Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President

REGULATIONS

For Implementing The Procedural Provisions Of The

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

Reprint
40 CFR Parts 1500–1508
(as of July 1, 1986)

CONTENTS

	Page
Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act . .	1
The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as Amended	35
The Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 .	40
The Clean Air Act § 309	42
Executive Order 11514, as Amended by Executive Order 11991	43

For further information, contact:
General Counsel
Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President
722 Jackson Pl. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503
(202) 395–5754

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

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.
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.

Sec.
1508.3 Affecting.
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.
Sec.
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.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609) and E.O. 11514, Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55990, Nov. 28, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 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 concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question, rather than amassing needless detail.

(c) Ultimately, of course, it is not better documents but better decisions that count. NEPA's purpose is not to generate paperwork—even excellent paperwork—but to foster excellent action. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment. These regulations provide the direction to achieve this purpose.

§ 1500.2 Policy.

Federal agencies shall to the fullest extent possible:

(a) Interpret and administer the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States in accordance with the policies set forth in the Act and in these regulations.

(b) Implement procedures to make the NEPA process more useful to decisionmakers and the public; to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data; and to emphasize real environmental issues and alternatives. Environmental impact statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analyses.

(c) Integrate the requirements of NEPA with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency practice so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively.

(d) Encourage and facilitate public involvement in decisions which affect the quality of the human environment.

(e) Use the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon the quality of the human environment.

(f) Use all practicable means, consistent with the requirements of the Act and other essential considerations of national policy, to restore and enhance the quality of the human environment and avoid or minimize any possible adverse effects of their actions upon the quality of the human environment.

§ 1500.3 Mandate.

Parts 1500 through 1508 of this title provide regulations applicable to and binding on all Federal agencies for implementing the procedural provisions

of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) (NEPA or the Act) except where compliance would be inconsistent with other statutory requirements. These regulations are issued pursuant to 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). These regulations, unlike the predecessor guidelines, are not confined to sec. 102(2)(C) (environmental impact statements). The regulations apply to the whole of section 102(2). The provisions of the Act and of these regulations must be read together as a whole in order to comply with the spirit and letter of the law. It is the Council's intention that judicial review of agency compliance with these regulations not occur before an agency has filed the final environmental impact statement, or has made a final finding of no significant impact (when such a finding will result in action affecting the environment), or takes action that will result in irreparable injury. Furthermore, it is the Council's intention that any trivial violation of these regulations not give rise to any independent cause of action.

§ 1500.4 Reducing paperwork.

Agencies shall reduce excessive paperwork by:

(a) Reducing the length of environmental impact statements (§ 1502.2(c)), by means such as setting appropriate page limits (§§ 1501.7(b)(1) and 1502.7).

(b) Preparing analytic rather than encyclopedic environmental impact statements (§ 1502.2(a)).

(c) Discussing only briefly issues other than significant ones (§ 1502.2(b)).

(d) Writing environmental impact statements in plain language (§ 1502.8).

(e) Following a clear format for environmental impact statements (§ 1502.10).

(f) Emphasizing the portions of the environmental impact statement that are useful to decisionmakers and the public (§§ 1502.14 and 1502.15) and reducing emphasis on background material (§ 1502.16).

(g) Using the scoping process, not only to identify significant environmental issues deserving of study, but also to deemphasize insignificant issues, narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement process accordingly (§ 1501.7).

(h) Summarizing the environmental impact statement (§ 1502.12) and circulating the summary instead of the entire environmental impact statement if the latter is unusually long (§ 1502.19).

(i) Using program, policy, or plan environmental impact statements and tiering from statements of broad scope to those of narrower scope, to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues (§§ 1502.4 and 1502.20).

(j) Incorporating by reference (§ 1502.21).

(k) Integrating NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements (§ 1502.25).

(l) Requiring comments to be as specific as possible (§ 1503.3).

(m) Attaching and circulating only changes to the draft environmental impact statement, rather than rewriting and circulating the entire statement when changes are minor (§ 1503.4(c)).

(n) Eliminating duplication with State and local procedures, by providing for joint preparation (§ 1506.2), and with other Federal procedures, by providing that an agency may adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by another agency (§ 1506.3).

(o) Combining environmental documents with other documents (§ 1506.4).

(p) Using categorical exclusions to define categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which are therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1508.4).

(q) Using a finding of no significant impact when an action not otherwise excluded will not have a significant

effect on the human environment and is therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1508.13).

[43 FR 55990, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1500.5 Reducing delay.

Agencies shall reduce delay by:

(a) Integrating the NEPA process into early planning (§ 1501.2).

(b) Emphasizing interagency cooperation before the environmental impact statement is prepared, rather than submission of adversary comments on a completed document (§ 1501.6).

(c) Insuring the swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes (§ 1501.5).

(d) Using the scoping process for an early identification of what are and what are not the real issues (§ 1501.7).

(e) Establishing appropriate time limits for the environmental impact statement process (§§ 1501.7(b)(2) and 1501.8).

(f) Preparing environmental impact statements early in the process (§ 1502.5).

(g) Integrating NEPA requirements with other environmental review and consultation requirements (§ 1502.25).

(h) Eliminating duplication with State and local procedures by providing for joint preparation (§ 1506.2) and with other Federal procedures by providing that an agency may adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by another agency (§ 1506.3).

(i) Combining environmental documents with other documents (§ 1506.4).

(j) Using accelerated procedures for proposals for legislation (§ 1506.8).

(k) Using categorical exclusions to define categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment (§ 1508.4) and which are therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(l) Using a finding of no significant impact when an action not otherwise excluded will not have a significant effect on the human environment (§ 1508.13) and is therefore exempt from requirements to prepare an environmental impact statement.

§ 1500.6 Agency authority.

Each agency shall interpret the provisions of the Act as a supplement to its existing authority and as a mandate to view traditional policies and missions in the light of the Act's national environmental objectives. Agencies shall review their policies, procedures, and regulations accordingly and revise them as necessary to insure full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act. The phrase "to the fullest extent possible" in section 102 means that each agency of the Federal Government shall comply with that section unless existing law applicable to the agency's operations expressly prohibits or makes compliance impossible.

PART 1501—NEPA AND AGENCY PLANNING

Sec.

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.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609, and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55992, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1501.1 Purpose.

The purposes of this part include:

(a) Integrating the NEPA process into early planning to insure appropriate consideration of NEPA's policies and to eliminate delay.

(b) Emphasizing cooperative consultation among agencies before the environmental impact statement is prepared rather than submission of adversary comments on a completed document.

(c) Providing for the swift and fair resolution of lead agency disputes.

(d) Identifying at an early stage the significant environmental issues deserving of study and deemphasizing insignificant issues, narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement accordingly.

(e) Providing a mechanism for putting appropriate time limits on the environmental impact statement process.

§ 1501.2 Apply NEPA early in the process.

Agencies shall integrate the NEPA process with other planning at the earliest possible time to insure that planning and decisions reflect environmental values, to avoid delays later in the process, and to head off potential conflicts. Each agency shall:

(a) Comply with the mandate of section 102(2)(A) 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 in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment," as specified by § 1507.2.

(b) Identify environmental effects and values in adequate detail so they can be compared to economic and technical analyses. Environmental documents and appropriate analyses shall be circulated and reviewed at the same time as other planning documents.

(c) Study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources as provided by section 102(2)(E) of the Act.

(d) Provide for cases where actions are planned by private applicants or other non-Federal entities before Federal involvement so that:

(1) Policies or designated staff are available to advise potential applicants of studies or other information foreseeably required for later Federal action.

(2) The Federal agency consults early with appropriate State and local agencies and Indian tribes and with interested private persons and organizations when its own involvement is reasonably foreseeable.

(3) The Federal agency commences its NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

§ 1501.3 When to prepare an environmental assessment.

(a) Agencies shall prepare an environmental assessment (§ 1508.9) when necessary under the procedures adopted by individual agencies to supplement these regulations as described in § 1507.3. An assessment is not necessary if the agency has decided to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(b) Agencies may prepare an environmental assessment on any action at any time in order to assist agency planning and decisionmaking.

§ 1501.4 Whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.

In determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement the Federal agency shall:

(a) Determine under its procedures supplementing these regulations (described in § 1507.3) whether the proposal is one which:

(1) Normally requires an environmental impact statement, or

(2) Normally does not require either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment (categorical exclusion).

(b) If the proposed action is not covered by paragraph (a) of this section, prepare an environmental assessment (§ 1508.9). The agency shall involve environmental agencies, applicants, and the public, to the extent practicable, in preparing assessments required by § 1508.9(a)(1).

(c) Based on the environmental assessment make its determination whether to prepare an environmental impact statement.

(d) Commence the scoping process (§ 1501.7), if the agency will prepare an environmental impact statement.

(e) Prepare a finding of no significant impact (§ 1508.13), if the agency determines on the basis of the environmental assessment not to prepare a statement.

(1) The agency shall make the finding of no significant impact available

to the affected public as specified in § 1506.6.

(2) In certain limited circumstances, which the agency may cover in its procedures under § 1507.3, the agency shall make the finding of no significant impact available for public review (including State and areawide clearinghouses) for 30 days before the agency makes its final determination whether to prepare an environmental impact statement and before the action may begin. The circumstances are:

(i) The proposed action is, or is closely similar to, one which normally requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement under the procedures adopted by the agency pursuant to § 1507.3, or

(ii) The nature of the proposed action is one without precedent.

§ 1501.5 Lead agencies.

(a) A lead agency shall supervise the preparation of an environmental impact statement if more than one Federal agency either:

(1) Proposes or is involved in the same action; or

(2) Is involved in a group of actions directly related to each other because of their functional interdependence or geographical proximity.

(b) Federal, State, or local agencies, including at least one Federal agency, may act as joint lead agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement (§ 1506.2).

(c) If an action falls within the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section the potential lead agencies shall determine by letter or memorandum which agency shall be the lead agency and which shall be cooperating agencies. The agencies shall resolve the lead agency question so as not to cause delay. If there is disagreement among the agencies, the following factors (which are listed in order of descending importance) shall determine lead agency designation:

(1) Magnitude of agency's involvement.

(2) Project approval/disapproval authority.

(3) Expertise concerning the action's environmental effects.

(4) Duration of agency's involvement.

(5) Sequence of agency's involvement.

(d) Any Federal agency, or any State or local agency or private person substantially affected by the absence of lead agency designation, may make a written request to the potential lead agencies that a lead agency be designated.

(e) If Federal agencies are unable to agree on which agency will be the lead agency or if the procedure described in paragraph (c) of this section has not resulted within 45 days in a lead agency designation, any of the agencies or persons concerned may file a request with the Council asking it to determine which Federal agency shall be the lead agency.

A copy of the request shall be transmitted to each potential lead agency. The request shall consist of:

(1) A precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed action.

(2) A detailed statement of why each potential lead agency should or should not be the lead agency under the criteria specified in paragraph (c) of this section.

(f) A response may be filed by any potential lead agency concerned within 20 days after a request is filed with the Council. The Council shall determine as soon as possible but not later than 20 days after receiving the request and all responses to it which Federal agency shall be the lead agency and which other Federal agencies shall be cooperating agencies.

[43 FR 55992, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1501.6 Cooperating agencies.

The purpose of this section is to emphasize agency cooperation early in the NEPA process. Upon request of the lead agency, any other Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law shall be a cooperating agency. In addition any other Federal agency which has special expertise with respect to any environmental issue, which should be addressed in the statement may be a cooperating agency upon request of the lead agency. An agency may re-

quest the lead agency to designate it a cooperating agency.

(a) The lead agency shall:

(1) Request the participation of each cooperating agency in the NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

(2) Use the environmental analysis and proposals of cooperating agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise, to the maximum extent possible consistent with its responsibility as lead agency.

(3) Meet with a cooperating agency at the latter's request.

(b) Each cooperating agency shall:

(1) Participate in the NEPA process at the earliest possible time.

(2) Participate in the scoping process (described below in § 1501.7).

(3) Assume on request of the lead agency responsibility for developing information and preparing environmental analyses including portions of the environmental impact statement concerning which the cooperating agency has special expertise.

(4) Make available staff support at the lead agency's request to enhance the latter's interdisciplinary capability.

(5) Normally use its own funds. The lead agency shall, to the extent available funds permit, fund those major activities or analyses it requests from cooperating agencies. Potential lead agencies shall include such funding requirements in their budget requests.

(c) A cooperating agency may in response to a lead agency's request for assistance in preparing the environmental impact statement (described in paragraph (b) (3), (4), or (5) of this section) reply that other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is the subject of the environmental impact statement. A copy of this reply shall be submitted to the Council.

§ 1501.7 Scoping.

There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process shall be termed scoping. As soon as practicable after its decision to prepare an environmental impact statement and before the scoping process the lead agency shall publish a notice of intent (§ 1508.22) in the FEDERAL REGISTER except as provided in § 1507.3(e).

(a) As part of the scoping process the lead agency shall:

(1) Invite the participation of affected Federal, State, and local agencies, any affected Indian tribe, the proponent of the action, and other interested persons (including those who might not be in accord with the action on environmental grounds), unless there is a limited exception under § 1507.3(c). An agency may give notice in accordance with § 1506.6.

(2) Determine the scope (§ 1508.25) and the significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the environmental impact statement.

(3) Identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review (§ 1506.3), narrowing the discussion of these issues in the statement to a brief presentation of why they will not have a significant effect on the human environment or providing a reference to their coverage elsewhere.

(4) Allocate assignments for preparation of the environmental impact statement among the lead and cooperating agencies, with the lead agency retaining responsibility for the statement.

(5) Indicate any public environmental assessments and other environmental impact statements which are being or will be prepared that are related to but are not part of the scope of the impact statement under consideration.

(6) Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements so the lead and cooperating agencies may prepare other required analyses and studies concurrently with, and integrated with, the environmental impact statement as provided in § 1502.25.

(7) Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of environmental analyses and the agency's tentative planning and decisionmaking schedule.

(b) As part of the scoping process the lead agency may:

(1) Set page limits on environmental documents (§ 1502.7).

(2) Set time limits (§ 1501.8).

(3) Adopt procedures under § 1507.3 to combine its environmental assessment process with its scoping process.

(4) Hold an early scoping meeting or meetings which may be integrated with any other early planning meeting the agency has. Such a scoping meeting will often be appropriate when the impacts of a particular action are confined to specific sites.

(c) An agency shall revise the determinations made under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section if substantial changes are made later in the proposed action, or if significant new circumstances or information arise which bear on the proposal or its impacts.

§ 1501.8 Time limits.

Although the Council has decided that prescribed universal time limits for the entire NEPA process are too inflexible, Federal agencies are encouraged to set time limits appropriate to individual actions (consistent with the time intervals required by § 1506.10). When multiple agencies are involved the reference to agency below means lead agency.

(a) The agency shall set time limits if an applicant for the proposed action requests them: *Provided,* That the limits are consistent with the purposes of NEPA and other essential considerations of national policy.

(b) The agency may:

(1) Consider the following factors in determining time limits:

(i) Potential for environmental harm.

(ii) Size of the proposed action.

(iii) State of the art of analytic techniques.

(iv) Degree of public need for the proposed action, including the consequences of delay.

(v) Number of persons and agencies affected.

(vi) Degree to which relevant information is known and if not known the time required for obtaining it.

(vii) Degree to which the action is controversial.

(viii) Other time limits imposed on the agency by law, regulations, or executive order.

(2) Set overall time limits or limits for each constituent part of the NEPA process, which may include:

(i) Decision on whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (if not already decided).

(ii) Determination of the scope of the environmental impact statement.

(iii) Preparation of the draft environmental impact statement.

