

**COMMENTS OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA, ILLINOIS,
MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, OREGON,
VERMONT, AND WASHINGTON, AND THE SECRETARY OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

August 20, 2018

VIA REGULATIONS.GOV

Edward A. Boling

Associate Director for the National Environmental Policy Act

Council on Environmental Quality

730 Jackson Place NW

Washington, DC 20503

Re: Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking – Update to the Regulations
for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National
Environmental Policy Act, 83 Fed. Reg. 28,591 (June 20, 2018)
Docket ID No. CEQ-2018-0001

Dear Associate Director Boling:

The undersigned State Attorneys General and state representatives, specifically, the Attorneys General of California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington, and the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (“States”) respectfully submit these comments on the Council on Environmental Quality’s (“CEQ”) advance notice of proposed rulemaking (“Advance Notice”) regarding potential revisions to the regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”), 42 U.S.C. § 4321, *et seq.*¹ The Advance Notice requests comments “on potential revisions to update and clarify” the process and scope of federal NEPA review by including questions on the following subjects: revising definitions of key NEPA terms, revising documents such as Notices of Intent and Categorical Exclusions, revising the timing of agency actions, revising agency and contractor responsibilities for document preparation, revising the public participation process, establishing mandatory time limits for preparation of documents and

¹ The advance notice of proposed rulemaking is entitled “Update to the Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act,” 83 Fed. Reg. 28,591 (June 20, 2018), Docket ID No. CEQ-2018-0001 [hereinafter Advance Notice].

completion of the NEPA process, narrowing the range of alternatives requiring analysis, seeking examples of purportedly “obsolete” regulations, seeking input on use of unspecified “new technologies,” and combining NEPA analyses and other decision documents.² The breadth of the questions posed by the Advance Notice suggests that CEQ’s existing NEPA regulations (“NEPA regulations”) need major amendments or even a wholesale regulatory overhaul. The States submit, however, that no demonstrated need for such substantial revisions exists, and we oppose any revisions that would threaten or destroy the fundamental environmental protections in NEPA.

CEQ’s NEPA regulations are the cornerstone of the federal government’s implementation of NEPA, providing a durable and environmentally protective framework on which the States and the public have relied for 40 years. Through prior administrations, CEQ has shown remarkable restraint, revising its regulations only when absolutely necessary. This restraint should continue because existing data do not demonstrate a need for any significant changes to NEPA regulations implied by this Advance Notice. Instead, as described more fully in Sections II and III, NEPA and the NEPA regulations have successfully accomplished the goal of forcing federal agencies to take a “hard look” at how their actions impact the environment.³ Therefore, the States urge CEQ to seriously consider whether it is appropriate to amend its NEPA regulations at all. If CEQ does decide to revise the NEPA regulations, it must first collect detailed data on NEPA’s implementation and evaluate the effect any revisions would have on future federal actions, public health, and the environment. Any revisions to the regulations, if warranted and supported by substantial evidence, must continue to prioritize protection of public health and the environment, and to ensure public participation in accordance with NEPA, over mere administrative expedience.

I. NEPA Is the Foundation of Our Nation’s Environmental Laws

Congress enacted NEPA in 1969 with the stated purpose 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.”⁴ NEPA was the first

² *See id.* at 28,591–92.

³ *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989).

⁴ 42 U.S.C. § 4321.

major environmental law in the United States and is often called the “Magna Carta” of federal environmental laws. The NEPA regulations “tell federal agencies what they must do to comply with the procedures and achieve the goals of the Act.”⁵ Over the past 40 years, the NEPA regulations have guided NEPA’s implementation across the nation and have become fundamental to the daily functioning and responsible decision-making of numerous federal and state agencies.

NEPA endorses a broad, deliberative approach, which focuses on public disclosure and requires all federal agencies to ensure that their decision-making takes public health and the environment into account. Nearly every major federal action, from the approval of significant energy and infrastructure projects to key decisions concerning the management of federal public lands, requires compliance with NEPA. Unlike many other subject-specific federal statutes such as the Clean Air Act,⁶ NEPA has a uniquely broad scope requiring consideration of all potential environmental and social impacts of a federal action. At the heart of NEPA—and embodied in the NEPA regulations—are the principles that federal agencies must complete their environmental analysis of proposed projects and alternatives before they act, that the analysis must be accurate and rigorous, that the analysis should enable public and inter-agency participation,⁷ and that the analysis should influence the decisions federal agencies ultimately make.⁸ Although NEPA does not require a particular outcome, it compels agencies to think carefully and comprehensively about the environment before acting, and emphasizes the importance of fully assessing environmental impacts and alternative approaches through public participation and inter-agency consultation. NEPA requires agencies to consult with other agencies that have expertise on a particular resource impacted by a project, developing more robust alternatives and reducing delay in preparation of documents.⁹ These principles must continue to underlie any potential changes to the NEPA regulations.

⁵ 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(a).

⁶ 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401, *et seq.*

⁷ 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

⁸ *See Am. Rivers v. Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm’n*, 895 F.3d 32, 49 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (NEPA ensures that agency decision-making is fully informed regarding environmental impacts); *Sierra Club v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 803 F.3d 31, 37 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (agencies must take a “hard look” at the environmental consequences of their actions before deciding whether and how to proceed).

⁹ *See* 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.5, 1501.5, 1501.6.

NEPA explicitly embraces democratic values by making the public important contributors to the environmental review process.¹⁰ As CEQ’s guidance states, “[t]wo major purposes of the environmental review process are better informed decisions and citizen involvement, both of which should lead to implementation of NEPA’s policies.”¹¹ Public comment in the NEPA process is critically important to, among other things, identify alternatives that improve a proposed action or reduce its environmental impacts, identify shortfalls in the agency’s analyses, spot missing issues, and provide additional information that the agency may not have known existed. To the extent Question 6 of the Advance Notice suggests public comment can be more “efficient,” CEQ should reject changes that weaken or shorten the public’s opportunity for participation. Because of NEPA, the public has a legal right and a voice in the federal planning process,¹² and public involvement is beneficial to federal decision-making.¹³ As CEQ itself has stated, “[s]ome of the most constructive and beneficial interaction between the public and an agency occurs when citizens identify or develop reasonable alternatives that the agency can evaluate in the EIS.”¹⁴

In sum, the NEPA regulations in their current form embody NEPA’s guiding principles, and any revisions to the NEPA regulations must adhere to these principles by ensuring the protection of public health and the environment through well-informed decision-making and robust and meaningful public involvement in the

¹⁰ See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1503.1(a)(4), 1506.6.

¹¹ CEQ, Exec. Office of the President, A Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA: Having Your Voice Heard, at 2 (Dec. 2007) [hereinafter Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA], available at https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/get-involved/Citizens_Guide_Dec07.pdf.

¹² 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1503.1(a)(4), 1506.6.

¹³ See Letter from Russell E. Train, *et al.* to The Honorable Cathy McMorris, at 2 (Sept. 19, 2005) (former Chairs and General Counsels of CEQ stating that “the public plays an indispensable role in the NEPA process”) [hereinafter Train Letter] (attached as Exhibit A); see also Env’tl. Law Inst., NEPA Success Stories: Celebrating 40 Years of Transparency and Open Government, at 6 (Aug. 2010) [hereinafter NEPA Success Stories], available at https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/get-involved/NEPA_Success_Stories.pdf; CEQ, Examples of Benefits from the NEPA Process for ARRA 2–3 [American Recovery and Reinvestment Act] Funded Activities (May 2011) [hereinafter Examples of NEPA Benefits], available at https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/get-involved/ARRA_NEPA_Benefits_List_May122100.pdf; Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA, *supra* note 11, at 24 (“Through NEPA, citizens were able to educate and assist the decision-makers in developing their alternatives.”).

¹⁴ Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA, *supra* note 11, at 14.

NEPA process. Any revisions must continue to require that Federal agencies “use all practicable means” to fulfill the purpose of NEPA embodied in the statute.¹⁵

II. The States Have Unique Interests in Ensuring That the NEPA Regulations Demand Careful, Timely Review of Federal Actions.

The NEPA process affects the States’ interests in several key ways, including their interests in protecting their residents and environmental resources by ensuring public participation and robust, informed decision-making processes for federal projects.

A. The States have an interest in ensuring that federal decisions do not harm their residents, property, or natural resources.

The States are injured in their *parens patriae* capacity when their residents suffer from the effects of environmental pollution or degradation, including cumulative impacts in environmental justice communities.¹⁶ The States also have a quasi-sovereign interest in preventing harm to the health of their natural resources and ecosystems.¹⁷ As federal courts have recognized, states are entitled to “special solicitude” in seeking redress for environmental harms within their borders, particularly where state property and quasi-sovereign interests are potentially injured.¹⁸ Accordingly, the States have an interest in and are committed to preventing any harm to their residents, ecosystems, and property from revisions to NEPA’s regulations that weaken environmental protections or undermine the policies and principles of NEPA—in particular, any revisions that would limit public participation or lead to less robust analysis and review.

The States have a fundamental interest in safeguarding their residents’ involvement in the NEPA process for federal projects that could impact their communities. Relatedly, NEPA proceedings and resulting analyses provide an important opportunity for state and municipal agencies to help shape federal decisions that affect state or municipal resources. Public involvement is critical in identifying and evaluating public health and environmental issues of local or statewide concern that may result from federal actions. CEQ’s current NEPA

¹⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 4331(b)(1)-(6).

¹⁶ *Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 607 (1982); *Maryland v. Louisiana*, 451 U.S. 725, 737–38 (1981).

¹⁷ *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 519–22 (2007).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 520.

regulations provide that agencies shall “make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.”¹⁹ As discussed more fully in Point I, above, and Point III, below, any revisions to the NEPA regulations such as those suggested by Question 6 of the Advance Notice that may weaken public participation would violate NEPA and injure the States’ interests.

The States are also required to undertake NEPA review in certain cases where federal funding is involved, such as for certain highway and other major infrastructure projects. Significant revisions to the NEPA regulations will impact the States’ implementation of and compliance with NEPA, and may require revisions to the States’ internal processes and significant investments of time and training resources to accommodate disruptive changes to long-settled processes.

The States also have a significant interest in ensuring that the environmental review process under NEPA is robust and detailed, particularly with respect to major infrastructure projects and projects affecting public lands and waterways that impact public health, environmental health, and the States’ economies. For example, the siting of nuclear waste disposal sites receives environmental review only through a NEPA process conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC”). In New York, the West Valley nuclear waste disposal site is presently undergoing a NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) process that is governed by the significant protections in the current NEPA regulations of both CEQ and the United States Department of Energy. The State of New York, along with numerous agencies and members of the public, is participating in this NEPA process. Any weakening of the procedural protections in NEPA, such as setting arbitrary and unreasonable timelines or page limits for NEPA review documents suggested by Questions 4 and 10 of the Advance Notice, or limiting the scope of issues as suggested by Question 5 or the range of alternatives considered as suggested by Question 13, could result in an environmental review process—in this case and many others—that is not compliant with the statutory requirements of NEPA, and that may injure the States’ sovereign and proprietary interests.

Similarly, NEPA review is built into and improves the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“FERC”) analysis of whether a proposed interstate natural gas pipeline is in the public convenience and necessity.²⁰ The Natural Gas Act preserves the States’ ability to issue substantive environmental permits under the

¹⁹ 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(a); *see also id.* § 1503.1(a)(4).

²⁰ *See* 15 U.S.C. § 717f; *see also* Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Facilities, 88 FERC 61,227, 61,745–46, 61,748, 61,749 (1999), *clarified*, 90 FERC 61,128, 61,397–98, *further clarified*, 92 FERC 61,094 (2000).

Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act for natural gas projects.²¹ The States' jurisdiction in each of these substantive environmental regimes should therefore be absolute, subject to compliance with applicable timelines.²² When reviewing a new pipeline application, FERC conducts its NEPA analysis at the same time as its review of the project's economic merits, reviewing both the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the project.²³ At the conclusion of the NEPA process, FERC generally issues a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") for the project. The CPCN not only authorizes the pipeline, but also includes numerous environmental conditions based largely on the NEPA analysis.

A robust and transparent NEPA analysis of proposed interstate natural gas pipeline projects is necessary to protect the States' interests because it requires careful consideration of the state and local laws that may apply or are relevant to the project and its impacts. However, the CPCNs that FERC issues—based on its NEPA process—often include language or conditions that may limit the States' substantive environmental jurisdiction. Therefore, the States have an interest in ensuring that the NEPA regulations retain their current strength to govern and shape FERC's NEPA analysis, as state environmental review processes may not be able to compensate in all cases for deficiencies in federal NEPA review in the course of decisions with significant and lasting environmental consequences for the States.

Finally, robust NEPA analyses provide important resources for the States in informing other important state programs and decisions affecting state resources. For example, robust EISs are critical to informing the States' "consistency determinations" under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1456, by which states assess the impact of federal projects on the land or water uses or natural resources in a state's coastal zone.²⁴ If regulatory amendments result in fewer or less thorough EISs, the States would have to expend additional resources to comprehensively assess the impact of federal projects on state resources.

²¹ 15 U.S.C § 717b(d).

²² *Id.*

²³ See Comments of the Attorneys General of Massachusetts, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Washington, and the District of Columbia on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's April 19, 2018 Notice of Inquiry on its Certification of New Interstate Natural Gas Facilities, Docket No. PL18-1-000 (July 25, 2018) (attached as Exhibit B).

²⁴ See, e.g., 15 C.F.R. § 930.31; 301 Code Mass. Regs. § 20.04.

B. Any Weakening of the NEPA Regulations Would Threaten the States' Abilities to Enforce Their Own State Environmental Laws to Protect Public Health and the Environment.

NEPA also served as a model to the States, many of which enacted their own environmental review laws to protect public health and the environment.²⁵ Several examples include New York's State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"),²⁶ the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act ("MEPA"), the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA")²⁷, and Washington's State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA").²⁸ These state laws are critically important to environmental review of state agency actions and are designed to complement NEPA review of federal actions within our States. The federal and state schemes most commonly interact when there are both federal agency and state agency components to a proposed action or project, such as a state highway project receiving federal funds. In such cases, a robust NEPA process remains vital to ensuring thorough and efficient review of numerous government actions that affect our residents' health and welfare and the environment. Revisions to the NEPA regulations should not negatively impact the States' abilities to implement and enforce their own environmental laws.

First, the States have an interest in the proper administration of their own environmental review laws, which could be adversely impacted by weakening the substance of NEPA reviews. The States' laws are often administered in conjunction with the NEPA regulations and either coordinate state and federal review, or allow project proponents to rely on NEPA review to satisfy State requirements. For example, in New York, the SEQRA regulations provide that, if a NEPA EIS has been prepared, generally no State EIS is required, provided the federal EIS is sufficient for the state to make its own findings.²⁹ Weaker federal review, less comprehensive federal EISs, or preparation of fewer EISs under NEPA may require that more EISs be prepared under a state process, likely leading to increased expenditures of State resources.

²⁵ See CEQ, States and Local Jurisdictions with NEPA-like Environmental Planning Requirements [hereinafter State and Local Laws], <https://ceq.doe.gov/laws-regulations/states.html> (last visited August 14, 2018).

²⁶ N.Y. Env'tl. Conserv. L. art. 8; 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617.

²⁷ Cal. Stats. ch. 1433 (1970), Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000–21189.57.

²⁸ RCW 43-21C-010–914; WAC 197-11-010–990.

²⁹ 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.15(a); N.Y. Env'tl. Conserv. L. § 8-0111(1) & (2); see *Hudson R. Sloop Clearwater v. Dep't of Navy*, 836 F.2d 760, 762 (2d Cir. 1988).

In Massachusetts, if fewer projects qualify as major federal actions requiring an EIS under amended CEQ regulations, as suggested by Question 7, more project proponents, including state agencies receiving federal funds, will have to draft Environmental Impact Reports (“EIRs”) under MEPA *ab initio* rather than substituting EISs for EIRs or building on EISs during coordinated review procedures.³⁰ Where Massachusetts projects still require both EISs and EIRs, if amended regulations relax the scoping as suggested by Question 5 of the Advance Notice, or cumulative effects and alternatives requirements for EISs as suggested by Question 13, EISs will prove a less helpful resource as project proponents prepare EIRs, requiring the expenditure of additional time and resources to comply with the comprehensive, environmentally protective State report requirements.

