[3125-01-M]

Title 40—Protection of Environment

CHAPTER V—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT—REGULATIONS

Implementation of Procedural Provisions

AGENCY: Council on Environmental Quality, Exective Office of the President.

ACTION: Final regulations.

SUMMARY: These final regulations establish uniform procedures for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. The regulations would accomplish three principal aims: to reduce paperwork, to reduce delays, and to produce better decisions. The regulations were issued in draft form in 43 FR 25230-25247 (June 9, 1978) for public review and comment and reflect changes made as a result of this process.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 30, 1979. (See exceptions listed in § 1506.12.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nicholas C. Yost, General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, 722 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20006 (telephone number 202-633-7032 or 202-395-5750).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. PURPOSE

We are publishing these final regulations to implement the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. Their purpose is to provide all Federal agencies with efficient, uniform procedures for translating the law into practical action. We expect the new regulations to accomplish three principal aims: To reduce paperwork, to reduce delays, and at the same time to produce better decisions which further the national policy to protect and enhance the quality of the human environment.

The Council on Environmental Quality is responsbile for overseeing Federal efforts to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). In 1970, the Council issued Guidelines for the preparation of environmental impact statements (EISs) under Executive Order 11514 (1970). The 1973 revised Guidelines are now in effect. Although the Council conceived of the Guidelines as non-discretionary standards for agency decisionmaking, some agencies viewed them as advisory only. Similarly, courts differed over the weight which should be accorded the Guidelines in evaluating agency compliance with the statute.

The result has been an evolution of inconsistent agency practices and interpretations of the law. The lack of a uniform, government-wide approach to implementing NEPA has impeded Federal coordination and made it more difficult for those outside government to understand and participate in the environmental review process. It has also caused unnecessary duplication, delay and paperwork.

Moreover, by the terms of Executive Order 11514, the Guidelines were confined to Subsection (C) of Section 102(2) of NEPA—the requirement for environmental impact statements. The Guidelines did not address Section 102(2)'s other important provisions for agency planning and decisionmaking. Consequently, the environmental impact statement has tended to become an end in itself, rather than a means to making better decisions. Environmental impact statements have often failed to establish the link between what is learned through the NEPA process and how the information can contribute to decisions which further national environmental policies and goals.

To correct these problems, the President issued Executive Order 11991 on May 24, 1977 directing the Council to issue the regulations. The Executive Order was based on the President's Constitutional and statutory authority, including NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act, and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The President has a constitutional duty to insure that the laws are faithfully executed (U.S. Const. art. II, sec. 3), which may be delegated to appropriate officials. (Title 3 U.S.C., Sec. 301). In signing Executive Order 11991, the President delegated this authority to the agency created by NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality.

In accordance with this directive, the Council's regulations are binding on all Federal agencies, replace some seventy different sets of agency regulations, and provide uniform standards applicable throughout the Federal government for conducting environmental reviews. The regulations also establish formal guidance from the Council on the requirements of NEPA for use by the courts in interpreting this law. The regulations address all nine subdivisions of Section 102(2) of the Act, rather than just the EIS provision covered by the Guidelines. Finally, as mandated by President Carter's Executive Order, the regulations are

"* * * designed to make the environmental impact statement more useful to decisionmakers and the public; and to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data, in order to emphasize the need to focus on real environmental issues and alternatives."

2. SUMMARY OF MAJOR INNOVATIONS IN THE REGULATIONS

Following this mandate in developing the new regulations, we have kept in mind the threefold objective of less paperwork, less delay, and better decisions.

A. REDUCING PAPERWORK

These regulations reduce paperwork requirements on agencies of government. Neither NEPA nor these regulations impose paperwork requirements on the public.

i. *Reducing the length of environmental impact statements.* Agencies are directed to write concise EISs (§ 1502.2(c)), which normally shall be less than 150 pages, or, for proposals of unusual scope or complexity, 300 pages (§ 1502.7).

ii. *Emphasizing real alternatives.* The regulations stress that the environmental analysis is to concentrate on alternatives, which are the heart of the process (§§ 1502.14, 1502.16); to treat peripheral matters briefly (§ 1502.2(b)); and to avoid accumulating masses of background data which tend to obscure the important issues (§§ 1502.1, 1502.15).

iii. *Using an early "scoping" process to determine what the important issues are.* A new "scoping" procedure is established to assist agencies in deciding what the central issues are, how long the EIS shall be, and how the responsibility for the EIS will be allocated among the lead agency and cooperating agencies (§ 1501.7). The scoping process is to begin as early in the NEPA process as possible—in most cases, shortly after the decision to prepare an EIS—and shall be integrated with other planning.

iv. *Using plain language.* The regulations strongly advocate writing in plain language (§ 1502.8).

v. *Following a clear format.* The regulations recommend a standard format intended to eliminate repetitive discussion, stress the major conclusions, highlight the areas of controversy, and focus on the issues to be resolved (§ 1502.10).

vi. *Requiring summaries of environmental impact statements.* The regulations are intended to make the document more usable by more people (§ 1502.12). With some exceptions, a summary may be circulated in lieu of the environmental impact statement if the latter is unusually long (§ 1502.19).

vii. *Eliminating duplication.* Under the regulations Federal agencies may prepare EISs jointly with State and local units of government which have "little NEPA" requirements (§ 1506.2).

They may also adopt another Federal agency's EIS (§ 1506.3).

viii. *Consistent terminology.* The regulations provide uniform terminology for the implementation of NEPA (§ 1508.1). For instance, the CEQ term "environmental assessment" will replace the following (nonexhaustive) list of comparable existing agency procedures: "survey" (Corps of Engineers), "environmental analysis" (Forest Service), "normal or special clearance" (HUD), "environmental analysis report" (Interior), and "marginal impact statement" (HEW) (§ 1508.9).

ix. *Incorporation by reference.* Agencies are encouraged to incorporate material by reference into the environmental impact statement when the material is not of central importance and when it is readily available for public inspection (§ 1502.21).

x. *Specific comments.* The regulations require that comments on environmental impact statements be as specific as possible to facilitate a timely and informative exchange of views among the lead agency and other agencies and the public (§ 1503.3).

xi. *Simplified procedures for making minor changes in environmental impact statements.* If comments on a draft environmental impact statement require only minor changes or factual corrections, an agency may circulate the comments, responses thereto, and the changes from language in the draft statement, rather than rewriting and circulating the entire document as a final environmental impact statement (§ 1506.4).

xii. *Combining documents.* Agencies may combine environmental impact statements and other environmental documents with any other document used in agency planning and decisionmaking (§ 1506.4).

xiii. *Reducing paperwork involved in reporting requirements.* The regulations will reduce the paperwork involved in reporting requirements as summarized below. In comparing the requirements under the existing Guidelines and the new CEQ regulations, it should be kept in mind that the regulations cover Sections 102(2)(A) through (I) of NEPA, while the Guidelines cover only Section 102(2)(C) (environmental impact statements). CEQ's new regulations will also replace more than 70 different existing sets of individual agency regulations. (Under the new regulations each agency will only issue implementing procedures to explain how the regulations apply to its particular policies and programs (§ 1507.3).)

Existing requirements (Applicable guidelines sections are noted)	New requirements (Applicable regulations sections are noted)
Assessment (optional under Guidelines on a case-by-case basis; currently required, however, by most major agencies in practice or in procedures) Sec. 1500.6.	*Assessment* (limited requirement: not required where there would not be environmental effects or where an EIS will be required) Secs. 1501.3, .4.
Notice of intent to prepare impact statement Sec. 1500.6.	*Notice of intent* to prepare EIS and commence scoping process Sec. 1501.7.
Quarterly list of notices of intent Sec. 1500.6.	Requirement abolished.
Negative determination (decision not to prepare impact statement) Sec. 1500.6.	*Finding of no significant impact* Sec. 1501.4.
Quarterly list of negative determinations Sec. 1500.6.	Requirement abolished.
Draft EIS Sec. 1500.7	*Draft EIS* Sec. 1502.9.
Final EIS Sec. 1500.6, .10	*Final EIS* Sec. 1502.9.
EISs on non-agency legislative reports ("agency reports on legislation initiated elsewhere") Sec. 1500.5(a)(1).	Requirment abolished.
Agency report to CEQ on implementation experience Sec. 1500.14(b).	Requirement abolished.
Agency report to CEQ on substantive guidance Secs. 1500.6(c), .14.	Requirement abolished.
Record of decision (no Guideline provision but required by many agencies' own procedures and in a wide range of cases generally under the Administrative Procedure Act and OMB Circular A-95, Part I, Sec. 6(c) and (d), Part II, Sec. 5(b)(4)).	*Record of decision* (brief explanation of decision based in part on EIS that was prepared; no circulation requirement) Sec. 1505.2.