(iv) Review of any comments on the draft environmental impact statement from the public and agencies.

(v) Preparation of the final environmental impact statement.

(vi) Review of any comments on the final environmental impact statement.

(vii) Decision on the action based in part on the environmental impact statement.

(3) Designate a person (such as the project manager or a person in the agency's office with NEPA responsibilities) to expedite the NEPA process.

(c) State or local agencies or members of the public may request a Federal Agency to set time limits.

PART 1502—ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Sec.

1502.1 Purpose.
1502.2 Implementation.
1502.3 Statutory requirements for statements.
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.

Sec.
1502.23 Cost-benefit analysis.
1502.24 Methodology and scientific accuracy.
1502.25 Environmental review and consultation requirements.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55994, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1502.1 Purpose.

The primary purpose of an environmental impact statement is to serve as an action-forcing device to insure that the policies and goals defined in the Act are infused into the ongoing programs and actions of the Federal Government. It shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decisionmakers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment. Agencies shall focus on significant environmental issues and alternatives and shall reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data. Statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that the agency has made the necessary environmental analyses. An environmental impact statement is more than a disclosure document. It shall be used by Federal officials in conjunction with other relevant material to plan actions and make decisions.

§ 1502.2 Implementation.

To achieve the purposes set forth in § 1502.1 agencies shall prepare environmental impact statements in the following manner:

(a) Environmental impact statements shall be analytic rather than encyclopedic.

(b) Impacts shall be discussed in proportion to their significance. There shall be only brief discussion of other than significant issues. As in a finding of no significant impact, there should be only enough discussion to show why more study is not warranted.

(c) Environmental impact statements shall be kept concise and shall be no longer than absolutely necessary to comply with NEPA and with these regulations. Length should vary first with potential environmental problems and then with project size.

(d) Environmental impact statements shall state how alternatives considered in it and decisions based on it will or will not achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1) of the Act and other environmental laws and policies.

(e) The range of alternatives discussed in environmental impact statements shall encompass those to be considered by the ultimate agency decisionmaker.

(f) Agencies shall not commit resources prejudicing selection of alternatives before making a final decision (§ 1506.1).

(g) Environmental impact statements shall serve as the means of assessing the environmental impact of proposed agency actions, rather than justifying decisions already made.

§ 1502.3 Statutory requirements for statements.

As required by sec. 102(2)(C) of NEPA environmental impact statements (§ 1508.11) are to be included in every recommendation or report.

On proposals (§ 1508.23).

For legislation and (§ 1508.17).

Other major Federal actions (§ 1508.18).

Significantly (§ 1508.27).

Affecting (§§ 1508.3, 1508.8).

The quality of the human environment (§ 1508.14).

§ 1502.4 Major Federal actions requiring the preparation of environmental impact statements.

(a) Agencies shall make sure the proposal which is the subject of an environmental impact statement is properly defined. Agencies shall use the criteria for scope (§ 1508.25) to determine which proposal(s) shall be the subject of a particular statement. Proposals or parts of proposals which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall

be evaluated in a single impact statement.

(b) Environmental impact statements may be prepared, and are sometimes required, for broad Federal actions such as the adoption of new agency programs or regulations (§ 1508.18). Agencies shall prepare statements on broad actions so that they are relevant to policy and are timed to coincide with meaningful points in agency planning and decisionmaking.

(c) When preparing statements on broad actions (including proposals by more than one agency), agencies may find it useful to evaluate the proposal(s) in one of the following ways:

(1) Geographically, including actions occurring in the same general location, such as body of water, region, or metropolitan area.

(2) Generically, including actions which have relevant similarities, such as common timing, impacts, alternatives, methods of implementation, media, or subject matter.

(3) By stage of technological development including federal or federally assisted research, development or demonstration programs for new technologies which, if applied, could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Statements shall be prepared on such programs and shall be available before the program has reached a stage of investment or commitment to implementation likely to determine subsequent development or restrict later alternatives.

(d) Agencies shall as appropriate employ scoping (§ 1501.7), tiering (§ 1502.20), and other methods listed in §§ 1500.4 and 1500.5 to relate broad and narrow actions and to avoid duplication and delay.

§ 1502.5 Timing.

An agency shall commence preparation of an environmental impact statement as close as possible to the time the agency is developing or is presented with a proposal (§ 1508.23) so that preparation can be completed in time for the final statement to be included in any recommendation or report on the proposal. The statement shall be prepared early enough so that it can serve practically as an important contribution to the decisionmaking process and will not be used to rationalize or justify decisions already made (§§ 1500.2(c), 1501.2, and 1502.2). For instance:

(a) For projects directly undertaken by Federal agencies the environmental impact statement shall be prepared at the feasibility analysis (go-no go) stage and may be supplemented at a later stage if necessary.

(b) For applications to the agency appropriate environmental assessments or statements shall be commenced no later than immediately after the application is received. Federal agencies are encouraged to begin preparation of such assessments or statements earlier, preferably jointly with applicable State or local agencies.

(c) For adjudication, the final environmental impact statement shall normally precede the final staff recommendation and that portion of the public hearing related to the impact study. In appropriate circumstances the statement may follow preliminary hearings designed to gather information for use in the statements.

(d) For informal rulemaking the draft environmental impact statement shall normally accompany the proposed rule.

§ 1502.6 Interdisciplinary preparation.

Environmental impact statements shall be prepared using an inter-disciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts (section 102(2)(A) of the Act). The disciplines of the preparers shall be appropriate to the scope and issues identified in the scoping process (§ 1501.7).

§ 1502.7 Page limits.

The text of final environmental impact statements (e.g., paragraphs (d) through (g) of § 1502.10) shall normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.

§ 1502.8 Writing.

Environmental impact statements shall be written in plain language and may use appropriate graphics so that decisionmakers and the public can readily understand them. Agencies should employ writers of clear prose or editors to write, review, or edit statements, which will be based upon the analysis and supporting data from the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts.

§ 1502.9 Draft, final, and supplemental statements.

Except for proposals for legislation as provided in § 1506.8 environmental impact statements shall be prepared in two stages and may be supplemented.

(a) Draft environmental impact statements shall be prepared in accordance with the scope decided upon in the scoping process. The lead agency shall work with the cooperating agencies and shall obtain comments as required in Part 1503 of this chapter. The draft statement must fulfill and satisfy to the fullest extent possible the requirements established for final statements in section 102(2)(C) of the Act. If a draft statement is so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis, the agency shall prepare and circulate a revised draft of the appropriate portion. The agency shall make every effort to disclose and discuss at appropriate points in the draft statement all major points of view on the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action.

(b) Final environmental impact statements shall respond to comments as required in Part 1503 of this chapter. The agency shall discuss at appropriate points in the final statement any responsible opposing view which was not adequately discussed in the draft statement and shall indicate the agency's response to the issues raised.

(c) Agencies:

(1) Shall prepare supplements to either draft or final environmental impact statements if:

(i) The agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns; or

(ii) There are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

(2) May also prepare supplements when the agency determines that the purposes of the Act will be furthered by doing so.

(3) Shall adopt procedures for introducing a supplement into its formal administrative record, if such a record exists.

(4) Shall prepare, circulate, and file a supplement to a statement in the same fashion (exclusive of scoping) as a draft and final statement unless alternative procedures are approved by the Council.

§ 1502.10 Recommended format.

Agencies shall use a format for environmental impact statements which will encourage good analysis and clear presentation of the alternatives including the proposed action. The following standard format for environmental impact statements should be followed unless the agency determines that there is a compelling reason to do otherwise:

(a) Cover sheet.

(b) Summary.

(c) Table of contents.

(d) Purpose of and need for action.

(e) Alternatives including proposed action (sections 102(2)(C)(iii) and 102(2)(E) of the Act).

(f) Affected environment.

(g) Environmental consequences (especially sections 102(2)(C) (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of the Act).

(h) List of preparers.

(i) List of Agencies, Organizations, and persons to whom copies of the statement are sent.

(j) Index.

(k) Appendices (if any).

If a different format is used, it shall include paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (h), (i), and (j), of this section and shall include the substance of paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (g), and (k) of this section, as further described in §§ 1502.11 through 1502.18, in any appropriate format.

§ 1502.11 Cover sheet.

The cover sheet shall not exceed one page. It shall include:

(a) A list of the responsible agencies including the lead agency and any cooperating agencies.

(b) The title of the proposed action that is the subject of the statement (and if appropriate the titles of related cooperating agency actions), together with the State(s) and county(ies) (or other jurisdiction if applicable) where the action is located.

(c) The name, address, and telephone number of the person at the agency who can supply further information.

(d) A designation of the statement as a draft, final, or draft or final supplement.

(e) A one paragraph abstract of the statement.

(f) The date by which comments must be received (computed in cooperation with EPA under § 1506.10).

The information required by this section may be entered on Standard Form 424 (in items 4, 6, 7, 10, and 18).

§ 1502.12 Summary.

Each environmental impact statement shall contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary shall stress the major conclusions, areas of controversy (including issues raised by agencies and the public), and the issues to be resolved (including the choice among alternatives). The summary will normally not exceed 15 pages.

§ 1502.13 Purpose and need.

The statement shall briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action.

§ 1502.14 Alternatives including the proposed action.

This section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. Based on the information and analysis presented in the sections on the Affected Environment (§ 1502.15) and the Environmental Consequences (§ 1502.16), it should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public. In this section agencies shall:

(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.

(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.

(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

(d) Include the alternative of no action.

(e) Identify the agency's preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.

(f) Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.

§ 1502.15 Affected environment.

The environmental impact statement shall succinctly describe the environment of the area(s) to be affected or created by the alternatives under consideration. The descriptions shall be no longer than is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives. Data and analyses in a statement shall be commensurate with the importance of the impact, with less important material summarized, consolidated, or simply referenced. Agencies shall avoid useless bulk in statements and shall concentrate effort and attention on important issues. Verbose descriptions of the affected environment are themselves no measure of the adequacy of an environmental impact statement.

§ 1502.16 Environmental consequences.

This section forms the scientific and analytic basis for the comparisons under § 1502.14. It shall consolidate

the discussions of those elements required by sections 102(2)(C) (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of NEPA which are within the scope of the statement and as much of section 102(2)(C)(iii) as is necessary to support the comparisons. The discussion will include the environmental impacts of the alternatives including the proposed action, any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposal should it be implemented. This section should not duplicate discussions in § 1502.14. It shall include discussions of:

(a) Direct effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).

(b) Indirect effects and their significance (§ 1508.8).

(c) Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. (See § 1506.2(d).)

(d) The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action. The comparisons under § 1502.14 will be based on this discussion.

(e) Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.

(f) Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.

(g) 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.

(h) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts (if not fully covered under § 1502.14(f)).

[43 FR 55994, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1502.17 List of preparers.

The environmental impact statement shall list the names, together with their qualifications (expertise, experience, professional disciplines), of the persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the environmental impact statement or significant background papers, including basic components of the statement (§§ 1502.6 and 1502.8). Where possible the persons who are responsible for a particular analysis, including analyses in background papers, shall be identified. Normally the list will not exceed two pages.

§ 1502.18 Appendix.

If an agency prepares an appendix to an environmental impact statement the appendix shall:

(a) Consist of material prepared in connection with an environmental impact statement (as distinct from material which is not so prepared and which is incorporated by reference (§ 1502.21)).

(b) Normally consist of material which substantiates any analysis fundamental to the impact statement.

(c) Normally be analytic and relevant to the decision to be made.

(d) Be circulated with the environmental impact statement or be readily available on request.

§ 1502.19 Circulation of the environmental impact statement.

Agencies shall circulate the entire draft and final environmental impact statements except for certain appendices as provided in § 1502.18(d) and unchanged statements as provided in § 1503.4(c). However, if the statement is unusually long, the agency may circulate the summary instead, except that the entire statement shall be furnished to:

(a) Any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and any appropriate Federal, State or local agency authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(b) The applicant, if any.

(c) Any person, organization, or agency requesting the entire environmental impact statement.

(d) In the case of a final environmental impact statement any person,

organization, or agency which submitted substantive comments on the draft.

If the agency circulates the summary and thereafter receives a timely request for the entire statement and for additional time to comment, the time for that requestor only shall be extended by at least 15 days beyond the minimum period.

§ 1502.20 Tiering.

Agencies are encouraged to tier their environmental impact statements to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and to focus on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review (§ 1508.28). Whenever a broad environmental impact statement has been prepared (such as a program or policy statement) and a subsequent statement or environmental assessment is then prepared on an action included within the entire program or policy (such as a site specific action) the subsequent statement or environmental assessment need only summarize the issues discussed in the broader statement and incorporate discussions from the broader statement by reference and shall concentrate on the issues specific to the subsequent action. The subsequent document shall state where the earlier document is available. Tiering may also be appropriate for different stages of actions. (Section 1508.28).

§ 1502.21 Incorporation by reference.

Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down on bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material based on proprietary data which is itself not available for review and comment shall not be incorporated by reference.

§ 1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.

When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.

(a) If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.

(b) If the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts cannot be obtained because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement: (1) A statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable; (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; (3) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and (4) the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts which have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

(c) The amended regulation will be applicable to all environmental impact statements for which a Notice of Intent (40 CFR 1508.22) is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on or after May 27, 1986. For environmental impact statements in progress, agencies may choose to comply with the re-

quirements of either the original or amended regulation.

[51 FR 15625, Apr. 25, 1986]

§ 1502.23 Cost-benefit analysis.

If a cost-benefit analysis relevant to the choice among environmentally different alternatives is being considered for the proposed action, it shall be incorporated by reference or appended to the statement as an aid in evaluating the environmental consequences. To assess the adequacy of compliance with section 102(2)(B) of the Act the statement shall, when a cost-benefit analysis is prepared, discuss the relationship between that analysis and any analyses of unquantified environmental impacts, values, and amenities. For purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations. In any event, an environmental impact statement should at least indicate those considerations, including factors not related to environmental quality, which are likely to be relevant and important to a decision.

§ 1502.24 Methodology and scientific accuracy.

Agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements. They shall identify any methodologies used and shall make explicit reference by footnote to the scientific and other sources relied upon for conclusions in the statement. An agency may place discussion of methodology in an appendix.

§ 1502.25 Environmental review and consultation requirements.

(a) To the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with and integrated with environmental impact analyses and related surveys and studies required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and other environmental review laws and executive orders.

(b) The draft environmental impact statement shall list all Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal. If it is uncertain whether a Federal permit, license, or other entitlement is necessary, the draft environmental impact statement shall so indicate.

PART 1503—COMMENTING

Sec.

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

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55997, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1503.1 Inviting comments.

(a) After preparing a draft environmental impact statement and before preparing a final environmental impact statement the agency shall:

(1) Obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved or which is authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(2) Request the comments of:

(i) Appropriate State and local agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards;

(ii) Indian tribes, when the effects may be on a reservation; and

(iii) Any agency which has requested that it receive statements on actions of the kind proposed.

Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 (Revised), through its system of clearinghouses, provides a means of securing the views of State and local environmental agencies. The clearinghouses may be used, by mutual agreement of the lead agency and the clearinghouse, for securing

State and local reviews of the draft environmental impact statements.

(3) Request comments from the applicant, if any.

(4) Request comments from the public, affirmatively soliciting comments from those persons or organizations who may be interested or affected.

(b) An agency may request comments on a final environmental impact statement before the decision is finally made. In any case other agencies or persons may make comments before the final decision unless a different time is provided under § 1506.10.

§ 1503.2 Duty to comment.