Likewise, Washington State law allows State agencies to adopt NEPA EISs that are adequate under CEQ’s NEPA regulations.³¹ However, if CEQ makes regulatory revisions that weaken NEPA and are not consistent with Washington’s environmental policy act requirements, then compliance with the federal NEPA process may not be sufficient to satisfy State law. As a result, project proponents may be required to navigate divergent environmental review processes, potentially making the processes longer, more complicated, and more prone to legal challenges.

In California, CEQA³² is designed to complement NEPA by eliciting public participation in protecting California’s environment. Even though CEQA and NEPA do not have identical requirements (and, in certain aspects CEQA has more rigorous procedural requirements than NEPA), where a project requires both federal and State approvals (an EIS and an EIR), joint review under both statutes avoids redundancy, improves efficiency and interagency cooperation, and is easier for applicants and citizens to navigate.³³ Sharing documents and reducing paperwork results in efficient outcomes that benefit social welfare, environmental stewardship, and California’s economy. If NEPA’s regulations are revised in a manner that reduces protections for natural resources and public health, it will become more difficult for California state agencies to utilize NEPA documents by reference in CEQA reviews,

³⁰ See, e.g., Mass. Gen. Laws c. 30, § 62; 310 Code Mass. Regs. § 11.09(c).

³¹ WAC 197-11-610(3).

³² Cal. Stats. ch. 1433 (1970); Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000–21189.57, 21001, 21100.

³³ See Exec. Office of the President & Governor of California’s Office of Planning and Research, NEPA and CEQA: Integrating Federal and State Environmental Reviews, at 1 (2014) [hereinafter CEQA-NEPA Integration Guidance].

precluding joint CEQA-NEPA review.³⁴ For example, if revised NEPA regulations curtail robust review of alternatives or cumulative impacts as suggested by Question 13 of the Advance Notice, coordinated CEQA-NEPA review of the proposed project would be impossible, resulting in greater inefficiency in projects requiring approvals under both statutes.

In addition, where projects require both federal and state-level environmental review, the NEPA regulations take account of many state partners' environmental review processes through state-specific memoranda designed to aid compliance with both federal and state schemes.³⁵ These carefully calibrated programs vary by state and represent significant work by CEQ and the States to harmonize these review programs. Any revisions to the CEQ regulations should account for the existing cooperative framework developed with the individual States to ensure compliance with each process—a framework that benefits the public and regulated community by providing an efficient linkage of state and federal requirements and facilitating coordinated compliance with both. CEQ should avoid amending the NEPA regulations in ways that will render such linked compliance more difficult or impossible. Furthermore, CEQ should evaluate the time and resources that will be needed if significant revisions to the CEQ regulations require substantial re-working of these memoranda to ensure continuing compliance with both federal and state programs.

The States have long relied on the NEPA regulations in implementing state environmental review statutes and regulations. For example, New York's SEQRA regulations drew from certain sections of the NEPA regulations in setting regulatory standards, such as when a supplemental EIS is required. New York SEQRA regulations also require review of potential catastrophic impacts from a proposed action³⁶ through provisions drawn and adapted from the NEPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22. NEPA regulations are also utilized by states courts in interpreting the obligations under equivalent state environmental review statutes. For example, courts in New York rely on NEPA in construing the scope of the SEQRA where appropriate, finding that certain decisions interpreting actions as exempt from NEPA

³⁴ See Exec. Order No. 13,807, 82 Fed. Reg. 40,463, 40,466–67 (Aug. 24, 2017); The White House, Legislative Outline for Rebuilding Infrastructure in America, 35–37, 48–50 (Feb. 28, 2018), available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/INFRASTRUCTURE-211.pdf>.

³⁵ See State and Local Laws, *supra* note 25; see also 40 C.F.R. § 1500.5(h).

³⁶ 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.9(b)(6).

review³⁷ are persuasive authority for determining whether such actions are required to undergo environmental review under the state statute.³⁸ In California, NEPA cases are considered persuasive authority in CEQA cases.³⁹ Courts in Washington State also look to NEPA decisions to interpret SEPA.⁴⁰ Some state courts have also adopted the federal “hard look” standard required by NEPA under their own States’ environmental review statutes. If CEQ revises the definition of key terms, as suggested by the Advance Notice Questions 7, 8, and 9, it may create divergence between state and federal standards, undermine our States’ ability to effectively implement our own environmental review laws, and impact the case law interpreting States’ well-developed statutory and regulatory regimes. As CEQ considers any possible revisions, it should take that concern into account.

In summary, the States have strong interests in the continued implementation of NEPA regulations that provide for a robust, deliberative, and complete federal environmental review process. CEQ must avoid arbitrarily limiting the scope and timeframe allowed for preparation and consideration of NEPA documents or truncating the public participation process as suggested by the Advance Notice, which would harm the States’ interests and violate the principles and provisions of NEPA.

III. CEQ Must Conduct a Thorough Review Process to Determine the Need, if Any, for NEPA Regulatory Revisions.

Consistent with NEPA’s animating principles and fundamental requirements, any revisions to the NEPA regulations must be inclusive, deliberative, and transparent, and employ a public review process similar to the process CEQ used

³⁷ See *H.O.M.E.S. v. New York State Urban Dev. Corp.*, 69 A.D.2d 222, 231, 418 N.Y.S.2d 827, 832 (4th Dep’t 1979).

³⁸ See *Villani v. Berle*, 91 Misc.2d 603, 608, 398 N.Y.S.2d 796, 801 (Sup. Ct. Suffolk County 1977); *Matter of Marino v. Platt*, 104 Misc.2d 386, 390, 428 N.Y.S.2d 433, 435–36 (Sup. Ct. Onondaga County 1980).

³⁹ See, e.g., *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 13 Cal.3d 68, 86, 529 P.2d 66, 78 (S.Ct. 1974) (California courts use NEPA as persuasive authority in CEQA); accord *Del Mar Terrace Conservancy, Inc. v. City Council of the City of San Diego*, 10 Cal.App.4th 712, 732, 12 Cal.Rptr.2d 785, 797 (1992).

⁴⁰ See, e.g., *Eastlake Cmty. Council v. Roanoke Assocs., Inc.*, 82 Wn.2d 475, 488, 513 P.3d 36, 44–45 (1983); *City of Des Moines v. Puget Sound Reg’l Council*, 98 Wn. App. 23, 37, 988 P.2d 27, 37 (1999); *Gebbers v. Okanogan Cty. Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1*, 144 Wn. App. 371, 381 & n.1, 183 P.3d 324, 328 & n.1 (2008) (looking to federal definition of cumulative impacts).

when it initially drafted its NEPA regulations,⁴¹ and when it subsequently reviewed the effectiveness of NEPA regulations in 1997.⁴² At a minimum, CEQ's review of whether to amend its NEPA regulations should include a detailed analysis of the effectiveness of current regulations and other tools in implementing NEPA, a demonstrated need for any revisions to the regulations to better support the purpose and structure of NEPA, and an analysis of whether changes to the regulations could increase litigation, delay, and confusion in the NEPA process.

A. CEQ Should Adequately Evaluate the Effectiveness of the NEPA Regulations and Tools to Address Any Concerns about NEPA's Implementation.

As discussed in detail below, the NEPA regulations have successfully safeguarded public health and the environment for the past 40 years. In light of this history, CEQ should first consider whether existing tools available under the current NEPA regulations will address CEQ's apparent concerns about NEPA's implementation. If CEQ nevertheless decides to pursue revisions to its NEPA regulations, then CEQ must adequately demonstrate the need for any such changes.

1. *Current Regulations Have Been Largely Successful in Implementing NEPA.*

Before CEQ makes any changes to its NEPA regulations, CEQ should carefully evaluate the demonstrated effectiveness of its current regulations implementing NEPA, which have provided a consistent regulatory environment for several decades.⁴³ Under these regulations, federal agencies annually prepare hundreds of environmental impact statements, tens of thousands of environmental assessments, and hundreds of thousands of categorical exclusions.⁴⁴

⁴¹ See National Environmental Policy Act—Regulations, 43 Fed. Reg. 55,978, 55,980 (Nov. 29, 1978) [hereinafter NEPA—Regulations] (rulemaking process included public hearings; meetings with all federal agencies; meetings with representatives of business, labor, State and local governments, and environmental groups; and detailed consideration of federal studies on the environmental impact statement process).

⁴² CEQ, Exec. Office of the President, National Environmental Policy Act: A Study of Its Effectiveness After Twenty-five Years, at 5 (Jan. 1997) [hereinafter NEPA Effectiveness Study] (CEQ solicited input from NEPA's original framers, members of Congress, State and local agencies, drafters of the CEQ regulations, federal agencies, and the public), available at <https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-publications/nepa25fn.pdf>.

⁴³ See Advance Notice, *supra* note 1, 83 Fed. Reg. at 28,591–92.

⁴⁴ NEPA.gov, <https://ceq.doe.gov/ceq-reports/litigation.html>; U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, GAO-14-369, National Environmental Policy Act: Little Information Exists on

The vast majority of environmental review processes result in “taxpayer dollars and energy saved, resources better protected and the fostering of community agreements.”⁴⁵ Indeed, when CEQ conducted a 25-year review of NEPA, it concluded “that NEPA is a success—it has made agencies take a hard look at the potential environmental consequences of their actions, and it has brought the public into the agency decision-making process like no other statute.”⁴⁶ The 2014 U.S. Government Accountability (“GAO”) Report on NEPA echoed this sentiment, stating that the NEPA process “ultimately saves time and reduces overall project costs by identifying and avoiding problems that may occur in later stages of project development.”⁴⁷ In short, as U.S. Forest Service officials have observed, “NEPA leads to better decisions.”⁴⁸

In addition, the NEPA environmental review process has yielded significant community involvement and decisions sensitive to local interests. As NEPA itself recognizes, states and local governments are active and important partners in the effective implementation of NEPA in their communities.⁴⁹ Recognizing this partnership, the Federal Transit Administration has commended the effectiveness of collaborative NEPA processes across the country including the final EIS for the Federal Way Link Extension and the Mukilteo Multimodal Project in Washington State, the final EIS for the Purple Line and the alternative analysis and draft EIS for the Red Line Corridor Transit Study in Maryland, and the EIS for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project in Oregon.⁵⁰

NEPA Analyses⁷ (2014) [hereinafter GAO Report], available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/670/662546.pdf>.

⁴⁵ Examples of NEPA Benefits, *supra* note 13, at 1.

⁴⁶ NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at iii.

⁴⁷ GAO Report, *supra* note 44, at 16.

⁴⁸ *Id.*; see also NEPA Success Stories, *supra* note 13; Examples of NEPA Benefits, *supra* note 13; Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA, *supra* note 11, at 24 (“Through NEPA, citizens were able to educate and assist the decision-makers in developing their alternatives.”).

⁴⁹ 42 U.S.C. § 4331(a).

⁵⁰ Fed. Transit Admin., Outstanding Achievement Award for Excellence in Environmental Document Preparation, <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/environmental-programs/outstanding-achievement-award-excellence> (last visited Aug. 14, 2018).

The NEPA process benefits the States' residents and natural resources alike. For example, following extensive community involvement and collaboration between multiple state and federal agencies and the two impacted towns, the final joint EIS and state EIR for the Herring River Restoration on Cape Cod in Massachusetts recommended,⁵¹ and the National Park Service adopted,⁵² an alternative plan that will restore at least 346 acres of the tidal marsh, protect fish species harmed by current, impeded river conditions, and improve fishing and shell fishing yields, among other significant benefits to the community and the environment.

Contrary to assertions by critics of NEPA, the NEPA process does not foster significant litigation. The vast majority of NEPA reviews of proposed federal actions—over 99 percent by some estimates⁵³—do not result in litigation.⁵⁴ Where projects are challenged, it is often by plaintiffs seeking to ensure that projects do not move forward without adequate review of environmental impacts. In such circumstances, the courts play a vital role in ensuring that federal agencies adhere to Congress's mandate to take a hard look at environmental consequences before taking

⁵¹ See Nat'l Park Serv., Town of Wellfleet, Town of Truro, & Herring River Restoration Committee, Herring River Restoration Project Final Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report (May 2016), *available at* <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=217&projectID=18573&documentID=73471>.

⁵² Nat'l Park Service, Record of Decision for Herring River Restoration Project, Final Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report (Sept. 15, 2016), *available at* <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=217&projectID=18573&documentID=75340>.

⁵³ Geo. U.L. Center, NEPA: Lessons Learned and Next Steps: Hearing Before the Task Force on Updating the National Environmental Policy Act of the H. Comm. on Resources, 109th Cong., Statement of Professor Robert G. Dreher, Nov. 17, 2005 (“[P]laintiffs bring around 100 NEPA lawsuits per year, representing only two-tenths of 1 percent of the 50,000 or so actions that Federal agencies document each year under NEPA.”).

⁵⁴ See GAO Report, *supra* note 44, at 19–20; NEPA.gov, <https://ceq.doe.gov/ceq-reports/litigation.html> (stating that “the amount of litigation on these NEPA analyses is comparatively small”); The Weaponization of the National Environmental Policy Act and the Implications of Environmental Lawfare: Hearing Before the House Comm. on Natural Res., 115th Cong. 8–11 (2018) (statement of Horst Greczmiel, Former CEQ Associate Director of NEPA Oversight) [hereinafter Greczmiel Statement].

major actions.⁵⁵ The opportunity for judicial review of agency actions is not a shortcoming of NEPA, but a fundamental part of the NEPA process that must be preserved.

2. *Tools Already Exist to Address Any Concerns about the NEPA Process.*

Although NEPA critics and Questions 1, 2, 6, 13, 15, 17 and 19 of the Advance Notice suggest the environmental review process under NEPA is inefficient, the NEPA regulations already provide at least 12 specific strategies to reduce delay in agencies' NEPA reviews.⁵⁶ These strategies were designed to *reduce* inefficiencies while producing “better decisions which further the national policy to protect and enhance the quality of the human environment.”⁵⁷ As a result, existing NEPA regulations—when properly implemented by well-resourced and well-trained federal agencies—already provide the tools to address many of CEQ's apparent efficiency concerns about the NEPA process.⁵⁸

For example, section 1500.4 of CEQ's NEPA regulations identifies more than a dozen different methods for reducing excessive paperwork, such as reducing duplication by allowing for joint preparation with state and local processes and allowing federal agencies to adopt appropriate environmental documents prepared by other agencies.⁵⁹ Similarly, section 1500.5 directs agencies to take a dozen enumerated actions to reduce delay, including integrating the NEPA process into early stages of project planning.⁶⁰ Likewise, in certain appropriate circumstances, programmatic reviews, as referenced in Question 12, have been used as an effective tool when considering an action that will take place at multiple sites, and may provide a model for considering impacts of multiple similar projects.⁶¹ Importantly, the NEPA

⁵⁵ See Greczmiel Statement, *supra* note 54, at 8–10.

⁵⁶ See 40 C.F.R. § 1500.5.

⁵⁷ See NEPA—Regulations, *supra* note 41, 43 Fed. Reg. at 55,978.

⁵⁸ See *generally*, CEQ, Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies on Improving the Process for Preparing Efficient and Timely Environmental Reviews under NEPA (Mar. 6, 2012), *available at* https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and-guidance/Improving_NEPA_Efficiencies_06Mar2012.pdf.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 1500.4(n); see also *id.* §§ 1501.5 (discussing lead agencies), 1501.6 (discussing cooperating agencies); see NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at 21.

⁶⁰ 40 C.F.R. § 1500.5.

⁶¹ See CEQ, Effective Use of Programmatic NEPA Reviews 6-7 (Dec. 18, 2014), *available at* <https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and->

regulations provide agencies the flexibility to adjust the NEPA process to meet the needs of the agency and the project under review, which can vary widely depending on the size and nature of the agency and the project.⁶²

As CEQ and others have identified, the effectiveness and efficiency of the NEPA process significantly increases when agencies:

- (a) integrate NEPA into their internal planning process as early as possible;⁶³
- (b) ensure that the NEPA process is well-funded and led by experienced and well-trained staff and engaged senior management;⁶⁴
- (c) engage in robust and inclusive public outreach;⁶⁵
- (d) rely on accurate scientific data and rigorous environmental analysis;⁶⁶
- (e) utilize NEPA regulations to facilitate interagency coordination to resolve or avoid conflicts, reduce duplication of effort, and improve the environmental permitting process;⁶⁷
- (f) draft NEPA documents in plain, concise, and honest language;⁶⁸ and

guidance/Effective_Use_of_Programmatic_NEPA_Reviews_Final_Dec2014_searchable.pdf

⁶² See, e.g., *id.* §§ 1501.7(b) (permitting lead agencies to set page and time limits), 1501.8(b) (providing factors to consider in setting time limits), 1501.8 (rejecting “prescribed universal time limits for the entire NEPA process” as “too inflexible”).