B. REDUCING DELAY

The measures to reduce delay are listed below.

i. *Time limits on the NEPA process.* The regulations encourage lead agencies to set time limits on the NEPA process and require that time limits be set when requested by an applicant (§§ 1501.7(b)(2), 1501.8).

ii. *Integrating EIS requirements with other environmental review requirements.* Often the NEPA process and the requirements of other laws proceed separately, causing delay. The regulations provide for all agencies with jurisdiction over a proposal to cooperate so that all reviews may be conducted simultaneously (§§ 1501.7, 1502.25).

iii. *Integrating the NEPA process into early planning.* If environmental review is tacked on to the end of the planning process, then the process is prolonged, or else the EIS is written to justify a decision that has already been made and genuine consideration may not be given to environmental factors. The regulations require agencies to integrate the NEPA process with other planning at the earliest possible time (§ 1501.2).

iv. *Emphasizing interagency cooperation before the EIS is drafted.* The regulations emphasize that other agencies should begin cooperating with the lead agency before the EIS is prepared in order to encourage early resolution of differences (§ 1501.6). We hope that early cooperation among affected agencies in preparing a draft EIS will produce a better draft and will reduce delays caused by unnecessarily late criticism.

v. *Swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes.* When agencies differ as to who shall take the lead in preparing an EIS, or when none is willing to take the lead, the regulations provide a means for prompt resolution of the dispute (§ 1501.5).

vi. *Preparing EISs on programs and not repeating the same material in project specific EISs.* Material common to many actions may be covered in a broad EIS, and then through "tiering" may be summarized and incorporated by reference rather than reiterated in each subsequent EIS (§§ 1502.4, 1502.20, 1502.21, 1508.28).

vii. *Legal delays.* The regulations provide that litigation, if any, should come at the end rather than in the middle of the process (§ 1500.3).

viii. *Accelerated procedures for legislative proposals.* The regulations provide accelerated, simplified procedures for environmental analysis of legislative proposals, to fit better with Congressional schedules (§ 1506.8).

ix. *Categorical exclusions.* Under the regulations, categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment may be excluded from environmental review requirements (§ 1508.4).

x. *Finding of no significant impact.* If an action has not been categorically excluded from environmental review under § 1508.4, but nevertheless will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, the agency will issue a finding of no significant impact as a basis for not preparing an EIS (§ 1508.13).

C. BETTER DECISIONS

Most of the features described above will help to improve decisionmaking. This, of course, is the fundamental purpose of the NEPA process the end to which the EIS is a means. Section 101 of NEPA sets forth the substantive requirements of the Act, the policy to be implemented by the "action-forcing" procedures of Section 102. These procedures must be tied to their intended purpose, otherwise they are indeed useless paperwork and wasted time.

i. *Recording in the decision how the EIS was used.* The new regulations re-

quire agencies to produce a concise public record, indicating how the EIS was used in arriving at the decision (§ 1505.2). This record of decision must indicate which alternative (or alternatives) considered in the EIS is preferable on environmental grounds. Agencies may also discuss preferences among alternatives based on relevant factors including economic and technical considerations and agency statutory missions. Agencies should identify those "essential considerations of national policy", including factors not related to environmental quality, which were balanced in making the decision.

ii. *Insure follow-up of agency decisions.* When an agency requires environmentally protective mitigation measures in its decisions, the regulations provide for means to ensure that these measures are implemented and monitored (§ 1505.3).

iii. *Securing more accurate, professional documents.* The regulations require accurate documents as the basis for sound decisions. As provided by Section 102(2)(A) of NEPA, the documents must draw upon all the appropriate disciplines from the natural and social sciences, plus the environmental design arts (§ 1502.6). The lead agency is responsible for the professional integrity of environmental documents and requirements are established to ensure this result, such as special provisions regarding the use of data provided by an applicant (§ 1506.5). A list of people who helped prepare documents, and their professional qualifications, shall be included in the EIS to encourage professional responsibility and ensure that an interdisciplinary approach was followed (§ 1502.17).

The regulations establish a streamlined process, and one which has a broader purpose than the Guidelines they replace. The Guidelines emphasized a single document, the EIS, while the regulations emphasize the entire NEPA process, from early planning through assessment and EIS preparation through decisions and provisions for follow-up. They are designed to gear means to ends—to ensure that the action-forcing procedures of Section 102(2) of NEPA are used by agencies to fulfill the requirements of the Congressionally mandated policy set out in Section 101 of the Act. Furthermore, the regulations are uniform, applying in the same way to all Federal agencies, although each agency will develop its own procedures for implementing the regulations. With these new regulations we seek to carry out as faithfully as possible the original intent of Congress in enacting NEPA.

3. Background

The Council was greatly assisted by the hundreds of people who responded to our call for suggestions on how to make the NEPA process work better. In all, the Council sought the views of almost 12,000 private organizations, individuals, State and local agencies, and Federal agencies. In public hearings which we held in June 1977, we invited testimony from a broad array of public officials, organizations, and private citizens, affirmatively involving NEPA's critics as well as its friends.

Among those represented were the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which coordinated testimony from business; the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, which did so for labor; the National Conference of State Legislatures, for State and local governments; and the Natural Resources Defense Council, for environmental groups. Scientists, scholars, and the general public were also represented.

There was broad consensus among these diverse witnesses. All, without exception, expressed the view that NEPA benefited the public. Equally widely shared was the view that the process had become needlessly cumbersome and should be streamlined. Witness after witness said that the length and detail of EISs made it difficult to distinguish the important from the trivial. The degree of unanimity about the good and bad points of the NEPA process was such that at one point an official spokesperson for the oil inductry rose to say that he adopted in its entirety the presentation of the President of the Sierra Club.

After the hearings we culled the record to organize both the problems and the solutions proposed by witnesses into a 38-page "NEPA Hearing Questionnaire." The questionnaire was sent to all witnesses, every State governor, all Federal agencies, and everyone who responded to an invitation in the FEDERAL REGISTER. We received more than 300 replies, from a broad cross section of groups and individuals. By the comments we received from respondents we gauged our success in faithfully presenting the results of the public hearings. One commenter, an electric utility official, said that for the first time in his life he knew the government was listening to him, because all the suggestions made at the hearing turned up in the questionnaire. We then collated all the responses for use in drafting the regulations.

We also met with every agency of the Federal government to discuss what should be in the regulations. Guided by these extensive interactions with government agencies and the public, we prepared draft regulations which were circulated for comment to all Federal agencies in December, 1977. We then studied agency comments in detail, and consulted numerous Federal officials with special experience in implementing the Act. Informal redrafts were circulated to the agencies with greatest experience in preparing environmental impact statements.

At the same time that Federal agencies were reviewing the early draft, we continued to meet with, listen to, and brief members of the public, including representatives of business, labor, State and local governments, environmental groups, and others. Their views were considered during this early stage of the rulemaking. We also considered seriously and proposed in our regulations virtually every major recommendation made by the Commission on Federal Paperwork and the General Accounting Office in their recent studies on the environmental impact statement process. The studies by these two independent bodies were among the most detailed and informed reviews of the paperwork abuses in the impact statement process. In many cases, such as streamlining intergovernmental coordination, the proposed regulations go further than their recommendations.

On June 9, 1978 the regulations were proposed in draft form (43 FR at pages 25230-25247) and the Council announced that the period for public review of and comment on the draft regulations would extend for two months until August 11, 1978. During this period, the Council received almost 500 written comments on the draft regulations, most of which contained specific and detailed suggestions for improving them. These comments were again broadly representative of the various interests which are involved in the NEPA process.

The Council carefully reevaluated the regulations in light of the comments we received. The Council's staff read and analyzed each of the comments and developed recommendations for responding to them. A clear majority of the comments were favorable and expressed strong support for the draft regulations as a major improvement over the existing Guidelines. Some comments suggested further improvements through changes in the wording of specific provisions. A smaller number expressed more general concerns about the approach and direction taken by the regulations. In continuing efforts to resolve issues raised during the review, staff members conducted numerous meetings with individuals and groups who had offered comments and with representatives of affected Federal agencies. This process continued until most concerns with the proposals were alleviated or satisfied.

When, after discussions and review the Council determined that the comments raised valid concerns, we altered the regulations accordingly. When we

decided that reasons supporting the regulations were stronger than those for challenging them, we left the regulations unchanged. Part 4 of the Preamble describes section by section the more significant comments we received, and how we responded to them.

4. COMMENTS AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

PART 1500—PURPOSE, POLICY AND MANDATE

Comments on § 1500.3: Mandate. Section 1500.3 of the draft regulations stated that it is the Council's intention that judicial review of agency compliance with the regulations not occur before an agency has filed the final environmental impact statement, causes irreparable injury, or has made a finding of no significant impact. Some comments expressed concern that court action might be commenced under this provision following a finding of no significant impact which was only tentative and did not represent a final determination that an environmental impact statement would not be prepared.

