**

The designation of a National Corridor itself does not result in any exercise of eminent domain. A National Corridor designation is not a determination that a transmission facility must or even

should be built. Whether construction of a transmission facility, as opposed to increased energy efficiency, demand response, and conservation, or siting of generation closer to load is the appropriate means of addressing congestion in a National Corridor is a matter that market participants, applicable regional planning entities, and State authorities, among others, will consider and decide before any project is built. In the event that a transmission facility is approved for construction, whether a State siting agency or FERC will route that project across a particular landowner's property and whether the project sponsor will be able to reach a consensual agreement with that landowner or have to rely on either State or Federal right of eminent domain will depend on the circumstances.

**8. Many commenters argued that DOE has a legal obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement before designating a National Corridor. Apparently, DOE does not agree – why not?**

Commenters argued in various ways that DOE has an obligation to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS). For example, several commenters held that National Corridor designation was likely to lead to frequent FERC permitting of transmission projects and growth in associated generation, specifically from coal-fired power plants. They asserted that National Corridor designation favors transmission-based solutions to congestion and is tantamount to permitting transmission projects.

DOE concluded that the designation of National Corridor, *per se*, has no environmental impact. It neither permits nor precludes the construction of any transmission projects or any other ground-disturbing activity. One of the primary themes voiced by these commenters is that DOE's designation of a National Corridor will lead inexorably to the construction of transmission projects and that DOE should predict and analyze their range, extent, and impact on the environment in an EIS. However, DOE has no authority to site transmission, and FERC's discretion to approve transmission projects located within National Corridors is circumscribed by law.

In particular, FERC may issue a permit only if the applicant has shown that its project will significantly reduce congestion in the National Corridor. If competing projects, including non-transmission projects, were to resolve the congestion or constraint problem before the issuance of a FERC permit, the sponsor of a transmission project would find it difficult to make such a showing. FERC, at the siting stage, would determine whether a transmission-based solution to particular instances of congestion is warranted. Any commitment to groundbreaking activities, with environmental impacts, would be made only after FERC had authorized construction. Before that point, however, FERC would have conducted a full NEPA review of the project.

**9. How are environmentally sensitive lands affected by the National Corridor designations?**

In determining the boundaries of the two National Corridors, DOE did not carve out environmentally sensitive lands because the statute does not require exclusion of such lands from a National Corridor. In the event of a FERC siting proceeding, FERC would conduct a review under

the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), which would include analysis of alternative routes for that project, including route realignments necessary to avoid adverse effects on the environment, landowners, and local communities. Therefore, DOE has attempted to make the National Corridors broad enough to encompass a range of alternative routes for potential transmission projects, thus leaving the determination of the best route for a specific project to the siting authorities, who are better positioned to make such a determination.

Further, nothing in FPA section 216 alters the applicability of Federal environmental and cultural statutes and regulations. Thus, any permit issued by FERC would be subject to any approvals required under Federal environmental or cultural laws. Such approvals would include approvals that are required from the Fish and Wildlife Service, and from State agencies that administer the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act (which are Federal statutes administered by State agencies).

Finally, routing of a transmission facility through property owned by the United States or a State would be subject to the consent of the appropriate Federal or State land-managing agency, because the statute does not grant the holder of a FERC permit issued under this section the right of eminent domain over such land.

**10. Many commenters argued that DOE’s draft National Corridors were so large as to be regions or zones, and not consistent with the Congress’ use of the word “corridor.” Again, it is clear DOE does not agree – why not?**

Several commenters held that with respect to National Corridors, DOE should have adhered to the concept of a “corridor” established in section 368(e) of the Energy Policy Act, which directs DOE and several other Federal departments to work together to designate multi-purpose energy corridors on Federal lands. This section explicitly requires that a “corridor designated under this section shall, at a minimum, specify the centerline, width, and compatible uses of the corridor.”

National Corridors serve a fundamentally different purpose than the multi-purpose energy corridors envisioned in section 368, making the use of different approaches to delineating the respective corridors appropriate and necessary. In section 368, the Congress required that the Federal land-management agencies effectuate these corridors by amending their resource management plans or equivalent land-use plans. Designation of the corridors under section 368 is a form of land-use planning by the agencies.