⁶³ NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at 11.

⁶⁴ See *id.*; Dep’t of Energy, NEPA Lessons Learned Quarterly Report, September 2017, at 7 (Sept. 2017) (attributing shorter NEPA completion times to, among other things, agency senior management attention, the availability of data, and engagement of experienced staff), *available at* https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2017/09/f37/LLQR%20Sep_2017.pdf.

⁶⁵ NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at 18; Train Letter, *supra* note 13, at 2, (“Meaningful efforts to improve [NEPA’s] implementation should address the critical needs for better guidance and additional training for agency personnel and enhanced resources for NEPA implementation by federal agencies.”).

⁶⁶ NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at 27–29.

⁶⁷ *Id.* at 21.

⁶⁸ *Id.* at 29.

(g) effectively partner with State and local governments.⁶⁹

As these measures demonstrate, there is insufficient evidence that any revisions to the NEPA regulations for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the environmental review process are needed. Instead, the existing efficiency measures should be implemented under current regulations by well-trained and well-funded federal agencies committed to NEPA's purpose and function.

Further, any concerns about the efficiency of the NEPA process for major infrastructure projects already have been addressed by Title 41 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015 ("FAST Act").⁷⁰ Title 41 sought to streamline the environmental review of major infrastructure projects by, among other things, emphasizing the importance of early and frequent coordination between cooperating and participating agencies, creating a federal infrastructure-permitting dashboard to allow agencies and the public to track the progress of Title 41 covered projects, enhancing early stakeholder engagement, and requiring the newly created Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council to publish an annual report of best practices.⁷¹ Given that Title 41 targeted many of the concerns about the NEPA process raised by the current Administration and suggested by the Advance Notice,⁷² CEQ should allow Title 41 to work in practice to better evaluate whether any changes to CEQ's NEPA regulations are warranted.

3. CEQ Must Demonstrate the Need for and Purpose of Any Regulatory Revisions.

To ensure informed decision-making consistent with NEPA's structure and purpose and the Administrative Procedure Act,⁷³ any revisions to the NEPA regulations must reflect reasoned decision-making based on accurate and reliable data demonstrating the need for the change and its consistency with the statute.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ See Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, Recommended Best Practices for Environmental Reviews and Authorizations for Infrastructure Projects for Fiscal Year 2018, 8–9 (Dec. 2017), available at <https://www.permits.performance.gov/sites/permits.performance.gov/files/docs/documentation/40856/fast-41fy-2018best-practices-report.pdf>.

⁷⁰ Pub. L. No. 114-94 (2015).

⁷¹ See 42 U.S.C. §§ 4370m-1–4370m-12.

⁷² See e.g., Exec. Order No. 13,807 (Aug. 15, 2017).

⁷³ 5 U.S.C. §§ 551–559.

⁷⁴ See *FCC v. Fox Television Stations*, 556 U.S. 502, 514–15 (2009) (changes in agency position must be based on reasoned explanation supported by the record and permissible under the statute); *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm*

Insufficient data presently exist to support revisions to the NEPA regulations. According to the 2014 GAO Report, most federal agencies do not routinely track important information about their NEPA processes, including the number of environmental assessments and categorical exclusions conducted and the time frames for completing these reviews.⁷⁵ In addition, few agencies track the cost of completing NEPA analyses, leading to little quantitative data on the costs and benefits of the NEPA process.⁷⁶ The data that do exist, however, demonstrate that consistent with NEPA's intent and purpose, the present NEPA regulations encourage public participation, lead to projects that are "financially and environmentally improved," and seldom involve litigation.⁷⁷

Given the lack of data demonstrating a need to revise NEPA's regulations—including the absence of meaningful discussion in the Advance Notice demonstrating a need to revise CEQ's NEPA regulations⁷⁸—CEQ must engage in a careful and detailed review before proposing any regulatory revisions. The vague questions in the Advance Notice do not provide an adequate basis for stakeholder input. To ensure CEQ engages in an informed review process, the States reiterate that CEQ should hold several public hearings on the Advance Notice before proposing any regulatory revisions.⁷⁹ In addition, consistent with its past practices, CEQ should analyze existing studies and reports on the effectiveness of the current NEPA regulations and solicit input from federal agencies, State and local governments, the public, academics, scientists, and other stakeholders to determine whether changes are appropriate.⁸⁰ If, after this review, CEQ decides to revise the NEPA regulations, then

Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (“[T]he agency must examine the relevant data and articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.” (quotation and citation omitted)).

⁷⁵ GAO Report, *supra* note 44; *see also* NEPA Effectiveness Study, *supra* note 42, at 6, 13; *see also id.* at 13 (discussing the lack of information of the time frame for completing EAs and CEs).

⁷⁶ GAO Report, *supra* note 44, at 10.

⁷⁷ *Id.* at 15–18.

⁷⁸ *See* Advance Notice, *supra* note 1, 83 Fed. Reg. at 28,591–92.

⁷⁹ *See* Letter from Attorneys General of Washington, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Oregon to Mary B. Neumayr re: Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Docket ID No. CEQ-2018-0001-0200, at 2 (July 3, 2018) (requesting several public hearings on the Advance Notice).

⁸⁰ *See* NEPA—Regulations, *supra* note 41, 43 Fed. Reg. at 55,980 (describing the process for drafting the current NEPA regulations as including public hearings,

CEQ should again hold regional public hearings and provide sufficient time for stakeholders to scrutinize and comment on the proposed revisions as required by the Administrative Procedure Act.

In particular, CEQ should solicit information on the extent and causes of any delay in the NEPA process. The questions in the Advance Notice assume delay is caused by NEPA but reference no data to support that assumption. As noted above, existing data suggest that concerns over the extent of delay may be overblown given the number of NEPA analyses completed by federal agencies each year. Although NEPA critics assert that NEPA review results in delay, as previously noted, only a small percentage of NEPA actions result in litigation and potential delay.⁸¹ Focusing on litigation as the sole or primary source of project delay also ignores a number of other factors that may cause delay and may be addressed without revisions to CEQ's NEPA regulations, including lack of funding to sufficiently implement the NEPA process, inadequate staff time and training to implement or supervise the NEPA process, local controversy over or opposition to a project that would exist regardless of NEPA, delays in non-NEPA permitting or approval processes, project sponsors' changes to project design that require substantial revisions, and uncertainties related to project funding.⁸² Accordingly, before proposing any regulatory changes, CEQ should conduct a detailed review to first determine if delay is occurring, the extent of the delay, and the actual causes of delay, and then target those causes through training, guidance, or, if necessary, carefully tailored regulatory changes.

B. Unnecessary Revisions to NEPA's Implementing Regulations Likely Will Increase Litigation, Delay, and Costs.

Given the significance of the NEPA regulations to the implementation of NEPA and to the daily function of federal agencies, unnecessary revisions to these regulations likely will increase litigation, delay, and costs, and weaken the effectiveness of NEPA in protecting public health and the environment. As former CEQ leaders have made clear, "[m]easures to exempt certain agencies and programs from NEPA, to restrict or eliminate alternatives analysis, or to limit the public's right

meetings with all federal agencies implementing NEPA, meetings with representatives of business, labor, State and local governments, environmental and other interested groups, and the general public, and detailed consideration of existing federal studies on the NEPA process).

⁸¹ See NEPA.gov, <https://ceq.doe.gov/ceq-reports/litigation.html>; GAO Report, *supra* note 44, at 19–20; Greczmiel Statement, *supra* note 54, at 8–11.

⁸² See GAO Report, *supra* note 44, at 18; Greczmiel Statement, *supra* note 54, at 4–6.

to participate in the NEPA process threaten NEPA's vital role in promoting responsible government decision-making."⁸³

As an initial matter, unnecessary revisions likely will require federal agencies to revise their own NEPA regulations and guidance to ensure compliance with the NEPA regulations.⁸⁴ And, as already noted, the States may need to amend their environmental review programs to respond to such changes. These processes would waste taxpayer dollars, delay projects, and create uncertainty for project proponents and the public as agencies reconfigure their own NEPA regulations and procedures to conform to CEQ's regulatory changes.

Changes to CEQ's NEPA regulations are also likely to increase NEPA litigation. One of the current regulations' successes was a reduction in NEPA litigation, but changes to these regulations—particularly if CEQ does not engage in the robust and thoughtful review outlined above—threaten to undo that success.⁸⁵ Litigation is particularly likely if CEQ attempts to change the definition of key NEPA terms (such as those identified in Questions 7, 8, and 9 of the Advance Notice), or constrains the ability of agencies to identify a range of mitigation actions to help minimize project impacts on the environment. Further, as NEPA requires, CEQ's current regulations ensure that the adverse environmental effects of federal agency decision-making are fully considered and that any alternatives to the agency action are fully developed. Revising the regulations to limit full consideration of the effects and alternatives of a proposed action would contravene NEPA's mandate that agencies consider alternatives to the proposed action and would also make litigation likely.⁸⁶

Moreover, because public involvement is so critical, CEQ should not revise the NEPA regulations in a manner suggested by Question 6 of the Advance Notice that would curtail public involvement, or by attempting to mandate completion of the environmental analysis on a predetermined timeframe, as suggested by Question 4 of the Advance Notice. For instance, Executive Order 13,807 envisions a two-year time frame for completing agency NEPA analyses. While such a time period may be adequate for some federal actions, others, such as the determination to issue permits

⁸³ Train Letter, *supra* note 13, at 2–3.

⁸⁴ See 40 C.F.R. § 1507.3.

⁸⁵ Bear, Dinah, *NEPA at 19: A Primer on an "Old" Law with Solutions to New Problems*, 19 *Env'tl. L. Rep.* 10,060, 10,062 (1989) (noting that annual surveys showed a low of 71 NEPA cases in 1986 compared with 189 cases in 1974).

⁸⁶ 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

for complex proposed projects, require significant agency time and expertise to consider the materials submitted. Arbitrarily restricting the NEPA timeframe does not reduce the complexity of projects and the need for thorough evaluation of important considerations such as the public need and environmental impacts of proposed natural gas pipelines or the site of a new nuclear electricity facility. Instead, the shortened timeframes tend to reduce the public comment period and truncate the agency's consideration of public comments, which, as discussed above, often propose alternatives or mitigation measures that lead to better agency decisions and better outcomes for public health and the environment. Arbitrary limits on the length or format of NEPA documents also reduce transparency, diminish the effectiveness of the public review process, and, again, ultimately lead to litigation.

In addition, changes to increase the use of categorical exclusion provisions as suggested by Question 9 may lead to the inappropriate overuse of categorical exclusions that would undermine the principles of NEPA and likely increase litigation. As CEQ has previously explained, “[i]f used inappropriately, categorical exclusions can thwart NEPA’s environmental stewardship goals, by compromising the quality and transparency of agency environmental review and decisionmaking, as well as compromising the opportunity for meaningful public participation and review.”⁸⁷ CEQ must ensure that whether a project has the potential to significantly affect the environment remains the touchstone of the NEPA process. CEQ should not adopt new regulations that will undermine this basic principle of NEPA.

IV. CEQ Should Limit Any Changes to Its Implementing Regulations to Codifying Its Environmentally Protective Guidance on Climate Change and Environmental Justice.

If CEQ decides to revise the NEPA regulations, the States urge CEQ to limit any regulatory revisions to codifying CEQ’s previously issued guidance on climate change and environmental justice. Although not specifically referenced in the Advance Notice, such revisions would “provide greater clarity to ensure NEPA documents better focus on significant issues that are relevant and useful to decisionmakers and the public,” as requested by Question 5.⁸⁸ By codifying established guidance regarding both climate change and environmental justice into

⁸⁷ See *Sierra Club v. Bosworth*, 510 F.3d 1016, 1027 (9th Cir. 2007) (to use categorical exclusions federal agencies “must document that the action to be undertaken is insignificant because the threshold question in a NEPA case is whether a proposed project will significantly affect the environment, thereby triggering the requirement for an EIS” quotation and citation omitted)); 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

⁸⁸ Advance Notice, *supra* note 1, 83 Fed. Reg. at 28,591.

the regulations, CEQ would ensure that these critical environmental impacts receive appropriate focus in NEPA analyses.

Climate change presents an enormous environmental problem that all federal agencies need to consider.⁸⁹ In 2010, CEQ issued draft guidance on incorporating climate change into NEPA analyses. It revised this guidance in 2014, and on August 5, 2016, CEQ finalized its NEPA Guidance on Climate Change (“Climate Change Guidance”).⁹⁰ The Climate Change Guidance makes recommendations to federal agencies performing NEPA review of climate change related impacts.⁹¹ These recommendations encourage agencies to consider both the “potential effects of a proposed action on climate change as indicated by assessing [greenhouse gas] emissions,” and the “effects of climate change on a proposed action and its environmental impacts,” and use these analyses to guide consideration of reasonable alternatives and potential mitigation.⁹² Developed in part in response to requests from multiple federal agencies on how best to address climate change impacts, this guidance ensures that agencies adequately consider the effects of climate change in evaluating proposed projects. Indeed, because of the importance of addressing climate change, several of the States have codified similar requirements in their own environmental review processes.⁹³ However, on April 5, 2017, in response to President Trump’s March 28, 2017 Presidential Executive Order on Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth, CEQ withdrew the Climate Change Guidance.⁹⁴

We urge CEQ not only to readopt the Climate Change Guidance, but also to incorporate its substantive recommendations into any revised regulations CEQ may propose. In particular, CEQ should incorporate these recommendations into 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16, which directs agencies in evaluating the environmental consequences of proposed actions and alternatives. Courts give substantial deference to the NEPA

⁸⁹ *Massachusetts*, 549 U.S. at 497.

⁹⁰ CEQ, Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in National Environmental Policy Act Reviews, 81 Fed. Reg. 51,866 (Aug. 5, 2016) [hereinafter Climate Change Guidance].

⁹¹ *Id.* at 4.

⁹² *Id.*

⁹³ *See, e.g.*, Mass Gen. Laws c. 30, § 61; 310 Code Mass. Regs. § 11.12(5).

⁹⁴ Exec. Order No. 13783, 82 Fed. Reg. 16,576 (Apr. 5, 2017).

regulations.⁹⁵ By codifying the Climate Change Guidance into its regulations, CEQ will ensure that agencies properly evaluate the climate impacts associated with projects. Codification could also improve interagency coordination, as each agency would follow a similar approach to addressing climate change in NEPA analyses, as opposed to the varying analyses presently occurring.⁹⁶

CEQ also has issued guidance on how federal agencies should consider environmental justice under NEPA (“EJ Guidance”).⁹⁷ CEQ published the EJ Guidance in 1997 in response to Executive Order 12,898, which directed agencies to identify and address “disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”⁹⁸ The EJ Guidance provides principles for considering environmental justice in NEPA analyses, including: ensuring sufficient opportunities for public input by minority, low-income, and Native American populations; considering relevant public health data concerning potential health and environmental hazards of an action; and recognizing the “interrelated cultural, social, occupational, historical, or economic factors that may amplify the natural and physical environmental effects of the proposed action.”⁹⁹

We urge CEQ to incorporate the EJ Guidance into its NEPA regulations to reinforce the responsibilities of federal agencies to consider environmental justice in NEPA review, particularly to ensure that environmental justice communities are not disproportionately burdened by cumulative adverse environmental impacts. Courts have long recognized the importance of environmental justice considerations in NEPA analyses.¹⁰⁰ Incorporating the EJ Guidance into regulations furthers the aims of Executive Order 12,898 by codifying the important role of assessing environmental

⁹⁵ See *Robertson*, 490 U.S. at 355.

⁹⁶ See, e.g., *In re Dominion Transmission*, 163 FERC ¶ 61,128 (Order Denying Rehearing) (Issued May 18, 2018).

⁹⁷ CEQ, Environmental Justice: Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act (Dec. 1997) [hereinafter EJ Guidance], available at <https://ceq.doe.gov/docs/ceq-regulations-and-guidance/regs/ej/justice.pdf>.

⁹⁸ Exec. Order No. 12,898, 59 Fed. Reg. 7,629 (Feb. 11, 1994).

⁹⁹ EJ Guidance, *supra* note 97, at 8–10.