Federal agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and agencies which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards shall comment on statements within their jurisdiction, expertise, or authority. Agencies shall comment within the time period specified for comment in § 1506.10. A Federal agency may reply that it has no comment. If a cooperating agency is satisfied that its views are adequately reflected in the environmental impact statement, it should reply that it has no comment.

§ 1503.3 Specificity of comments.

(a) Comments on an environmental impact statement or on a proposed action shall be as specific as possible and may address either the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed or both.

(b) When a commenting agency criticizes a lead agency's predictive methodology, the commenting agency should describe the alternative methodology which it prefers and why.

(c) A cooperating agency shall specify in its comments whether it needs additional information to fulfill other applicable environmental reviews or consultation requirements and what information it needs. In particular, it shall specify any additional information it needs to comment adequately on the draft statement's analysis of significant site-specific effects associated with the granting or approving by that cooperating agency of necessary Federal permits, licenses, or entitlements.

(d) When a cooperating agency with jurisdiction by law objects to or expresses reservations about the proposal on grounds of environmental impacts, the agency expressing the objection or reservation shall specify the mitigation measures it considers necessary to allow the agency to grant or approve applicable permit, license, or related requirements or concurrences.

§ 1503.4 Response to comments.

(a) An agency preparing a final environmental impact statement shall assess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to:

(1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action.

(2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.

(3) Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.

(4) Make factual corrections.

(5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

(b) All substantive comments received on the draft statement (or summaries thereof where the response has been exceptionally voluminous), should be attached to the final statement whether or not the comment is thought to merit individual discussion by the agency in the text of the statement.

(c) If changes in response to comments are minor and are confined to the responses described in paragraphs (a) (4) and (5) of this section, agencies may write them on errata sheets and attach them to the statement instead of rewriting the draft statement. In such cases only the comments, the responses, and the changes and not the final statement need be circulated (§ 1502.19). The entire document with

a new cover sheet shall be filed as the final statement (§ 1506.9).

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

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

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55998, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1504.1 Purpose.

(a) This part establishes procedures for referring to the Council Federal interagency disagreements concerning proposed major Federal actions that might cause unsatisfactory environmental effects. It provides means for early resolution of such disagreements.

(b) Under section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is directed to review and comment publicly on the environmental impacts of Federal activities, including actions for which environmental impact statements are prepared. If after this review the Administrator determines that the matter is "unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality," section 309 directs that the matter be referred to the Council (hereafter "environmental referrals").

(c) Under section 102(2)(C) of the Act other Federal agencies may make similar reviews of environmental impact statements, including judgments on the acceptability of anticipated environmental impacts. These reviews must be made available to the President, the Council and the public.

§ 1504.2 Criteria for referral.

Environmental referrals should be made to the Council only after concerted, timely (as early as possible in the process), but unsuccessful attempts to resolve differences with the lead agency. In determining what environmental objections to the matter are appropriate to refer to the Council, an agency should weigh potential adverse environmental impacts, considering:

(a) Possible violation of national environmental standards or policies.

(b) Severity.

(c) Geographical scope.

(d) Duration.

(e) Importance as precedents.

(f) Availability of environmentally preferable alternatives.

§ 1504.3 Procedure for referrals and response.

(a) A Federal agency making the referral to the Council shall:

(1) Advise the lead agency at the earliest possible time that it intends to refer a matter to the Council unless a satisfactory agreement is reached.

(2) Include such advice in the referring agency's comments on the draft environmental impact statement, except when the statement does not contain adequate information to permit an assessment of the matter's environmental acceptability.

(3) Identify any essential information that is lacking and request that it be made available at the earliest possible time.

(4) Send copies of such advice to the Council.

(b) The referring agency shall deliver its referral to the Council not later than twenty-five (25) days after the final environmental impact statement has been made available to the Environmental Protection Agency, commenting agencies, and the public. Except when an extension of this period has been granted by the lead agency, the Council will not accept a referral after that date.

(c) The referral shall consist of:

(1) A copy of the letter signed by the head of the referring agency and delivered to the lead agency informing the lead agency of the referral and the reasons for it, and requesting that no action be taken to implement the matter until the Council acts upon the

referral. The letter shall include a copy of the statement referred to in (c)(2) of this section.

(2) A statement supported by factual evidence leading to the conclusion that the matter is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. The statement shall:

(i) Identify any material facts in controversy and incorporate (by reference if appropriate) agreed upon facts,

(ii) Identify any existing environmental requirements or policies which would be violated by the matter,

(iii) Present the reasons why the referring agency believes the matter is environmentally unsatisfactory,

(iv) Contain a finding by the agency whether the issue raised is of national importance because of the threat to national environmental resources or policies or for some other reason,

(v) Review the steps taken by the referring agency to bring its concerns to the attention of the lead agency at the earliest possible time, and

(vi) Give the referring agency's recommendations as to what mitigation alternative, further study, or other course of action (including abandonment of the matter) are necessary to remedy the situation.

(d) Not later than twenty-five (25) days after the referral to the Council the lead agency may deliver a response to the Council, and the referring agency. If the lead agency requests more time and gives assurance that the matter will not go forward in the interim, the Council may grant an extension. The response shall:

(1) Address fully the issues raised in the referral.

(2) Be supported by evidence.

(3) Give the lead agency's response to the referring agency's recommendations.

(e) Interested persons (including the applicant) may deliver their views in writing to the Council. Views in support of the referral should be delivered not later than the referral. Views in support of the response shall be delivered not later than the response.

(f) Not later than twenty-five (25) days after receipt of both the referral and any response or upon being informed that there will be no response (unless the lead agency agrees to a longer time), the Council may take one or more of the following actions:

(1) Conclude that the process of referral and response has successfully resolved the problem.

(2) Initiate discussions with the agencies with the objective of mediation with referring and lead agencies.

(3) Hold public meetings or hearings to obtain additional views and information.

(4) Determine that the issue is not one of national importance and request the referring and lead agencies to pursue their decision process.

(5) Determine that the issue should be further negotiated by the referring and lead agencies and is not appropriate for Council consideration until one or more heads of agencies report to the Council that the agencies' disagreements are irreconcilable.

(6) Publish its findings and recommendations (including where appropriate a finding that the submitted evidence does not support the position of an agency).

(7) When appropriate, submit the referral and the response together with the Council's recommendation to the President for action.

(g) The Council shall take no longer than 60 days to complete the actions specified in paragraph (f) (2), (3), or (5) of this section.

(h) When the referral involves an action required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for agency hearing, the referral shall be conducted in a manner consistent with 5 U.S.C. 557(d) (Administrative Procedure Act).

[43 FR 55998, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 873, Jan. 3, 1979]

PART 1505—NEPA AND AGENCY DECISIONMAKING

Sec.

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

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C.

7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 55999, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1505.1 Agency decisionmaking procedures.

Agencies shall adopt procedures (§ 1507.3) to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the policies and purposes of the Act. Such procedures shall include but not be limited to:

(a) Implementing procedures under section 102(2) to achieve the requirements of sections 101 and 102(1).

(b) Designating the major decision points for the agency's principal programs likely to have a significant effect on the human environment and assuring that the NEPA process corresponds with them.

(c) Requiring that relevant environmental documents, comments, and responses be part of the record in formal rulemaking or adjudicatory proceedings.

(d) Requiring that relevant environmental documents, comments, and responses accompany the proposal through existing agency review processes so that agency officials use the statement in making decisions.

(e) Requiring that the alternatives considered by the decisionmaker are encompassed by the range of alternatives discussed in the relevant environmental documents and that the decisionmaker consider the alternatives described in the environmental impact statement. If another decision document accompanies the relevant environmental documents to the decisionmaker, agencies are encouraged to make available to the public before the decision is made any part of that document that relates to the comparison of alternatives.

§ 1505.2 Record of decision in cases requiring environmental impact statements.

At the time of its decision (§ 1506.10) or, if appropriate, its recommendation to Congress, each agency shall prepare a concise public record of decision. The record, which may be integrated into any other record prepared by the agency, including that required by OMB Circular A-95 (Revised), part I, sections 6 (c) and (d), and part II, section 5(b)(4), shall:

(a) State what the decision was.

(b) Identify all alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision, specifying the alternative or alternatives which were considered to be environmentally preferable. An agency may discuss preferences among alternatives based on relevant factors including economic and technical considerations and agency statutory missions. An agency shall identify and discuss all such factors including any essential considerations of national policy which were balanced by the agency in making its decision and state how those considerations entered into its decision.

(c) State whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not. A monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted and summarized where applicable for any mitigation.

§ 1505.3 Implementing the decision.

Agencies may provide for monitoring to assure that their decisions are carried out and should do so in important cases. Mitigation (§ 1505.2(c)) and other conditions established in the environmental impact statement or during its review and committed as part of the decision shall be implemented by the lead agency or other appropriate consenting agency. The lead agency shall:

(a) Include appropriate conditions in grants, permits or other approvals.

(b) Condition funding of actions on mitigation.

(c) Upon request, inform cooperating or commenting agencies on progress in carrying out mitigation measures which they have proposed and which were adopted by the agency making the decision.

(d) Upon request, make available to the public the results of relevant monitoring.

PART 1506—OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF NEPA

Sec.
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.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56000, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1506.1 Limitations on actions during NEPA process.

(a) Until an agency issues a record of decision as provided in § 1505.2 (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section), no action concerning the proposal shall be taken which would:

(1) Have an adverse environmental impact; or

(2) Limit the choice of reasonable alternatives.

(b) If any agency is considering an application from a non-Federal entity, and is aware that the applicant is about to take an action within the agency's jurisdiction that would meet either of the criteria in paragraph (a) of this section, then the agency shall promptly notify the applicant that the agency will take appropriate action to insure that the objectives and procedures of NEPA are achieved.

(c) While work on a required program environmental impact statement is in progress and the action is not covered by an existing program statement, agencies shall not undertake in the interim any major Federal action covered by the program which may significantly affect the quality of the human environment unless such action:

(1) Is justified independently of the program;

(2) Is itself accompanied by an adequate environmental impact statement; and

(3) Will not prejudice the ultimate decision on the program. Interim action prejudices the ultimate decision on the program when it tends to determine subsequent development or limit alternatives.

(d) This section does not preclude development by applicants of plans or designs or performance of other work necessary to support an application for Federal, State or local permits or assistance. Nothing in this section shall preclude Rural Electrification Administration approval of minimal expenditures not affecting the environment (*e.g.* long leadtime equipment and purchase options) made by nongovernmental entities seeking loan guarantees from the Administration.

§ 1506.2 Elimination of duplication with State and local procedures.

(a) Agencies authorized by law to cooperate with State agencies of statewide jurisdiction pursuant to section 102(2)(D) of the Act may do so.

(b) Agencies shall cooperate with State and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements, unless the agencies are specifically barred from doing so by some other law. Except for cases covered by paragraph (a) of this section, such cooperation shall to the fullest extent possible include:

(1) Joint planning processes.

(2) Joint environmental research and studies.

(3) Joint public hearings (except where otherwise provided by statute).

(4) Joint environmental assessments.

(c) Agencies shall cooperate with State and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and comparable State and local requirements, unless the agencies are specifically barred from doing so by some other law. Except for cases covered by paragraph (a) of this section, such cooperation shall to the fullest extent possible include joint environmental impact statements. In

such cases one or more Federal agencies and one or more State or local agencies shall be joint lead agencies. Where State laws or local ordinances have environmental impact statement requirements in addition to but not in conflict with those in NEPA, Federal agencies shall cooperate in fulfilling these requirements as well as those of Federal laws so that one document will comply with all applicable laws.

(d) To better integrate environmental impact statements into State or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an inconsistency exists, the statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law.

§ 1506.3 Adoption.

(a) An agency may adopt a Federal draft or final environmental impact statement or portion thereof provided that the statement or portion thereof meets the standards for an adequate statement under these regulations.

(b) If the actions covered by the original environmental impact statement and the proposed action are substantially the same, the agency adopting another agency's statement is not required to recirculate it except as a final statement. Otherwise the adopting agency shall treat the statement as a draft and recirculate it (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section).

(c) A cooperating agency may adopt without recirculating the environmental impact statement of a lead agency when, after an independent review of the statement, the cooperating agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied.

(d) When an agency adopts a statement which is not final within the agency that prepared it, or when the action it assesses is the subject of a referral under Part 1504, or when the statement's adequacy is the subject of a judicial action which is not final, the agency shall so specify.

§ 1506.4 Combining documents.

Any environmental document in compliance with NEPA may be combined with any other agency document to reduce duplication and paperwork.

§ 1506.5 Agency responsibility.

(a) *Information.* If an agency requires an applicant to submit environmental information for possible use by the agency in preparing an environmental impact statement, then the agency should assist the applicant by outlining the types of information required. The agency shall independently evaluate the information submitted and shall be responsible for its accuracy. If the agency chooses to use the information submitted by the applicant in the environmental impact statement, either directly or by reference, then the names of the persons responsible for the independent evaluation shall be included in the list of preparers (§ 1502.17). It is the intent of this paragraph that acceptable work not be redone, but that it be verified by the agency.

(b) *Environmental assessments.* If an agency permits an applicant to prepare an environmental assessment, the agency, besides fulfilling the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section, shall make its own evaluation of the environmental issues and take responsibility for the scope and content of the environmental assessment.

(c) *Environmental impact statements.* Except as provided in §§ 1506.2 and 1506.3 any environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to the requirements of NEPA shall be prepared directly by or by a contractor selected by the lead agency or where appropriate under § 1501.6(b), a cooperating agency. It is the intent of these regulations that the contractor be chosen solely by the lead agency, or by the lead agency in cooperation with cooperating agencies, or where appropriate by a cooperating agency to avoid any conflict of interest. Contractors shall execute a disclosure statement prepared by the lead agency, or where appropriate the cooperating agency, specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the out-

come of the project. If the document is prepared by contract, the responsible Federal official shall furnish guidance and participate in the preparation and shall independently evaluate the statement prior to its approval and take responsibility for its scope and contents. Nothing in this section is intended to prohibit any agency from requesting any person to submit information to it or to prohibit any person from submitting information to any agency.

§ 1506.6 Public involvement.

Agencies shall:

(a) Make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.

(b) Provide public notice of NEPA-related hearings, public meetings, and the availability of environmental documents so as to inform those persons and agencies who may be interested or affected.

(1) In all cases the agency shall mail notice to those who have requested it on an individual action.

(2) In the case of an action with effects of national concern notice shall include publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER and notice by mail to national organizations reasonably expected to be interested in the matter and may include listing in the *102 Monitor.* An agency engaged in rulemaking may provide notice by mail to national organizations who have requested that notice regularly be provided. Agencies shall maintain a list of such organizations.

(3) In the case of an action with effects primarily of local concern the notice may include:

(i) Notice to State and areawide clearinghouses pursuant to OMB Circular A-95 (Revised).

(ii) Notice to Indian tribes when effects may occur on reservations.

(iii) Following the affected State's public notice procedures for comparable actions.

(iv) Publication in local newspapers (in papers of general circulation rather than legal papers).

(v) Notice through other local media.

(vi) Notice to potentially interested community organizations including small business associations.

(vii) Publication in newsletters that may be expected to reach potentially interested persons.

(viii) Direct mailing to owners and occupants of nearby or affected property.

(ix) Posting of notice on and off site in the area where the action is to be located.

(c) Hold or sponsor public hearings or public meetings whenever appropriate or in accordance with statutory requirements applicable to the agency. Criteria shall include whether there is:

(1) Substantial environmental controversy concerning the proposed action or substantial interest in holding the hearing.

(2) A request for a hearing by another agency with jurisdiction over the action supported by reasons why a hearing will be helpful. If a draft environmental impact statement is to be considered at a public hearing, the agency should make the statement available to the public at least 15 days in advance (unless the purpose of the hearing is to provide information for the draft environmental impact statement).