The Council made two changes in response to this concern: First, the word "final" was inserted before the phrase "finding of no significant impact." Thus, the Council eliminated the possibility of interpreting this phrase to mean a preliminary or tentative determination. Second, a clarification was added to this provision to indicate the Council's intention that judicial review would be appropriate only where the finding of no significant impact would lead to action affecting the environment.

Several comments on § 1500.3 expressed concern that agency action could be invalidated in court proceedings as the result of trivial departures from the requirements established by the Council's regulations. This is not the Council's intention. Accordingly, a sentence was added to indicate the Council's intention that a trivial departure from the regulations not give rise to an independent cause of action under law.

PART 1501—NEPA AND AGENCY PLANNING

Comments on § 1501.2: Apply NEPA early in process. Section (d)(1) of § 1501.2 stated that Federal agencies should take steps to ensure that private parties and State and local entities initiate environmental studies as soon as Federal involvement in their proposals can be foreseen. Several commenters raised questions concerning the authority of a Federal agency to require that environmental studies be initiated by private parties, for example, even before that agency had become officially involved in the review of the proposal.

The Council's intention in this provision is to ensure that environmental factors are considered at an early stage in the planning process. The Council recognizes that the authority of Federal agencies may be limited before their duty to review proposals initiated by parties outside the Federal government officially begins. Accordingly, the Council altered subsection (d)(1) of § 1501.2 to require that in such cases Federal agencies must ensure that "[p]olicies or designated staff are available to advise potential applicants of studies or other information foreseeably required by later Federal action." The purpose of the amended provision is to assure the full cooperation and support of Federal agencies for efforts by private parties and State and local entities in making an early start on studies for proposals that will eventually be reviewed by the agencies.

Comments on § 1501.3: When to prepare an environmental assessment. One commenter asked whether an environmental assessment would be required where an agency had already decided to prepare an environmental impact statement. This is not the Council's intention. To clarify this point, the Council added a sentence to this provision stating that an assessment is not necessary if the agency has decided to prepare an environmental impact statement.

Comments on § 1501.5: Lead agencies. The Council's proposal was designed to insure the swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes. Section 1501.5 of the draft regulations established procedures for resolving disagreements among agencies over which of them must take the lead in preparing an environmental impact statement. Under subsection (d) of this section, persons and governmental entities substantially affected by the failure of Federal agencies to resolve this question may request these agencies in writing to designate a lead agency forthwith. If this request has not been met "within a reasonable period of time," subsection (e) authorizes such persons and governmental entities to petition the Council for a resolution of this issue.

Several comments objected to the phrase "within a reasonable time" because it was vague, and left it uncertain when concerned parties could file a request with the Council. The comments urged that a precise time period be fixed instead. The Council adopted this suggestion and substituted 45 days for the phrase "within a reasonable period of time." With this change, the regulations require that a lead agency be designated, if necessary by the Council, within a fixed period following a request from concerned parties that this be done.

Several commenters suggested that the Council take responsibility for designating lead agencies in every case to reduce delay. These commenters recommended that all preliminary steps be dropped in favor of immediate Council action whenever the lead agency issue arose.

The Council determined, however, that individual agencies are in the best position to decide these questions and should be given the opportunity to do so. In view of its limited resources, the Council does not have the capability to make lead agency designations for all proposals. As a result of these factors, the Council determined not to alter this provision.

Several commenters opposed the concept of joint lead agencies authorized by subsection (b) of this section, particularly where two or more of the agencies are Federal. These commenters expressed doubt that Federal agencies could cooperate in such circumstances and stated their view that the environmental review process will only work where one agency is given primary responsibility for conducting it.

In the Council's judgment, however, the designation of joint lead agencies may be the most efficient way to approach the NEPA process where more than one agency plays a significant role in reviewing proposed actions. The Council believes that Federal agencies should have the option to become joint lead agencies in such cases.

Comments on § 1501.6: Cooperating agencies. The Council developed proposals to emphasize interagency cooperation before the environmental impact statement was prepared rather than comments on a completed document. Section 1501.6 stated that agencies with jurisdiction by law over a proposal would be required to become "cooperating agencies" in the preparation of an EIS should the lead agency request that they do so. Under subsection (b) of this provision, "cooperating agencies" could be required to assume responsibility for developing information and analysis within their special competence and to make staff support available to enhance the interdisciplinary capability of the lead agency.

Several comments pointed out that principal authority for environmental matters resides in a small number of agencies in the Federal government. Concern was expressed that these few agencies could be inundated with requests for cooperation in the preparation of EISs and, if required to meet these requests in every case, drained of resources required to fulfill other statutory mandates.

The Council determined that this was a valid concern. Accordingly, it added a new subsection (c) to this sec-

tion which authorizes a cooperating agency to decline to participate or otherwise limit its involvement in the preparation of an EIS where existing program commitments preclude more extensive cooperation.

Subsection (b)(5) of this section provided that a lead agency shall finance the major activities or analyses it requests from cooperating agencies to the extent available funds permit. Several commenters expressed opposition to this provision on grounds that a lead agency should conserve its funds for the fulfillment of its own statutory mandate rather than disburse funds for analyses prepared by other agencies.

The same considerations apply, however, to cooperating agencies. All Federal agencies are subject to the mandate of the National Environmental Policy Act. This provision of the regulations allows a lead agency to facilitate compliance with this statute by funding analyses prepared by cooperating agencies "to the extent available funds permit." In the Council's view, this section will enhance the ability of a lead agency to meet all of its obligations under law.

Section 1501.7: Scoping. The new concept of "scoping" was intended by the Council and perceived by the great preponderance of the commenters as a means for early identification of what are and what are not the important issues deserving of study in the EIS. Section 1501.7 of the draft regulations established a formal mechanism for agencies, in consultation with affected parties, to identify the significant issues which must be discussed in detail in an EIS, to identify the issues that do not require detailed study, and to allocate responsibilities for preparation of the document. The section provided that a scoping meeting must be held when practicable. One purpose of scoping is to encourage affected parties to identify the crucial issues raised by a proposal before an environmental impact statement is prepared in order to reduce the possibility that matters of importance will be overlooked in the early stages of a NEPA review. Scoping is also designed to ensure that agency resources will not be spent on analysis of issues which none concerned believe are significant. Finally, since scoping requires the lead agency to allocate responsibility for preparing the EIS among affected agencies and to identify other environmental review and consultation requirements applicable to the project, it will set the stage for a more timely, coordinated, and efficient Federal review of the proposal.

The concept of scoping was one of the innovations in the proposed regulations most uniformly praised by members of the public ranging from business to environmentalists. There was considerable discussion of the details of implementing the concept. Some commenters objected to the formality of the scoping process, expressing the view that compliance with this provision in every case would be time-consuming, would lead to legal challenges by citizens and private organizations with objections to the agency's way of conducting the process, and would lead to paperwork since every issue raised during the process would have to be addressed to some extent in the environmental impact statement. These commenters stated further that Federal agencies themselves were in the best position to determine matters of scope, and that public participation in these decisions was unnecessary because any scoping errors that were made by such agencies could be commented upon when the draft EIS was issued (as was done in the past) and corrected in the final document. These commenters urged that scoping at least be more open-ended and flexible and that agencies be merely encouraged rather than required to undertake the process.

Other commenters said that the Council had not gone for enough in imposing uniform requirements. These commenters urged the Council to require that a scoping meeting be held in every case, rather than only when practicable; that a scoping document be issued which reflected the decisions reached during the process; and that formal procedures be established for the resolution of disagreements over scope that arise during the scoping process. These commenters felt that more stringent requirements were necessary to ensure that agencies did not avoid the process.

In developing § 1501.7, the Council sought to ensure that the benefits of scoping would be widely realized in Federal decisionmaking, but without significant disruptions for existing procedures. The Council made the process itself mandatory to guarantee that early cooperation among affected parties would be initiated in every case. However, § 1501.7 left important elements of scoping to agency discretion. After reviewing the recommendations for more flexibility on the one hand, and more formality on the other, and while making several specific changes in response to specific comments, the Council determined that the proper balance had been struck in Section 1501.7 and did not change the basic outline of this provision. The Council did accept amendments to make clear that scoping meetings were permissive and that an agency might make provision for combining its scoping process with its environmental assessment process.

Comments on § 1501.8: Time limits. Reducing delay and uncertainty by the use of time limits is one of the Council's principal changes. Section 1501.8 of the draft regulations established criteria for setting time limits for completion of the entire NEPA process or any part of the process. These criteria include the size of the proposal and its potential for environmental harm, the state of the art, the number of agencies involved, the availability of relevant information and the time required to obtain it. Under this section, if a private applicant requests a lead agency to set time limits for an EIS review, the agency must do so provided that the time limits are consistent with the purposes of NEPA and other essential considerations of national policy. If a Federal agency is the sponsor of a proposal for major action, the lead agency is encouraged to set a timetable for the EIS review.