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., *Communities Against Runway Expansion, Inc. v. F.A.A.*, 355 F.3d 678, 689 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (permitting challenge to environmental justice analysis); see also *Senville v. Peters*, 327 F. Supp. 2d 335, 362–63 (D. Vt. 2004); *Coliseum Square Ass’n, Inc. v. Jackson*, 465 F.3d 215, 232–33 (5th Cir. 2006); *Saint Paul Branch of N.A.A.C.P. v. U.S. D.O.T.*, 764 F. Supp. 2d 1092, 1099, 1107–09, 1113, 1117 (D. Minn. 2011).

justice implications in NEPA analyses. In turn, this will help agencies focus on alternatives, mitigation strategies, monitoring, and preferences of the disproportionately affected communities.

V. Conclusion

In conclusion, the States submit that any revisions to CEQ's NEPA regulations must continue to protect the fundamental policies enshrined in the statute, including protection of the environment and public health and robust public participation. Any such revisions must fully respect the States' interests in a strong partnership to promote federal decision-making that protects these policies. We urge CEQ to fully examine the existing state of NEPA implementation and assess whether revisions to the NEPA regulations are even necessary. Then, only if changes are absolutely necessary and supported by a robust record, CEQ should engage in a careful, deliberative, and fully transparent process to propose limited and targeted regulatory changes consistent with the purpose and structure of NEPA.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: August 17, 2018

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General

By:




SARAH MORRISON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
JAMIE JEFFERSON
JULIA FORGIE
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Tel. (213) 269-6328
Sarah.Morrison@doj.ca.gov
Jamie.Jefferson@doj.ca.gov
Julia.Forgie@doj.ca.gov

Dated: August 20, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew J. Dunn", is written over a solid horizontal line.


MATTHEW J. DUNN
Chief, Environmental Enforcement/Asbestos
Litigation Division
DANIEL I. ROTTENBERG
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Bureau
69 W. Washington St.
Suite 1800
Chicago, IL 60602
MDunn@atg.state.il.us
DRottenberg@atg.state.il.us

Dated: August 7, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General

By:



LEAH J. TULIN
Assistant Attorney General
200 Saint Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 576-6962
ltulin@oag.state.md.us

Dated: August 17, 2018

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General

By:




CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE
Assistant Attorney General and Chief
TURNER SMITH
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Environmental Protection Div.
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 727-2200
christophe.courchesne@state.ma.us
turner.smith@state.ma.us

Dated: August 17, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

GURBIR S. GREWAL
Attorney General

By:



DAVID C. APY
Assistant Attorney General
KRISTINA MILES
Deputy Attorney General
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093
(609) 376-2804
david.apy@law.njoag.gov
kristina.miles@law.njoag.gov


Dated: August 20, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD

Attorney General

By:



MICHAEL J. MYERS

Senior Counsel

CLAIBORNE E. WALTHALL

Assistant Attorney General

Environmental Protection Bureau

New York State Attorney General

The Capitol

Albany, NY 12224


(518) 776-2380

Claiborne.Walthall@ag.ny.gov

Dated: August 17 2018

FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General

By: 


PAUL GARRAHAN
Attorney-in-Charge
Natural Resources Section
STEVE NOVICK
Special Assistant Attorney General
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-4096
(503) 947-4520
paul.garrahan@doj.state.or.us
steve.novick@doj.state.or.us

Dated: August 17, 2018

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

ALEXANDRA C. CHIARUTTINI
Chief Counsel

By:



MARGARET O. MURPHY
Department of Environmental Protection
Office of Chief Counsel
400 Market Street, 9th Floor
P.O. Box 8464
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8464
(717) 787-7060
mamurphy@pa.gov

Dated: August 7, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
Attorney General

By:




LAURA B. MURPHY
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
(802) 828-1059
laura.murphy@vermont.gov

Dated: August 17th, 2018

FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

Attorney General

By: 

WILLIAM R. SHERMAN

Assistant Attorney General

AURORA R. JANKE

Special Assistant Attorney General

Counsel for Environmental Protection

800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14

Seattle, WA 98104-3188

(206) 442-4485

(206) 233-3391

bill.sherman@atg.wa.gov

auroraj@atg.wa.gov

EXHIBIT A

September 19, 2005

The Honorable Cathy McMorris
Chair, Task Force on Improving the
National Environmental Policy Act
House Committee on Resources
United States House of Representatives
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congresswoman McMorris:

We, the undersigned former Chairs and General Counsels of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, are writing to you in your capacity as Chair of the Task Force on Improving the National Environmental Policy Act to state our support for NEPA, to articulate our understanding of the basic principles served by this landmark legislation, and to express our concerns about recent measures and pending proposals that threaten to undermine NEPA. Collectively, we have served Presidents of both parties since NEPA was signed into law on January 1, 1970.

We urge you and the other members of the Task Force to approach your work with an appreciation for the important role that NEPA plays in our government's decision-making with respect to the environment. NEPA is, in the words of the CEQ regulations, "our basic national charter for protection of the environment." NEPA established, for the first time, a national policy favoring protection of the environment, and committed the Federal government 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." It also established farsighted procedural mechanisms, now emulated around the world, that require government agencies to consider and disclose to the public the environmental effects of proposed major government actions, and to provide an opportunity for the public to express concerns regarding the impacts of such actions.

Several principles embodied in NEPA are of overarching importance to achieving our nation's goal of "productive harmony" between man and nature.

Honorable Cathy McMorris
September 19, 2005
Page two

First, consideration of the impacts of proposed government actions on the quality of the human environment is essential to responsible government decision-making. Government projects and programs have effects on the environment with important consequences for every American, and those impacts should be carefully weighed by public officials before taking action. Environmental impact analysis is thus not an impediment to responsible government action; it is a prerequisite for it.

Second, analysis of alternatives to an agency's proposed course of action is the heart of meaningful environmental review. Review of reasonable alternatives allows agencies to evaluate systematically the potential effects of their decisions and to assess how they can better protect the environment while still fully implementing their primary missions.

Third, the public plays an indispensable role in the NEPA process. Public comments inform agencies of environmental impacts that they may have misunderstood or failed to recognize, and often provide valuable insights for reshaping proposed projects to minimize their adverse environmental effects. The public also serves as a watchdog, ensuring that Federal agencies fulfill their responsibilities under the law. Public participation under NEPA supports the democratic process by allowing citizens to communicate with and influence government actions that directly affect their health and well-being.


We recognize that environmental impact analysis should be efficient, timely and helpful to agencies and to the public. CEQ has always emphasized that the purpose of environmental review is "not to generate paperwork – even excellent paperwork – but to foster excellent action." The CEQ regulations direct Federal agencies to make the NEPA process more useful to decision-makers and the public, reduce paperwork, and emphasize real environmental issues and alternatives, and contain detailed guidance for integrating NEPA efficiently and effectively into agency planning processes. Unfortunately, not every Federal agency, and not every NEPA review, complies effectively with this mandate. Meaningful efforts to improve the Act's implementation should address the critical needs for better guidance and additional training for agency personnel and enhanced resources for NEPA implementation by federal agencies.

We are concerned that certain recent measures and pending proposals fail to reflect, and in some instances may undermine, the basic principles served by NEPA. Measures to exempt certain agencies and programs from NEPA, to restrict or eliminate alternatives analysis, or to limit the public's right to participate in the NEPA process

Honorable Cathy McMorris
September 19, 2005
Page three

threaten NEPA's vital role in promoting responsible government decision-making. We urge you and the other members of the Task Force to support the basic principles of NEPA and reject proposals that would weaken or undermine NEPA.

Sincerely,




Russell E. Train
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1970-1973)




Russell W. Peterson
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1973-1976)



John Busterud
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1976-1977)



Charles W. Warren
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1977-1979)




J. Gustave Speth
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1979-1981)

Honorable Cathy McMorris
September 19, 2005
Page four




Michael R. Deland
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1989-1993)




Kathleen A. McGinty
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1995-1998)



George T. Frampton Jr.
Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
(1998-2001)



Gary Widman
General Counsel, Council on Environmental
Quality (1974-1976)



Nick Yost
General Counsel, Council on Environmental
Quality (1977-1981)

EXHIBIT B

project with the project's adverse effects, including economic and environmental impacts.⁴ In addition, the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*, requires the Commission to take a "hard look" at the full range of environmental impacts associated with proposed pipeline infrastructure.⁵ For jurisdictional projects, the Commission holds ultimate land use siting authority—a role played by states and local governments for many other energy production and energy transportation facilities.

Between 1999 and 2017, the Commission approved interstate natural gas pipeline capacity additions of 180 billion cubic-feet per day nationwide, a significant number that exceeds current national peak demand.⁶ While these additions may increase the availability of natural gas to customers, they also come with long-duration costs, many ultimately paid by residents and small businesses in our states, and significant environmental impacts. Meanwhile, new pipeline infrastructure projects are entering a rapidly changing energy market, which raises major questions about the business and environmental case for new capacity built using traditional financing approaches and assumptions. It is in this context that the undersigned Attorneys General believe that the Commission's review of proposed gas pipeline projects under the Policy Statement does not fully satisfy its vital obligations under the NGA and NEPA to protect the public interest.

Despite its broad statutory authority and duty to consider the full range and scope of relevant factors related to pipeline projects, the Commission's current process is unduly segmented and narrow in scope. In assessing project need, the Commission generally fails to account for the extent of regional need for new gas capacity or the evolving market for gas demand and relies too heavily on precedent agreements as proof of need for isolated projects.

⁴ See *Sierra Club v. FERC*, 867 F.3d 1357, 1373 (D.C. Cir. 2017).

⁵ *Kleppe v. Sierra Club*, 427 U.S. 390, 410 n.21 (1976) (citation omitted); *Coal. for Responsible Growth & Res. Conservation v. FERC*, 485 F. App'x 472, 474 (2d Cir. 2012).

⁶ See SUSAN TIERNEY, ANALYSIS GROUP, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE CERTIFICATION: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR A CHANGING INDUSTRY (2017), at 1-2, available at http://www.analysisgroup.com/uploadedfiles/content/insights/publishing/ag_ferc_natural_gas_pipeline_certification.pdf.

This practice does not permit the Commission to understand the broader context for the alleged benefits of a proposed project and risks approving more infrastructure and capacity (on potentially inefficient terms) than the public need requires or prospective market conditions can or should support. The Commission's single-minded reliance on precedent agreements is also contrary to the existing Policy Statement which directs the Commission to "consider all relevant factors reflecting on the need for the project," including studies of projected demand, the market to be served, and potential cost savings to consumers.

The Commission's current practice also fails to meet its statutory obligations under NEPA to assess the environmental impacts of proposed pipeline projects in a comprehensive and robust manner. By generally focusing on single projects in isolation, the Commission does not appropriately consider reasonable alternatives or account for cumulative environmental impacts on a regional basis. The Commission also fails to adequately assess non-gas energy alternatives and other project alternatives such as energy storage, demand response, and energy efficiency, and routinely fails to appropriately consider state policies, such as state choices regarding our energy resource portfolios. And by not consistently and thoroughly assessing and quantifying upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions using the best available measures, the Commission's approach to assessing climate impacts does not satisfy NEPA requirements. Relatedly, the Commission's inadequate implementation of NEPA hobbles its broader statutory obligation under the NGA to evaluate the public interest in Certificate decisions by balancing project benefits against a full accounting of adverse environmental and socioeconomic impacts.

The undersigned Attorneys General strongly urge the Commission to revise the Policy Statement in accordance with the recommendations discussed in detail below. Implementing these recommendations will assist the Commission in addressing the issues raised by the Commission in its Notice of Inquiry, including growing stakeholder concerns and legal challenges related to the adverse impacts of pipeline projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First, regarding project need, we recommend that the Commission assess need on a comprehensive, regional basis, and expand its analysis beyond the current dependence on precedent agreements, employing heightened scrutiny of precedent agreements with affiliates of project proponents.

Second, we urge the Commission to conduct a more thorough and robust NEPA analysis, comprehensively assessing on a regional basis the impacts of, and alternatives to, a proposed project, considering clean energy and other non-pipeline alternatives, thoroughly analyzing upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions, and considering state greenhouse gas emission-reduction policies.

Third, we recommend that the Commission consider environmental harm, including climate impacts quantified using the best available measure—the Social Cost of Carbon—and more heavily weigh the harm from use of eminent domain takings in its public interest assessment when balancing project benefits and harm in making a Certificate decision.

Fourth, we urge the Commission to better incorporate and consider state environmental and land use policies, no longer issue Certificates conditioned on later receipt of state certifications and permits under federal statutes, and to condition Certificates on obtaining and complying with state and local permits that do not unreasonably conflict with or delay approved projects.

Finally, we recommend that the Commission no longer issue partial notices to proceed with construction when Certificate rehearing requests are pending and limit the use and time of tolling periods for rehearing requests.

The Commission should seize the opportunity presented by the Notice of Inquiry to make these important reforms, to bring its review of proposed pipeline projects into full compliance with the NGA and NEPA, and to fulfill its statutory role in protecting the public interest. In contrast to the Commission's current process, such an approach would promote efficiency, reduce the risks of litigation delay in project development, and improve the Commission's ability to promote orderly competition and innovation in the gas market.

I. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ENGAGE IN A SEARCHING ASSESSMENT OF PIPELINE PROJECT NEED.

Pursuant to the standard established in Section 7 of the NGA⁷, an applicant must show that its proposed pipeline project is consistent with the public convenience and necessity by demonstrating that the public benefits the proposed pipeline project would achieve are proportional to its adverse impacts (the “Public Benefits Assessment”).⁸ Applicants must show that there is market demand in order to satisfy part of the public benefit requirement—that is, that the project is “needed” (the “Needs Assessment”).⁹ The current Needs Assessment fails to take into account the regional need for, and impacts of, building new pipelines, and relies too heavily on the existence of precedent agreements, and affiliate precedent agreements in particular. The Attorneys General recommend that the Commission assess market need and impacts on a comprehensive regional basis, expand the assessment to include factors beyond precedent agreements, and employ a rebuttable presumption that affiliate contracts do not demonstrate pipeline need.

A. Market need should be assessed on a comprehensive regional basis.

The Commission should broaden its Needs Assessment from assessing the need for each individual pipeline project to considering each pipeline project within the broader context of regional need. Regional designations should be based upon the Commission’s natural gas market regions: Midwest, Northeast, Gulf, Southeast, and Western.¹⁰ Changes in gas production, delivery, and consumption, as well as new sources of natural gas, have transformed the natural gas industry since the Policy Statement was issued, leading to a proliferation of natural gas pipelines and infrastructure whose impact on ratepayer and environmental interests necessitates a regional approach. Specifically, the Commission should develop a comprehensive

⁷ 15 U.S.C. § 717f.

⁸ Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 25.

⁹ See Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 32, 47 n.91.

¹⁰ See *Natural Gas Markets: National Overview*, FED. ENERGY REGULATORY COMM’N, <https://www.ferc.gov/market-oversight/mkt-gas/overview.asp> (July 3, 2018).

analysis of each region’s need for natural gas, taking into account existing pipelines and the integration of gas and electric systems, and evaluating available alternatives to pipeline infrastructure, as well as the impacts of pipeline infrastructure and alternatives.¹¹ Regional assessments would allow the Commission to systematically assess current and future need for additional natural gas capacity (including use by natural gas-fired power plants) in regional markets, accounting for projected growth in renewables and energy efficiency. In addition, the Commission’s regional analyses would provide critical foundation for rational and regionally consistent project-specific Needs Assessments, which would build upon the regional assessments, incorporating more detailed analysis and information from project proponents.

The regional analyses should consider each region’s existing infrastructure and natural gas pipeline capacity as well as state policy goals and projections of the future demand for natural gas, including the types of services that will be needed in a changing energy market. Other regional considerations should include whether the capacity is needed for new or existing generators, whether the additional capacity promotes competitive markets, whether anticipated markets will materialize, and whether there is a reliability benefit.^{12,13}

B. The current market needs assessment is too narrow and should be expanded to consider multiple factors.

Although the Policy Statement specifically rejected sole reliance on precedent agreements to demonstrate project benefits or need and recommends multiple factors the Commission should consider in the Needs Assessment, in practice, the Commission has relied heavily on proof of precedent agreements to find need.¹⁴ This practice unduly restricts the

¹¹ See *infra* Section II A and B for further discussion of alternatives analysis.

¹² *National Fuel Gas Supply Corp.*, 158 FERC ¶ 61,145 (2017) (statement of Commissioner Bay).

¹³ See SUSAN TIERNEY, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE CERTIFICATION: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR A CHANGING INDUSTRY, *supra* note 6.

