

## **WHAT OTHERS ARE SAYING ABOUT NEPA AND PERMITTING DELAYS**

### **National Academy of Sciences:**

The lack of early, consistent cooperation and participation by all the federal, state, and local agencies involved in the NEPA process results in excessive costs, delays and inefficiencies in the permitting of mines on federal lands. Delays and inconsistent involvement by nongovernmental organizations exacerbates these problems. (*Hardrock Mining on Federal Lands*, National Academy Press, 1999)

### **Department of the Navy:**

During the last decade, several environmental statutes have been enacted and revised procedures/regulations issued regarding consultations and their relationship to the preparation and finalization of NEPA documentation. Many of these consultation processes are open ended in regard to timely completion of NEPA documentation. Major projects are delayed, and additional, unplanned resources must be expended to maintain expertise and continuity until such processes are completed. (September 2002 comments to Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA Taskforce)

### **Western Governors' Association:**

Too often, NEPA's requirements have resulted in duplicative environmental analyses of projects by multiple federal agencies. In addition, each federal agency has developed its own set of NEPA regulations and processes which further adds confusion and complexity. In some cases, NEPA also has been misused by forcing lengthy delays – especially at the “eleventh hour” – after many hours have been spent studying, analyzing, planning and developing projects. (WGA Policy Resolution 02-08, “Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act,” June 2002)

### **State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources:**

Need to refocus the federal government's implementation of NEPA away from the present emphasis on unproductive process and documentation and toward more meaningful environmental outcomes. The important purposes of NEPA are best achieved when the environmental analysis and public disclosure requirements of this law are applied only to those federal decisions truly in need of further environmental analysis in a process emphasizing timely interagency collaboration. (Sept 2002 comments to CEQ NEPA Taskforce)

### **Western [Congressional] Caucus :**

The NEPA process has drained many agency resources in both work-hours and budgets. One of the goals of the Caucus is to reduce federal spending in order to inhibit the growth of deficits. A good first step would be to streamline the NEPA process to stop the needless flow of dollars. After spending millions of dollars on completing an EIS the study is often appealed and revised, appealed and revised. This unnecessary bureaucratic dance can be remedied by a modernization of a law enacted in 1969. (Western Caucus web site -- <http://chriscannon.house.gov/wc/meetings/Conference/enviro.htm>)

### **State of Utah Department of Natural Resources:**

The Department is concerned that, since the passage of NEPA, a process has developed such that application of the act results in disharmony and acrimony among people to the detriment of the general welfare and the environment. This is the result of protracted analyses, overlapping and conflicting laws, implementing regulations and legal decisions, postage stamp veto power and interest-based litigation which have created an atmosphere of confusion, mistrust and conflict. Customer service and timely decision-making often become secondary objectives in today's litigious environment. . . . The NEPA process . . . has become too complicated, too slow, too contentious, too expensive and ineffective. (Sept 2002 comments to CEQ NEPA Taskforce)

### **Congressman George Radanovich (R-CA):**

NEPA prevents, because of the time allowed and the ability for interest groups to sue and delay, prevent people, good forest managers, from coming in and getting the wood out of there, and actually reseeded to get that timber stand up and the environment healthy again, because of the lengthy time of the NEPA process. . . . But take a look at the law after, what, 20 years now and make some reform in the legislation so that we get some balanced land management policies. (April 2005 E&E TV OnPoint interview)