By contrast, designation by DOE of a National Corridor is not a form of land-use planning. FPA section 216(a) established a very different task for the Department, directing it to identify geographic areas where congestion and constraint problems exist. This task is novel but limited in scope, and does not include the range of functions typically exercised by siting authorities in evaluating routes for transmission facilities. Significantly, none of the “considerations” listed in FPA 216(a)(4) that the Department may take into account in designating a National Corridor pertain to land use issues.

Thus, unlike a corridor under section 368, a National Corridor is not intended to identify a preferred route for potential transmission facilities. Selection of such routes is a State responsibility, or,

under certain circumstances, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. DOE found that it was necessary to delineate a large National Corridor in order to link a broad congestion area with a range of relevant source areas without infringing upon the latitude of siting agencies to make their decisions.

**11. DOE and some other Federal agencies are preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement prior to designating energy corridors on federal lands in the western States. Doesn't the same logic apply to National Corridors?**

As discussed in the response to the previous question, the selection of corridors under section 368 is a form of land-use planning. By contrast, the designation of a National Corridor stops short of land-use planning and leaves such planning to others. Therefore an environmental impact statement is not appropriate or necessary in relation to a National Corridor, although a project-specific statement might be needed at a later stage to evaluate a proposed transmission project that might be sited within the National Corridor.

**12. Many commenters argued that before designating a National Corridor, DOE should have published an analysis of a broad range of alternative means of easing transmission congestion in the affected area, and some held that it should designate a National Corridor only if transmission has been shown to be the most cost-effective solution. What is DOE's response?**

The Department has concluded that, although FPA section 216(a)(2) calls for the Secretary to consider "alternatives and recommendations from interested parties," nothing in the section suggests that the Department must or should analyze non-transmission solutions in comparison to transmission solutions as a precondition to designation of a National Corridor, or that DOE must first show that transmission would be a superior solution.

On the contrary, the structure of FPA section 216 indicates that DOE's role is limited to the identification of congestion and constraint problems and the geographic areas where these problems exist, and does not extend to the functions exercised by electric system planners or siting authorities in evaluating alternative solutions to congestion or constraint problems. Expanding the Department's role to include analyzing and making findings on the merits of competing remedies for congestion could supplant, duplicate, or conflict with the roles of States and other entities.

DOE therefore interprets the law's direction to consider "alternatives and recommendations from interested parties" to mean considering suggestions that National Corridors be designated in relation to specific congestion or constraint problems, alternative boundaries for a possible National Corridor, or suggestions that DOE do something in a particular area other than designate a National Corridor.

**13. Some commenters argued that by designating National Corridors, DOE is facilitating increased emissions from coal-fired power plants and supporting obsolete generation and transmission technologies. What is DOE's response?**

A number of the comments seemed premised on the assumption that designation of a National Corridor would create a bias in favor of long transmission lines running across the National Corridor, particularly long transmission lines connecting to coal-fired generation. The Department regards such an assumption as unfounded. A National Corridor designation does not constitute a finding that transmission must or even should be built; it does not prejudice State or Federal siting processes against non-transmission solutions; and it should not discourage market participants from pursuing such solutions.

Further, even within the realm of potential transmission solutions, designation of a National Corridor would not favor any particular transmission project within the Corridor. The Department's identification of source areas was only a means of setting an outer bound on the geographic range of potential transmission projects that could become subject to FERC jurisdiction. Designation of a National Corridor no more dictates or endorses the construction of transmission lines to access coal-fired generation than it does the construction of transmission lines to access wind-rich or other renewable source areas. Finally, if a transmission project were proposed within a National Corridor to deliver generation to a DOE-identified congestion area from somewhere other than the identified source areas, the developer of the project would be eligible to seek a FERC permit, provided it met the standards of FPA section 216(b).

**14. Some commenters objected strongly to the inclusion of various kinds of sensitive or protected land areas in the draft National Corridors. In its orders, DOE did not exclude such areas from the National Corridors. Why not?**

Exclusion of environmentally, historically, or culturally sensitive lands from a National Corridor is neither required nor necessary. First, with regard to public lands such as parks and wildlife refuges, nothing in the statute suggests that the Department should exclude such lands from a National Corridor. In fact, FPA section 216(f)(2) expressly excludes property owned by the United States or a State from a FERC permit holder's exercise of eminent domain authority. Given that FERC can only issue permits that cover geographic areas within a National Corridor, the presence of explicit statutory language clarifying that a FERC permit does not provide the right of eminent domain over Federal or State property indicates that Congress envisioned that such property could be included within National Corridors.

