Alternatives Considered but Not Proposed For Detailed Study
"Purple Corridors"

Sub-segment	Reference Points	Explanation (Basis for no further consideration at this time)
Segment 1 East Windstar to Aeolus		
Thunder Basin	1,1Ea, 1Eb	• Follows less steep terrain. • However, closely parallels historic trail • Crosses US Forest Service land.
Medicine Bow	1Eb, 2	• More direct corridor. • However, located further from wind resources serviced by the proposed alternative. • This alternative is in closer proximity to biological resources having conservation practices with stipulations that limit/restrict seasonal presence and proximity of disturbance (sage grouse).
Segment 2 Aeolus to Creston		
Seven Mile	2, 2b, 2c	• This alternative would cross a planned wind farm. • Operational integrity of transmission line and wind farm are in conflict with one another.
Rawlins	2d, 2f	• Stays within Section 368 Energy Act Corridor and existing utility corridor. • However, the alternative could not reasonably avoid existing infrastructure (oil and gas wells). • This alternative is in closer proximity to biological resources having conservation practices with stipulations that limit/restrict seasonal presence and proximity of disturbance (sage grouse).
	2h, 2i	• Stays within Section 368 Energy Act Corridor and existing utility corridor. • However, the alternative could not reasonably avoid existing infrastructure (oil and gas wells). • This alternative is in closer proximity to biological resources having conservation practices with stipulations that limit/restrict seasonal presence and proximity of disturbance (sage grouse).
Segment 3 Creston to Jim Bridger		
Tipton	3, 3b, 4	• Stays within the Section 368 Energy Act Corridor and existing utility corridor. • However, the alternative could not reasonably avoid existing infrastructure (oil and gas wells) and other surface disturbances.
Segment 4 Jim Bridger to Populus		
Kemmerer	4a, 4d, 4e	• Stays within more Section 368 Energy Act Corridor. • However, this alternative is at least six miles longer than the proposed alternative. • This alternative uses less of the existing 345kV corridor. • This alternative is in closer proximity to biological resources having conservation practices with stipulations that limit/restrict seasonal presence and proximity of disturbance (sage grouse, elk winter range and calving areas). •

Sub-segment	Reference Points	Explanation (Basis for no further consideration at this time)
	4f, 4g	• This alternative stays along more of the existing 345 corridor, but does not avoid resource concerns. • This alternative is in close proximity to high value National Historic Trails.
Segment 5 Populus to Borah		
Deep Creek	5a, 5c, 5d	• This alternative avoids VRM Class II areas. • However, it is considerably longer.
	5b, 5e	• This alternative is shorter. • However it would create a second corridor across visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas.
Segment 6 Borah to Midpoint		
No alternatives warrant consideration in this segment due to no new construction. Line will be "re-energized" to 500kV.		
Segment 7 Populus to Cedar Hill		
Deep Creek	7a, 7b, 7d	• This alternative avoids VRM Class II areas. • However, it is considerably longer.
Burley	7h, 7n, 7s	• This alternative is longer. • This alternative passes through irrigated agricultural lands (primarily center pivot).
	7m, 7p, 7q, 7t, 7s	• This alternative is longer. • This alternative passes through irrigated agricultural lands (primarily center pivot)
	7m, 7p, 7o, 7q,	• This alternative passes through fewer agricultural areas. • However, it is longer
	7p, 7q	• This alternative passes through fewer agricultural areas. • However, it is longer
	5, 7r, 7q, 7s	• This is the most direct alternative. • However, it crosses US Forest Service lands in multiple locations. • This alternative is in closer proximity to biological resources having conservation practices with stipulations that limit/restrict seasonal presence and proximity of disturbance (sage grouse).
Segment 8 Midpoint to Hemingway		
North Snake River	8, 8d	• Stays within the Section 368 Energy Act Corridor and existing utility corridor. • However, this alternative has multiple crossings of the Snake River. • This alternative has additional impacts from crossing visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas.
	8a, 8c	• This alternative has multiple crossings of the Snake River. • This alternative is in close proximity to developed land uses (agricultural residential, commercial). • This alternative is primarily a greenfield corridor.
	8b, 8e	• This alternative is primarily a greenfield corridor. • This alternative has additional impacts from crossing visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas.

Sub-segment	Reference Points	Explanation (Basis for no further consideration at this time)
	8b, 8f	• This alternative is primarily a greenfield corridor. • This alternative is longer but avoids crossing visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas.
Segment 9 Cedar Hill to Hemingway		
Magic Valley	9, 9e, 9f	• This alternative passes through irrigated agricultural lands (primarily center pivot). • This alternative is in close proximity to rural residential development.
	9c, 9d, 9e, 9g, 9h	• This alternative stays within the Section 368 Energy Act Corridor and existing utility corridor over the majority of its length. • However, it is considerably longer.
Saylor Creek	9b, 9m	• Alternative avoids the constriction point between Saylor Creek Bombing Range and Bruneau Dunes State Park. • This alternative does not follow the Section 368 Energy Act Corridor. • This alternative is considerably longer. • This alternative has additional impacts from crossing visual resource management (VRM) Class II areas and Bruneau Canyon
Segment 10 Cedar Hill to Midpoint		
Minidoka	10a, 10c	• Follows existing transmission line, but does not avoid Minidoka National Monument.
Segment 7 and 9 – I-84 and Cedar Hill Substation Alternative		
Burley/Magic Valley/Saylor Creek	7g, 7i, CH2 (alternate location for Cedar Hill Substation), 9g	• Adjacent to existing transportation corridor. • However, this alternative may affect developed land uses (residential, agricultural, industrial and commercial) along the transportation corridor. • This alternative would require re-location of the Cedar Hill substation.