

119TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2783

To expedite the environmental review process and approval of priority manufacturing projects, and for other purposes.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 9, 2025

Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MANNION, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. RILEY of New York, and Ms. TENNEY) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

---

## A BILL

To expedite the environmental review process and approval of priority manufacturing projects, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-  
2       tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3       **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4       This Act may be cited as the “Infrastructure Project  
5       Acceleration Act”.

1 SEC. 2. EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF PRIORITY MANUFAC-  
2 TURING PROJECTS.

3       (a) DEFINITION OF PRIORITY MANUFACTURING  
4 PROJECT.—In this section, the term “priority manufac-  
5 turing project” means the construction or expansion of a  
6 manufacturing facility in the United States—

7                   (1)    the    cost    of    which    is    at    least  
8    \$1,000,000,000; and

(2) which requires one or more Federal approvals described in subsection (c).

11 (b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

22 (c) EXCLUSIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provi-  
23 sion of law, a priority manufacturing project shall not be  
24 required to obtain any permit that would otherwise be re-  
25 quired pursuant to—

1                             (1) section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution  
2                             Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344); or

3                             (2) section 7, 9, or 10 of the Endangered Spe-  
4                             cies Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536, 1538, or 1539).

5                             (d) SCOPE OF REVIEW UNDER NEPA.—Section  
6                             106(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

7                             (42 U.S.C. 4336(a)) is amended—

8                             (1) in paragraph (3), by striking “or”;

9                             (2) in paragraph (4), by striking “action.” and  
10                             inserting “action; or”; and

11                             (3) by adding at the end of the following:

12                                 “(5) the proposed agency action relates to a  
13                             project or action that is subject to a State or Tribal  
14                             environmental review statute that the lead agency  
15                             determines is the functional equivalent of this Act.  
16                             A lead agency shall determine the functional equiva-  
17                             lence of this Act is satisfied if the State or Tribal  
18                             agency considered relevant environmental informa-  
19                             tion and the public has been informed regarding the  
20                             decision-making process.”.

21                             (e) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN APPROVALS.—

22                             (1) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN APPROV-  
23                             ALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law,  
24                             no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action  
25                             or inaction taken by a Federal agency or a State ad-

1       ministrative agency acting pursuant to Federal law  
2       that approves the construction or expansion of a pri-  
3       ority manufacturing project.

4                     (2) JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN CLAIMS.—  
5       The United States Court of Appeals for the District  
6       of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive  
7       jurisdiction over any claim alleging the invalidity of  
8       this section or that an action described in paragraph  
9       (1) is beyond the scope of authority conferred by  
10      this section.