¹⁴ Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 32, 47 n. 91. The Commission’s decision to consider “all relevant factors” amended its previous policy which relied primarily on the “contract test”—the percentage of capacity under long-term contracts—to establish market need. The Commission further stated that the amount of capacity under contract “is not a sufficient indicator by itself of the need for a project.” Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 5. However, the Commission has continued to find public need by relying solely upon long-term precedent agreements. See, e.g. Order on Rehearing, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, Equitrans, L.P., 163 FERC ¶ 61,197

Commission's inquiry and fails to account for the context of the alleged benefits of a proposed project and risks approving more infrastructure and capacity, on potentially inefficient terms, than the public need requires or prospective market conditions can support. Furthermore, the Policy Statement states that in evaluating market need, the Commission should "consider all relevant factors reflecting on the need for the project," and provide a range of factors in addition to evidence of precedent agreements, including studies of projected demand, the market to be served, and potential cost savings to consumers.¹⁵ We recommend that the Commission make a renewed commitment to considering these factors and all others relevant to determining whether a pipeline project is needed, including accounting for the integration of gas and electric systems in the region and the projected growth in the use of renewables and energy efficiency measures. Where appropriate, the Commission should conduct evidentiary hearings or utilize other methods to create a more complete record and transparent process to provide greater confidence in the Commission's Public Benefits Assessments and Certificate decisions.

C. The Commission should further scrutinize and limit the use of affiliate contracts in demonstrating pipeline project need.

The Policy Statement notes that "[u]sing contracts as the primary indicator of market support for the proposed pipeline project also raises additional issues when the contracts are held by pipeline affiliates."¹⁶ Despite this recognition there are currently no restrictions on providing precedent agreements signed by affiliates to demonstrate project need. In practice, the Commission has stated repeatedly that it will not "look behind the precedent agreements to evaluate project need," even when affiliates constitute a majority of the precedent agreement capacity.¹⁷

at *35-44 (June 15, 2018) [hereinafter "Mountain Valley Rehearing Order"]; Order Issuing Certificates, PennEast Pipeline Company, LLC, 162 FERC ¶ 61,053 at *27-29, *33, *36 (January 19, 2018) [hereinafter "PennEast Order"].

¹⁵ Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at *23; PennEast Order, *supra* note 14 (Glick, C., dissenting, at *1-2).

¹⁶ Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at *16.

¹⁷ See, e.g., PennEast Order, *supra* note 14, at *33; Mountain Valley Rehearing Order, *supra* note 14, at *40.

Relying too heavily on affiliate contracts risks mischaracterizing the need for the proposed pipeline project. In his dissent in *PennEast*, Commissioner Glick found that “precedent agreements that are in significant part between the pipeline developer and its affiliates [are] insufficient to carry the developer’s burden to show that the pipeline is needed.”¹⁸ Indeed, where a utility holding company invests in a pipeline development project and an affiliate utility contracts for long-term firm service on that project, the utility holding company may pass the risk and the cost of the development of the pipeline to captive customers of the affiliate utility.¹⁹ Without having to bear the risk or cost of development, the pipeline holding company has an economic incentive to construct new pipelines (and receive a return on its investment) regardless whether they are needed.²⁰ A pipeline project that is based on precedent agreements with multiple new customers tends to show a greater indication of need than a pipeline project supported by precedent agreements with affiliates.²¹

To protect ratepayers from undue costs and ensure projects truly reflect market need, the Commission should employ a rebuttable presumption that affiliate contracts do not demonstrate need wherever a pipeline project would not proceed absent affiliate contracts. In such instances, the Commission should require independent supporting evidence of need, such as third-party market analysis or state-approved resource plans, to overcome the presumption. Even where they make up only a relatively small portion of precedent agreements, the Commission should implement a more stringent standard of review for affiliate contracts. This standard should give the Commission the authority to look behind the contracts, including where needed an independent review of state regulatory filings and analyses regarding those contracts. Additional scrutiny of affiliate contracts will enable the Commission to better

¹⁸ *PennEast* Order, *supra* note 14 (Glick, C., dissenting at *1).

¹⁹ *Art of the Self-Deal*, Oilchange International (2017), at 20.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 26.

evaluate the market need for the pipeline project and ensure that ratepayers are not burdened with unwarranted costs.

II. THE COMMISSION SHOULD MORE ROBUSTLY AND COMPREHENSIVELY ASSESS THE IMPACTS OF, AND ALTERNATIVES TO, PROPOSED PIPELINE PROJECTS.

NEPA requires federal decision-makers, including the Commission, to prepare a “detailed statement” on the environmental impacts of certain actions prior to making decisions.²² This environmental impact statement (“EIS”) must take a “hard look” at the impacts of the proposed action,²³ including direct and cumulative impacts, as well as any “reasonably foreseeable” indirect impacts.²⁴ Consideration of environmental and economic impacts is also part of the Commission’s Public Benefits Assessment under the NGA.²⁵ Yet, in practice, the Commission often fails to satisfy its duty to assess robustly and consistently the full range of impacts of, and alternatives to, proposed pipeline projects.²⁶ As discussed below, the Commission must take a more comprehensive approach to its impacts review—both to satisfy its legal obligations and to help forestall challenges to Commission decisions.

A. The Commission should holistically evaluate the need for, the impacts of, and alternatives to new pipeline projects in each U.S. region.

As noted in Section I A above, the Commission’s piecemeal review of natural gas infrastructure risks approval of more capacity than is in the public interest. Moreover, as underscored by recent federal court decisions vacating Commission orders, the Commission’s

²² 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

²³ *Kleppe*, 427 U.S. at 410 (citation omitted); *see also Coal. for Responsible Growth & Res. Conservation v. FERC*, 485 F. App’x 472, 474 (2d Cir. 2012) and *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 249 (1989).

²⁴ 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C)(i); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.16, 1508.8(a), (b); *see also* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7 (a cumulative impact is “the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions”); *Sierra Club v. Marsh*, 976 F.2d 763, 767 (1st Cir. 1992) (a “reasonably foreseeable” impact or action is “sufficiently likely to occur that a person of ordinary prudence would take it into account in reaching a decision”).

²⁵ *See* Order Denying Rehearing, *Dominion Transmission, Inc.*, 163 FERC ¶ 61,128 (May 18, 2018) [hereinafter “Dominion Order”] (Glick, C., dissenting in part, at *1–2, *7).

²⁶ In recent years, federal courts have vacated orders based on deficiencies in the Commission’s environmental impacts review process. *See Sierra Club*, 867 F.3d at 1373–75; *Del. Riverkeeper Network v. FERC*, 753 F.3d 1304, 1308–09 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

segmented approach does not align with the requirements of NEPA and increases legal risks.²⁷ The Commission should instead undertake assessments of the impacts of and alternatives to new pipeline projects on a regional basis together with a regional assessment of need.²⁸ Regional analyses would offer an opportunity to standardize the Commission's impacts assessments approach across pipeline project review proceedings by setting forth data, metrics, projections, and other information that the Commission will use to evaluate pipeline projects in a particular region, including the cumulative and indirect impacts of pipeline projects, as discussed further below.²⁹

B. The Commission's alternatives assessment should include clean-energy and other non-pipeline alternatives.

The alternatives analysis required by NEPA is “the heart of the environmental impact statement.”³⁰ Federal regulations require the Commission to explore all reasonable alternatives rigorously with an analysis that “present[s] the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis

²⁷ See, e.g., *Sierra Club* 867 F.3d at 1373–75 (vacating a Commission decision due to the Commission's failure to properly consider the full range of pipeline project impacts under NEPA); *Del. Riverkeeper*, 753 F.3d at 1308–09, *supra* note 25 (holding that the Commission violated NEPA by failing to analyze the impacts of a project in conjunction with “three other connected, contemporaneous, closely related, and interdependent” pipeline certificate applications).

²⁸ Programmatic EISs (“PEISs”) and combined EISs offer models for such regional assessments. They may even be mandated in certain circumstances. See 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25 (agencies “shall” consider “closely related,” cumulative, and similar actions together in an EIS); *id.* § 1502.4(c)(1)–(2) (urging federal agencies to consider undertaking a PEIS when they are considering multiple projects in one region, or where projects share “relevant similarities, such as common timing, impacts, alternatives, [and] methods of implementation”); *Del. Riverkeeper*, 753 F.3d at 1308–09 (holding that the Commission must conduct a unified NEPA review of multiple connected gas pipeline segments); *Kleppe*, 427 U.S. at 409–10 (“A comprehensive impact statement may be necessary” where “several proposals for coal-related actions that will have cumulative or synergistic environmental impact upon a region are pending concurrently before an agency.”); *Alpine Lakes Prot. Soc’y v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 838 F. Supp. 478, 484 (W.D. Wash. 1993) (agency must consider seven access roads in the same region as “cumulative actions” under NEPA); *cf.* U.S. DEP’T OF INTERIOR, ORDER NO. 3338, DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT TO MODERNIZE THE FEDERAL COAL PROGRAM (2016) (announcing the Department of Interior’s then intent to conduct a programmatic EIS for the federal coal-leasing program).

²⁹ *Cf.* U.S. Envtl. Protection Agency, EPA Detailed Comments on FERC NOI for Policy Statement on New Natural Gas Transportation Facilities 1 (June 21, 2018) (recommending the Commission undertake regional analyses of the cumulative impacts associated with pipeline projects and mitigation opportunities).

³⁰ 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14; see also *Union Neighbors United, Inc. v. Jewell*, 831 F.3d 564 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public.”³¹ In addition to exploring the effect of not building the proposed project,³² the analysis must thoroughly address non-pipeline alternatives outside of the Commission’s jurisdiction and the project applicant’s preferences or capabilities.³³ Indeed, the Commission’s own environmental review regulations and guidance require that the alternatives analysis address “the potential for accomplishing the proposed objectives through the use of other systems,”³⁴ including “non-gas energy alternatives, and/or energy conservation or efficiency, as applicable.”³⁵ More explicitly, the Commission has said that the alternatives analysis should “[d]escribe the effect of any state or regional energy conservation, load-management, and demand-side management programs on the long-term and short-term demand for the energy to be supplied by the project.”³⁶

And yet, the Commission’s NEPA alternatives analyses consistently give short shrift to or ignore non-gas energy alternatives or other measures such as energy storage, demand response, and energy efficiency to meet the need addressed by the proposed project. When such alternatives are addressed, they are typically considered in isolation and rejected in cursory fashion as unsuitable or insufficient to meet the demand evidenced by the precedent agreements the pipeline project applicant submits as demonstration of need.³⁷

³¹ *Id.*

³² 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14 (d) (the analysis must “[i]nclude the alternative of no action”).

³³ 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14 (c) (the analysis must “[i]nclude reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency”); *see also* Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations, 46 Fed. Reg. 18,026, 18,033 (March 23, 1981) (“In determining the scope of alternatives to be considered, the emphasis is on what is ‘reasonable’ rather than on whether the proponent or applicant likes or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative.”)

³⁴ Environmental reports for NGA applications, 18 C.F.R. § 380.12(l)(1) (the alternatives analysis must “[d]iscuss the “no action” alternative and the potential for accomplishing the proposed objectives through the use of other systems and/or energy conservation.”).

³⁵ FED. ENERGY REGULATORY COMM’N, GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT PREPARATION FOR APPLICATIONS FILED UNDER THE NGA, Vol. I, 4–136 (2017).

³⁶ FED. ENERGY REGULATORY COMM’N, GUIDANCE MANUAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT PREPARATION, 3–6 (2002).

³⁷ *See, e.g.*, Order Issuing Certificates and Granting Abandonment Authority, Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC, Equitrans, L.P., 161 FERC § 61,043 (October 13, 2017) [hereinafter “Mountain Valley Order”] (LaFleur dissenting at *2–3) (discussing “environmentally superior alternatives” limited to consideration of single, merged pipeline right of ways as alternatives to two separate pipeline project proposals).

Natural gas is but one of many resources that can be utilized to meet customers' electric and thermal needs. Storage or electric system upgrades, for example, may be more cost-effective than pipeline expansion, particularly to satisfy peak demand. The Commission's alternatives analysis should analyze thoroughly and robustly all reasonable non-gas energy alternatives, including, where applicable, renewables and other clean-energy sources, the use of demand response and other market-based programs, and the impact of existing and projected increases in energy efficiency and energy conservation measures—accounting for state renewable portfolio standards and other programs and policies requiring or encouraging increased use of energy efficiency and conservation measures.

Not only should each individual alternative be thoroughly analyzed, but the combined effect of all non-gas pipeline alternatives also should be considered for its potential to meet the need to be addressed by the proposed project. NEPA requires no less.³⁸ Moreover, the public and states have significant interest in such analysis, particularly where state law and policy requires expansion of renewable and clean energy alternatives, increased energy efficiency measures, and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, as discussed further below.

C. The Commission must consistently analyze upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions associated with pipeline projects.

A robust comparative analysis of the climate impacts of pipeline infrastructure and reasonable alternatives is essential to inform the Commission's decisionmaking about proposed projects. As the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals "clearly signaled" in its 2017 opinion in *Sierra Club v. FERC*,³⁹ which vacated a Commission decision due to the Commission's failure to properly analyze greenhouse gas impacts,⁴⁰ "the Commission should be doing more as part of

³⁸ *Cf. Davis v. Mineta*, 302 F.3d 1104, 1122 (10th Cir. 2002) ("Many [project] alternatives were improperly rejected because, standing alone, they did not meet the purpose and need of the Project. Cumulative options, however, were not given adequate study. Alternatives were dismissed in a cursory and perfunctory manner that do [*sic*] not support a conclusion that it was unreasonable to consider them as viable alternatives.").

³⁹ 867 F.3d 1357 (D.C. Cir. 2017).

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 1373–75.

its environmental reviews” to analyze the climate impacts of pipeline projects.⁴¹ In *Sierra Club*, the court found that downstream combustion of gas transported by a pipeline project “is not just ‘reasonably foreseeable,’ it is the project’s entire purpose.”⁴² There is relative certainty about the likely fate of the natural gas resources that will be transported by pipeline projects: combustion.⁴³ Indeed, if a pipeline project is *not* needed to transport additional quantities of gas for combustion, the Commission would have no basis to approve the pipeline project.⁴⁴ As well, it is foreseeable that an expansion in natural gas transportation capacity would impact production of natural gas upstream in the supply chain.⁴⁵

Yet, in recent orders, the Commission has maintained that it is not required to consider the full range of greenhouse gas emissions associated with pipeline projects because the impacts of such emissions are too speculative or not causally related to approval of a proposed pipeline project.⁴⁶ For instance, in its recent Order Denying Rehearing in *Dominion*

⁴¹ *Dominion Order*, *supra* note 25 (LaFleur, C., dissenting in part, at *3).

⁴² *Sierra Club*, 867 F.3d at 1372; *cf. High Country Conservation Advocates v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 52 F. Supp. 3d 1174, 1196 (D. Colo. 2014) (finding that downstream greenhouse gas emissions related to constructing roads for coal mining are foreseeable).

⁴³ See Statement of Commissioner Cheryl A LaFleur on Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 2 n.3 (June 12, 2018), available at https://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?accession_num=20180614-3074 [hereinafter “LaFleur June 12, 2018 Statement”] (“[I]t is reasonably foreseeable in the vast majority of cases that the gas being transported by a pipeline we authorize will be burned for electric generation or residential, commercial, or industrial end uses. . . . [T]here is a reasonably close causal relationship between the Commission’s action to authorize a pipeline project . . . and the downstream GHG emissions that result”); *cf. Mid States Coalition for Progress v. Surface Transportation Board*, 345 F.3d 520, 549 (8th Cir. 2003) (agency unlawfully failed to consider downstream emissions from the burning of transported coal); *San Juan Citizens Alliance et al. v. U.S. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, Slip Op. at *39 (D. N.M. 2018) (agency’s “failure to estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions which will result from consumption of the oil and gas produced as a result of development of wells on the leased areas was arbitrary” and a violation of NEPA’s requirement to analyze indirect and cumulative impacts).

⁴⁴ *Cf. N. Plains Res. Council, Inc. v. Surface Transp. Bd.*, 668 F.3d 1067, 1082 (9th Cir. 2011) (climate emissions were foreseeable where agency relied on mine development to justify investment in coal rail line proposal).

⁴⁵ *Cf. Barnes v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 655 F.3d 1124, 1138–39 (9th Cir. 2011) (finding that “a new runway has a unique potential to spur demand,” and agency therefore was required to analyze the impacts of such increased demand in EIS).