(d) Solicit appropriate information from the public.

(e) Explain in its procedures where interested persons can get information or status reports on environmental impact statements and other elements of the NEPA process.

(f) Make environmental impact statements, the comments received, and any underlying documents available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), without regard to the exclusion for interagency memoranda where such memoranda transmit comments of Federal agencies on the environmental impact of the proposed action. Materials to be made available to the public shall be provided to the public without charge to the extent practicable, or at a fee which is not more than the actual costs of reproducing copies required to be sent to other Federal agencies, including the Council.

§ 1506.7 Further guidance.

The Council may provide further guidance concerning NEPA and its procedures including:

(a) A handbook which the Council may supplement from time to time, which shall in plain language provide guidance and instructions concerning the application of NEPA and these regulations.

(b) Publication of the Council's Memoranda to Heads of Agencies.

(c) In conjunction with the Environmental Protection Agency and the publication of the 102 Monitor, notice of:

(1) Research activities;

(2) Meetings and conferences related to NEPA; and

(3) Successful and innovative procedures used by agencies to implement NEPA.

§ 1506.8 Proposals for legislation.

(a) The NEPA process for proposals for legislation (§ 1508.17) significantly affecting the quality of the human environment shall be integrated with the legislative process of the Congress. A legislative environmental impact statement is the detailed statement required by law to be included in a recommendation or report on a legislative proposal to Congress. A legislative environmental impact statement shall be considered part of the formal transmittal of a legislative proposal to Congress; however, it may be transmitted to Congress up to 30 days later in order to allow time for completion of an accurate statement which can serve as the basis for public and Congressional debate. The statement must be available in time for Congressional hearings and deliberations.

(b) Preparation of a legislative environmental impact statement shall conform to the requirements of these regulations except as follows:

(1) There need not be a scoping process.

(2) The legislative statement shall be prepared in the same manner as a draft statement, but shall be considered the "detailed statement" required by statute; *Provided*, That when any of the following conditions exist both the draft and final environmental impact statement on the legislative proposal shall be prepared and circulated as provided by §§ 1503.1 and 1506.10.

(i) A Congressional Committee with jurisdiction over the proposal has a rule requiring both draft and final environmental impact statements.

(ii) The proposal results from a study process required by statute (such as those required by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.)).

(iii) Legislative approval is sought for Federal or federally assisted construction or other projects which the agency recommends be located at specific geographic locations. For proposals requiring an environmental impact statement for the acquisition of space by the General Services Administration, a draft statement shall accompany the Prospectus or the 11(b) Report of Building Project Surveys to the Congress, and a final statement shall be completed before site acquisition.

(iv) The agency decides to prepare draft and final statements.

(c) Comments on the legislative statement shall be given to the lead agency which shall forward them along with its own responses to the Congressional committees with jurisdiction.

§ 1506.9 Filing requirements.

Environmental impact statements together with comments and responses shall be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency, attention Office of Federal Activities (A-104), 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Statements shall be filed with EPA no earlier than they are also transmitted to commenting agencies and made available to the public. EPA shall deliver one copy of each statement to the Council, which shall satisfy the requirement of availability to the President. EPA may issue guidelines to agencies to implement its responsibilities under this section and § 1506.10.

§ 1506.10 Timing of agency action.

(a) The Environmental Protection Agency shall publish a notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER each week of the environmental impact statements filed

during the preceding week. The minimum time periods set forth in this section shall be calculated from the date of publication of this notice.

(b) No decision on the proposed action shall be made or recorded under § 1505.2 by a Federal agency until the later of the following dates:

(1) Ninety (90) days after publication of the notice described above in paragraph (a) of this section for a draft environmental impact statement.

(2) Thirty (30) days after publication of the notice described above in paragraph (a) of this section for a final environmental impact statement.

An exception to the rules on timing may be made in the case of an agency decision which is subject to a formal internal appeal. Some agencies have a formally established appeal process which allows other agencies or the public to take appeals on a decision and make their views known, after publication of the final environmental impact statement. In such cases, where a real opportunity exists to alter the decision, the decision may be made and recorded at the same time the environmental impact statement is published. This means that the period for appeal of the decision and the 30-day period prescribed in paragraph (b)(2) of this section may run concurrently. In such cases the environmental impact statement shall explain the timing and the public's right of appeal. An agency engaged in rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act or other statute for the purpose of protecting the public health or safety, may waive the time period in paragraph (b)(2) of this section and publish a decision on the final rule simultaneously with publication of the notice of the availability of the final environmental impact statement as described in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) If the final environmental impact statement is filed within ninety (90) days after a draft environmental impact statement is filed with the Environmental Protection Agency, the minimum thirty (30) day period and the minimum ninety (90) day period may run concurrently. However, subject to paragraph (d) of this section agencies shall allow not less than 45 days for comments on draft statements.

(d) The lead agency may extend prescribed periods. The Environmental Protection Agency may upon a showing by the lead agency of compelling reasons of national policy reduce the prescribed periods and may upon a showing by any other Federal agency of compelling reasons of national policy also extend prescribed periods, but only after consultation with the lead agency. (Also see § 1507.3(d).) Failure to file timely comments shall not be a sufficient reason for extending a period. If the lead agency does not concur with the extension of time, EPA may not extend it for more than 30 days. When the Environmental Protection Agency reduces or extends any period of time it shall notify the Council.

[43 FR 56000, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 874, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1506.11 Emergencies.

Where emergency circumstances make it necessary to take an action with significant environmental impact without observing the provisions of these regulations, the Federal agency taking the action should consult with the Council about alternative arrangements. Agencies and the Council will limit such arrangements to actions necessary to control the immediate impacts of the emergency. Other actions remain subject to NEPA review.

§ 1506.12 Effective date.

The effective date of these regulations is July 30, 1979, except that for agencies that administer programs that qualify under section 102(2)(D) of the Act or under sec. 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 an additional four months shall be allowed for the State or local agencies to adopt their implementing procedures.

(a) These regulations shall apply to the fullest extent practicable to ongoing activities and environmental documents begun before the effective date. These regulations do not apply to an environmental impact statement or supplement if the draft statement was filed before the effective date of these

regulations. No completed environmental documents need be redone by reasons of these regulations. Until these regulations are applicable, the Council's guidelines published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 1, 1973, shall continue to be applicable. In cases where these regulations are applicable the guidelines are superseded. However, nothing shall prevent an agency from proceeding under these regulations at an earlier time.

(b) NEPA shall continue to be applicable to actions begun before January 1, 1970, to the fullest extent possible.

PART 1507—AGENCY COMPLIANCE

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

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56002, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1507.1 Compliance.

All agencies of the Federal Government shall comply with these regulations. It is the intent of these regulations to allow each agency flexibility in adapting its implementing procedures authorized by § 1507.3 to the requirements of other applicable laws.

§ 1507.2 Agency capability to comply.

Each agency shall be capable (in terms of personnel and other resources) of complying with the requirements enumerated below. Such compliance may include use of other's resources, but the using agency shall itself have sufficient capability to evaluate what others do for it. Agencies shall:

(a) Fulfill the requirements of section 102(2)(A) of the Act 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 in decisionmaking which may have an impact on the human environment. Agencies shall designate a person to be responsible for overall review of agency NEPA compliance.

(b) Identify methods and procedures required by section 102(2)(B) to insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration.

(c) Prepare adequate environmental impact statements pursuant to section 102(2)(C) and comment on statements in the areas where the agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise or is authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards.

(d) Study, develop, and describe alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. This requirement of section 102(2)(E) extends to all such proposals, not just the more limited scope of section 102(2)(C)(iii) where the discussion of alternatives is confined to impact statements.

(e) Comply with the requirements of section 102(2)(H) that the agency initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects.

(f) Fulfill the requirements of sections 102(2)(F), 102(2)(G), and 102(2)(I), of the Act and of Executive Order 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality, Sec. 2.

§ 1507.3 Agency procedures.

(a) Not later than eight months after publication of these regulations as finally adopted in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or five months after the establishment of an agency, whichever shall come later, each agency shall as necessary adopt procedures to supplement these regulations. When the agency is a department, major subunits are encouraged (with the consent of the department) to adopt their own procedures. Such procedures shall not paraphrase these regulations. They shall confine themselves to implementing procedures. Each agency shall consult with the Council while developing its procedures and before publishing them in the FEDERAL REGISTER for comment. Agencies with similar programs should consult with each other

and the Council to coordinate their procedures, especially for programs requesting similar information from applicants. The procedures shall be adopted only after an opportunity for public review and after review by the Council for conformity with the Act and these regulations. The Council shall complete its review within 30 days. Once in effect they shall be filed with the Council and made readily available to the public. Agencies are encouraged to publish explanatory guidance for these regulations and their own procedures. Agencies shall continue to review their policies and procedures and in consultation with the Council to revise them as necessary to ensure full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act.

(b) Agency procedures shall comply with these regulations except where compliance would be inconsistent with statutory requirements and shall include:

(1) Those procedures required by §§ 1501.2(d), 1502.9(c)(3), 1505.1, 1506.6(e), and 1508.4.

(2) Specific criteria for and identification of those typical classes of action:

(i) Which normally do require environmental impact statements.

(ii) Which normally do not require either an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment (categorical exclusions (§ 1508.4)).

(iii) Which normally require environmental assessments but not necessarily environmental impact statements.

(c) Agency procedures may include specific criteria for providing limited exceptions to the provisions of these regulations for classified proposals. They are proposed actions which are specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive Order or statute to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and are in fact properly classified pursuant to such Executive Order or statute. Environmental assessments and environmental impact statements which address classified proposals may be safeguarded and restricted from public dissemination in accordance with agencies' own regulations applicable to classified information. These documents may be organized so that classified portions can be included as annexes, in order that the unclassified portions can be made available to the public.

(d) Agency procedures may provide for periods of time other than those presented in § 1506.10 when necessary to comply with other specific statutory requirements.

(e) Agency procedures may provide that where there is a lengthy period between the agency's decision to prepare an environmental impact statement and the time of actual preparation, the notice of intent required by § 1501.7 may be published at a reasonable time in advance of preparation of the draft statement.

PART 1508—TERMINOLOGY AND INDEX

Sec.

1508.1 Terminology.
1508.2 Act.
1508.3 Affecting.
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.

AUTHORITY: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

SOURCE: 43 FR 56003, Nov. 29, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§ 1508.1 Terminology.

The terminology of this part shall be uniform throughout the Federal Government.

§ 1508.2 Act.

"Act" means the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq.) which is also referred to as "NEPA."

§ 1508.3 Affecting.

"Affecting" means will or may have an effect on.

§ 1508.4 Categorical exclusion.

"Categorical exclusion" means a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which have been found to have no such effect in procedures adopted by a Federal agency in implementation of these regulations (§ 1507.3) and for which, therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required. An agency may decide in its procedures or otherwise, to prepare environmental assessments for the reasons stated in § 1508.9 even though it is not required to do so. Any procedures under this section shall provide for extraordinary circumstances in which a normally excluded action may have a significant environmental effect.

§ 1508.5 Cooperating agency.

"Cooperating agency" means any Federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The selection and responsibilities of a cooperating agency are described in § 1501.6. A State or local agency of similar qualifications or, when the effects are on a reservation, an Indian Tribe, may by agreement with the lead agency become a cooperating agency.

§ 1508.6 Council.

"Council" means the Council on Environmental Quality established by Title II of the Act.

§ 1508.7 Cumulative impact.

"Cumulative impact" is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

§ 1508.8 Effects.

"Effects" include:

(a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.

(b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.

§ 1508.9 Environmental assessment.

"Environmental assessment":

(a) Means a concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves to:

(1) Briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining

whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact.

(2) Aid an agency's compliance with the Act when no environmental impact statement is necessary.

(3) Facilitate preparation of a statement when one is necessary.

(b) Shall include brief discussions of the need for the proposal, of alternatives as required by section 102(2)(E), of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted.

§ 1508.10 Environmental document.

"Environmental document" includes the documents specified in § 1508.9 (environmental assessment), § 1508.11 (environmental impact statement), § 1508.13 (finding of no significant impact), and § 1508.22 (notice of intent).

§ 1508.11 Environmental impact statement.

"Environmental impact statement" means a detailed written statement as required by section 102(2)(C) of the Act.

§ 1508.12 Federal agency.

"Federal agency" means all agencies of the Federal Government. It does not mean the Congress, the Judiciary, or the President, including the performance of staff functions for the President in his Executive Office. It also includes for purposes of these regulations States and units of general local government and Indian tribes assuming NEPA responsibilities under section 104(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

§ 1508.13 Finding of no significant impact.

"Finding of no significant impact" means a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why an action, not otherwise excluded (§ 1508.4), will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared. It shall include the environmental assessment or a summary of it and shall note any other environmental documents related to it (§ 1501.7(a)(5)). If the assessment is included, the finding need not repeat any of the discussion in the assessment but may incorporate it by reference.

§ 1508.14 Human environment.

"Human environment" shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. (See the definition of "effects" (§ 1508.8).) This means that economic or social effects are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an environmental impact statement. When an environmental impact statement is prepared and economic or social and natural or physical environmental effects are interrelated, then the environmental impact statement will discuss all of these effects on the human environment.

§ 1508.15 Jurisdiction by law.

"Jurisdiction by law" means agency authority to approve, veto, or finance all or part of the proposal.

§ 1508.16 Lead agency.

"Lead agency" means the agency or agencies preparing or having taken primary responsibility for preparing the environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.17 Legislation.

"Legislation" includes a bill or legislative proposal to Congress developed by or with the significant cooperation and support of a Federal agency, but does not include requests for appropriations. The test for significant cooperation is whether the proposal is in fact predominantly that of the agency rather than another source. Drafting does not by itself constitute significant cooperation. Proposals for legislation include requests for ratification of treaties. Only the agency which has primary responsibility for the subject matter involved will prepare a legislative environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.18 Major Federal action.

"Major Federal action" includes actions with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to

Federal control and responsibility. Major reinforces but does not have a meaning independent of significantly (§ 1508.27). Actions include the circumstance where the responsible officials fail to act and that failure to act is reviewable by courts or administrative tribunals under the Administrative Procedure Act or other applicable law as agency action.

(a) Actions include new and continuing activities, including projects and programs entirely or partly financed, assisted, conducted, regulated, or approved by federal agencies; new or revised agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and legislative proposals (§§ 1506.8, 1508.17). Actions do not include funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds, distributed under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, 31 U.S.C. 1221 et seq., with no Federal agency control over the subsequent use of such funds. Actions do not include bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions.

(b) Federal actions tend to fall within one of the following categories:

(1) Adoption of official policy, such as rules, regulations, and interpretations adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq.; treaties and international conventions or agreements; formal documents establishing an agency's policies which will result in or substantially alter agency programs.

(2) Adoption of formal plans, such as official documents prepared or approved by federal agencies which guide or prescribe alternative uses of federal resources, upon which future agency actions will be based.

(3) Adoption of programs, such as a group of concerted actions to implement a specific policy or plan; systematic and connected agency decisions allocating agency resources to implement a specific statutory program or executive directive.

(4) Approval of specific projects, such as construction or management activities located in a defined geographic area. Projects include actions approved by permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted activities.

§ 1508.19 Matter.

"Matter" includes for purposes of Part 1504:

(a) With respect to the Environmental Protection Agency, any proposed legislation, project, action or regulation as those terms are used in section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609).

(b) With respect to all other agencies, any proposed major federal action to which section 102(2)(C) of NEPA applies.

§ 1508.20 Mitigation.

"Mitigation" includes:

(a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.

