

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. NEPA’s Promise, Mandate, and Goals1
 - A. NEPA’s Promises1
 - B. NEPA’s Mandate and Goals.....3
- II. The public comment process on this rulemaking has shown disrespect for public engagement.....5
- III. The proposed regulation would impose unlawful procedural hurdles to public participation and litigation.....6
- IV. The proposed rules would unlawfully narrow NEPA’s scope11
 - A. CEQ’s proposed redefinition of “major federal action” is contrary to longstanding judicial precedent and a commonsense interpretation of NEPA11
 - B. The proposed rule’s provisions regarding supplementation, in conjunction with its proposed redefinition of “effects,” will cause significant, cumulative environmental impacts to be missed or ignored.....14
 - C. Any restriction on NEPA’s extraterritorial application would be unlawful.....16
 - 1. NEPA applies extraterritorially on its face.....16
 - 2. NEPA’s legislative history indicates Congress anticipated that it would apply outside the United States17
 - 3. Restricting NEPA’s extraterritorial application would contravene case law19
 - 4. Longstanding agency practice demonstrates that NEPA is successfully applied extraterritorially20
- V. CEQ’s proposed changes to the purpose-and-need statement are bad policy, inconsistent with judicial precedent, and

	beyond CEQ’s authority	21
VI.	The proposed rule would encourage less informative, less thorough, and unlawfully incomplete environmental analyses	24
	A. CEQ’s proposed revisions would unlawfully exclude analysis of cumulative and indirect effects	25
	1. The legislative history of NEPA makes clear that Congress intended for agencies to analyze and disclose the full effects of their actions	25
	2. Judicial precedent makes clear that NEPA requires agencies to consider indirect and cumulative effects	26
	3. CEQ’s own precedents indicate that analysis of indirect and cumulative effects is required by NEPA	30
	4. CEQ’s proposed “codification” of <i>Public Citizen</i> misstates and is inconsistent with precedent.....	35
	5. CEQ’s proposed new definition of “effects” ignores precedent about reasonable foreseeability.....	38
	B. To ensure informed decision making, NEPA requires full and meaningful consideration, as well as a detailed description, of all reasonable alternatives to a proposed action.....	42
	1. NEPA requires agencies to evaluate all reasonable alternatives.....	43
	2. NEPA requires agencies to thoroughly study and describe in detail all reasonable alternatives.....	47
	3. Long-standing precedent requires agencies to evaluate reasonable alternatives not within their jurisdiction	49
	4. Establishing a “presumptive maximum number of alternatives for evaluation of a proposed action, or alternatively for certain categories of	

	proposed actions,” would violate agencies’ statutory obligations to objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives	51
C.	NEPA’s detailed statement of environmental impacts depends upon and requires a clear articulation of baseline conditions.....	52
D.	CEQ’s proposed delegation of EIS preparation to an applicant is improper	54
	1. The proposal to allow delegation of EIS Preparation to a project applicant is reversal of CEQ’s longstanding position	55
	2. CEQ offers no evidence to support its delegation proposal, and available evidence does not support that proposal either.....	56
	3. CEQ’s proposed safeguards will not effectively address the conflicts of interest created by delegating EIS preparation to a project applicant.....	59
VII.	The proposed regulations fail to meet NEPA’s mandate to evaluate the impacts of climate change	59
A.	Climate change impacts are already occurring and must be analyzed and disclosed with greenhouse gas emissions	61
B.	Federal government decisions regarding fossil fuels will have impacts to climate change	67
C.	Agencies must analyze and disclose the true magnitude of GHG pollution using the best available science	71
D.	Agencies must analyze and disclose the impacts that could result from the greenhouse gas emissions produced by their actions	73
	1. The social cost of carbon	76

2.	The social cost of methane	79
3.	Global carbon budgeting	82
E.	Agencies must consider a range of reasonable alternatives, including those that reduce GHG emissions	85
F.	Mitigation measures	88
G.	The state of the affected environment.....	89
H.	Agencies must analyze and disclose the impacts of their decisions on vulnerable populations and public health.....	89
1.	Vulnerable populations.....	90
2.	Public health	91
I.	CEQ fails to justify its departure from past practice regarding analysis of climate change.....	92
VIII.	The proposed rule’s conclusive presumption of regularity is unlawful	103
IX.	By excusing agencies from the need to undertake new scientific and technical research, the proposed rule would all but ensure uninformed decision making	105
X.	The proposal would permit unlawful commitment of resources in advance of NEPA compliance	108
A.	NEPA requires environmental analysis before any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources	108
B.	The proposed rule would allow an agency to authorize irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources before an EIS is prepared	109
XI.	CEQ’s regulation proposal will not solve the problems CEQ identifies	111

A.	CEQ’s proposed presumptive time and page limits are arbitrary, capricious, and counterproductive	111
1.	The record does not support CEQ’s suggestion that NEPA reviews are too long	113
2.	CEQ’s presumptive page limits are arbitrary and capricious	116
3.	CEQ’s presumptive time limits are arbitrary and capricious	118
4.	The “senior official” exception to page and time limits is insufficient to ensure informed decision making	120
5.	CEQ’s arbitrary limits will interfere with existing efficiencies	121
B.	The proposed regulations will increase litigation, vacatur of project approvals based on inadequate environmental documents, and attendant delay	122
XII.	The distinctions drawn by the proposal’s public notification provisions could leave many members of the public without access to relevant information.....	126
XIII.	CEQ’s proposal to exempt agencies from NEPA’s requirement to prepare an EIS when the agency prepares a “functional equivalent” analysis is unlawful.....	128
A.	The proposed rule contravenes established caselaw	128
B.	The proposed rule’s “functional equivalence” standards are vague and unenforceable	130
C.	Regulatory Impact Analyses are not functionally equivalent to the “detailed statements” of environmental impacts that NEPA requires	133
D.	CEQ’s request for comments on additional analyses that would be “functionally equivalent” to EISs is too vague	

to allow meaningful public input134

E. No label given to a document can shield it from
compliance with NEPA's "hard look" requirements135