⁴⁶ See, e.g., Order Denying Rehearing and Dismissing Stay Request, Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC, 154 FERC ¶ 61,048, *44–46 (Jan. 28, 2016); *Dominion Order*, *supra* note 25, at *16–17; Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC, 153 FERC ¶ 61,064 at *6 (Oct. 14, 2015).

Transmission, Inc. (“Dominion Order”),⁴⁷ the Commission stated that “where the Commission lacks meaningful information about potential future natural gas production” or “about future power plants, storage facilities, or distribution networks, within the geographic scope of a project-affected resource, then these impacts are not reasonably foreseeable.”⁴⁸ Consequently, according to the Commission, neither NEPA nor the NGA requires the Commission to quantify or even consider those greenhouse gas emissions.⁴⁹

This interpretation is a plain misreading of the Commission’s legal authority and duties.⁵⁰ The NGA vests the Commission with broad authority to consider “all factors bearing on the public interest,”⁵¹ which includes consideration of the full range of climate impacts⁵² of proposed pipeline projects.⁵³ As Commissioner Glick noted in a recent dissenting opinion, a proposed project’s “contribution to the harm caused by climate change[is] critical to determining whether the Project[is] in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission’s failure to adequately address them is a sufficient basis for vacating [a] certificate.”⁵⁴ Moreover, NEPA’s requirement that the Commission take a “hard look” at the impacts of pipeline projects

⁴⁷ See *Dominion Order*, *supra* note 25.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at *14–15.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at *19 & n.96.

⁵⁰ Furthermore, we find it concerning that the Commission pronounced a new, broadly applicable policy in the context of a proceeding for an individual pipeline project, and while the Commission is simultaneously soliciting stakeholder feedback on the same set of issues in the instant docket. We urge the Commission to seize its review of the Policy Statement as an opportunity to reconsider the positions set forth in the recent *Dominion Order* and to revise its policy in line with our recommendations.

⁵¹ *Atl. Ref. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 360 U.S. 378, 391 (1959); see also *NAACP v. FPC*, 425 U.S. 662, 670 n.6 (1976) (explaining the Commission’s broad authorities, including authority to consider “conservation” and “environmental” matters).

⁵² See discussion *infra* in Section III.

⁵³ *Accord* *Dominion Order*, *supra* note 25 (LaFleur, C., dissenting in part, at *1); *id.* (Glick, C., dissenting in part, at *7); see also *Mountain Valley Rehearing Order*, *supra* note 14 (Glick, C., dissenting, at *1) (“In order to meet our obligations under both NEPA and the NGA, the Commission must adequately consider the environmental impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions on climate change.”); see also *Sierra Club*, 867 F.3d at 1373.

⁵⁴ *Mountain Valley Rehearing Order*, *supra* note 14 (Glick, C., dissenting, at *1–2); *accord* *Sierra Club*, 867 F.3d at 1373 (affirming that “FERC could deny a pipeline certificate on the ground that the pipeline would be too harmful to the environment”); *Dominion Order*, *supra* note 25 (Glick, C., dissenting, at *7) (“[T]he NGA’s public interest standard requires the Commission to consider greenhouse gas emissions associated with the incremental production and consumption of natural gas caused by a new pipeline.”).

obligates the Commission to comprehensively and carefully consider the proposed project's contribution to climate change—an urgent environmental and public health crisis.⁵⁵ Federal caselaw makes clear that the Commission cannot evade this far-reaching requirement by claiming that climate impacts are characterized by some uncertainty.⁵⁶

NEPA does not require a perfect forecast. Where there is uncertainty about project impacts, the Commission must provide a “summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant” to those impacts.⁵⁷ There are many analytical tools and data available to help the Commission estimate upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions,⁵⁸ as demonstrated in part by the Commission's past use of studies from the Department of Energy and other entities to estimate “upper-bound” climate emissions.⁵⁹ Notably, the regional assessments recommended above would address the Commission's claims in prior orders that decision-analysis tools, lifecycle emissions estimates, and other available resources are too general for the purposes of estimating certain project-level climate impacts.⁶⁰ Regional need and impacts assessments would allow the Commission to assess the climate impacts of pipeline projects at a broader level, based on the best available data and modeling relevant to the impacted region.

⁵⁵ *Cf. Baltimore Gas & Elec. Co. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 87, 97 (1983) (“NEPA . . . places upon an agency the obligation to consider *every* significant aspect of the environmental impact of a proposed action.”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis added)).

⁵⁶ *See, e.g., Scientists' Inst. For Pub. Info., Inc. v. U.S. Atomic Energy Comm'n*, 481 F.2d 1079, 1092 (D.C. Cir. 1973) (courts must “reject any attempt by agencies to shirk their responsibility under NEPA by labeling any and all discussion of future environmental effects as ‘crystal ball inquiry’”); *Mid States Coal. For Progress v. Surface Transp. Bd.*, 345 F.3d 520, 549–50 (8th Cir. 2003) (finding that coal rail project would affect national long-term demand for coal and have upstream impacts by making coal a “more attractive option”).

⁵⁷ 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(b)(3).

⁵⁸ *See, e.g.,* U.S. Evtl. Protection Agency, EPA Detailed Comments on FERC NOI for Policy Statement on New Natural Gas Transportation Facilities 2–4 (June 21, 2018) (listing existing tools and information available to the Commission to calculate the upstream and downstream climate emissions associated with pipeline infrastructure).

⁵⁹ *See* Dominion Order, *supra* note 25 (LaFleur, C., dissenting in part, at *2); LaFleur June 12, 2018 Statement, *supra* note 53, at 2 n.7 (citing studies used in past Commission orders); Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 43–44.

⁶⁰ *See, e.g.,* Dominion Order, *supra* note 25, at *14–18; Mountain Valley Rehearing Order, *supra* note 14, at *150–53.

And, in general, where essential information is lacking, NEPA requires the Commission to conduct independent research or otherwise compile missing information.⁶¹ Thus, where the Commission finds that existing data and resources are inappropriate for estimating upstream or downstream emissions from a particular proposed pipeline project, the Commission should take advantage of available opportunities during the pre-filing and formal application process to seek more detailed information from proponents about the source and end use of the gas to be transported by the proposed project, and use that data to conduct its own analysis.⁶²

Where more specific modeling is not feasible, NEPA requires the Commission to use or produce the best comparable information based on reasonable forecasts and estimates.⁶³ In such cases, the Commission should consider using the best available general modeling system and describe in its NEPA documents how it expects that project-related emissions might differ from available estimates.⁶⁴ For instance, the Commission could produce a “full-burn” estimate (i.e., an estimate of lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions from wellhead to point of consumption, taking into account leaks and losses in production, transmission, and distribution system, assuming total consumption of delivered gas) accompanied by a caveat that ultimately the pipeline project may result in fewer emissions.⁶⁵ We note that in past proceedings, the

⁶¹ 40 C.F.R. § 1502.22(a).

⁶² *Accord* Dominion Order, *supra* note 25 (Glick, C., dissenting in part, at *3).

⁶³ *Accord id.* (Glick, C., dissenting in part, at *3–4).

⁶⁴ Notably, while some consumption-related impacts are dependent upon details regarding when and where the associated emissions while occur (such as impacts to local air or water quality), the climate-warming effects of greenhouse gas emissions are globalized. Therefore, even without more specific details, the Commission can produce decision-relevant information about the climate impacts of pipeline projects based on an estimate of the quantity of natural gas that will be transported by the proposed infrastructure over its lifetime.

⁶⁵ Methane emissions from leaks and other system releases must be accounted for, particularly because methane is a potent greenhouse gas that is over thirty times more powerful than carbon dioxide in its ability to trap heat in the atmosphere over a 100-year time frame, and eighty-six times more potent over a twenty-year timeframe. According to the EPA, methane emissions from the oil and gas sector are the largest industrial source of methane emissions in the United States, accounting for about 30 percent of total U.S. methane emissions. See <http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html>. But a recent study found that methane emissions were sixty percent higher than the U.S. EPA inventory estimate, likely because existing inventory methods miss emissions released during abnormal operating conditions. See Ramón A. Alvarez, et al., *Assessment of Methane Emissions from the U.S. Oil and Gas Supply Chain*, SCIENCE, June 21, 2018.

Commission has made gross, net, and “full-burn” estimations of upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions, evidencing the feasibility of this approach.⁶⁶ At the very least, the Commission should require project proponents to provide specific information on the indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed pipeline project in the context of existing, under-development, and reasonably foreseeable energy projects and market trends in the region, as well as state energy and environmental policies. In no event, however, is the Commission permitted to abdicate its responsibility to consider climate impacts altogether.⁶⁷ Consistently analyzing upstream and downstream greenhouse gas emissions—even at some level of generality, if that is all that is feasible—would better inform Commission decisionmaking and the public than no information at all, while also increasing certainty for project proponents.

D. The Commission should consider state policies and the Social Cost of Carbon in determining whether greenhouse gas emissions are significant.

The Commission has claimed that “no standard methodology exists to determine how a project’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions would translate into physical effects on the environment for the purposes of evaluating [a pipeline project’s] impacts on climate change.”⁶⁸ “Thus . . . any attempt by the Commission” to determine whether such emissions are significant for the purposes of NEPA review “would be arbitrary.”⁶⁹ On the contrary, it is arbitrary and unlawful for the Commission to monetize and compare other benefits and impacts of pipeline projects without taking a similar approach to greenhouse gas emissions.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ See Dominion Order, *supra* note 24 (LaFleur, C., dissenting in part, at *2).

⁶⁷ *Accord Mid States Coal. For Progress*, 345 F.3d at 549–50 (where the “nature of the effect is reasonably foreseeable but its extent is not,” the “agency may not simply ignore the effect”) (emphasis in original); LaFleur June 12, 2018 Statement, *supra* note 43, at 2; see also 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b) (requiring that agencies’ NEPA analysis must be based on “high quality” information and “accurate scientific analysis”).

⁶⁸ Dominion Order, *supra* note 25, *34; *accord* Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 41.

⁶⁹ Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 41; see also Dominion Order, *supra* note 25, at *28–29.

⁷⁰ See *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin.*, 538 F.3d 1172, 1198 (9th Cir. 2008) (agency “cannot put a thumb on the scale by undervaluing the benefits and overvaluing the costs” in failing to analyze the benefits of reducing greenhouse gas emissions). As a general matter, there can be no doubt that greenhouse gas emissions related to natural gas extraction, transportation, and consumption in the United States as a whole are significant. See, e.g., EPA, INVENTORY OF U.S. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND SINKS 3–6, 3–79 (2018), available at <https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks-1990-2016> (reporting 2016 U.S. emissions associated with natural gas combustion (1,476.1 MMt CO₂e) and

Despite the Commission’s claims, there is a variety of relevant information to inform the Commission’s determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions.⁷¹ In particular, the Commission should use the best available data and methodologies to estimate the incremental societal impact of greenhouse emissions—also referred to as the Social Cost of Carbon. Though Executive Order 13,783 § 5 (2017) withdrew the Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases (“IWG”) technical support documents for a range of federal estimates of the social cost of carbon, the information and models underpinning these estimates remain credible and useful, and the IWG’s estimates continue to represent the best available science.⁷² The Commission has claimed that “it is not useful or appropriate” to use the Social Cost of Carbon in NEPA documents,⁷³ yet the Commission routinely monetizes other types of impacts in its NEPA documents. The Commission cannot evade its legal obligation to quantify the climate impacts of pipeline infrastructure projects where a scientifically based, peer-reviewed method to do so is available.⁷⁴

In addition, the consistency of a proposed pipeline project’s greenhouse gas emissions with relevant federal, regional, and state energy and climate policies and goals—which the

natural gas transmission and storage systems (32.8 MMt CO₂e of methane)). The Commission plays a key role in approving actions that cause and contribute to these emissions. *Cf. Coal. on Sensible Transp. v. Dole*, 826 F.2d 60, 68 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (agency cannot avoid the requirements of NEPA by “artificially dividing” its combined contribution “into smaller components, each without a ‘significant’ impact”).

⁷¹ See, e.g., Comments of Columbia Law School Sabin Ctr. for Climate Change Law on Southeast Market Pipelines Project, Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Docket Nos. CP14-554-002; CP15-16-003; CPS15-17-002, at 2–3 (Nov. 17, 2017) (arguing that greenhouse gas emissions are significant where: 1) they exceed the reporting threshold of 25,000 tons per year of CO₂e used previously by EPA and CEQ to identify major emitters; 2) the monetized social cost of the emissions is large; 3) the net increase in emissions constitutes a large percentage of the affected state’s greenhouse gas emissions inventory; and 4) the emissions over the lifetime of the pipeline project would be viewed as significant in the context of state, local, and regional climate policies).

⁷² Richard L. Revesz et al., *Best Cost Estimate of Greenhouse Gases*, 357 SCIENCE 6352 (2017).

⁷³ See Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 45 (citing *Fla. Se. Connection*, 162 FERC ¶ 61,233 at *37–38 (LaFleur and Glick, Comm’rs dissenting)).

⁷⁴ See *High Country Conservation Advocates v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 52 F. Supp. 3d 1174, 1191 (D. Colo. 2014) (EIS was arbitrary and capricious where agency did not monetize climate impacts of coal mining activity “when such an analysis was in fact possible”).

Commission already analyzes in its NEPA documents⁷⁵—can be used as a metric for evaluating whether emissions are “significant.”⁷⁶ Many of our states have adopted ambitious greenhouse gas reduction goals and mandates, the achievement of which would be threatened by rapid buildout of natural gas infrastructure in our regions. Massachusetts has adopted a broad portfolio of laws and regulations to reduce economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050 from 1990 levels, including the Global Warming Solutions Act (2008), the Green Communities Act (2008), the Act to Promote Energy Diversity (2016), the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, and programs to promote low and zero-emission vehicles, among others. The clean energy industry is a powerful and growing economic engine for Massachusetts.⁷⁷ Similarly, Washington State has adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals to reduce overall state emissions of greenhouse gasses to 1990 levels by 2020 and fifty percent below 1990 levels by 2050.⁷⁸ In addition, Washington law requires large utilities to obtain fifteen percent of their electricity from new renewable resources by 2020⁷⁹; imposes a greenhouse gas emission standard on electric power⁸⁰; requires new power plants to mitigate at least 20 percent of their greenhouse gas emissions⁸¹; and sets minimum efficiency

⁷⁵ See Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 40.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Ctr. For Biological Diversity v. Cal. Dep’t of Fish & Wildlife*, 62 Cal.4th 204, 225–27 (2015) (rejecting agency’s approach to significance where agency failed to provide a reasoned explanation for how estimated project emissions compare to achieving statewide greenhouse gas reduction target).

⁷⁷ See Initial Comments of the Attorneys General of Massachusetts, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, And Washington, Connecticut Department of Energy And Environmental Protection, Rhode Island Division Of Public Utilities And Carriers, and New Hampshire Office of The Consumer Advocate, Grid Reliability and Resiliency Pricing, FERC Docket No. RM18-1-000, October 23, 2017, available at <https://www.mass.gov/files/documents/2017/10/23/Multistate%20Comments%20RM18-1%20-%2010-23-17%20%28FINAL%29.pdf>. Furthermore, a study by the Analysis Group found that increasing natural gas capacity in Massachusetts and New England would result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions and threaten compliance with Massachusetts’s state law emission reduction mandate. See Hibbard, P. and Aubuchon, C., POWER SYSTEM RELIABILITY IN NEW ENGLAND: MEETING ELECTRIC RESOURCE NEEDS IN AN ERA OF GROWING DEPENDENCE ON NATURAL GAS, ANALYSIS GROUP, (2015), available at <http://www.mass.gov/ago/doing-business-in-massachusetts/energy-and-utilities/regional-electric-reliability-options-study.html>.

⁷⁸ Rev. Code of Wash. 70.235.020(1)(a).

⁷⁹ Rev. Code of Wash. 19.285.010.

⁸⁰ Rev. Code of Wash. 80.80.040

⁸¹ Rev. Code of Wash. 80.70.020

standards for appliances.⁸² The District of Columbia’s climate and energy plan, Clean Energy DC, proposes to reduce the District’s greenhouse gas emissions by 50 percent below 2006 levels by 2032.⁸³ As part of its Public Benefits Analysis, the Commission should weigh the effect of project greenhouse gas emissions on our states’ abilities to comply with our climate and clean energy laws and policies.

III. THE COMMISSION’S PUBLIC BENEFITS ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE INFORMED BY THE ECONOMIC HARM OF A PROJECT’S ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MORE HEAVILY WEIGH HARM FROM EMINENT DOMAIN TAKINGS.