(b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.

(d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

§ 1508.21 NEPA process.

"NEPA process" means all measures necessary for compliance with the requirements of section 2 and Title I of NEPA.

§ 1508.22 Notice of intent.

"Notice of intent" means a notice that an environmental impact statement will be prepared and considered. The notice shall briefly:

(a) Describe the proposed action and possible alternatives.

(b) Describe the agency's proposed scoping process including whether, when, and where any scoping meeting will be held.

(c) State the name and address of a person within the agency who can answer questions about the proposed action and the environmental impact statement.

§ 1508.23 **Proposal.**

"Proposal" exists at that stage in the development of an action when an agency subject to the Act has a goal and is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal and the effects can be meaningfully evaluated. Preparation of an environmental impact statement on a proposal should be timed (§ 1502.5) so that the final statement may be completed in time for the statement to be included in any recommendation or report on the proposal. A proposal may exist in fact as well as by agency declaration that one exists.

§ 1508.24 **Referring agency.**

"Referring agency" means the federal agency which has referred any matter to the Council after a determination that the matter is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality.

§ 1508.25 **Scope.**

Scope consists of the range of actions, alternatives, and impacts to be considered in an environmental impact statement. The scope of an individual statement may depend on its relationships to other statements (§§1502.20 and 1508.28). To determine the scope of environmental impact statements, agencies shall consider 3 types of actions, 3 types of alternatives, and 3 types of impacts. They include:

(a) Actions (other than unconnected single actions) which may be:

(1) Connected actions, which means that they are closely related and therefore should be discussed in the same impact statement. Actions are connected if they:

(i) Automatically trigger other actions which may require environmental impact statements.

(ii) Cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously.

(iii) Are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification.

(2) Cumulative actions, which when viewed with other proposed actions have cumulatively significant impacts and should therefore be discussed in the same impact statement.

(3) Similar actions, which when viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequencies together, such as common timing or geography. An agency may wish to analyze these actions in the same impact statement. It should do so when the best way to assess adequately the combined impacts of similar actions or reasonable alternatives to such actions is to treat them in a single impact statement.

(b) Alternatives, which include: (1) No action alternative.

(2) Other reasonable courses of actions.

(3) Mitigation measures (not in the proposed action).

(c) Impacts, which may be: (1) Direct; (2) indirect; (3) cumulative.

§ 1508.26 **Special expertise.**

"Special expertise" means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.

§ 1508.27 **Significantly.**

"Significantly" as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity:

(a) *Context.* This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant.

(b) *Intensity.* This refers to the severity of impact. Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action. The following should be considered in evaluating intensity:

(1) Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency

believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

(2) The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

(3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

(4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

(5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

(6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

(7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.

(8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

(9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

[43 FR 56003, Nov. 29, 1978; 44 FR 874, Jan. 3, 1979]

§ 1508.28 Tiering.

"Tiering" refers to the coverage of general matters in broader environmental impact statements (such as national program or policy statements) with subsequent narrower statements or environmental analyses (such as regional or basinwide program statements or ultimately site-specific statements) incorporating by reference the general discussions and concentrating solely on the issues specific to the statement subsequently prepared. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of statements or analyses is:

(a) From a program, plan, or policy environmental impact statement to a program, plan, or policy statement or analysis of lesser scope or to a site-specific statement or analysis.

(b) From an environmental impact statement on a specific action at an early stage (such as need and site selection) to a supplement (which is preferred) or a subsequent statement or analysis at a later stage (such as environmental mitigation). Tiering in such cases is appropriate when it helps the lead agency to focus on the issues which are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ripe.

INDEX

Act	1508.2.
Action	1508.18, 1508.25.
Action-forcing	1500.1, 1502.1.
Adoption	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1506.3.
Affected Environment	1502.10(f), 1502.15.
Affecting	1502.3, 1508.3.
Agency Authority	1500.6.
Agency Capability	1501.2(a), 1507.2.
Agency Compliance	1507.1.
Agency Procedures	1505.1, 1507.3.
Agency Responsibility	1506.5.
Alternatives	1501.2(c), 1502.2, 1502.10(e), 1502.14, 1505.1(e), 1505.2, 1507.2(d), 1508.25(b).
Appendices	1502.10(k), 1502.18, 1502.24.
Applicant	1501.2(d)(1), 1501.4(b), 1501.8(a), 1502.19(b), 1503.1(a)(3), 1504.3(e), 1506.1(d), 1506.5(a), 1506.5(b).
Apply NEPA Early in the Process.	1501.2.
Categorical Exclusion	1500.4(p), 1500.5(k), 1501.4(a), 1507.3(b), 1508.4.
Circulating of Environmental Impact Statement.	1502.19, 1506.3.
Classified Information	1507.3(c).
Clean Air Act	1504.1, 1508.19(a).
Combining Documents	1500.4(o), 1500.5(i), 1506.4.
Commenting	1502.19, 1503.1, 1503.2, 1503.3, 1503.4, 1506.6(c).
Consultation Requirement	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g), 1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25.
Context	1508.27(a).
Cooperating Agency	1500.5(b), 1501.1(b), 1501.5(c), 1501.5(f), 1501.6, 1503.1(a)(1), 1503.2, 1503.3, 1506.3(c), 1506.5(a), 1508.5.
Cost-Benefit	1502.23.
Council on Environmental Quality.	1500.3, 1501.5(e), 1501.5(f), 1501.6(c), 1502.9(c)(4), 1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3, 1506.6(f), 1506.9, 1506.10(e), 1506.11, 1507.3, 1508.6, 1508.24.
Cover Sheet	1502.10(a), 1502.11.
Cumulative Impact	1508.7, 1508.25(a), 1508.25(c).
Decisionmaking	1505.1, 1506.1.
Decision points	1505.1(b).
Dependent	1508.25(a).
Draft Environmental Impact Statement.	1502.9(a).
Early Application of NEPA	1501.2.
Economic Effects	1508.8.
Effective Date	1506.12.
Effects	1502.16, 1508.8.
Emergencies	1506.11.
Endangered Species Act	1502.25, 1508.27(b)(9).
Energy	1502.16(e).
Environmental Assessment	1501.3, 1501.4(b), 1501.4(c), 1501.7(b)(3), 1506.2(b)(4), 1506.5(b), 1508.4, 1508.9, 1508.10, 1508.13.
Environmental Consequences.	1502.10(g), 1502.16.

INDEX—Continued

Environmental Consultation Requirements.	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g), 1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25, 1503.3(c).
Environmental Documents	1508.10.
Environmental Impact Statement.	1500.4, 1501.4(c), 1501.7, 1501.3, 1502.1, 1502.2, 1502.3, 1502.4, 1502.5, 1502.6, 1502.7, 1502.8, 1502.9, 1502.10, 1502.11, 1502.12, 1502.13, 1502.14, 1502.15, 1502.16, 1502.17, 1502.18, 1502.19, 1502.20, 1502.21, 1502.22, 1502.23, 1502.24, 1502.25, 1506.2(b)(4), 1506.3, 1506.8, 1508.11.
Environmental Protection Agency.	1502.11(f), 1504.1, 1504.3, 1506.7(c), 1506.9, 1506.10, 1508.19(a).
Environmental Review Requirements.	1500.4(k), 1500.5(g), 1501.7(a)(6), 1502.25 1503.3(c).
Expediter	1501.8(b)(2).
Federal Agency	1508.12.
Filing	1506.9.
Final Environmental Impact Statement.	1502.9(b), 1503.1, 1503.4(b).
Finding of No Significant Impact.	1500.3, 1500.4(q), 1500.5(1), 1501.4(e), 1508.13.
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.	1502.25.
Format for Environmental Impact Statement.	1502.10.
Freedom of Information Act	1506.6(f).
Further Guidance	1506.7.
Generic	1502.4(c)(2).
General Services Administration.	1506.8(b)(5).
Geographic	1502.4(c)(1).
Graphics	1502.8.
Handbook	1506.7(a).
Housing and Community Development Act.	1506.12, 1508.12.
Human Environment	1502.3, 1502.22, 1508.14.
Impacts	1508.8, 1508.25(c).
Implementing the Decision	1505.3.
Incomplete or Unavailable Information.	1502.22.
Incorporation by Reference	1500.4(j), 1502.21.
Index	1502.10(j).
Indian Tribes	1501.2(d)(2), 1501.7(a)(1), 1502.15(c), 1503.1(a)(2)(ii), 1506.6(b)(3)(ii), 1508.5, 1508.12.
Intensity	1508.27(b).
Interdisciplinary Preparation	1502.6, 1502.17.
Interim Actions	1506.1.
Joint Lead Agency	1501.5(b), 1506.2.
Judicial Review	1500.3.
Jurisdication by Law	1508.15.
Lead Agency	1500.5(c), 1501.1(c), 1501.5, 1501.6, 1501.7, 1501.8, 1504.3, 1506.2(b)(4), 1506.8(a), 1506.10(e), 1508.16.
Legislation	1500.5(j), 1502.3, 1506.8, 1508.17, 1508.18(a).
Limitation on Action During NEPA Process.	1506.1.
List of Preparers	1502.10(h), 1502.17.

Local or State	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1501.2(d)(2), 1501.5(b), 1501.5(d), 1501.7(a)(1), 1501.8(c), 1502.16(c), 1503.1(a)(2), 1506.2(b), 1506.6(b)(3), 1508.5, 1508.12, 1508.18.
Major Federal Action	1502.3, 1508.18.
Mandate	1500.3.
Matter	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3, 1508.19.
Methodology	1502.24.
Mitigation	1502.14(h), 1502.16(h), 1503.3(d), 1505.2(c), 1505.3, 1508.20.
Monitoring	1505.2(c), 1505.3.
National Historic Preservation Act.	1502.25.
National Register of Historical Places.	1508.27(b)(8).
Natural or Depletable Resource Requirements.	1502.16(f).
Need for Action	1502.10(d), 1502.13.
NEPA Process	1508.21.
Non-Federal Sponsor	1501.2(d).
Notice of Intent	1501.7, 1507.3(e), 1508.22.
OMB Circular A-95	1503.1(a)(2)(iii), 1505.2, 1506.6(b)(3)(i).
102 Monitor	1506.6(b)(2), 1506.7(c).
Ongoing Activities	1506.12.
Page Limits	1500.4(a), 1501.7(b), 1502.7.
Planning	1500.5(a), 1501.2(b), 1502.4(a), 1508.18.
Policy	1500.2, 1502.4(b), 1508.18(a).
Program Environmental Impact Statement.	1500.4(i), 1502.4, 1502.20, 1508.18.
Programs	1502.4, 1508.18(b).
Projects	1508.18.
Proposal	1502.4, 1502.5, 1506.8, 1508.23.
Proposed Action	1502.10(e), 1502.14, 1506.2(c).
Public Health and Welfare	1504.1.
Public Involvement	1501.4(e), 1503.1(a)(3), 1506.6.
Purpose	1500.1, 1501.1, 1502.1, 1504.1.
Purpose of Action	1502.10(d), 1502.13.

INDEX—Continued

Record of Decision	1505.2, 1506.1.
Referrals	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3, 1506.3(d).
Referring Agency	1504.1, 1504.2, 1504.3.
Response to Comments	1503.4.
Rural Electrification Administration.	1506.1(d).
Scientific Accuracy	1502.24.
Scope	1502.4(a), 1502.9(a), 1508.25.
Scoping	1500.4(b), 1501.1(d), 1501.4(d), 1501.7, 1502.9(a), 1506.8(a).
Significantly	1502.3, 1508.27.
Similar	1508.25.
Small Business Associations	1506.6(b)(3)(vi).
Social Effects	1508.8.
Special Expertise	1508.26.
Specificity of Comments	1500.4(1), 1503.3.
State and Areawide Clearinghouses.	1501.4(e)(2), 1503.1(a)(2)(iii), 1506.6(b)(3)(i).
State and Local	1500.4(n), 1500.5(h), 1501.2(d)(2), 1501.5(b), 1501.5(d), 1501.7(a)(1), 1501.8(c), 1502.16(c), 1503.1(a)(2), 1506.2(b), 1506.6(b)(3), 1508.5, 1508.12, 1508.18.
State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.	1508.18(a).
Summary	1500.4(h), 1502.10(b), 1502.12.
Supplements to Environmental Impact Statements.	1502.9(c).
Table of Contents	1502.10(c).
Technological Development	1502.4(c)(3).
Terminology	1508.1.
Tiering	1500.4(i), 1502.4(d), 1502.20, 1508.28.
Time Limits	1500.5(e), 1501.1(e), 1501.7(b)(2), 1501.8.
Timing	1502.4, 1502.5, 1506.10.
Treaties	1508.17.
When to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.	1501.3.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	1506.8(b)(ii).
Wilderness Act	1506.8(b)(ii).
Writing	1502.

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969, AS AMENDED*

An Act to establish a national policy for the environment, to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

TITLE I

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances and recognizing further the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

(b) In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may—

(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

(2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

(3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice;

(5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

(6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

*Pub. L. 91–190, 42 U.S.C. 4321–4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94–52, July 3, 1975, and Pub. L. 94–83, August 9, 1975.

(c) The Congress recognizes that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

SEC. 102. The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible: (1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and (2) all agencies of the Federal Government shall—

(A) 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 in decisionmaking which may have an impact on man's environment;

(B) Identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations;

(C) Include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

(i) The environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) Any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

(iii) Alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) The relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) Any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;

(D) Any detailed statement required under subparagraph (c) after January 1, 1970, for any major Federal action funded under a program of grants to States shall not be deemed to be legally insufficient solely by reason of having been prepared by a State agency or official, if:

(i) the State agency or official has statewide jurisdiction and has the responsibility for such action,

(ii) the responsible Federal official furnishes guidance and participates in such preparation,

(iii) the responsible Federal official independently evaluates such statement prior to its approval and adoption, and

(iv) after January 1, 1976, the responsible Federal official provides early notification to, and solicits the views of, any other State or any Federal land management entity of any action or any alternative thereto which may have significant impacts upon such State or affected Federal land management entity and, if there is any disagreement on such impacts, prepares a written assessment of such impacts and views for incorporation into such detailed statement.

The procedures in this subparagraph shall not relieve the Federal official of his responsibilities for the scope, objectivity, and content of the entire statement or of any other responsibility under this Act; and further, this subparagraph does not affect the legal sufficiency of statements prepared by State agencies with less than statewide jurisdiction.

(E) Study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources;

(F) Recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and, where consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment;

(G) Make available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(H) Initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects; and

(I) Assist the Council on Environmental Quality established by title II of this Act.

SEC. 103. All agencies of the Federal Government shall review their present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures for the purpose of determining whether there are any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of this Act and shall propose to the President not later than July 1, 1971, such measures as may be necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformity with the intent, purposes, and procedures set forth in this Act.

SEC. 104. Nothing in section 102 or 103 shall in any way affect the specific statutory obligations of any Federal agency (1) to comply with criteria or standards of environmental quality, (2) to coordinate or consult with any other Federal or State agency, or (3) to act, or refrain from acting contingent upon the recommendations or certification of any other Federal or State agency.

SEC. 105. The policies and goals set forth in this Act are supplementary to those set forth in existing authorizations of Federal agencies.

TITLE II

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SEC. 201. The President shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning July 1, 1970, an Environmental Quality Report (hereinafter referred to as the "report") which shall set forth (1) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban and rural environment; (2) current and foreseeable trends in the quality, management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; (3) the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human and economic requirements of the Nation in the light of expected population pressures; (4) a review of the programs and activities (including regulatory activities) of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, and nongovernmental entities or individuals with particular reference to their effect on the environment and on the conservation, development and utilization of natural resources; and (5) a program for remedying the deficiencies of existing programs and activities, together with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 202. There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President to serve at his pleasure, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council to serve as Chairman. Each member shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally well qualified to analyze and interpret environmental trends and information of all kinds; to appraise programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in title I of this Act; to be conscious of and responsive to

the scientific, economic, social, esthetic, and cultural needs and interests of the Nation; and to formulate and recommend national policies to promote the improvement of the quality of the environment.

