of the CEQ guidelines state that “[e]nvironmental impact statements shall be written in plain language and may use appropriate graphics so that decisionmakers and interested non-professionals could understand them’’ [emphasis added]. Courts have interpreted this “plain language’’ provision as to require Federal agencies to provide the public with comprehensive environmental consequences of a proposed action and to do so in a readily understandable manner. See Klammath-Siskiyou Wildlands Cen-
ter v. Bureau of Land Management, 367 F.3d 989 (2004), “While the conclusions of agency expert are entitled to deference, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) docu-
ments must contain only narratives of expert opinions, and the docu-
ments are unacceptable if they are indecipherable to the public’’; Earth Island Institute v. U.S. Forest Service, C.A.9 (Cal.), 442 F.3d 1147 (2006), certoriori denied 127 S.C.t. 1829, 549 U.S. 1278, 167 L.Ed.2d 318 (emphasis added), “A final environmental impact statement (FEIS) must be organized and written so as to be readily understandable by governmental de-
cisionmakers and by interested non-profes-
sional laypersons likely to be affected by actions taken under the environmental impact state-
ment” [. . .] “Upon review of environ-
mental impact statement, parties may intro-
duce evidence regarding level of af-
fected public and expert testimony concerning indica-
dia of inherent readability. National Envi-
(C.Eril 1980). These requirements for FEISs apply equally to EAs, as indicated in the CEQ regu-
lations’ use of the term “environmental doc-
ments’’ rather than ‘environmental state-
mements’”. 

In the case of Puerto Rico, a Draft EA that
was not “readily understandable” in order be
‘readily understandable’ by governmental
decisionmakers and by interested non profes-
sional laypersons likely to be affected by ac-
tions taken under the environmental impact state-
mement” [. . .]. 

ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC
HOLDER MUST RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, later today, the House will consider the REINS Act, which is legislation de-
signed to make sure that in a Repub-
lican-controlled Congress, no new regu-
lations would be put into effect, wheth-
er they deal with clean drinking water, air, clean air, child safety, the safety of children when they play with their toys, the drugs that so many citizens need to take to maintain their health, or occupational safety at the work-
place. All of that would be destroyed under the REINS Act.

You might ask yourself what would society look like? Well, we had a pre-
view of what that society looks like yesterday when the Mine Safety and Health Administration released its rep-
port on the Upper Big Branch. What that society looked like to these miners and to their families was 29 dead coal miners, because the Massey Corporation was basically allowed by its board of directors to evade the basic regulations that were in place to pro-
tect the miners.

Although the miners don’t have whis-
tleblower protections, we saw that Massey was able to intimidate the workers every day not to report safety violations, not to write up safety viola-
tions, not to report things that needed to be repaired, because the chairman of the board told them the priority was the production of coal, not the safety of the workers.