Several commenters objected to the concept of time limits for the NEPA process. In their opinion, the uncertainties involved in an EIS review and competing demands for limited Federal resources could make it difficult for agencies to predict how much time will be required to complete environmental impact statements on major proposals. These commenters were concerned that time limits could prompt agencies to forego necessary analysis in order to meet deadlines. In their view, the concept of time limits should be dropped from the regulations in favor of more flexible "targets" or "goals" which would be set only after consultation with all concerned parties.

On the other side of the question, the Council received several comments that the provision for time limits was not strict enough. These comments expressed concern that the criteria contained in the draft regulations were vague and would not serve effectively to encourage tight timetables for rapid completion of environmental reviews. The Council was urged to strengthen this section by including definite time limits for the completion of the EIS process in every case or by providing that CEQ itself set such limits for every environmental review, and by setting time limits for the establishment of time limits.

A primary goal of the Council's regulations is to reduce delays in the EIS process. The Council recognizes the difficulties of evaluating in advance the time required to complete environmental reviews. Nevertheless, the Council believes that a provision for time limits is necessary to concentrate agencies' attention on the timely completion of environmental impact statements and to provide private applicants with reasonable certainty as to how long the NEPA process will take. Section 1501.7(c) of the regulations

allows revision of time limits if significant new circumstances (including information) arise which bear on the proposal or its impacts.

At the same time, the Council believes that precise time limits to apply uniformly across government would be unrealistic. The factors which determine the time needed to complete an environmental review are various, including the state of the art, the size and complexity of the proposal, the number of Federal agencies involved, and the presence of sensitive ecological conditions. These factors may differ significantly from one proposal to the next. The same law that applies to a Trans-Alaska pipeline may also apply to a modest federally funded building in a historic district. In the Council's judgment, individual agencies are in the best position to perform this function. The Council does not have the resources to weigh these factors for each proposal. Accordingly, the Council determined not to change these provisions of § 1501.8 of the regulations.

PART 1502—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Comments on Section 1502.5: Timing. Several commenters noted that it has become common practice in informal rulemaking for Federal agencies to issue required draft environmental impact statements at the same time that rules are issued in proposed form. These commenters expressed the view that this procedure was convenient, time-saving and consistent with NEPA, and urged that the regulations provide for it. The Council added a new subsection (d) to § 1502.5 on informal rulemaking stating that this procedure shall normally be followed.

Comments on section 1502.7: Page limits. A principal purpose of these regulations is to turn bulky, often unused EISs into short, usable documents which are in fact used. Section 1502.7 of the draft regulations provided that final environmental impact statements shall normally be less than 150 pages long and, for proposals of unusual scope or complexity, shall normally be less than 300 pages. Numerous commenters expressed strong support for the Council's decision to establish page limits for environmental impact statements.

Several commenters objected to the concept of page limits for environmental impact statements on grounds that it could constrain the thoroughness of environmental reviews. Some said that the limits were too short and would preclude essential analysis; others contended that they were too long and would encourage the inclusion of unnecessary detail. One commenter proposed a "sliding scale" for page limits; another suggested that a limitation on the number of words would be more effective than a limitation on the number of pages. A number of commenters urged that page limits be simply recommended rather than established as standards that should normally be met.

The usefulness of the NEPA process to decisionmakers and the public has been jeopardized in recent years by the length and complexity of environmental impact statements. In accordance with the President's directive, a primary objective of the regulations is to insure that these documents are clear, concise, and to the point. Numerous provisions in the regulations underscore the importance of focusing on the major issues and real choices facing federal decisionmakers and excluding less important matters from detailed study. Other sections in the regulations provide that certain technical and background materials developed during the environmental review process may be appended but need not be presented in the body of an EIS.

The Council recognizes the tension between the requirement of a thorough review of environmental issues and a limitation on the number of pages that may be devoted to the analysis. The Council believes that the limits set in the regulations are realistic and will help to achieve the goal of more succinct and useful environmental documents. The Council also determined that a limitation on the number of words in an EIS was not required for accomplishing the objective of this provision. The inclusion of the term "normally" in this provision accords Federal agencies latitude if abnormal circumstances exist.

Others suggested that page limits might result in conflict with judicial precedents on adequacy of EISs, that the proverbial kitchen sink may have to be included to insure an adequate document, whatever the length. The Council trusts and intends that this not be the case. Based on its day-to-day experience in overseeing the administration of NEPA throughout the Federal government, the Council is acutely aware that in many cases bulky EISs are not read and are not used by decisionmakers. An unread and unused document quite simply cannot achieve the purpose Congress set for it. The only way to give greater assurance that EISs will be used is to make them usable and that means making them shorter. By way of analogy, judicial opinions are themselves often models of compact treatment of complex subjects. Departmental option documents often provide brief coverage of complicated decisions. Without sacrifice of analytical rigor, we see no reason why the material to be covered in an EIS cannot normally be covered in 150 pages (or 300 pages in extraordinary circumstances).

Comments on § 1502.10: Recommended format. Section 1502.10 stated that agencies shall normally use a standard format for environmental impact statements. This provision received broad support from those commenting on the draft regulations.

As part of the recommended format, environmental impact statements would be required to describe the environmental consequences of a proposed action before they described the environment that would be affected. Many commenters felt that these elements of the EIS should be reversed so that a description of the environmental consequences of a proposal would follow rather than precede a description of the affected environment. The commenters stated their view that it would be easier for the reader to appreciate the nature and significance of environmental consequences if a description of the affected environment was presented first. The Council concurs in this view and adopted the suggested change.

Comments on § 1502.13: Purpose and need. This section of the draft regulations provided that agencies shall briefly specify—normally in one page or less—the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing alternatives for action. Many commenters stated that in some cases this analysis would require more than one page. The Council responded to these comments by deleting the one page limitation.

Comments on § 1502.14: Alternatives including the proposed action. Subsection (a) of this section of the draft regulations provided, among other things, that agencies shall rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives. This provision was strongly supported by a majority of those who commented on the provision.

A number of commenters objected to the phrase "all reasonable alternatives" on the grounds that it was unduly broad. The commenters suggested a variety of ways to narrow this requirement and to place limits on the range and type of alternatives that would have to be considered in an EIS.

The phrase "all reasonable alternatives" is firmly established in the case law interpreting NEPA. The phrase has not been interpreted to require that an infinite or unreasonable number of alternatives be analyzed. Accordingly, the Council determined not to alter this subsection of the regulations.

Subsection (c) requires Federal agencies to consider reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. Subsection (d) requires consideration of the no action alternative. A

few commenters inquired into the basis for these provisions. Subsections (c) and (d) are declaratory of existing law.

Subsection (e) of this section required Federal agencies to designate the "environmentally preferable alternative (or alternatives, if two or more are equally preferable)" and the reasons for identifying it. While the purpose of NEPA is better environmental decisionmaking, the process itself has not always successfully focused attention on this central goal. The objective of this requirement is to ensure that Federal agencies consider which course of action available to them will most effectively promote national environmental policies and goals. This provision was strongly supported in many comments on the regulations.

Some commenters noted that a wide variety of decisionmaking procedures are employed by agencies which are subject to NEPA and recommended flexibility to accommodate these diverse agency practices. In particular, the commenters recommended that agencies be given latitude to determine at what stage in the NEPA process—from the draft EIS to the record of decision—the environmentally preferable alternative would be designated.

The Council adopted this recommendation and deleted this requirement from the EIS portion of the regulations (§ 1502.14), while leaving it in § 1505.2 regarding the record of decision. Nothing in these regulations would preclude Federal agencies from choosing to identify the environmentally preferable alternative or alternatives in the environmental impact statement.

Comments on § 1502.15: Environmental consequences. Subsection (e) of this section requires an environmental impact statement to discuss energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures. One commenter asked whether the subsection would require agencies to analyze total energy costs, including possible hidden or indirect costs, and total energy benefits of proposed actions. The Council intends that the subsection be interpreted in this way.

Several commenters suggested that the regulations expressly mention the quality of the urban environment as an environmental consequence to be discussed in an environmental impact statement. The Council responded by adding a new subsection (g) to this section requiring that EISs include a discussion of urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures. Section 1502.15 has been renumbered as § 1502.16.

Comments on § 1502.17: List of preparers. Section 1502.17 provided that environmental impact statements shall identify and describe the qualifications and professional disciplines of those persons who were primarily involved in preparing the document and background analyses. This section has three principal purposes: First, Section 102(2)(A) of NEPA requires Federal agencies to "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment." The list of preparers will provide a basis for evaluating whether such a "systematic interdisciplinary approach" was used in preparing the EIS. Second, publication of a list of preparers increases accountability for the analyses appearing in the EIS and thus tends to encourage professional competence among those preparing them. Finally, publication of the list will enhance the professional standing of the preparers by giving proper attribution to their contributions, and making them a recognized part of the literature of their disciplines. This provision received broad support from those commenting on the regulations.