The Department sees no need to exclude Federal or State property from a National Corridor. If FERC were to issue a permit for a proposed transmission facility that would cross Federal or State property, the permit holder would still need to obtain a right-of-way across that property. Inclusion of Federal or State property in a National Corridor does nothing to change the process for obtaining such a right-of-way. With or without a National Corridor designation, a developer seeking to build a transmission facility on Federal or State property would need to obtain the permission of the Federal or State agency responsible for managing that property.

Further, neither a National Corridor designation nor the issuance of a FERC permit controls a Federal or State land managing agency's decision whether to grant or deny a right-of-way. Thus, contrary to the assertions of some commenters, inclusion of Federal and State property within the

Mid-Atlantic Area National Corridor creates no additional risk that such property might become the site of a transmission facility.

**15. Several of the affected States have argued that a National Corridor in their area is unnecessary and will interfere with state decision-making concerning how best to deal with transmission congestion and whether and where to site transmission facilities. What is DOE's view?**

The Department does not believe that designation of a National Corridor will disrupt ongoing State or regional planning processes. A National Corridor designation itself does not preempt State authority or any State actions. Thus, States retain the authority to work together to address aggressively the congestion problems confronting their region. Further, we expect utilities within a National Corridor to continue to work cooperatively with State and local authorities. We note that FERC has indicated that it will consider any allegations that an applicant has acted in bad faith in State proceedings when it reviews permit applications under FPA section 216(b)(1)(C)(i).

State and regional efforts may well resolve the congestion problems afflicting the congestion areas without any invocation of Federal review. Given the increasingly interconnected nature of the transmission grid and wholesale power markets, however, siting of electricity infrastructure poses increasingly complex questions about how to balance competing interests equitably. Tensions can exist between what is perceived to be best for a region as a whole versus what is perceived to be best for an individual State or an individual portion of one State. National Corridor designation provides, in a defined set of circumstances, a potential mechanism for analyzing the need for transmission from a national, rather than State or local, perspective. The comments the Department received on the draft National Corridors reveal the presence of the kinds of tensions that prompted Congress to create this mechanism.

**16. How long will the National Corridor Designations remain in effect?**

FPA section 216(a) does not itself impose any explicit time limit on a National Corridor designation, nor does the statute require the Department to impose any such limit. Nevertheless, in recognition of State concerns about open-ended National Corridor designations, the Secretary has decided to impose a time limit on the National Corridor designations. Any such time limit, however, must balance State concerns against the disruptive effect that regulatory uncertainty can have on transmission investment. Given the time frames involved in planning and developing a transmission project, the Secretary concludes that it is appropriate to set a twelve-year term for the two National Corridor designations, subject to the Department's right to rescind or renew the designation after notice and opportunity for comment.

**17. Some commenters argued that if a National Corridor is designated, it should be limited to the area experiencing the congestion, and should not extend out into other areas. DOE has not accepted that view. Why not?**

DOE determined that a source-and sink approach should be used to set the boundaries for these National Corridors. This approach is consistent with the common usage of “corridor” as an area linking two other areas. Such an approach also makes sense electrically, because a transmission line into a congested or constrained load area will not benefit that load unless the line connects with a source of power that could help to serve the load.

**18. Will DOE issue draft National Corridors for other parts of the Nation? If so, when and where?**

DOE has not made any decisions about additional National Corridors. If the Department finds that designation of one or more National Corridors in other areas should be given serious consideration, it will issue draft designations of such National Corridors for public comment.

**19. What happens next concerning these two National Corridors?**

The orders are effective upon their publication in the *Federal Register*. Under section 313 of the Federal Power Act, parties to the order may apply for rehearing within thirty days. A filing of an application for rehearing does not, unless specifically ordered by the Department, operate as a stay of the orders. DOE will review any petitions for rehearing it receives, and make a decision whether to grant or deny the rehearing requests. Section 313 of the Federal Power Act provides for judicial review of an order issued pursuant to the Act.