SEC. 203. The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

SEC. 204. It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report required by section 201 of this title;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in the quality of the environment both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in title I of this Act, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(3) to review and appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in title I of this Act for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet the conservation, social, economic, health, and other requirements and goals of the Nation;

(5) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality;

(6) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(7) to report at least once each year to the President on the state and condition of the environment; and

(8) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request.

SEC. 205. In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, the Council shall—

(1) Consult with the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality established by Executive Order No. 11472, dated May 29, 1969, and with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation organizations, State and local governments and other groups, as it deems advisable; and

(2) Utilize, to the fullest extent possible, the services, facilities and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies and organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided, thus assuring that the Council's activities will not unnecessarily overlap or conflict with similar activities authorized by law and performed by established agencies.

SEC. 206. Members of the Council shall serve full time and the Chairman of the Council shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level II of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5313). The other members of the Council shall be compensated at the rate provided for Level IV of the Executive Schedule Pay Rates (5 U.S.C. 5315).

SEC. 207. The Council may accept reimbursements from any private nonprofit organization or from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, any State, or local government, for the reasonable travel expenses incurred by an officer or employee of the Council in connection with his attendance at any conference, seminar, or similar meeting conducted for the benefit of the Council.

SEC. 208. The Council may make expenditures in support of its international activities, including expenditures for: (1) international travel; (2) activities in implementation of international agreements; and (3) the sup-

port of international exchange programs in the United States and in foreign countries.

SEC. 209. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this chapter not to exceed $300,000 for fiscal year 1970, $700,000 for fiscal year 1971, and $1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1970*

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (OF THE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1974)

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970."

FINDINGS, DECLARATIONS, AND PURPOSES

SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) That man has caused changes in the environment;

(2) That many of these changes may affect the relationship between man and his environment; and

(3) That population increases and urban concentration contribute directly to pollution and the degradation of our environment.

(b)(1) The Congress declares that there is a national policy for the environment which provides for the enhancement of environmental quality. This policy is evidenced by statutes heretofore enacted relating to the prevention, abatement, and control of environmental pollution, water and land resources, transportation, and economic and regional development.

(2) The primary responsibility for implementing this policy rests with State and local governments.

(3) The Federal Government encourages and supports implementation of this policy through appropriate regional organizations established under existing law.

(c) The purposes of this title are—

(1) To assure that each Federal department and agency conducting or supporting public works activities which affect the environment shall implement the policies established under existing law; and

(2) To authorize an Office of Environmental Quality, which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide the professional and administrative staff for the Council on Environmental Quality established by Public Law 91-190.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SEC. 203. (a) There is established in the Executive Office of the President an office to be known as the Office of Environmental Quality (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Office"). The Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality established by Public Law 91-190 shall be the Director of the Office. There shall be in the Office a Deputy Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The compensation of the Deputy Director shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(c) The Director is authorized to employ such officers and employees (including experts and consultants) as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions under this title and Public Law 91-190, except that he may employ no more than 10 specialists and other experts without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and pay such specialists and experts without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter 111 of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but no such specialist or

*Pub. L. 91-224, 42 U.S.C. 4371-4374, April 3, 1970.

expert shall be paid at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5330 of title 5.

(d) In carrying out his functions the Director shall assist and advise the President on policies and programs of the Federal Government affecting environmental quality by—

(1) Providing the professional and administrative staff and support for the Council on Environmental Quality established by Public Law 91–190;

(2) Assisting the Federal agencies and departments in appraising the effectiveness of existing and proposed facilities, programs, policies, and activities of the Federal Government, and those specific major projects designated by the President which do not require individual project authorization by Congress, which affect environmental quality;

(3) Reviewing the adequacy of existing systems for monitoring and predicting environmental changes in order to achieve effective coverage and efficient use of research facilities and other resources;

(4) Promoting the advancement of scientific knowledge of the effects of actions and technology on the environment and encourage the development of the means to prevent or reduce adverse effects that endanger the health and well-being of man;

(5) Assisting in coordinating among the Federal departments and agencies those programs and activities which affect, protect, and improve environmental quality;

(6) Assisting the Federal departments and agencies in the development and interrelationship of environmental quality criteria and standards established through the Federal Government;

(7) Collecting, collating, analyzing, and interpreting data and information on environmental quality, ecological research, and evaluation.

(e) The Director is authorized to contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations and with individuals without regard to sections 3618 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5) in carrying out his functions.

REPORT

SEC. 204. Each Environmental Quality Report required by Public Law 91–190 shall, upon transmittal to Congress, be referred to each standing committee having jurisdiction over any part of the subject matter of the Report.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, not to exceed $750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, not to exceed $1,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and not to exceed $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. These authorizations are in addition to those contained in Public Law 91–190.

Approved April 3, 1970.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT § 309*

§ 7609. Policy review

(a) The Administrator shall review and comment in writing on the environmental impact of any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this chapter or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator, contained in any (1) legislation proposed by any Federal department or agency, (2) newly authorized Federal projects for construction and any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 4332(2)(C) of this title applies, and (3) proposed regulations published by any department or agency of the Federal Government. Such written comment shall be made public at the conclusion of any such review.

(b) In the event the Administrator determines that any such legislation, action, or regulation is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality, he shall publish his determination and the matter shall be referred to the Council on Environmental Quality.

---

*July 14, 1955, c. 360, § 309, as added Dec. 31, 1970, Pub. L. 91-604 § 12(a), 42 U.S.C. § 7609 (1970).

Executive Order 11514. March 5, 1970

PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

As amended by Executive Order 11991. (Secs. 2(g) and (3(h)). May 24, 1977*

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States and in furtherance of the purpose and policy of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law No. 91-190, approved January 1, 1970), it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Policy.* The Federal Government shall provide leadership in protecting and enhancing the quality of the Nation's environment to sustain and enrich human life. Federal agencies shall initiate measures needed to direct their policies, plans and programs so as to meet national environmental goals. The Council on Environmental Quality, through the Chairman, shall advise and assist the President in leading this national effort.

Sec. 2. *Responsibilities of Federal agencies.* Consonant with Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, hereafter referred to as the "Act", the heads of Federal agencies shall:

(a) Monitor, evaluate, and control on a continuing basis their agencies' activities so as to protect and enhance the quality of the environment. Such activities shall include those directed to controlling pollution and enhancing the environment and those designed to accomplish other program objectives which may affect the quality of the environment. Agencies shall develop programs and measures to protect and enhance environmental quality and shall assess progress in meeting the specific objectives of such activities. Heads of agencies shall consult with appropriate Federal, State and local agencies in carrying out their activities as they affect the quality of the environment.

(b) Develop procedures to ensure the fullest practicable provision of timely public information and understanding of Federal plans and programs with environmental impact in order to obtain the views of interested parties. These procedures shall include, whenever appropriate, provision for public hearings, and shall provide the public with relevant information, including information on alternative courses of action. Federal agencies shall also encourage State and local agencies to adopt similar procedures for informing the public concerning their activities affecting the quality of the environment.

(c) Insure that information regarding existing or potential environmental problems and control methods developed as part of research, development, demonstration, test, or evaluation activities is made available to Federal agencies, States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and other entities, as appropriate.

---

*The Preamble to Executive Order 11991 is as follows:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States of America, and as President of the United States of America, in furtherance of the purpose and policy of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857h-7), it is hereby ordered as follows:

(d) Review their agencies' statutory authority, administrative regulations, policies, and procedures, including those relating to loans, grants, contracts, leases, licenses, or permits, in order to identify any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit or limit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of the Act. A report on this review and the corrective actions taken or planned, including such measures to be proposed to the President as may be necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformance with the intent, purposes, and procedures of the Act, shall be provided to the Council on Environmental Quality not later than September 1, 1970.

(e) Engage in exchange of data and research results, and cooperate with agencies of other governments to foster the purposes of the Act.

(f) Proceed, in coordination with other agencies, with actions required by section 102 of the Act.

(g) In carrying out their responsibilites under the Act and this Order, comply with the regulations issued by the Council except where such compliance would be inconsistent with statutory requirements.

Sec. 3. *Responsibilities of Council on Environmental Quality.* The Council on Environmental Quality shall:

(a) Evaluate existing and proposed policies and activities of the Federal Government directed to the control of pollution and the enhancement of the environment and to the accomplishment of other objectives which affect the quality of the environment. This shall include continuing review of procedures employed in the development and enforcement of Federal standards affecting environmental quality. Based upon such evaluations the Council shall, where appropriate, recommend to the President policies and programs to achieve more effective protection and enhancement of environmental quality and shall, where appropriate, seek resolution of significant environmental issues.

(b) Recommend to the President and to the agencies priorities among programs designed for the control of pollution and for enhancement of the environment.

(c) Determine the need for new policies and programs for dealing with environmental problems not being adequately addressed.

(d) Conduct, as it determines to be appropriate, public hearings or conferences on issues of environmental significance.

(e) Promote the development and use of indices and monitoring systems (1) to assess environmental conditions and trends, (2) to predict the environmental impact of proposed public and private actions, and (3) to determine the effectiveness of programs for protecting and enhancing environmental quality.

(f) Coordinate Federal programs related to environmental quality.

(g) Advise and assist the President and the agencies in achieving international cooperation for dealing with environmental problems, under the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State.

(h) Issue regulations to Federal agencies for the implementation of the procedural provisions of the Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)). Such regulations shall be developed after consultation with affected agencies and after such public hearings as may be appropriate. They will be designed to make the environmental impact statement process 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. They will require impact statements to be concise, clear, and to the point, and supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary environmental analyses. The Council shall include in its regulations procedures (1) for the early preparation of environmental impact statements, and (2) for the referral to the Council of conflicts between agencies concerning the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, for the Council's recommendation as to their prompt resolution.

(i) Issue such other instructions to agencies, and request such reports and other information from them, as may be required to carry out the Council's responsibilities under the Act.

(j) Assist the President in preparing the annual Environmental Quality Report provided for in section 201 of the Act.

(k) Foster investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to (i) ecological systems and environmental quality, (ii) the impact of new and changing technologies thereon, and (iii) means of preventing or reducing adverse effects from such technologies.

Sec. 4. *Amendments of E.O. 11472.* Executive Order No. 11472 of May 29, 1969, including the heading thereof, is hereby amended:

(1) By substituting for the term "the Environmental Quality Council", wherever it occurs, the following: "the Cabinet Committee on the Environment".

(2) By substituting for the term "the Council", wherever it occurs, the following: "the Cabinet Committee".

(3) By inserting in subsection (f) of section 101, after "Budget,", the following: "the Director of the Office of Science and Technology,".

(4) By substituting for subsection (g) of section 101 the following:

"(g) The Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality (established by Public Law 91-190) shall assist the President in directing the affairs of the Cabinet Committee."

(5) by deleting subsection (c) of section 102.

(6) By substituting for "the Office of Science and Technology", in section 104, the following: "the Council on Environmental Quality (established by Public Law 91-190)".

(7) By substituting for "(hereinafter referred to as the 'Committee')", in section 201, the following: "(hereinafter referred to as the 'Citizens' Committee')".

(8) By substituting for the term "the Committee", wherever it occurs, the following: "the Citizens' Committee'.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

40 CFR Part 1502

National Environmental Policy Act Regulations; Incomplete or Unavailable Information

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) promulgates regulations, binding on all federal agencies, to implement the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The regulations address the administration of the NEPA process, including preparation of environmental impact statements for major federal actions which significantly affect the quality of the human environment. On August 9, 1985, CEQ published a proposed amendment to one of these regulations (40 CFR 1502.22), which addresses incomplete or unavailable information in an environmental impact statement (EIS). 50 FR 32234. After reviewing the comments received in response to that proposal, the CEQ now issues the final amendment to that regulation. The final amendment requires all federal agencies to disclose the fact of incomplete or unavailable information when evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment in an EIS, and to obtain that information if the overall costs of doing so are not exorbitant. If the agency is unable to obtain the information because overall costs are exorbitant or because the means to obtain it are not known, the agency must (1) affirmatively disclose the fact that such information is unavailable; (2) explain the relevance of the unavailable information; (3) summarize the existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to the agency's evaluation of significant adverse impacts on the human environment; and (4) evaluate the impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. The amendment also specifies that impacts which have a low probability of occurrence but catastrophic consequences if they do occur, should be evaluated if the analysis is supported by credible scientific evidence and is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason. The requirement to prepare a "worst case analysis" is rescinded.

The existing guidance regarding 40 CFR 1502.22, found in Question 20 of *Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations*, 46 FR 18032 (1981), is hereby withdrawn. Guidance relevant to the amended regulation will be published after the regulation becomes effective.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 27, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dinah Bear, General Counsel, Council on Environmental Quality, 722 Jackson Place NW., Washington, DC 20006. (202) 395-5754.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12291

Under Executive Order 12291, CEQ must judge whether a regulation is major and, therfore, whether a Regulatory Impact Analysis must be prepared. This regulation does not satisfy any of the criteria specified in section 1(b) of the Executive Order and, as such, does not constitute a major rulemaking. As required by Executive Order 12291, this regulation was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. There were no comments from OMB to CEQ regarding compliance with Executive Order 12291 in relationship to amendment of 40 CFR 1502.22.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements in this proposed rule were submitted for approval to OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* No comments were submitted by OMB or the public on the information collection requirements.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, CEQ is required to prepare a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for proposed regulations which would have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. No analysis is required, however, when the Chairman of the Council certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, I hereby certify, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that this final amendment would not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Environmental Assessment

Although there are substantial legal questions as to whether entities within the Executive Office of the President are required to prepare environmental assessments, CEQ, consistent with its practice in 1978, has prepared a special environmental assessment and a Finding of No Significant Impact regarding amendment of this regulation, which is available to the public upon request. For the reasons stated in the Finding of No Significant Impact, CEQ has concluded that the amendment to 40 CFR 1502.22 will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Background

The National Environmental Policy Act, signed into law by President Nixon on January 1, 1970, articulated national policy and goals for the nation, established the Council on Environmental Quality, and, among other federal agencies to assess the environmental impacts of and, among other things, required all federal agencies to assess the environmental impacts of and alternatives to proposals for major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The Council on Environmental Quality, charged with the duty of overseeing the implementation of NEPA, developed guidelines to aid federal agencies in assessing the environmental impacts of their proposals. A combination of agency practice, judicial decisions and CEQ guidance resulted in the development of what is commonly referred to as "the NEPA process", which includes the preparation of environmental impact statements for certain types of federal actions.

Because of complaints about paperwork and delays in projects caused by the NEPA process, and a perception that the problem was caused in part by lack of a uniform, binding authority, CEQ was directed in 1977 to promulgate binding regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA. (Executive Order 11991, 3 CFR 123 (1978). Council was directed to specifically: "make the environmental impact statement process 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." After undertaking an extensive process of review and comment with federal, state and local governmental officials, private citizens, business and industry representatives, and public interest organizations, the Council issued the NEPA regulations on November 29, 1978, 40 CFR 1500–1508 (1958). The regulations were hailed as a "significant improvement on prior EIS guidelines", (Letter, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, January 8, 1979), and became effective for, and binding upon, most federal agencies on July 30, 1979, and for all remaining federal agencies on November 29, 1979.