Some commenters felt that a list of preparers would be used as a list of witnesses by those challenging the adequacy of an EIS in court proceedings. However, this information would ordinarily be available anyway through normal discovery proceedings.

Section 1502.17 was also criticized for failing expressly to mention expertise and experience as "qualifications" for preparing environmental impact statements. The Council added these two terms to this section to insure that the term "qualifications" would be interpreted in this way.

Some commenters suggested that the list of preparers should also specify the amount of time that was spent on the EIS by each person identified. These commenters felt that such information was required as a basis for accurately evaluating whether an interdisciplinary approach had been employed. While the Council felt there was much to be said for this suggestion, it determined that the incremental benefits gained from this information did not justify the additional agency efforts that would be required to provide it.

Comments on § 1502.19: Circulation of the environmental impact statement. If an EIS is unusually long, Section 1502.19 provided, with certain exceptions, that a summary can be circulated in lieu of the entire document. Several commenters suggested that private applicants sponsoring a proposal should receive the entire environmental impact statement in every case in view of their interest and probable involvement in the NEPA process. The Council concurs and altered this provision accordingly.

Comments on § 1502.20: Tiering. Section 1502.20 encouraged agencies to tier their environmental impact statements to eliminate repetitive discussions and to focus on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. Some commenters objected to tiering on grounds that it was not required by NEPA and would add an additional unauthorized layer to the environmental review process.

Section 1502.20 authorizes tiering of EISs; it does not require that it be done. In addition, the purpose of tiering is to simplify the EIS process by providing that environmental analysis completed at a broad program level not be duplicated for site-specific project reviews. Many agencies have already used tiering successfully in their decisionmaking. In view of these and other considerations, the Council determined not to alter this provision.

Comments on § 1502.22: Incomplete or unavailable information. Section 1502.22 provided, among other things, that agencies prepare a worst case analysis of the risk and severity of possible adverse environmental impacts when it proceeds with a proposal in the face of uncertainty. This provision received strong support from many commenters.

Several commenters expressed concern that this requirement would place undue emphasis on the possible occurence of adverse environmental consequences regardless of how remote the possibility might be. In response, the Council added a phrase designed to ensure that the improbability as well as the probability of adverse environmental consequences would be discussed in worst case analyses prepared under this section.

Section 1502.22 stated that if information is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and is not known and the costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement. Some commenters inquired into the meaning of the term "costs." The Council intends for this word to be interpreted as including financial and other costs and adopted the phrase "overall costs" to convey this meaning.

PART 1503—COMMENTING

Comments on § 1503.1: Inviting comments. Section 1503.1 set forth the responsibility of Federal agencies to solicit comments on environmental impact statements. Several commenters observed that may Federal

agencies solicit comments from State and local environmental agencies through procedures established by Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 and suggested that the Council confirm this approach in the regulations. The Council adopted this suggestion by adding an appropriate paragraph to the section.

Comments on § 1503.2: Duty to comment. Section 1503.2 set forth the responsibilities of Federal agencies to comment on environmental impact statements. Several commenters suggested reinforcing the requirement that Federal agencies are subject to the same time limits as those outside the Federal government in order to avoid delays. The Council concurred in this suggestion and amended the provision accordingly. The Council was constrained from further changes by the requirement of Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA that agencies "consult with and obtain" the comments of specified other agencies.

Comments on § 1503.3: Specificity of comments. Section 1503.3 of the draft regulations elaborated upon the responsibilities of Federal agencies to comment specifically upon draft environmental impact statements prepared by other agencies. Several commenters suggested that cooperating agencies should assume a particular obligation in this regard. They noted that cooperating agencies which are themselves required independently to evaluate and/or approve the proposal at some later stage in the Federal review process are uniquely qualified to advise the lead agency of what additional steps may be required to facilitate these actions. In the opinion of these commenters, cooperating agencies should be required to provide this information to lead agencies when they comment on draft EISs so that the final EIS can be prepared with further Federal involvement in mind.

The Council adopted this suggestion and amended § 1503.3 through the addition of new subsections (c) and (d). The new subsections require cooperating agencies, in their comments on draft EISs, to specify what additional information, if any, is required for them to fulfill other applicable environmental review and consultation requirements, and to comment adequately on the site-specific effects to be expected from issuance of subsequent Federal approvals for the proposal. In addition, if a cooperating agency criticizes the proposed action, this section now requires that it specify the mitigation measures which would be necessary in order for it to approve the proposal under its independent statutory authority.

Comments on § 1504.3: Procedure for referrals and response. Several commenters noted that § 1504.3 did not establish a role for members of the public or applicants in the referral process. The Council determined that such persons and organizations were entitled to a role and that their views would be helpful in reaching a proper decision on the referral. Accordingly, the Council added subsection (e) to this section, authorizing interested persons including the applicant to submit their views on the referral, and any response to the referral, in writing to the Council.

Subsection (d) of this section provided that the Council may take one of several actions within 25 days after the referral and agency responses to the referral, if any, are received. Several commenters observed, however, that this subsection did not establish a deadline for final action by the Council in cases where additional discussions, public meetings, or negotiations were deemed appropriate. These commenters expressed concern that the absence of a deadline could lead to delays in concluding the referral process. The Council concurred. Accordingly, the Council added subsection (g) to this section which requires that specified actions be completed within 60 days.

Several commenters noted that the procedures established by Section 1504.3 may be inappropriate for referrals which involve agency determinations required by statute to be made on the record after opportunity for public hearing. The Council agrees. The Council added subsection (h) to this section requiring referrals in such cases to be conducted in a manner consistent with 5 U.S.C. 557(d). Thus, communications to agency officials who made the decision which is the subject of the referral must be made on the public record and after notice to all parties to the referral proceeding. In other words, ex parte contacts with agency decisionmakers in such cases are prohibited.

PART 1505—NEPA AND AGENCY DECISIONMAKING

Comments on Section 1501.1: Agency decisionmaking procedures. Some commenters asked whether this or other sections of the regulations would allow Federal agencies to place responsibility for compliance with NEPA in the hands of those with decisionmaking authority at the field level. Nothing in the regulations would prevent this arrangement. By delegating authority in this way, agencies can avoid multiple approvals of environmental documents and enhance the role of those most directly involved in their preparation and use. For policy oversight and quality control, an environmental quality review office at the national level can, among other things, establish general procedures and guidance for NEPA compliance, monitor agency performance through periodic review of selected environmental documents, and facilitate coordination among agency subunits involved in the NEPA process.

Comments on § 1505.2: Record of decision in those cases requiring environmental impact statements. Section 1505.2 provided that in cases where an environmental statement was prepared, the agency shall prepare a concise public record stating what its final decision was. If an environmentally preferable alternative was not selected, § 1505.2 required the record of decision to state why other specific considerations of national policy overrode those alternatives.

This requirement was the single provision most strongly supported by individuals and organizations commenting on the regulations. These commenters stated, among things, that the requirement for a record of decision would be the most significant improvement over the existing process, would procedurally link NEPA's documentation to NEPA's policy, would relate the EIS process to agency decisionmaking, would ensure that EISs are actually considered by Federal decisionmakers, and was required as sound administrative practice.

As noted above, the Council decided that agencies shall identify the environmentally preferable alternative and the reasons for identifying it in the record of decision. *See* Comments on § 1502.14. The Council's decision does not involve the preparation of additional analysis in the EIS process; it simply affects where the analysis will be presented.

Some commenters objected to the concept of a public record of decision on actions subject to NEPA review. In the Council's opinion, however, a public record of decision is essential for the effective implementation of NEPA. As previously noted, environmental impact statement preparation has too often become an end in itself with no necessary role in agency decisionmaking. One serious problem with the administration of NEPA has been the separation between an agency's NEPA process and its decisionmaking process. In too many cases bulky EISs have been prepared and transmitted but not used by the decisionmaker. The primary purpose of requiring that a decisionmaker concisely record his or her decision in those cases where an EIS has been prepared is to tie means to ends, to see that the decisionmaker considers and pays attention to what the NEPA process has shown to be an environmentally sensitive way of doing things. Other factors may, on balance, lead the decisionmaker to decide that other policies outweigh the environmental ones, but at least

the record of decision will have achieved the original Congressional purpose of ensuring that environmental factors are integrated into the agency's decisionmaking.

Some commenters expressed the opinion that it could be difficult for Federal agencies to identify the environmentally preferable alternative or alternatives because of the multitude of factors that would have to be weighed in any such determination and the subjective nature of the balancing process. By way of illustration, commenters asked: Is clean water preferable to clean air, or the preservation of prime farmland in one region preferable to the preservation of wildlife habitat in another?