Thereafter, next steps would depend on actions by industry, other stakeholders, the States, and possibly FERC to address the congestion problems that led to the designation of the National Corridors. DOE would monitor and review the implications of such actions when it conducts the triennial national congestion studies required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

**20. Who is eligible to file a request for rehearing?**

The May 7, 2007, *Federal Register* notice stated that: “Only those persons who file ... comments [that are received by DOE on or before July 6, 2007,] will become parties to the proceedings and, thus, eligible to file a request for rehearing under FPA Section 313 of any final order issued in these proceedings.”

Ordering Paragraph C of the current order provides additional guidance regarding the Mid-Atlantic Area National Corridor:

“The Department grants party status in Docket No. 2007-OE-01 [the docket for the proceeding concerning the Mid-Atlantic Area National Corridor] to all persons who either:

- 1) Filed comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-01” electronically at <http://nietc.anl.gov> on or before July 6, 2007;

- 2) Mailed written comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-01” to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, OE-20, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585, that were received on or before July 6, 2007; or
- 3) Hand-delivered written comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-01” at one of the public meetings. Only those persons who are parties to the proceeding in Docket No. 2007-OE-01 and who are aggrieved by the order in that docket may apply for rehearing pursuant to FPA section 313.”

Similarly, ordering Paragraph D of the current order provides guidance concerning the Southwest Area National Corridor:

“The Department grants party status in Docket No. 2007-OE-02 to all persons who either:

- 1) Filed comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-02” electronically at <http://nietc.anl.gov> on or before July 6, 2007;
- 2) Mailed written comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-02” to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, OE-20, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585, that were received on or before July 6, 2007; or
- 3) Hand-delivered written comments marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-02” at one of the public meetings. Only those persons who are parties to the proceeding in Docket No. 2007-OE-02 and who are aggrieved by the order in that docket may apply for rehearing pursuant to FPA section 313.”

## **21. How do eligible parties file a request for a rehearing?**

Any application for rehearing must be either:

- 1) Mailed or hand-delivered to the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, OE-20, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585; or
- 2) Faxed to 202-586-8008.

Further, applications for rehearing of the order in Docket No. 2007-OE-01 must be marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-01.” Applications for rehearing of the order in Docket No. 2007-OE-02 must be marked “Attn: Docket No. 2007-OE-02.” Applications for rehearing must be received by 5:00 p.m., Eastern time [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS FROM DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]. The Department will not accept responses to requests for rehearing.

Note: Delivery of U.S. Postal Service mail to DOE continues to be delayed by several weeks due to security screening; therefore, applicants who choose to mail their rehearing applications are encouraged to use express mail.

**22. If I am not a party to the proceedings but still want to submit comments to DOE, how can I do so?**

Any individual or party is always welcome to communicate with DOE on issues of concern to them. Communications concerning these National Corridors should be addressed to:

Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, OE-20  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20585

If you wish, mark your envelope “ATTN: National Corridors.”

**23. Are more data and information available beyond that released in the two National Corridor designations?**

DOE has included substantial amounts of data and information in the body of the *Federal Register* Notice, and in the May 7 *Federal Register* Notice and its associated appendices. It has also made data and information pertaining to the 2006 Congestion Study available on its website, <http://nietc.anl.gov>.

**24. Where do I get more information?**

Please visit the DOE Office of Electric Delivery and Energy Reliability website at <http://nietc.anl.gov> for further information. You may also sign up for automatic updates via email at this website. In addition, you may contact David Meyer in DOE’s Office of Electric Delivery and Energy Reliability at 202-586-1411 or at [david.meyer@hq.doe.gov](mailto:david.meyer@hq.doe.gov).

All press inquiries should be directed to DOE's Office of Public Affairs, at (202) 586-4940.