The Commission should wait until NEPA review is complete before conducting a Public Benefits Assessment—an assessment that should be made at the final stage of the process in conjunction with a Certificate decision and consider together adverse environmental and economic impacts, including the exercise of eminent domain. The Commission’s current system of conducting the economic analyses first, followed by an assessment of environmental impacts which is wholly separate from the economic analyses, necessarily underestimates the value of avoiding the environmental impacts in the first place.

A. The Commission’s Public Benefits Assessment should be informed by the economic harm of a project’s environmental impacts quantified using the Social Cost of Carbon.

The Commission’s Public Benefits Assessment and Certificate decisions should fully and robustly incorporate consideration of environmental impacts identified during NEPA review—including climate impacts. Currently, the Public Benefits Assessment tends to occur prior to NEPA review and only considers adverse economic impacts on the project proponent’s customers, on other pipelines in the market, and on property owners affected by the proposed

⁸² Rev. Code of Wash. 19.260.040

⁸³ See *Clean Energy DC: The District of Columbia Climate and Energy Plan*, October 2016 Draft, available at https://doee.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ddoe/publication/attachments/Clean_Energy_DC_2016_final_print_si_nle_pages_102616_print.pdf.

route.⁸⁴ This assessment does not consider adverse environmental impacts and comes before NEPA review is complete.⁸⁵

By determining public benefit without regard to adverse environmental impacts and without consideration of the climate harm caused by a project, the Commission is failing to meet its obligations under both the NGA and NEPA. With the NGA, Congress broadly instructed the Commission to consider the public interest⁸⁶ by balancing a proposed project's public benefits against its adverse effects—including *environmental impacts*—when deciding if the public convenience and necessity requires granting a Certificate.⁸⁷ Indeed, “climate change bears on the public interest in terms of adverse effects” of a proposed pipeline, just as the need for system reliability bears on public benefit.⁸⁸ And, as discussed above, NEPA requires the

⁸⁴ See Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 18–19.

⁸⁵ See *id.*

⁸⁶ See *id.* at 23 (“In deciding whether a proposal is required by the public convenience and necessity, the Commission will consider the effects of the project on all the affected interests; this means more than the interests of the applicant, the potential new customers, and the general societal interests”); see also, *Atl. Ref. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 360 U.S. 378, 391 (1959) (holding that § 7 of NGA requires the Commission to consider “all factors bearing on the public interest”); *FPC v. Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Co.*, 365 U.S. 1, 7 (1961) (“The Commission is the guardian of the public interest in determining whether certificates of convenience and necessity shall be granted. For the performance of that function, the Commission has been entrusted with a wide range of discretionary authority.”).

⁸⁷ See *Sierra Club*, 867 F.3d at 1373 (citing *Minisink Residents for Env’tl. Pres. & Safety v. FERC*, 762 F.3d 97, 101–02 (D.C. Cir. 2014) and *Myersville Citizens for a Rural Cmty. v. FERC*, 783 F.3d 1301, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 2015)); see also *Pub. Utils. Comm’n of Cal. v. FERC*, 900 F.2d 269, 281 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (The public interest standard under the NGA includes factors such as the environment and conservation, particularly as decisions concerning the construction, operation, and transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce “necessarily and typically have dramatic natural resource impacts.”).

⁸⁸ Order on Remand Reinstating Certificate and Abandonment Authorization, Florida Southeast Connection LLC, Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Co., LLC, Sabal Trail Transmission, LLC, 162 FERC 61,233 (March 14, 2018) [hereinafter “Sabal Trail Remand Order”] (Glick, C., dissenting at *3); see also Dominion Order, *supra* note 25 (LaFleur, C., dissenting in part, at *1) (“deciding whether a project is in the public interest requires a careful balancing of the economic need for a project and all of its environmental impacts. Climate change impacts of GHG emissions are environmental effects of a project and are part of [the] public interest determination.”); Dominion Order, *supra* note 25 (Glick, C., dissenting in part, at *2) (“[c]limate change poses an existential threat to our security, economy, environment, and, ultimately, the health of individual citizens. [. . .] Accordingly, it is critical that the Commission carefully consider [projects’] contributions to climate change, both to fulfill NEPA’s requirements and to determine whether the Projects are in the public interest”) (emphasis added).

Commission to quantify a project's climate-related and other reasonably ascertainable environmental costs.⁸⁹

The Commission therefore should expand its evaluation of economic impacts in its Public Benefits Assessment to consider the costs of environmental harms, including climate impacts monetized utilizing the Social Cost of Carbon, as required by NEPA and the NGA.

B. The Commission's Public Benefits Assessment should weigh more heavily the adverse effect of eminent domain takings.

In the Policy Statement, the Commission recognized that if the exercise of eminent domain will likely be required for a substantial portion of a pipeline right of way and other facility siting locations, the economic harm caused by the project may outweigh its public benefit.⁹⁰ And yet, the Commission has continued to issue Certificates without requiring a heightened showing of public benefit as disputes over pipeline siting and approvals have intensified in recent years and private property owners have increasingly resisted entering into voluntary easement agreements.⁹¹ The Commission should require an enhanced showing of public benefit to offset the economic harm caused by the exercise of eminent domain where a pipeline project applicant fails to acquire voluntary easements for a significant portion of the project.

The use of eminent domain should be a last resort.⁹² Indeed, the NGA requires no less⁹³ and the Commission should require project applicants to negotiate in good faith with property

⁸⁹ See discussion *supra* in Section II C and D.

⁹⁰ See Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 27 ("The strength of the benefit showing will need to be proportional to the applicant's proposed exercise of eminent domain.").

⁹¹ See, e.g., Mountain Valley Order, *supra* note 37 (LaFleur, C. dissenting at *2-3 (concluding that because of the projects' environmental impacts and adverse impacts to property owners, the project, on balance is not in the public interest); Mountain Valley Rehearing Order, *supra* note 14 (LaFleur dissenting at *3) (noting the significant impact to landowners); *id.* (Glick dissenting at *2-3) (applicant failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the project to support a finding that the project's benefits outweigh its harms, especially where need was established solely through the existence of precedent agreements with the applicant's affiliates).

⁹² See generally 42 U.S.C. § 4651 (requiring federal agencies undertaking condemnation in furtherance of federal programs "to encourage and expedite the acquisition of real property by agreements with owners, to avoid litigation and relieve congestion in the courts" by following federal condemnation policies).

⁹³ See 15 U.S.C. § 717f(h) (requiring as a precondition of condemnation litigation that the Certificate holder demonstrate that it "cannot acquire by contract" the real property rights needed); see also *USG Pipeline Co. v.*

owners for voluntary easement agreements as a Certificate condition. Furthermore, as discussed below, the Commission should help facilitate increased use of voluntary easement agreements by making the currently voluntary pre-filing process mandatory, and by requiring that pipeline project proponents engage extensively with local property owners and state and local officials prior to filing an application with a preferred pipeline route and facility sites.

IV. THE COMMISSION SHOULD BETTER COORDINATE ITS REVIEW WITH THAT OF STATE AND LOCAL PERMITTING AGENCIES.

The Commission seeks recommendations on how it may work more effectively with other agencies and on ways to change its review procedures to increase efficiency.⁹⁴ For the reasons discussed below, the Commission should make mandatory the current pre-filing process and require more thorough review and incorporation of state and local environmental and land use requirements during pre-filing and NEPA review. Pipeline project proponents should be required to promptly apply for required state certifications and approvals under the federal Clean Water Act⁹⁵ (“CWA”), Clean Air Act⁹⁶ (“CAA”), and the Coastal Zone Management Act⁹⁷ (“CZMA”) upon filing an application with the Commission, to the extent consistent with the application process established by the relevant state agencies. The Commission should, strive to issue Certificates for pipeline projects only after completion of required state review under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA. The Commission should also expressly condition Certificates

1.74 Acres in Marion Cty., Tenn., 1 F. Supp. 2d 816, 822 (E.D. Tenn. 1998) (“Courts also have imposed a requirement that the holder of the FERC Certificate negotiate in good faith with the owners to acquire the property.”); *Transcon. Gas Pipe Line Corp. v. 118 Acres of Land*, 745 F. Supp. 366, 369 (E.D. La. 1990) (“In addition to satisfying the requirements of § 717f(h), federal law requires the condemnor to have conducted good faith negotiations with the landowners in order to acquire the property.”). *But cf. Maritimes & Ne. Pipeline, L.L.C. v. Decoulos*, 146 F. App'x 495, 498 (1st Cir. 2005) (declining to find that the NGA requires that a pipeline project Certificate holder establish good faith negotiations with a property owner a requirement precedent to a condemnation action); *Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC v. Simmons*, 307 F. Supp. 3d 506, 511 (N.D.W. Va. 2018) (“MVP is not required by the Natural Gas Act or Rule 71.1 to engage in good faith negotiations with the landowner.”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

⁹⁴ See Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 53–54.

⁹⁵ 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251–1388.

⁹⁶ 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401–7671q.

⁹⁷ 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451–1466.

on compliance with state and local land use requirements and environmental permits (not required by federal law) when the Commission relies on them to minimize environmental impacts or when such permits do not unreasonably conflict with or delay Commission-approved pipeline projects. These reforms would increase efficiency, transparency, and predictability while reducing the likelihood of post-Certificate litigation.

A. Pre-filing should be mandatory and better incorporate state review.

Now voluntary, the Commission's pre-filing process encourages pipeline project proponents to engage with property owners, stakeholders, and federal, state, and local agencies prior to filing an application with a preferred pipeline route and siting locations for compressor stations and other facilities. The pre-filing process thus provides stakeholders and agencies an opportunity become involved early in the project development process by providing information about the extent and nature of pipeline project impacts and environmental permitting and land use requirements. Through this process, applicants may alter pipeline project design, scale, and route to minimize impacts and siting controversies.

The Commission should not only make this pre-filing process mandatory but also require that pipeline project proponents engage with state and local officials and thoroughly examine all required state and local environmental permitting and land use requirements prior to filing an application with a preferred pipeline route and facility sites.⁹⁸ To help facilitate increased site access for ground surveys and encourage use of voluntary easement agreements to limit the exercise of eminent domain takings, the Commission should require that project proponents engage extensively with local property owners during pre-filing.⁹⁹ Pipeline project proponents should be required to prepare resource reports that comprehensively review

⁹⁸ This should require applicants to not merely meet with state and local officials, but listen, and to respect local requirements, then incorporate such requirements into the ultimate project siting and design as discussed *infra* in Section IV D.

⁹⁹ See discussion *supra* in Section III B, and *infra* in Section V. Property owner refusal to grant site access for ground surveys may hinder NEPA review as well as states' abilities to complete review of applications for state water quality certifications under CWA Section 401. Even when private property owners resist entering into voluntary easement agreements for pipeline construction right of ways, early landowner engagement may facilitate site access for performance of environmental and ground condition surveys.

pipeline project impacts and all permitting requirements—including what must be submitted for state review under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA¹⁰⁰—based on consultation with state and local agencies.

Immediately following the filing of an application, and concurrent with NEPA review, the Commission should require applicants to expeditiously file for all required state certifications and approvals under the federal CWA, CAA, and CZMA, seeking provisional approvals for the preferred route. The Commission should also encourage applicants to simultaneously work with state and local regulators to prepare for and begin filing all required permit applications.

B. The Commission should not issue certificates before states have issued permits and certifications under federal statutes.

The NGA expressly preserves the rights of states under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA.¹⁰¹ Under Section 401(a) of the CWA¹⁰², an applicant must present the Commission with state certification that pipeline project discharges will not violate state water quality standards and requirements, and any conditions imposed by a state water quality certification become conditions of the Commission's Certificate.¹⁰³ Pipeline project applicants must also present the Commission with state-issued permits under the CAA, and with certification that the pipeline project and its impacts are consistent with state Coastal Zone Management Plans approved under the CZMA.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ See discussion *infra* in Section IV B.

¹⁰¹ See 15 U.S.C. § 717b(d); *Meyersville Citizens for a Rural Cmty, Inc. v. FERC*, 783 F.3d 1301, 1315 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (the NGA "savings clause", 15 U.S.C. § 717b(d), saves from preemption the rights of states under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA); see also *Islander E. Pipeline Co., LLC v. Conn. Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 482 F.3d 72, 89 (2d Cir. 2006) (*Islander I*); *Islander E. Pipeline Co., LLC v. Conn. Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 525 F.3d 141, 143 (2d Cir. 2008) (*Islander II*).

¹⁰² In addition to CWA Section 401, where States have assumed federal authority over freshwater wetlands pursuant to CWA Section 404, the State's requirements become federal law and must be treated as a federal permit. *Delaware Riverkeeper v. Sec'y Pa. Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 833 F.3d 360 (3d Cir. 2016).

¹⁰³ 33 U.S.C. § 1341(a), (d).

¹⁰⁴ See *Islander I*, 482 F.3d at 84, 86; *Dominion Transmission v. Summers*, 723 F.3d 238, 240 (D.C. Cir. 2013).

The Commission should end its practice of issuing Certificates conditioned on later receipt of state certifications, permits, and approvals under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA.¹⁰⁵ Following NEPA review, but prior to completion of required state review under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA, the Commission typically issues a Certificate approving a pipeline project conditioned on the applicant obtaining state-issued certifications and approvals under these federal statutes.¹⁰⁶ Requiring completion of state reviews prior to Certificate issuance would allow the Commission to better evaluate pipeline routing and facility siting alternatives informed by expert review by state agency regulators applying state standards that are applicable under federal law. This would also allow state regulators to review the preferred pipeline project route in the application, as well as alternative routes and facility siting locations, either denying or provisionally approving preferred and alternate routes and siting, pending the Commission's final review and siting approval in its Certificate. Additionally, it would prevent landowners' unnecessary loss of property via eminent domain for pipeline projects that may never be constructed.¹⁰⁷

Notably, ending the routine issuance of Certificates conditioned on later receipt of state approvals under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA would most likely reduce post-Certificate litigation by precluding situations where the Commission approves a pipeline project only to have it blocked in whole or in part by one or more states denying federally-required permits.¹⁰⁸ Under

¹⁰⁵ The Commission typically issues conditional Certificates if state review will take more than six months. See Policy Statement, *supra* note 2, at 19. State CWA water quality certifications may take up to one year to complete. See 33 U.S.C. § 1341(a)(1) and discussion *infra* in note 98 (state waives its right to issue a CWA Section 401 water quality certification if it fails to act on a certification request within a reasonable time, not to exceed one year).

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g., PennEast Pipeline Order, *supra* note 14 (issuing a Certificate conditioned upon the completion of unfinished surveys and documentation of unobtained permits).

¹⁰⁷ See discussion *infra* at note 108.

¹⁰⁸ See, e.g., *Constitution Pipeline Co., LLC v. N.Y. State Dep't of Env'tl. Conservation*, 868 F.3d 87, 90 (2d Cir. 2017), rehearing denied (2017), cert. denied (2018) (upholding the New York Department of Conservation's denial of Constitution's application for a CWA Section 401 water quality certification where the company failed to provide adequate information regarding a large number of stream crossings to demonstrate that project impacts would not violate state water quality standards); *Islander II*, 525 F.3d at 151–53 (upholding as supported by the record following remand the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection's

such circumstances, the Commission's conditional Certificate decision is subject to reconsideration and judicial review. After initiating such challenge, stakeholders or an applicant may subsequently file petitions in Circuit Courts of Appeals challenging state-issued certifications and permits under federal law.¹⁰⁹ Issuing Certificates after completion of all federally required state permitting would not only prevent staggered judicial review, but also provide a more complete record supporting the Commission's ultimate Certificate decision.

Waiting to issue a Certificate until all federally required state approvals have been obtained will also prevent irreparable harm that may result from the Commission's current practice of granting partial notices to proceed with construction for portions of a project. In the Constitution Pipeline project, the Commission's issuance of a partial notice to proceed with construction resulted in acres of mature trees being cut in Pennsylvania before the completion of the project was stopped by New York's denial of a CWA Section 401 water quality certification.¹¹⁰

As recommended above, the Commission should require that pipeline project applicants promptly file for state approvals under CWA, CAA, and CZMA after fully assessing state requirements and procedures under these federal statutes by working with state regulators during pre-filing. This will facilitate review by state regulators and reduce the instances of

denial of Islander's application for a CWA Section 401 water quality certification because of the project's adverse effects on shellfish habitat and other water quality impacts).