In response, the Council has amended the regulations to permit agencies to identify more than one environmentally preferable alternative, regardless of whether they are "equally" preferable, as originally proposed. Moreover, the "environmentally preferable alternative" will be that alternative which best promotes the national environmental policy as expressed in Section 101 of NEPA and most specifically in Section 101(b). Section 101(a) stresses that the policy is concerned with man and nature, to see that they exist in productive harmony and that the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans are fulfilled. Section 101(c) recognizes the need for a healthy environment and each person's responsibility to contribute to it. Section 101(b) contemplates Federal actions which will enable the Nation to fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee for the environment for succeeding generations; to attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment; to preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our national heritage; and to accomplish other important goals. The Council recognizes that the identification of the environmentally preferable alternative or alternatives may involve difficult assessments in some cases. The Council determined that the benefits of ensuring that decisionmakers consider and take account of environmental factors outweigh these difficulties. To assist agencies in developing and determining environmentally preferable alternatives, commenters on impact statements may choose to provide agencies with their views on this matter.

Several commenters expressed concern that the regulations did not authorize Federal agencies to express preferences based on factors other than environmental quality. In the opinion of these commenters, this emphasis on environmental considerations was misplaced and not consistent with the factors that agencies are expected to consider in decisionmaking.

The Council responded to these comments by reference to the statute, recognizing that Title II of NEPA and especially Section 101 clearly contemplate balancing of essential considerations of national policy. We provided that agencies may discuss preferences they have among alternatives based on relevant factors, including economic and technical considerations and agency statutory mission. Agencies should identify those considerations, including factors not related to environmental quality, which were balanced in making the decision. Nothing in the final regulations precludes Federal agencies from choosing to discuss these preferences and identifying these factors in the environmental impact statement.

Some commenters objected to the word "overrode" in this provision. The language of the Act and its legislative history make clear that Federal agencies must act in an environmentally responsible fashion and not merely consider environmental factors. NEPA requires that each Federal agency use "all practicable means and measures" to protect and improve the environment "consistent with other essential considerations of national policy." Section 101(b). The Council determined to tie this provision of the regulations to NEPA's statutory provision in place of the "overrode" language.

Several commenters expressed concern that the phrase "national policy" would not allow agencies to refer to state and local policies in the record of decision. "National policy" is the phrase used by Congress in NEPA. However, in many cases specific statutory provisions require that Federal agencies adhere to or pay heed to State and local policies.

Finally, some commenters expressed concern that the requirement for a concise record of decision would involve additional agency efforts. The intention is not to require new efforts, but to see that environmental considerations are built into existing processes. Preparing such decision records is recognized as good administrative practice and the benefits of this requirement outweigh the difficulties of building environmental considerations into the decisionmaking process.

Subsection (c) of § 1505.2 states that for any mitigation adopted a monitoring and enforcement program where applicable shall be adopted and summarized in the record of decision. One commenter asked what the term "summarized" was intended to mean in this context. The Council intends this word to be interpreted as requiring a brief and concise statement describing the monitoring and enforcement program which has been adopted.

Comments on § 1505.3: Implementing the decision. Section 1505.3 provides for mitigation of adverse environmental effects. Several commenters expressed concern that this provision would grant broad authority to the lead agency for mandating that other agencies undertake and monitor mitigation measures without their consent. This is not the Council's intention and the language of the provision does not support this interpretation.

PART 1506—OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF NEPA

Comments on §1506.1: Limitations on actions during NEPA process. Section 1506.1 placed limitations on actions which can be taken before completion of the environmental review process because of the possibility of prejudicing or foreclosing important choices. Some commenters expressed concern that these limitations would impair the ability of those outside the Federal government to develop proposals for agency review and approval. Accordingly, the Council added a new paragraph (d) to this section which authorizes certain limited activities before completion of the environmental review process.

Comments on § 1506.2: Elimination of duplication with State and local procedures. This section received strong support from many commenters. Several commenters sought clarification of the procedures established by this section. It provides for coordination among Federal, State and local agencies in several distinct situations. First, subsection (a) of this section simply confirms that Federal agencies funding State programs have been authorized by Section 102(2)(D) of NEPA to cooperate with certain State agencies with statewide jurisdiction in conducting environmental reviews. Second, subsection (b) provides generally for Federal cooperation with all States in environmental reviews such as joint planning processes, joint research, joint public hearings, and joint environmental assessments. Third, subsection (c) specifically provides for Federal cooperation with those States and localities which administer "little NEPA's." The Federal agencies are directed to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and comparable State and local requirements. Approximately half the states now have some sort of environmental impact statement requirement either legislatively adopted or administratively promulgated. In these circumstances, Federal agencies are required to cooperate in fulfilling these requirements as well as those of Federal laws so that one document will comply with all applicable laws. Finally, subsection (d) provides that Federal agencies generally shall in en-

vironmental impact statements discuss any inconsistency between a proposed action and any approved State or local plan or laws, regardless of whether the latter are Federally sanctioned.

Comments on § 1506.3: Adoption. Section 1506.3 authorized one Federal agency to adopt an environmental impact statement prepared by another in prescribed circumstances, provided that the statement is circulated for public comment in the same fashion as a draft EIS. Several commenters stated their view that recirculation was unnecessary if the actions contemplated by both agencies were substantially the same. The Council concurs and added a new paragraph (b) which provides that recirculation is not required in these circumstances.

Comments on § 1506.4: Combining documents. Section 1506.4 provided for the combination of environmental documents with other agency documents. Some commenters expressed the view that this section should enumerate the types of agency documents which could be combined under this provision. The Council concluded that such a list was not necessary and that such matters were better left to agency discretion. Thus, agencies may choose to combine a regulatory analysis review document, an urban impact analysis, and final decision or option documents with environmental impact statements.

Comments on § 1506.5: Agency responsibility. NEPA is a law which imposes obligations on Federal agencies. This provision is designed to insure that those agencies meet those obligations and to minimize the conflict of interest inherent in the situation of those outside the government coming to the government for money, leases or permits while attempting impartially to analyze the environmental consequences of their getting it. § 1506.5 set forth the responsibility of Federal agencies for preparing environmental documents, and addressed the role of those outside the Federal government. As proposed, subsection (b) of this section provided that environmental impact statements shall be prepared either by Federal agencies or by parties under contract to and chosen solely by Federal agencies. The purpose of this provision is to ensure the objectivity of the environmental review process.

Some commenters expressed the view that requiring Federal agencies to be a formal party to every contract for the preparation of an environmental impact statement was not necessary to ensure objectivity so long as the contractor was chosen solely by Federal agencies. These commenters contended that a requirement for formal Federal involvement in all such contracts could cause delay. The Council concurs and deleted the phrase "under contract" from this provision.

Several commenters noted that the existing procedures for a few Federal programs are not consistent with § 1506.5. The Council recognizes that this provision will in a few cases require additional agency efforts where, for example, agencies have relied on applicants for the preparation of environmental impact statements. The Council determined that such efforts were justified by the goal of this provision.

Several commenters expressed concern that environmental information provided by private applicants would not be adequately evaluated by Federal agencies before it was used in environmental documents. Other commenters wanted to insure that applicants were free to submit information to the agencies. Accordingly, the Council amended subsection (a) to allow receipt of such information while requiring Federal agencies to independently evaluate the information submitted and to be responsible for its accuracy. In cases where the information is used in an environmental impact statement, the persons responsible for that evaluation must be identified in the list of preparers required by § 1502.17.

Several commenters expressed the view that applicants should be allowed to prepare environmental assessments. These commenters noted that the number of assessments prepared each year is far greater than the number of environmental impact statements; that such authority was necessary to ensure environmental sensitivity was built into actions, which while ultimately Federal were planned outside the Federal government; that assessments are much shorter and less complex than EISs; and that it would be considerably less difficult for Federal agencies independently to evaluate the information submitted for an environmental assessment than for an environmental impact statement.

The Council concurs and has added a new subsection (b) to this section which authorizes the preparation of environmental assessments by applicants. The Council intends that this provision enable private and State and local applicants to build the environment into their own planning processes, while the Federal agency retains the obligation for the ultimate EIS. The Council emphasizes, however, that Federal agencies must independently evaluate the information submitted for environmental assessments and assume responsibility for its accuracy; make their own evaluation of environmental issues; and take responsibility for the scope and content of environmental assessments.

Comments on § 1506.6: Public involvement. Subsection (b)(3) of this section listed several means by which Federal agencies might provide notice of actions which have effects primarily of local concern. Several commenters urged that such notices be made mandatory, rather than permissive; other commenters felt these methods of public notice should not be listed at all. Some commenters suggested that additional methods be included in this subsection; others urged that one or more methods be deleted.

Subsection (b) of this section required agencies to provide public notice by means calculated to inform those persons and agencies who may be interested or affected. Paragraph 3 of the subsection merely identified alternative techniques that might be used for this purpose at the local level. Paragraph 3 is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the means of providing adequate public notice. Nor are the measures it lists mandatory in nature. On the basis of these considerations, the Council determined not to alter this provision.