**25. Where are the two National Corridors located?**

**A. Mid-Atlantic Area National Corridor (Docket No. 2007-OE-01)**

The affected States are: Delaware, Washington DC, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. The National Corridor’s boundaries coincide with county boundaries. The counties included in the National Corridor, by State, are:

**DELAWARE**

Kent County  
New Castle County  
Sussex County

**WASHINGTON, DC**

**MARYLAND**

Allegany County  
Anne Arundel County  
Baltimore City  
Baltimore County  
Calvert County  
Caroline County  
Carroll County  
Cecil County  
Charles County  
Dorchester County  
Frederick County  
Garrett County  
Harford County  
Howard County  
Kent County  
Montgomery County  
Prince George's County  
Queen Anne's County  
St. Mary's County  
Talbot County  
Washington County  
Wicomico County  
Worcester County

**NEW JERSEY**

Atlantic County  
Bergen County  
Burlington County  
Camden County  
Cape May County  
Cumberland County  
Essex County  
Gloucester County  
Hudson County  
Hunterdon County  
Mercer County  
Middlesex County

Monmouth County  
Morris County  
Ocean County  
Passaic County  
Salem County  
Somerset County  
Sussex County  
Union County  
Warren County

**NEW YORK**

Alba County  
Bronx County  
Broome County  
Cayuga County  
Chenango County  
Clinton County  
Columbia County  
Delaware County  
Dutchess County  
Erie County  
Franklin County  
Fulton County  
Genesee County  
Greene County  
Herkimer County  
Jefferson County  
Kings County  
Lewis County  
Livingston County  
Madison County  
Monroe County  
Montgomery County  
Nassau County  
New York County  
Niagara County  
Oneida County  
Onondaga County  
Ontario County  
Orange County  
Orleans County  
Otsego County  
Putnam County  
Queens County  
Rensselaer County  
Richmond County

Rockland County  
St. Lawrence County  
Saratoga County  
Schenectady County  
Schoharie County  
Seneca County  
Suffolk County  
Sullivan County  
Ulster County  
Wayne County  
Westchester County  
Wyoming County

**OHIO**

Belmont County  
Carroll County  
Columbiana County  
Harrison County  
Jefferson County  
Monroe County  
Stark County

**PENNSYLVANIA**

Adams County  
Allegheny County  
Armstrong County  
Beaver County  
Bedford County  
Berks County  
Blair County  
Bradford County  
Bucks County  
Butler County  
Cambria County  
Carbon County  
Centre County  
Chester County  
Clearfield County  
Clinton County  
Columbia County  
Cumberland County  
Dauphin County  
Delaware County  
Fayette County  
Franklin County  
Fulton County

Greene County  
Huntingdon County  
Indiana County  
Jefferson County  
Juniata County  
Lackawanna County  
Lancaster County  
Lebanon County  
Lehigh County  
Luzerne County  
Mifflin County  
Monroe County  
Montgomery County  
Montour County  
Northampton County  
Northumberland County  
Perry County  
Philadelphia County  
Pike County  
Schuylkill County  
Snyder County  
Somerset County  
Susquehanna County  
Union County  
Wayne County  
Washington County  
Westmoreland County  
Wyoming County  
York County

**VIRGINIA**

Arlington County  
Clarke County  
Culpeper County  
Fairfax County  
Fauquier County  
Frederick County  
Loudon County  
Madison County  
Page County  
Prince William County  
Rappahannock County  
Rockingham County  
Shenandoah County  
Stafford County  
Warren County

City of Alexandria  
City of Harrisonburg  
City of Fairfax  
City of Falls Church  
City of Manassas  
City of Manassas Park  
City of Winchester

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Barbour County  
Berkeley County  
Boone County  
Braxton County  
Brooke County  
Calhoun County  
Clay County  
Doddridge County  
Gilmer County  
Grant County  
Hampshire County  
Hancock County  
Hardy County  
Harrison County  
Jackson County  
Jefferson County  
Kanawha County  
Lewis County  
Marion County  
Marshall County  
Mason County  
Mineral County  
Monongalia County  
Morgan County  
Nicholas County  
Ohio County  
Pendleton County  
Pleasants County  
Pocahontas County  
Preston County  
Putnam County  
Randolph County  
Ritchie County  
Roane County  
Taylor County  
Tucker County  
Tyler County

Upshur County  
Webster County  
Wetzel County  
Wirt County  
Wood County

**B. Southwest Area National Corridor (Docket No. 2007-OE-02)**

The affected States are Arizona and California. The National Corridor's boundaries coincide with county boundaries. The counties included in the National Corridor, by State, are:

**ARIZONA**

La Paz County  
Maricopa County  
Yuma County

**CALIFORNIA**

Imperial County  
Kern County  
Los Angeles County  
Orange County  
Riverside County  
San Bernardino County  
San Diego County