Since promulgation of the NEPA regulations, the Council has continually reviewed the regulations to identify areas where further interpretation or guidance is required.[1] No broad support for amendment of the regulations surfaced during review under the 1981 Vice President's Regulatory Relief Task Force; indeed, some recommended that, "CEQ's streamlining regulations for the implementation of NEPA requirements should receive full support from the Administration and the federal agencies". (Letter, National League of Cities, May 14, 1981). Although continual attention is required to ensure that the mandate of the regulations is being fulfilled, the regulations appear to be generally working well.

During the past two and a half years, however, the Council has received numerous requests from both government agencies and private parties to review and amend the regulation which addresses "incomplete or unavailable information" in the EIS process. That regulation currently reads as follows:

"Section 1502.22. Incomplete or unavailable information.

"When an agency is evaluating significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there are gaps in relevant information or scientific uncertainty, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking or that uncertainty exists.

"(a) If the information relevant to adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and is not known and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.

"(b) If (1) the information relevant to adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and is not known and the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or (2) the information relevant to adverse impacts is important to the decision and the means to obtain it are not known (e.g., the means for obtaining it are beyond the state of the art) the agency shall weigh the need for the action against the risk and severity of possible adverse impacts were the action to proceed in the face of uncertainty. If the agency proceeds, it shall include a worst case analysis and an indication of the probability or improbability of its occurrence." 40 CFR 1502.22.

On August 11, 1983, the Council proposed guidance regarding the "worst case analysis" requirement and asked for comments on the proposed guidance 48 FR 36486 (1983). The draft guidance suggested that an initial threshold of probability should be crossed before the requirements in 40 CFR 1502.22 became applicable. Although some

[1] See, *Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations*, 46 FR 18026 (1981); *Memorandum for General Counsels, NEPA Liaisons and Participants in Scoping*, April 30, 1981 (available upon request from the General Counsel's office, CEQ); *Guidance Regarding NEPA Regulations*, 48 FR 34263 (1983).

commentators agreed with the guidance, others believed that the proposed threshold would weaken analysis of low probability and severe consequences impacts. Other writers suggested different approaches to the issue, or advocated amendment of the regulation rather than guidance. After reviewing the comments received in response to that proposal, the Council withdrew the proposed guidance, stating its intent to give the matter additional examination before publishing a new proposal. 49 FR 4803 (1984).

After many discussions with federal agency representatives and other interested parties in state governments, public interest groups, and business and industry, the Council published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) for 40 CFR 1502.22, and stated that it was considering the need to amend the regulation. 49 FR 50744 (1984). The ANPRM posed five questions about the issue of incomplete or unavailable information in an EIS and asked for thoughtful written responses to the questions. The Council received 161 responses to the ANPRM. A majority of the commentators cited problems with the "worst case analysis" requirement, but recognized the need to address potential impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. Many commentators thought that either the regulation itself or recent judicial decisions required agencies to go beyond the "rule of reason". These commentators suggested that the "rule of reason" should be made specifically applicable to the requirements of the regulation. A minority of commentators felt strongly that the original regulation was adequate and should not be amended.

On March 18, 1985, the Council held a meeting, open to the public, to discuss the comments received in response to the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. 50 FR 9535 (1985). Shortly after that meeting, the Council voted to amend the regulation. On August 9, 1985, CEQ published a proposed amendment to 40 CFR 1502.22 which read as follows:

"Section 1502.22. Incomplete of unavailable information.

"In preparing an environmental impact statement, the agency shall make reasonable efforts, in light of overall costs and state of the art, to obtain missing information which, in its judgment, is important to evaluating significant adverse impacts on the human environment that are reasonably foreseeable. If, for the reasons stated above, the agency is unable to obtain this missing information, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement (a) a statement that such information is missing, (b) a statement of the relevance of the missing information to evaluating significant adverse impacts on the human environment, (c) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and (d) the agency's evaluation of such evidence. 'Reasonably foreseeable' includes impacts which have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that they have credible scientific support, are not based on pure conjecture, and are within the rule of reason." 50 FR 32238 (1985).

The Council received 184 comments in response to the proposed amendment: 81 comments from business and industry; 39 comments from private citizens; 30 comments from public interest groups; 15 comments from federal agencies; 14 comments from state governments; 4 comments from local governments; and one comment from a Member of Congress.

A majority of the commentators favored an amendment to the regulation, and supported the general approach of the proposed amendment. However, many of these writers offered specific suggestions for improving the proposal. Many commentators asked for definitions of terms used in the proposal, particularly for the phrase "credible scientific evidence." Some commentators wanted the Council to specify a particular methodology, such as risk assessment, as a substitute for a worst case analysis. Many commentators had specific comments about particular words or phrases used in the proposed amendment. Many commentators asked CEQ to provide further guidance or monitoring after the regulation was issued in final form.

A minority of commentators strongly opposed the amendment. Some of these writers were concerned over perceived changes in the first two paragraphs of the original regulation—requirements to disclose the fact that information is missing, and to obtain that information, if possible. Some commentators opposed deletion of the "worst case analysis" requirement. Other commentators believed that the proposed amendment did not require agencies to analyze or evaluate impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. These comments, and others, will be discussed below in the section "Comments and the Council's Response".

On January 9, 1986, CEQ held a meeting, open to the public, to discuss the comments received in response to the proposed amendment. 50 FR 53061 (1985). A summary of the presentation made at that meeting is available from the Office of the General Counsel. Shortly after that meeting, the Council voted to proceed to final amendment of the regulation.

Purpose and Analysis of Final Amendment

CEQ is amending this regulation because it has concluded that the new requirements provide a wiser and more manageable approach to the evaluation of reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information in an EIS. The new procedure for analyzing such impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information will better inform the decisionmaker and the public. The Council's concerns regarding the original wording of 40 CFR 1502.22 are discussed at length in the preamble to the proposed amendment. 50 FR 32234 (1985). It must again be emphasized that the Council concurs in the underlying goals of the original regulation—that is, disclosure of the fact of incomplete or unavailable information; acquisition of that information if reasonably possible; and evaluation of reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts even in the absence of all information. These goals are based on sound public policy and early NEPA case law.[3] Rather, the need for amendment is based upon the Council's perception that the "worst case analysis" requirement is an unproductive and ineffective method of achieving those goals; one which can breed endless hypothesis and speculation.

The amended regulation applies when a federal agency is preparing an EIS on a major federal action sigificantly affecting the quality of the human environment and finds that there is incomplete or unavailable information relating to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the environment. It retains the legal requirements of the first paragraph and subsection (a) of the environment and finds that there is incomplete or unavailable information relating to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the environment. It retains the legal requirements of the first paragraph and subsection (a) of the

[3] See, for example, *Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc. v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 481 F.2d 1079 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

original regulation. Thus, when preparing an EIS, agencies must disclose the fact that there is incomplete or unavailable information. The term "incomplete information" refers to information which the agency cannot obtain because the overall costs of doing so are exorbitant. The term "unavailable information" refers to information which cannot be obtained because the means to obtain it are not known. If the incomplete information relevant to adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency must include the information in the EIS. The first paragraph and subsection (a) of the original regulation have been amended only insofar as the phrases "incomplete or unavailable information" (title of the original regulation) or "incomplete information" are substituted for synonymous phrases and the term "reasonably foreseeable" is added to modify "significant adverse impacts". These changes are made for consistency, clarity and readability.

Subsection (b) is amended to require federal agencies to include four items in an EIS if the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts remains unavailable because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known. The first step is disclosure of the fact that such information is incomplete or unavailable; that is, "a statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable". The second step is to discuss why this incomplete or unavailable information is relevant to the task of evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts; thus, "a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts, impacts on the human environment". Fourth, the agency must use sound scientific methods to evaluate the potential impacts; or in the words of the regulation, "the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community".

The regulation also makes clear that the reasonably foreseeable potential impacts which the agency must evaluate include those which have a low probability of occurrence but which would be expected to result in catastrophic consequences if they do occur. However, the regulation specifies that the analysis must be supported by credible scientific evidence, not based on pure conjecture, and be within the rule of reason.

Subsection (b) deletes two substantive requirements from the same subsection of the original regulation, promulgated in 1978. First, it eliminates the requirement for agencies to "weigh the need for the action against the risk and severity of possible adverse impacts were the action to proceed in the face of uncertainty" while in the process of preparing an EIS. The Council believes that the weighing of risks and benefits for the particular federal proposal at hand is properly done after completion of the entire NEPA process, and is reflected in the Record of Decision. Nothing, of course, prohibits a decisionmaker from withdrawing a proposal during the course of EIS preparation.

Second, the regulation eliminates the "worst case analysis" requirement. It does not, however, eliminate the requirement for federal agencies to evaluate the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts of an action, even in the face of unavailable or incomplete information. Rather, it specifies that the evaluation must be carefully conducted, based upon credible scientific evidence, and must consider those reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts which are based upon scientific evidence. The requirement to disclose all credible scientific evidence extends to responsible opposing views which are supported by theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community (in other words, credible scientific evidence).

The regulation also requires that analysis of impacts in the face of unavailable information be grounded in the "rule of reason". The "rule of reason" is basically a judicial device to ensure that common sense and reason are not lost in the rubric of regulation. The rule of reason has been cited in numerous NEPA cases for the proposition that, "An EIS need not discuss remote and highly speculative consequences. . . . This is consistent with the (CEQ) Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines and the frequently expressed view that adequacy of the content of the EIS should be determined through use of a rule of reason." *Trout Unlimited* v. *Morton*, 509 F.2d 1276, 1283 (9th Cir. 1974). In the seminal case which applied the rule of reason to the problem of unavailable information, the court stated that, "[NEPA's] requirement that the agency describe the anticipated environmental effects of a proposed action is subject to a rule of reason. The agency need not foresee the unforeseeable, but by the same token, neither can it avoid drafting an impact statement simply because describing the environmental effects of alternatives to particular agency action involves some degree of forecasting . . . 'The statute must be construed in the light of reason if it is not to demand what is, fairly speaking, not meaningfully possible . . .'" *Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc.* v. *Atomic Energy Commission*, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. 1973), citing *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee* v. *Atomic Energy Commission*, 499 F.2d 1109, 1114 (D.C. Cir. 1971). The Council's amendment supports and conforms with this direction.

The evaluation of impacts under § 1502.22 is an integral part of an EIS and should be treated in the same manner as those impacts normally analyzed in an EIS. The information included in the EIS to fulfill the requirements of § 1502.22 is properly a part of the "Environmental Consequences" section of the EIS (40 CFR 1502.16). As with other portions of the EIS, material substantiating the analysis fundamental to the evaluation of impacts may properly be included in an appendix to the EIS.

Comments and the Council's Response

Comment: CEQ does not make clear the fact that the first paragraph and paragraph (a) of 1502.22 would be eliminated in the proposed amendment. The preamble says nothing about radical changes in the research requirements of the existing regulation.

Response: The changes to the first paragraph and subsection (a) of the existing regulation in the proposed amendment were made primarily for the purpose of attempting to clarify and simplify the existing requirements. However, in response to a number of concerns regarding perceived changes in the legal requirements of these paragraphs, the Council has chosen to retain the original format of the regulation. The Council intends that the substitution of the phrase "incomplete or unavailable information" and "incomplete information" are taken from the title of the regulation itself, and are being inserted for the sake of consistency of terms and clarity.

Comment: The term "reasonable efforts" should be defined.

Response: The term "reasonable efforts" does not appear in the final regulation.

Comment: The proposed amendment drops the standard of "exorbitant costs"

and substitutes "overall costs." Substantively, the current standard should be retained. It is a purposefully high standard, intended to counter agencies' demonstrated reluctance to seek out information. The proposed standard is lax and undefined.

Response: The final regulation retains the original standard.

Comment: The term "state of the art" should be replaced with "the availability of adequate scientific or other analytical techniques or equipment".

Response: The term has been deleted in the final regulation, and the phrase "the means to obtain it are not known" is substituted. That phrase is meant to include circumstances in which the unavailable information cannot be obtained because adequate scientific knowledge, expertise, techniques or equipment do not exist.

Comment: The regulation should make clear that "overall costs" include, among other things, all economic costs and delays in timing. The "overall cost" requirement needs to be further defined to reflect items such as comparing low cost/high cost risk (and vice versa), costs of time in obtaining information, costs of delaying projects, benefit/cost ratio and outyear impact cost.

Response: CEQ intends that the term "overall costs" encompasses financial costs and other costs such as costs in terms of time (delay) and personnel. It does not intend that the phrase be interpreted as a requirement to weigh the cost of obtaining the information against the severity of the impacts, or to perform a cost-benefit analysis. Rather, it intends that the agency interpret "overall costs" in light of overall program needs.

Comment: The term "missing information" should be clarified or changed.

Response: The term "missing information" is deleted in the final regulation, and is replaced with the terms "incomplete or unavailable information" and "incomplete information". These terms are consistent with the title of the regulation.

Comment: The word "material" should be substituted for the word "significant" because the word "significant" is a term of art and incorporates consideration of controversy surrounding a proposal. The word "material" would be more appropriate.

Response: The final regulation retains the term "significant". "Significant" is indeed a term of art which connotes the type of environmental impact which the agency is obligated to analyze in an EIS. Consideration of controversy is one of many factors which must be considered in determining whether an impact is "significant"; others include the degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety, unique characteristics of the geographic area such as wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, etc., the degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks, the cumulative impacts of an action, whether the action may adversely affect an endangered species or critical habitat, the degree to which an action may adversely affect historic areas, and whether the proposed action would violate another federal, state or local environmental law. 40 CFR 1508.27. The 1978 CEQ regulations differed from the earlier CEQ Guidelines in stating that the fact of controversy does not, alone, require preparation of an EIS; rather, it is one of many factors which the responsible official must bear in mind in judging the context and intensity of the potential impacts.

Comment: The term "in its judgment" gives agencies the administrative discretion to limit the data needed to prepare an EIS. It gives too much discretionary authority to agency officials to decide if they need to obtain the information. Suggest deleting "in its judgment" or adding "and with the concurrence of appropriate federal or state resource agencies".

Related Comment: It is important to allow an agency discretion to determine the extent of the investigation required to obtain information.

Response: The term "in its judgment" is deleted from the final regulation. However, deletion of that phrase is not intended to change the discretion currently vested in the agencies to determine the extent of the investigation required to obtain information. The agency's discretion must be used to make judgments about cost and scientific availability of the information.

Comment: The proposed amendment's definition of "reasonably foreseeable" should be strengthened or clarified or the use of this phrase should be changed.

Response: The term "reasonably foreseeable" has a long history of use in the context of NEPA law, and is included elsewhere in the CEQ NEPA regulations. 40 CFR 1508.8(b). Generally, the term has been used to describe what kind of environmental impacts federal agencies must analyze in an EIS; for example, ". . . if the [agency] makes a good faith effort in the survey to describe the *reasonably foreseeable* environmental impact of the program, alternatives to the program and their *reasonably foreseeable* environmental impact, and the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources the program involves, we see no reason why the survey will not fully satisfy the requirements of [NEPA] section 102(C)." *Sierra Club* v. *Morton*, 379 F. Supp. 1254, 1259 (D. Col. 1974) (emphasis added). *See also, Town of Orangetown* v. *Gorsuch*, 718 F.2d 29, 34 (2d Cir. 1983); *NRDC* v. *NRC*, 685 F.2d 459, 476 (D.C. Cir. 1982). The term has also been used in the context of incomplete or unavailable information. *See Scientists' Institute for Public Information* v. *Atomic Energy Commission*, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

Because of the controversy and nature of this particular regulation, CEQ has specified that in the context of 40 CFR 1502.22, the term "reasonably foreseeable" includes low probability/severe consequence impacts, provided that the analysis of such impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

Comment: To prevent confusion, the proposed amendment should use either the term "credible scientific evidence" or "credible scientific support"—not both.