As proposed, subsection (f) of this section required Federal agencies to make comments on environmental impact statements available to the public. This subsection repeated the existing language on the subject that has been in the Guidelines since 1973 (40 CFR 1500.11(d)) relative to the public availability of comments. On the basis of comments received, the Council altered this provision to state that intra-agency documents need not be made available when the Freedom of Information Act allows them to be withheld.

Several commenters observed that subsection (f) did not establish limitations on charges for environmental impact statements as the Council's Guidelines had. Accordingly, the Council incorporated the standard of the Guidelines into this subsection. The standard provides that such documents shall be provided to the public without charge to the extent practicable, or at a fee which is not more than the actual costs incurred.

Comments on § 1506.8: Proposals for legislation. Section 1506.8 established modified procedures for the preparation of environmental impact statements on legislative proposals. Except in prescribed circumstances, this section provided for the transmittal of a single legislative EIS to the Congress and to Federal, State and local agencies and the public for review and comment. No revised EIS is required in such cases.

A few commenters objected to these procedures and urged that draft and final environmental impact statements be required for all legislative proposals. These commenters said that the

conventional final environmental impact statement, including an agency's response to comments, was no less important in this context than in a purely administrative setting.

However, the Council views legislative proposals as different from proposed actions to be undertaken by agencies, in several important respects. Unlike administrative proposals, the timing of critical steps (hearings, votes) is not under the control of the administrative agency. Congress will hold its hearings or take its votes when it chooses, and if an EIS is to influence those actions, it must be there in time. Congress may request Federal agencies to provide any additional environmental information it needs following receipt of a legislative EIS. Administration proposals are considered alongside other proposals introduced by members of Congress and the final product, if any, may be substantially different from the proposal transmitted by the Federal agency. Congress may hold hearings on legislative proposals and invite testimony on all aspects of proposed legislation including its environmental impacts. On the basis of these considerations, the Council determined that it would be overly burdensome and unproductive to require draft and final legislative environmental impact statements for all legislation, wherever it originates.

Several commenters also expressed concern about the requirement that the legislative environmental impact statement actually accompany legislative proposals when they are transmitted to Congress. These commenters noted that such proposals are often transmitted on an urgent basis without advance warning. Accordingly, the Council amended this section to provide for a period of thirty days for transmittal of legislative environmental impact statements, except that agencies must always transmit such EISs before the Congress begins formal deliberations on the proposal.

Comments on § 1506.10: Timing of agency action. Subsection (c) of this section provided that agencies shall allow not less than 45 days for comments on draft environmental impact statements. Several commenters felt that this period was too long; others thought it too short.

The Council recognizes that a balance must be struck between an adequate period for public comment on draft EIS's and timely completion of the environmental review process. In the Council's judgment, 45 days has proven to be the proper balance. This period for public comment was established by the Guidelines in 1973, and the Council determined not to alter it. Subsection (e) of this section authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce time periods for agency action for compelling reasons of national policy.

Comments on § 1506.11: Emergencies. Section 1506.11 provided for agency action in emergency circumstances without observing the requirements of the regulations. The section required the Federal agency "proposing to take the action" to consult with the Council about alternative arrangements.

Several commenters expressed concern that use of the phrase "proposing to take the action" would be interpreted to mean that agencies consult with the Council before emergency action was taken. In the view of these commenters, such a requirement might be impractical in emergency circumstances and could defeat the purpose of the section. The Council concurs and substituted the phrase "taking the action" for "proposing to take the action." Similarly, the Council amended the section to provide for consultation "as soon as feasible" and not necessarily before emergency action.

PART 1507—AGENCY COMPLIANCE

Comments on § 1507.2: Agency capability to comply. Section 1507.2 provided, among other things, that a Federal agency shall itself have "sufficient capability" to evaluate any analysis prepared for it by others. Several commenters expressed concern that this could be interpreted to mean that each agency must employ the full range of professionals including geologists, biologists, chemists, botanists and others to gain sufficient capability for evaluating work prepared by others. This is not the Council's intention. Agency staffing requirements will vary with the agency's mission and needs including the number of EIS's for which they are responsible.

Comments on § 1507.3: Agency procedures. Subsection (a) of § 1507.3 provided that agencies shall adopt procedures for implementation of the regulations within eight months after the regulations are published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Several commenters noted that State and local agencies participating in the NEPA process under certain statutory highway and community development programs would also require implementing procedures but could not finally begin to develop them until the relevant Federal agencies had completed this task. Accordingly, the Council amended this provision to allow such state and local agencies an additional four months for the adoption of implementing procedures.

Several commenters suggested that agencies with similar programs should establish similar procedures, especially for the submission of information by applicants. The Council concurs and added a new sentence to subsection (a) stating that agencies with similar programs should consult with each other and the Council to coordinate their procedures, especially for programs requesting similar information from applicants.

Several commenters suggested that a committee be established to review agency compliance with these regulations. Under subsection (a), the Council will review agency implementing procedures for conformity with the Act and the regulations. Moreover, the Council regularly consults with Federal agencies regarding their implementation of NEPA and conducts periodic reviews on how the process is working. On the basis of these considerations, the Council determined that a committee for the review of agency compliance with NEPA should not be established.

PART 1508—TERMINOLOGY AND INDEX

Comments on § 1508.8: Effects. Several commenters urged that the term "effects" expressly include aesthetic, historic and cultural impacts. The Council adopted this suggestion and altered this provision accordingly.

Comments on § 1508.12: Federal agency. Several commenters urged that States and units of general local government assuming NEPA responsibilities under Section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 be expressly recognized as Federal agencies for purposes of these regulations. The Council adopted this suggestion and amended this provision accordingly.

Comments on § 1508.14: Human environment. In its proposed form, § 1508.14 stated that the term "human environment" shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the interaction of people with that environment. A few commenters expressed concern that this definition could be interpreted as being limited to the natural and physical aspects of the environment. This is not the Council's intention. *See* § 1508.8 (relating to effects) and our discussion of the environment in the portion of this Preamble relating to § 1505.2. The full scope of the environment is set out in Section 101 of NEPA. Human beings are central to that concept. In § 1508.14 the Council replaced the work "interaction" with the work "relationship" to ensure that the definition is interpreted as being inclusive of the human environment.

The only line we draw is one drawn by the cases. Section 1508.14 stated that economic or social effects are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an environmental impact statement. A few commenters sought further explanation of this provision. This provision reflects the

Council's determination, which accords with the case law, that NEPA was not intended to require an environmental impact statement where the closing of a military base, for example, only affects such things as the composition of the population or the level of personal income in a region.

Comments on § 1508.16: Legislation. Section 1508.16 defined legislation to exclude requests for appropriations. Some commenters felt that this exclusion was inappropriate. Others noted that environmental reviews for requests for appropriations had not been conducted in the eight years since NEPA was enacted. On the basis of traditional concepts relating to appropriations and the budget cycle, considerations of timing and confidentiality, and other factors, the Council decided not to alter the scope of this provision. The Council is aware that this is the one instance in the regulations where we assert a position opposed to that in the predecessor Guidelines. Quite simply, the Council in its experience found that preparation of EISs is ill-suited to the budget preparation process. Nothing in the Council's determination, however, relieves agencies of responsibility to prepare statements when otherwise required on the underlying program or other actions. (We note that a petition for certiorari on this issue is now pending before the Supreme Court.) This section was renumbered as § 1508.17.

Comments on § 1508.17: Major Federal action. Section 1508.17 of the draft regulations addressed the issue of NEPA's application to Federal programs which are delegated or otherwise transferred to State and local government. Some commenters said that the application of NEPA in such circumstances is a highly complicated issue; that its proper resolution depends on a variety of factors that may differ significantly from one program to the next and should be weighed on a case-by-case basis; and that agencies themselves should be accorded latitude in resolving this issue, subject to judicial review. The Council concurs and determined not to address this issue in this context at the present time. This determination should not be interpreted as a decision one way or the other on the merits of the issue.

Section 1508.17 also stated that the term "major" reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of the term "significantly" in NEPA's phrase "major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." A few commenters noted that courts have differed over whether these terms should have independent meaning under NEPA. The Council determined that any Federal action which significantly affects the quality of the human environment is "major" for purposes of NEPA. The Council's view is in accord with *Minnesota PIRG v. Butz*, 498 F. 2d 1314 (8th Cir., 1974).

Section 1508.17 was renumbered as § 1508.18.

Comments on § 1508.22: Proposal. Section 1508.22 stated that a proposal exists when an agency is "actively considering" alternatives and certain other factors are present. Several commenters expressed the view that this phrase could be interpreted to mean that a proposal exists too early in planning and decisionmaking, before there is any likelihood that the agency will be making a decision on the matter. In response to this concern, and to emphasize the link between EISs and actual agency decisions, the Council deleted the phrase "actively considering" and replaced it with the phrase "actively preparing to make a decision on" alternatives. The Council does not intend the change to detract from the importance of integrating NEPA with agency planning as provided in § 1501.2 of the regulations.