¹⁰⁹ Section 19(d)(1) of the NGA vests Circuit Courts of Appeals with original and exclusive jurisdiction over petitions seeking judicial review of state certifications and permits issued under the CWA, CAA, or CZMA. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 717r(d)(1). To be clear, we are not recommending that the Commission hold off issuing a Certificate during the pendency of judicial review following the filing of a petition under NGA Section 19(d)(1), although petitioners may seek a stay of the Commission's Certificate from the Court.

¹¹⁰ *See Constitution Pipeline*, 868 F.3d at 90, 92–93 and discussion *supra*, note 108.

project proponents filing incomplete applications that delay review by state regulators under these federal statutes.^{111, 112}

C. State water quality certification under the CWA should not be subject to new time limitations or otherwise constrained.

The Commission also seeks comments on whether there are “classes of projects that should appropriately be subject to a shortened [Certificate review] process.”¹¹³ Recent or contemplated federal legislative proposals would amend the CWA to shorten the time allowed states to review applications for CWA Section 401 water quality certifications.¹¹⁴

The undersigned state Attorneys General strongly oppose any legislative change or regulatory effort to limit the time allowed for state review of water quality applications under CWA Section 401. For projects with large numbers of discharges, state water quality review can be a complex and lengthy process. For instance, the Constitution Pipeline project proposal

¹¹¹ See, e.g., *N.Y. State Dep’t of Envtl. Conservation v. FERC*, 884 F.3d 450 (2d Cir. 2018) (*Millennium Pipeline*). In *Millennium Pipeline*, the company took more than nine months to complete its application for state water quality certification. The Court held that the “reasonable period of time (which shall not exceed one year)” for states to act on a request for CWA Section 401 water quality certification begins to run on the date the state receives the initial application, not when the application is deemed complete. *Id.* at 455–56. The Court noted that states may assist applicants in completing applications and, if necessary, request that incomplete applications be withdrawn and resubmitted. *Id.* at 456. *But cf. Berkshire Envtl. Action Team, Inc. v. Tenn. Gas Pipeline, LLC*, 851 F.3d 105 (1st Cir. 2017) (holding that Massachusetts’ initial approval of a water quality certification made within one year of application was not final for purposes of NGA Section 19(d)(1) and that judicial review must wait for a final agency decision upon completion of a timely made administrative appeal).

¹¹² Section 19(d)(2) of the NGA provides a remedy for proponents faced with unreasonable delay or failure to act by a state agency on an application for a certification or permit under the CWA or CAA, in the form of seeking injunctive relief from the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. See 15 U.S.C. § 717r(d)(2), EPA Act, 2005. Section 19(d)(2) of the NGA grants the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit with exclusive jurisdiction over actions seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against state permitting agencies for undue delay or failure to act on federally-required permits. See discussion *infra* in Section III C.

¹¹³ See Pipeline NOI, *supra* note 1, at 54.

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., H.R. 2910, Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act, 2017 (specifying limited timeframes and procedural requirements for the Commission and other agencies to follow in conducting environmental reviews related to proposed natural gas facility projects); see also Saqib Rahim and Nick Sobczk, “Legislative ‘Reform’ to Narrow States’ Power,” ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL NEWS, February 2, 2018, <https://eenew.net/energywire/stories/1060072719> (discussion contemplated amendments to the CWA that would allow states up to 90 days to determine if an application for a Section 401 water quality certification was complete, after which states would have 90 days to complete application review and issue or deny the requested water quality certification).

involved discharges to 251 different streams and a variety of different water quality impacts, including habitat loss or degradations (87 impacted streams supported trout or trout spawning), changes in thermal conditions, increased erosion, and increases in stream instability and turbidity.¹¹⁵ Any effort to shorten the one-year period Congress has deemed reasonable would be unlawful and arbitrary and capricious and, especially for large or complex projects, severely constrain states' rights to uphold and protect the quality of their waters under the cooperative federalism approach mandated by the CWA. Congress has already provided a remedy for pipeline project proponents faced with unreasonable delay or state agency obstruction on an application for certifications or permits under the CWA or CAA.¹¹⁶

It bears emphasizing that imposing arbitrary timeframes on CWA water quality certification review will not appreciably speed up pipeline project review. The Director of the Commission's Office of Energy Projects recently testified that, on average, eighty-eight percent of projects are issued Certificates within one year, and the single greatest factor slowing down review is the failure of the project applicant to provide the Commission and other agencies with "timely and complete information necessary to perform Congressionally-mandated project reviews."¹¹⁷ Thus, the Commission should not entertain recommendations to curtail or expedite state review under CWA Section 401 (or other state approvals under federal statutes). Any such effort would contravene Congressional intent and do little to expedite state review.

D. The Commission's Certificates should be conditioned on compliance with all state and local environmental permits and land use requirements that do not unreasonably conflict with or delay approved pipeline projects.

Beyond federally required, state-issued certifications and approvals under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA, it is "the Commission[']s goal to include state and local authorities to the extent

¹¹⁵ See *Constitution Pipeline*, 868 F.3d at 90, 92–93 and discussion *supra* note 108.

¹¹⁶ See *supra* note 112, (referencing 15 U.S.C. § 717r(d)(2)) EPAAct, 2005.

¹¹⁷ House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Hearing on "Legislation Addressing Pipeline and Hydropower Infrastructure Modernization," Testimony of Terry Turpin, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 115th Cong. (May 3, 2017).

possible” in pipeline project planning and construction.¹¹⁸ As FERC routinely asserts in Certificate decisions, a “rule of reason must govern both state and local authorities’ exercise of their power and an applicant’s bona fide attempts to comply with state and local requirements.”¹¹⁹ The mere fact that “a state or local authority requires something more or different than the Commission does not necessarily make it unreasonable for an applicant to comply with both the Commission’s and state and local agency’s requirements,” even if state and local compliance would add additional cost and potentially threaten the facility’s in-service date.¹²⁰

Despite its goal to include state and municipal agencies in pipeline project planning and to strongly encourage compliance with their requirements, the Commission does not typically condition its Certificates on receipt of reasonable state and local permits.¹²¹ This often leads to confusion about and litigation over whether an applicant has reasonably attempted to comply with state and local requirements that do not block or unduly delay a pipeline project. And rather than continue to work with state and local regulators as the Commission intends, applicants often assert preemption once armed with the Commission’s Certificate.¹²²

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., Order on Rehearing and Approving Agreements, Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline, L.L.C., 81 FERC ¶ 61,166, 17 (1997).

¹¹⁹ See Pac. Connector Gas Pipeline LP, 134 FERC ¶ 61,102 at *1, *4, *11-12 (2011); Order Issuing Certificate, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 154 FERC ¶ 61,191, at *30 (2016) (same).

¹²⁰ Order Issuing Certificate, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 154 FERC ¶ 61,191, *30 (2016); see also Order on Rehearing and Approving Agreements, Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline, L.L.C., 81 FERC ¶ 61,166, 19-22 (1997) (ruling that several additional state conditions, including state review and approval requirements for pipeline route surveys and additional endangered species surveys, would not unreasonably delay the project where there was only a possibility that the conditions would conflict with the pipeline’s in-service date).

¹²¹ See, e.g., Order Issuing Certificate, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C., 154 FERC ¶ 61,191, *29-30 (2016) (noting and encouraging compliance with substantive land use restrictions and procedural requirements for allowing easement through conservation land protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, but declining to expressly condition Certificate on compliance with these requirements as requested by the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation and the Massachusetts Attorney General); see also discussion *infra* in note 122.

¹²² See, e.g., *Millennium Pipeline Co., LLC v. Seggos*, 288 F. Supp. 3d 530 (N.D.N.Y. 2017) (granting preliminary injunction barring state from using state permitting requirements to delay construction of pipeline); Memorandum of Decision and Order on Plaintiff’s Motion to Confirm Authority To Condemn Easements and Motion For Injunctive Relief Authorizing Immediate Entry, *Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, Berkshire Superior Court, Civ. No. 16-0083, May 9, 2016 at *2-4, *11-16 (On motion for

To avoid these disputes and unnecessary litigation, and to address jurisdictional public interest and environmental considerations identified under the NGA and NEPA, the Commission should, first, require that applicants consult with state and local permitting agencies during pre-filing. This step would help identify potentially applicable state and local permitting and other requirements that should be considered as potential Certificate conditions. Then, in lieu of the Commission's much vaguer conditions, the Commission should expressly condition its Certificates on applicants complying with state and local environmental permits and land use requirements the Commission has identified during pre-filing and NEPA review and on which it relies for mitigation of environmental harm, or on permits that do not unreasonably conflict with or delay the approved pipeline project. This step would avoid confusion about the precise regulatory requirements applicable to a pipeline project and permit the Commission to utilize its federal authorities, in partnership with states and local governments, to responsibly manage the development of natural gas infrastructure in a manner more responsive to local requirements and concerns.

* * *

Because state practice varies, and coordinating federal, state, and local regulatory authority has presented challenges for the Commission, states, local governments, project developers, and other stakeholders alike, the Commission should consider convening a technical conference on procedural requirements, review timelines, and other practical coordination issues in this area, and how to best alter the Commission's process.

condemnation of easements asserting preemption of Massachusetts Constitution Article 97 (discussed *supra* in note 121), the Court noted that “[d]espite the preemption of Article 97, the Certificate does not give Tennessee unrestrained right to ignore the Commonwealth. Instead, the Certificate expressly requires Tennessee to make a good faith effort to cooperate with state and local authorities.”); Request for Reconsideration and Clarification, *National Fuel Gas Supply Corp.*, Docket No. CP15-115 (March 3, 2017) (seeking “clarification” from FERC that all state and local environmental permits were preempted by the Natural Gas Act).

V. PARTIAL NOTICES TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION SHOULD NOT BE ISSUED PRIOR TO REHEARING REQUEST DECISIONS, AND THE USE AND TIME OF TOLLING ORDERS SHOULD BE LIMITED.

The Commission's practice of allowing construction to proceed while delaying rehearing decisions through tolling orders inflicts irreparable harm while effectively foreclosing remedies on judicial review, denying injured parties due process. Though the NGA and the Commission's regulations require it to issue a decision within thirty days of a request for a Certificate rehearing,¹²³ the Commission routinely issues orders tolling this thirty-day period to allow it additional time to evaluate the merits of a rehearing request. These tolling orders routinely delay rehearing decisions for a year or more.¹²⁴

Moreover, the Commission often grants requests for partial notices to proceed with construction after a Certificate issues—even when a tolled decision on a rehearing request is pending—so long as the Certificate holder has received all state-issued permits under the federal CWA, CAA, and CZMA (where construction activity could impact resources covered by those federally required permits). This practice results in significant and irreparable harm from project construction. For instance, as a rehearing request was tolled for more than thirteen months, the Commission granted the Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company's Leidy Southeast Project a total of twenty partial notices to proceed resulting more than one hundred acres of tree clearing.¹²⁵ And while parties seeking rehearing of Commission Certificate Orders may request that FERC stay project construction during the pendency of the tolling period and

¹²³ See 15 U.S.C. § 717r(b); 18 C.F.R. § 157.20(a).

¹²⁴ While a few recent egregious tolling periods were attributable *in part* to an extended period in 2017 when the Commission lacked a quorum, tolling periods of a year or more are common even when there are no quorum issues. See, e.g., Order Denying Rehearing, Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, 154 FERC ¶ 61,166 (March 3, 2016) (the Commission denied a rehearing request more than one year after timely rehearing requests made in January 2015 and a tolling order issued in February 2015).

¹²⁵ See Transcontinental Gas Pipeline, *supra* note 124. Similarly, a Commission tolling order delayed a rehearing decision regarding the Connecticut Expansion Project for over sixteen months, authorizing tree clearing and construction for the project, including through a two-mile stretch of conservation land protected under the Massachusetts Constitution in Otis State Forest. See Order on Rehearing, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, 160 FERC ¶ 61,027 (August 25, 2017) (denying timely rehearing requests made in April 2016).

rehearing request, the Commission rarely, if ever, grants such stay requests, even when rehearing requests raise serious issues of merit.¹²⁶

Because petitioners may not seek judicial review until the Commission rules on the merits of their request for rehearing,¹²⁷ the Commission's routine practice of delaying rehearing decisions raises serious due process concerns.¹²⁸ In addition to denying affected parties judicial review before construction begins, tolling orders deny landowners judicial review before their land is taken through eminent domain.¹²⁹ Because the power of eminent domain attaches regardless whether a rehearing has been requested, developers are free to take land while the Commission has not yet ruled on the rehearing request and while landowners have no judicial recourse.¹³⁰ To minimize the number of landowners whose land is taken without opportunity for judicial review, the Commission should end its practice of issuing tolling orders except in rare cases where the additional time is absolutely necessary, in which case tolling orders should be for as brief a period as practicable.

¹²⁶ See *Del. Riverkeeper*, 753 F.3d at 1308–09 (Commission issued rehearing request tolling order, delaying judicial review, where the Court ultimately held that Commission's review violated NEPA).

¹²⁷ 15 U.S.C. § 717r(b); see also *Kokajko v. F.E.R.C.*, 837 F.2d 524, 525 (1st Cir. 1988) (“[B]ecause FERC has not yet issued a ruling on the merits of the petition, this court is without jurisdiction.”).

¹²⁸ See, e.g., *MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. F.C.C.*, 627 F.2d 322, 341 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (“[D]elay in the resolution of administrative proceedings can . . . deprive regulated entities, their competitors or the public of rights and economic opportunities without the due process the Constitution requires.”); *Kokajko*, 837 F.2d at 526 (“[A] claim which is virtually tied up in interminable successive rounds of administrative review may present due process concerns.”); cf. *Pub. Citizen Health Research Grp. v. Comm’r, Food & Drug Admin.*, 740 F.2d 21, 34 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (“When the public health may be at stake, the agency must move expeditiously to consider and resolve the issues before it.”).

¹²⁹ This is particularly true where, as is increasingly the practice, the pipeline seeks immediate entry onto and possession of the property rights it is condemning through the use of preliminary injunctions. See, e.g. *East Tennessee Natural Gas Company v. Sage*, 361 F.3d 808 (4th Cir. 2004) (granting a preliminary injunction to a pipeline company in a condemnation matter prior to the payment of just compensation); *Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC v. 1.01 Acres, More or Less, In Penn Twp*, 768 F.3d 300, 315–16 (3d Cir. 2014) (discussing *Sage* and granting a preliminary injunction to the pipeline company prior to the payment of just compensation). Since a District Court's reviewing role is limited, see *Columbia Gas Transmission* at 304, tolling orders issued by FERC can, when combined with preliminary injunctions granted by District Courts, deprive a property owner of any real judicial review until the pipeline has already taken full possession of the property.

¹³⁰ While the eminent domain proceeding occurs in a court, landowners cannot collaterally attack the Certificate, and therefore cannot challenge the developer's right to use eminent domain. See, e.g., *Williams Natural Gas Co. v. City of Oklahoma City*, 890 F.2d 255, 262, 264 (10th Cir. 1989).

CONCLUSION

The undersigned Attorneys General strongly urge the Commission to revise the Policy Statement in accordance with all the above recommendations. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

MAURA HEALEY
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Healey', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.


CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE
CHIEF, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION
REBECCA TEPPER
CHIEF, ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS DIVISION
MATTHEW IRELAND
SARAH BRESOLIN SILVER
ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
MEGAN HERZOG
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

LISA MADIGAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ILLINOIS




MATTHEW J. DUNN
CHIEF, ENVIRONMENTAL
ENFORCEMENT/ASBESTOS LITIGATION DIVISION
JANICE A. DALE
CHIEF, PUBLIC UTILITIES BUREAU
DANIEL I. ROTTENBERG
JACQUES ERFFMEYER
ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602

BRIAN E. FROSH
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND



JOSHUA M. SEGAL
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202

PETER F. KILMARTIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF RHODE ISLAND



LEO J. WOLD
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF
ATTORNEY GENERAL
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903

BOB FERGUSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON



WILLIAM R. SHERMAN
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
STACEY S. BERNSTEIN
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
AURORA R. JANKE
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
COUNSEL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14
Seattle, WA 98104-3188

GURBIR S. GREWAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY



DAVID C. APY
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
R.J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
25 MARKET STREET, P.O. BOX 093
TRENTON, NJ 08625

KARL A. RACINE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



DAVID S. HOFFMANN
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
SARAH KOGEL-SMUCKER
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
PUBLIC ADVOCACY DIVISION
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
441 Fourth Street, N.W., Suite 630 South
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dated: July 25, 2018