Response: The final regulation uses the term "credible scientific evidence" and deletes the term "credible scientific support".

Comment: The term "credible scientific evidence" should be defined. (A number of commentators offered specific suggestions for such a definition).

Response: The final regulation states that the agency's evaluation of impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information should be based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. While this is admittedly a broad and general direction, CEQ is concerned that a narrow definition of "credible scientific evidence" would prove inappropriate in some circumstances, given the wide variety of actions which potentially fall under the auspices of this regulation. In many cases, the Council expects that "theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community" will include commonly accepted professional practices such as literature searches and peer review.

Comment: The term "credible" should be deleted from the regulation, and all information should be considered.

Response: The definition of the word "credible" is, "capable of being

believed". *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary*, 1984. Information which is unworthy of belief should not be included in an EIS.

Comment: The term "scientific" is overly restrictive since measurement of an action's environmental effects may be grounded in, among other things, economic, historical or sociological information.

Response: In an EIS, federal agencies are responsible for analysis of significant environmental effects which include "ecological, aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative." 40 CFR 1508.8(b). The requirement to analyze these potential impacts or effects are not modified in any manner by the qualified "scientific evidence" in 40 CFR 1502.22. Rather, the term "scientific" is meant to imply that the evidence presented about the possibility of a certain impact should be based upon methodological activity, discipline or study. *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, 1984*.

Comment: The amendment should include some recognized scientific method for evaluating uncertainty, such as, perhaps, a risk assessment approach.

Response: Because of the wide variety of types of incomplete or unavailable information which may potentially fall within the scope of this regulation, CEQ does not choose to specify a particular methodology. Rather, each agency should select that approach which best meets the goals of evaluating potential impacts in the face of unavailable information. Further, a requirement that a particular methodology be utilized might be soon outdated by scientific developments in a particular field.

Comment: The draft preamble states that the summary of credible scientific evidence must include all information from all sources, including minority or opposing viewpoints. What are "minority views" as they relate to credible scientific evidence?

Response: The preamble to the proposed amendment states that the requirement to disclose all credible scientific evidence extends to those views which are generally regarded as "minority views" within the scientific community. The final preamble adopts the term "responsible opposing views" as the preferred term, consistent with 40 CFR 1502.9(b). The requirement to include responsible opposing views reflects the belief that many times, particularly when dealing with questions of incomplete or unavailable information, there will be more than one point of view about potential environmental impacts which has scientific credibility. The regulation requires an agency to include information about such views which have scientific credibility, rather than simply selecting one concept which supports its particular view. The responsible opposing views, must, of course, meet the criteria set out in subsection (b) of the regulation. Once such information is set out in the EIA, the agency must then use its own judgment and discretion to determine which viewpoint it believes is the most worthy of acceptance.

Comment: CEQ should indicate in the preamble that along with available scientific evidence, the views and conclusions of other government agencies and departments may be considered.

Response: The views and conclusion of other government agencies and departments are appropriately considered throughout the EIS process, beginning with the scoping process. Section 1502.22 does not limit involvement by other federal agencies in that process. Special attention should be paid to the views of those agencies with special expertise or jurisdiction by law in a particular field of inquiry. 40 CFR 1503.1(a)(1). The views of the public, and indeed all interested parties, are, of course also to be considered throughout the EIS process.

Comment: It should be made clear that the summary should be limited to credible scientific evidence only.

Response: This is precisely the requirement of the regulation itself. Again, credible scientific evidence includes both majority views and responsible opposing views, so long as these views meet the criteria in the regulation.

Comment: The regulation should require agencies to state the probability or improbability of the occurrence of the impacts which are identified.

Response: Although this requirement is not part of the final regulation, agencies are free to include this information in the EIS. The Council encourages the inclusion of such data when it is relatively reliable and when such information would help to put the analysis in perspective for the decisionmaker and other persons who read and comment on the EIS.

Comment: The fourth requirement, to include the agency's "evaluation" of the scientific evidence is vague. Presumably, what is meant is not a critique of the evidence, but an application of the evidence to predict impacts.

Response: The fourth requirement has been reworded so that it is clear that the agency is required to evaluate reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts which significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Comment: There is no requirement for the agencies to analyze impacts—the basic purpose of the regulation.

Response: The fourth requirement clearly states a requirement for the agencies to evaluate the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts.

Comment: The final amendment should require agencies to address high probability/low or chronic impacts, as well as low probability/catastrophic impacts.

Response: If there is a high probability of an impact occurring, an agency is probably not in the realm of incomplete or unavailable information; hence, the impacts would be analyzed under the ordinary requirements in the "Environmental consequences" section. This section includes the analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposal and the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action. 40 CFR 1502.16.

Comment: The preamble to the draft amendment errs in asserting that case law has established a precedent to go beyond the rule of reason and it ignores subsequent Ninth Circuit case law which applies the rule of reason to find that agencies properly refused to prepare a worst case analysis.

Response: The Ninth Circuit decision referred to in this comment held that a worst case analysis was not required because the lead agency had obtained the information which it needed; thus there was no incomplete or unavailable information to trigger the worst case analysis requirement. *Friends of Endangered Species* v. *Jantzen*, 760 F.2d 976 (9th Cir. 1985).

Comment: The threshold triggering the agency's responsibility to comply with 40 CFR 1502.22(b) is actually the existance of incomplete or unavailable information. "Scientific credibility" is not a threshold, but rather a standard to be applied to the analysis once the duty to comply is triggered.

Response: This comment is correct.

Comment: The Council should make clear in the regulation itself that "scientific credibility" is the threshold which triggers the regulation.

Response: "Scientific credibility" is the criterion for the evidence which should be used to evaluate impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. The trigger to comply with the regulation itself is incomplete or unavailable information.

Comment: If the phrase "worst case analysis" is unacceptable, the Council should consider replacing the term with

its functional equivalent, "spectrum of events".

Response: In the final regulation, a lead agency is required to evaluate "impacts". "Impacts" or "effects" (the two are synonymous under CEQ regulations) are the subject of analysis in an EIS, not "events". Indeed, the event to be anticipated is the proposed action itself.

Under the final regulation, agencies are required to evaluate impacts for which there is credible scientific evidence. In implementing this section, agencies will have to determine the appropriate range of analysis based on the unique facts of each particular proposal. In some cases, this may amount to a spectrum or range of impacts. In other cases, the scope of suggested impacts may be much more limited. Credible scientific evidence should determine the scope of the analysis, as opposed to a pre-determined number of impacts.

Comment: A careful reading of the case law reveals that neither the Ninth Circuit nor any other circuit has required worst case analysis in the absence of scientific opinion, evidence, and experience, as alleged in the draft preamble.

Response: Although CEQ was asked to consider this question by various persons who were concerned about the effect in future cases of possible interpretations of judicial decisions involving the worst case analysis requirement, CEQ has amended the regulation because it believes, based on further review, that the worst case analysis requirement is flawed, and the new requirements provide a better and more logical means of dealing with the analysis of impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information in an EIS.

Comment: Deletion of the worst case requirement will weaken environmental protection.

Response: This assertion is incorrect. The amended regulation establishes a better approach to dealing with the issue of incomplete and unavailable information in an EIS. It is a less sensational approach, but one which is a more careful and professional approach to the analysis of impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. It should improve the quality of the EIS and the decision which follows, and, hence, strengthen environmental protection, in conformance with the purpose and goals of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321, 4331. It will provide the public and the decisionmaker with an improved and more informed basis for the decision.

Comment: Before eliminating the term "worst case analysis", the Council should determine whether a worst case analysis is really impossible to prepare, or whether it is being resisted by agencies unwilling to learn because they do not want to admit the adverse impacts of their preferred programs.

Response: The Council does not maintain that a worst case analysis is impossible to prepare; however, it does view the worst case analysis requirement as a flawed technique to analyze impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. The new requirement will provide more accurate and relevant information about reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts. To the extent that agencies were reluctant to discuss such impacts under the requirements of the original regulation, the amended regulation will not offer them an escape route.

Comment: The expressed need for clarification can be met by simply adding the "rule of reason" to the existing regulation.

Response: While the "rule of reason" is indeed added to the language of the regulation, CEQ believes that it is also important to amend the requirement to prepare a worst case analysis. The requirement that the analysis of impacts be based on credible scientific evidence is viewed as a specific component of the "rule of reason".

Comment: The proposal inappropriately removes the obligation to weigh the need for an action against its potential impacts.

Response: The regulation deletes this requirement because it is more properly accomplished at the conclusion of the entire NEPA process. A decisionmaker may, of course, decide to withdraw a proposal at any stage of the NEPA process for any reason, including the belief that the paucity of information undermines the wisdom of proceeding in the face of possibly severe impacts. However, such weighing and balancing in the middle of EIS preparation is a matter of policy, not law.

It is clear that, "one of the costs that must be weighed by decisionmakers is the cost of uncertainty—i.e., the costs of proceeding without more and better information." *Alaska v. Andrus*, 580 F.2d 465, 473 (D.C. Cir. 1978). However, that weighing takes place after completion of the EIS process, including the public comment process. Indeed, it would seem that the results of such a weighing process would naturally be more informed and wiser after the agency has completed the requirements of § 1502.22 to evaluate the potential impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. After completion of the EIS process, the responsible decisionmaker must then weigh the costs of proceeding in the face of uncertainty, "and where the responsible decision-maker has decided that it is outweighed by the benefits of proceeding with the project without further delay . . ." he may proceed to do so. *Id.* Similarly, he or she may also decide, with the benefit of the best possible information, to delay the project until further information is obtained or to cancel the project altogether.

Comment: CEQ should provide additional guidance about the new regulation, and oversee and actively monitor its implementation.

Response: CEQ plans to provide additional guidance about the new regulation in the form of an amended question 20 of *Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations.* CEQ also plans to actively monitor the implementation of the amended regulation, and evaluate its effectiveness after it has been implemented for a sufficient period of time to make a reasonable assessment.

Comment: It is unclear in which situations the new rule would apply, and what specific information it mandates. CEQ should apply the rule to actual or hypothetical situations and explain how the rule will apply and how the agencies' obligations differ under the new rule from those of the old. Request the Council provide such an analysis for particular fact patterns.

Response: CEQ plans to provide specific examples of the application of the rule to hypothetical situations in its guidance, following issuance of the final rule. The amended regulation will apply, of course, to the very same situations to which the original regulation applies; that is, the existence of incomplete or unavailable information related to significant adverse impacts on the human environment. The modifications to the regulation are designed to better articulate the precise requirements with which an agency must comply once it finds itself in this situation.

Comment: It is essential to mention the Committee of Scientists which was instrumental in development of the proposed regulation.

Response: The writer is probably referring to a proposed Advisory Committee on Worst Case Analysis, which would have included scientists. The Committee was never formed, and thus had no role in developing the amended regulation. Instead, the Council sought public comment through the process of asking questions in the

Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Comment: CEQ should state that this analysis is to be done only in conjunction with an EIS, as opposed to an environmental assessment.

Response: Section 1502.22 is part of the set of regulations which govern the EIS process, as opposed to the preparation of an environmental assessment. *It is only appropriate to require this level of analysis when an agency is preparing an EIS.* The type of analysis called for in § 1502.22 is clearly much more sophisticated and detailed than the scope of an environmental assessment. Environmental assessments should be concise public documents which *briefly* provide sufficient analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS, and aid in an agency's compliance with NEPA when no EIS is necessary. "Since the EA [environmental assessment] is a concise document, it should not contain long descriptions or detailed data which the agency may have gathered". The Council's suggested page limit for environmental assessments are ten to fifteen pages. *Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations.* Question 36a, 46 FR 18026, 18037 (1981).

Comment: CEQ should state clearly that the amendment is intended to repudiate and overrule the Ninth Circuit decisions on worst case analysis.

Response: The Ninth Circuit opinions are based on the requirements of former § 1502.22, or agency reflections thereof, and are inapplicable to this revision. The regulation is being amended to provide a better approach to the problem of analyzing environmental impacts in the face of incomplete or unavailable information. Because the requirements of the amended regulation are more clearly articulated and manageable than the "worst case analysis" requirement, CEQ expects that there will be less litigation based on § 1502.22 than the former version of § 1502.22 interpreted by the Ninth Circuit.

Comment: CEQ should withdraw the guidance contained in the 1981 publication, *Forty Most Asked Questions about CEQ's NEPA Regulations*, relating to worst case analysis.

Response: That guidance is withdrawn by this publication.

Comment: CEQ has not complied with its duties to assert its substantive powers over federal agencies to comply with NEPA, to coordinate programs, and to issue instructions to agencies, but has instead succumbed to pressure from defendant agencies and their attorneys to amend the regulation. Further, CEQ is collaterally estopped from overruling the Ninth Circuit decisions.

Response: CEQ manifests its oversight of the NEPA process in a number of ways on a daily basis; for example, review of agency NEPA procedures, resolving referrals of proposals of major federal actions, and assisting parties on an individual basis in resolving difficulties with the NEPA process. The requirements of the amended regulation are a more productive use of the agencies' resources than attempting to prepare a worst case analysis. Collateral estoppel is a doctrine by which a party may be barred from relitigating a question decided in a prior case. It does not bar an agency from changing a regulation that the courts have interpreted.

Comment: Agencies should be required to present an evaluation of the existing evidence of the most likely outcome.

Response: Step four of subsection (b) requires agencies to evaluate potential impacts. The lead agency may wish to specify which of the impacts are the most likely to occur, and the Council encourages inclusion of such data when it is reliable information which would be useful to the decisionmaker and the public.

Comment: Case law required worst case analysis prior to adoption of 40 CFR 1502.22.

Response: This assertion is incorrect. Case law prior to the adoption of 40 CFR 1502.22 *did* require agencies to make a "good faith effort . . . to describe the reasonably foreseeable environmental impact(s)" of the proposal and alternatives to the proposal in the face of incomplete or unavailable information, consistent with the "rule of reason". *Scientists' Institute for Public Information* v. *Atomic Energy Commission*, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. Cir. 1973). The "worst case analysis" requirement was a technique adopted by CEQ as a means of achieving the goals enunciated in such case law. The "worst case" requirement itself, however, was clearly a "major innovation". Comment, *New Rules for the NEPA Process: CEQ Establishes Uniform Procedures to Improve Implementation*, 9 Envt'l L.Rep. 10,005, 10,008 (1979). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, interpreting the "worst case analysis" requirement for the first time in a litigation context, recognized that it was an innovation of CEQ. *Sierra Club* v. *Sigler*, 695 F.2d 957, 972 (5th Cir. 1983). CEQ has since observed difficulties with the technique of "worst case analysis" and is replacing it with a better approach to the problem of incomplete or unavailable information in an EIS.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 1502

Environmental impact statements.

PART 1502—[Amended].

40 CFR Part 1502 is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 1502 continues to read:

Authority: NEPA, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 *et seq.*), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).

2. Section 1502.22 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1502.22 Incomplete or unavailable information.

When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.

(a) If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.

(b) If the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts cannot be obtained because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement: (1) A statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable; (2) a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; (3) a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment, and (4) the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts which have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure

conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

(c) The amended regulation will be applicable to all environmental impact statements for which a Notice of Intent (40 CFR 1508.22) is published in the **Federal Register** on or after May 27, 1986. For environmental impact statements in progress, agencies may choose to comply with the requirements of either the original or amended regulation.

Dated: April 21, 1986.

A. Alan Hill,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 86-9270 Filed 4-24-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3125-01-M