This section was renumbered as § 1508.23.

OTHER COMMENTS

Comments on the application of NEPA abroad. Several commenters urged that the question of whether NEPA applies abroad be resolved by these regulations. However, the President has publicly announced his intention to address this issue in an Executive Order. The Executive Order, when issued, will represent the position of the Administration on that issue.

Comments on the role of Indian tribes in the NEPA process. Several commenters stated that the regulations should clarify the role of Indian Tribes in the NEPA process. Accordingly, the Council expressly identified Indian Tribes as participants in the NEPA process in §§ 1501.2(d)(2), 1501.7(a)(1), 1502.15(c) and 1503.1(a)(2)(ii).

Comments on the Council's special environmental assessment for the NEPA regulations. The Council prepared a special environmental assessment for these regulations and announced in the preamble to the draft regulations that the document was available to the public upon request. Some commenters expressed the view that it did not contain an adequate evaluation of the effects of the regulations. For the reasons set out in the assessment, and the preamble to the proposed regulations, the Council confirmed its earlier determination that the special environmental assessment did provide an adequate evaluation for these procedural regulations.

Comments on the President's authority to issue Executive Order 11991 and the Council's authority to issue regulations. A few commenters questioned the authority of the President to issue Executive Order 11991, and the authority of the Council to issue the regulations. The President is empowered to issue regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA by virtue of the authority vested in him as President of the United States under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution and other provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States. The President is empowered to delegate responsibility for performing this function to the Council on Environmental Quality under Section 301 of Title 3 of the United States Code and other laws of the United States.

Comments on the responsibilities of Federal agencies in the NEPA process. Agency responsibilities under the regulations often depend upon whether they have "jurisdiction by law" or "special expertise" with respect to a particular proposal. Several commenters noted that these terms were not defined in the regulations and could be subject to varying interpretations. Accordingly, the Council added definitions for these terms in §§ 1508.15 and 1508.26.

Comments on the role of State and areawide clearinghouses. At the request of several States, the Council recognized the role of state and areawide clearinghouses in distributing Federal documents to appropriate recipients. *See* e.g. §§ 1501.4(e)(2), 1503.1(2)(iii), and 1506.6(b)(3)(i).

Comments on the concept of a national data bank. When the Council issued the proposed regulations, it invited comment on the concept of a national data bank. The purpose of a data bank would be to provide for the storage and recall of information developed in one EIS for use in subsequent EISs. Most commenters expressed reservations about the idea on grounds of cost and practicality. The Council, while still intrigued by the concept did not change its initial conclusion that the financial and other resources that would be required are beyond the benefits that might be achieved.

Comments on Federal funding of public comments on EISs. The Council also invited comment on a proposal for encouraging Federal agencies to fund public comments on EISs when an important viewpoint would otherwise not be presented. Several commenters supported this proposal on grounds that it would broaden the range and improve the quality of public comments on EISs. Others doubted that the expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose would be worthwhile. Some felt that Congress should decide the question. The Council determined not to address the issue of Federal funding for public comments on EISs in the regu-

lations, but to leave the matter to individual agencies' discretion.

5. REGULATORY ANALYSES

The final regulations implement the policy and other requirements of Executive Order 12044 to the fullest extent possible. We intend agencies in implementing these regulations to minimize burdens on the public. The determinations required by Section 2(d) of the Order have been made by the Council and are available on request.

It is our intention that a Regulatory Analysis required by Section 3 of the Order be undertaken concurrently with and, where appropriate, integrated with an environmental impact statement required by NEPA and these regulations.

6. CONCLUSION

We could not, of course, adopt every suggestion that was made on the regulations. We have tried to respond to the major concerns that were expressed. In the process, we have changed 74 of the 92 sections, making a total of 340 amendments to the regulations. We are confident that any issues which arise in the future can be resolved through a variety of mechanisms that exists for improving the NEPA process.

We appreciate the efforts of the many people who participated in developing the regulations and look forward to their cooperation as the regulations are implemented by individual agencies.

CHARLES WARREN,
Chairman.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1500—PURPOSE, POLICY, AND MANDATE

Sec.
1500.1 Purpose.
1500.2 Policy.
1500.3 Mandate.
1500.4 Reducing paperwork.
1500.5 Reducing delay.
1500.6 Agency authority.

PART 1501—NEPA AND AGENCY PLANNING

1501.1 Purpose.
1501.2 Apply NEPA early in the process.
1501.3 When to prepare an environmental assessment.
1501.4 Whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.
1501.5 Lead agencies.
1501.6 Cooperating agencies.
1501.7 Scoping.
1501.8 Time limits.

PART 1502—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1502.1 Purpose.
1502.2 Implementation.
1502.3 Statutory requirements for statements.
Sec.
1502.4 Major Federal actions requiring the preparation of environmental impact statements.
1502.5 Timing.
1502.6 Interdisciplinary preparation.
1502.7 Page limits.
1502.8 Writing.
1502.9 Draft, final, and supplemental statements.
1502.10 Recommended format.
1502.11 Cover sheet.
1502.12 Summary.
1502.13 Purpose and need.
1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.
1502.15 Affected environment.
1502.16 Environmental consequences.
1502.17 List of preparers.
1502.18 Appendix.
1502.19 Circulation of the environmental impact statement.
1502.20 Tiering.
1502.21 Incorporation by reference.
1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.
1502.23 Cost-benefit analysis.
1502.24 Methodology and scientific accuracy.
1502.25 Environmental review and consultation requirements.

PART 1503—COMMENTING

1503.1 Inviting comments.
1503.2 Duty to comment.
1503.3 Specificity of comments.
1503.4 Response to comments.

PART 1504—PREDECISION REFERRALS TO THE COUNCIL OF PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTIONS DETERMINED TO BE ENVIRONMENTALLY UNSATISFACTORY

1504.1 Purpose.
1504.2 Criteria for referral.
1504.3 Procedure for referrals and response.

PART 1505—NEPA AND AGENCY DECISIONMAKING

1505.1 Agency decisionmaking procedures.
1505.2 Record of decision in cases requiring environmental impact statements.
1505.3 Implementing the decision.

PART 1506—OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF NEPA

1506.1 Limitations on actions during NEPA process.
1506.2 Elimination of duplication with State and local procedures.
1506.3 Adoption.
1506.4 Combining documents.
1506.5 Agency responsibility.
1506.6 Public involvement.
1506.7 Further guidance.
1506.8 Proposals for legislation.
1506.9 Filing requirements.
1506.10 Timing of agency action.
1506.11 Emergencies.
1506.12 Effective date.

PART 1507—AGENCY COMPLIANCE

1507.1 Compliance.
1507.2 Agency capability to comply.
1507.3 Agency procedures.

PART 1508—TERMINOLOGY AND INDEX

1508.1 Terminology.
1508.2 Act.
1508.3 Affecting.
Sec.
1508.4 Categorical exclusion.
1508.5 Cooperating agency.
1508.6 Council.
1508.7 Cumulative impact.
1508.8 Effects.
1508.9 Environmental assessment.
1508.10 Environmental document.
1508.11 Environmental impact statement.
1508.12 Federal agency.
1508.13 Finding of no significant impact.
1508.14 Human environment.
1508.15 Jurisdiction by law.
1508.16 Lead agency.
1508.17 Legislation.
1508.18 Major Federal action.
1508.19 Matter.
1508.20 Mitigation.
1508.21 NEPA process.
1508.22 Notice of intent.
1508.23 Proposal.
1508.24 Referring agency.
1508.25 Scope.
1508.26 Special expertise.
1508.27 Significantly.
1508.28 Tiering.
Index.

PART 1500—PURPOSE, POLICY, AND MANDATE

Sec.
1500.1 Purpose.
1500.2 Policy.
1500.3 Mandate.
1500.4 Reducing paperwork.
1500.5 Reducing delay.
1500.6 Agency authority.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.), section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609) and Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality (March 5, 1970 as amended by Executive Order 11991, May 24, 1977).

§ 1500.1 Purpose.

(a) The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is our basic national charter for protection of the environment. It establishes policy, sets goals (section 101), and provides means (section 102) for carrying out the policy. Section 102(2) contains "action-forcing" provisions to make sure that federal agencies act according to the letter and spirit of the Act. The regulations that follow implement Section 102(2). Their purpose is to tell federal agencies what they must do to comply with the procedures and achieve the goals of the Act. The President, the federal agencies, and the courts share responsibility for enforcing the Act so as to achieve the substantive requirements of section 101.

(b) NEPA procedures must insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken. The information must be of high quality. Accurate scientific analysis, expert agency comments, and public scrutiny are essential to implementing NEPA. Most important, NEPA documents must con-