

STANDARDIZING PERMITTING AND EXPEDITING
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

DECEMBER 4, 2025.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. WESTERMAN, from the Committee on Natural Resources,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4776]

The Committee on Natural Resources, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4776) to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to clarify ambiguous provisions and facilitate a more efficient, effective, and timely environmental review process, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act” or the “SPEED Act”.

SEC. 2. NEPA REFORM.

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 2 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321) is amended—

(1) by striking “The purposes” and inserting “(a) The purposes”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) This Act is a purely procedural statute intended to ensure Federal agencies consider the environmental impacts of their actions during the decisionmaking process. This Act does not mandate particular results, and only prescribes a process. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to mandate any specific environmental outcome or result, nor shall this Act be interpreted to confer substantive rights or impose substantive duties beyond procedural requirements.”.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW.—Section 106 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “; SCOPE OF REVIEW” after “LEVEL OF REVIEW”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

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

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “action.” and inserting “action;”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) the agency determines the proposed agency action is an action for which such agency’s compliance with another statute’s requirements serves the function of agency compliance with this Act with respect to such action; or

“(6) the proposed agency action relates to a project or action that has already been reviewed pursuant to a State environmental review statute or a Tribal environmental review statute, ordinance, resolution, regulation, or formally adopted policy and the lead agency determines such review serves the function of agency compliance with this Act.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “does not” and inserting “is not likely to”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) is not required to—

“(i) undertake new scientific or technical research unless the new scientific or technical research is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall costs and time frame of obtaining it are not unreasonable; or

“(ii) undertake new scientific or technical research after the receipt of an application, as applicable, with respect to a proposed agency action.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In preparing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, a Federal agency—

“(1) may consider only those effects that share a reasonably close causal relationship to, and are proximately caused by, the immediate project or action under consideration; and

“(2) may not consider effects that are speculative, attenuated from the project or action, separate in time or place from the project or action, or in relation to separate existing or potential future projects or actions.

“(d) CERTAINTY.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—A Federal agency may not rescind, withdraw, amend, alter, or otherwise render ineffective any environmental document completed under this Act for a project or action where there is an applicant unless the Federal agency has been so ordered by a court or the applicant has agreed in writing to such rescission, withdrawal, amendment, or alteration.

“(2) AUTHORIZATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection or existing law, a Federal agency may not revoke, rescind, withdraw, terminate, suspend, amend, alter, or take any other action to interfere with an authorization unless—

“(i) the Federal agency is required to take such action by order of a court of competent jurisdiction;

“(ii) the holder of the authorization has materially breached the terms of the authorization, or otherwise violated applicable law;

“(iii) the authorization was obtained through fraud, intentional concealment, or material misrepresentation;

“(iv) such action is necessary to prevent specific, immediate, substantial, and proximate harm or damage to life, property, national security, or defense that was not considered in the underlying environmental review process or final agency action for the authorization; or

“(v) the Federal agency has received a request from the holder of the authorization or project sponsor to take such action.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—The actions described in subparagraph (A) shall be, as appropriate and where feasible, supported by clear and convincing evidence and reasonably limited in duration and scope by the agency to address the specific issue such action is intended to address.

“(C) NOTICE.—Before an agency takes an action described in subparagraph (A), the agency shall notify the holder of the authorization and the project sponsor in writing of such action, including by providing a detailed explanation of the action, identifying the statutory authority relied upon for the action, and providing the evidence supporting the action.

“(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An action described in subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

“(ii) VENUE.—A person seeking judicial review of an action described in subparagraph (A) may only obtain review of such action in the United States court of appeals for any circuit wherein the project for which the authorization was issued is located.

“(iii) PETITIONS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—No Federal agency may petition a court for vacatur or voluntary remand of an authorization unless the holder of the authorization or the project sponsor consents in writing to such a petition.

“(E) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to provide any Federal agency new, enhanced, or expanded authority, or to limit any existing authority, concerning any authorization.

“(e) PRESUMPTION OF NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF TAKING NO ACTION RELATING TO TRIBAL TRUST RESOURCES.—For any proposed agency action carried out on, or directly affecting, tribal trust resources (including lands and minerals) that is initiated by the federally recognized Indian Tribe for which the United States holds the affected resources in trust, and for which an environmental document was prepared that included consideration of a no action alternative, there shall be a presumption that the effects of taking no action will be negative for the federally recognized Indian Tribe.

“(f) EFFECT OF THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS ON OTHER AGENCIES.—If a lead agency determines an environmental document is not required to be prepared with respect to a proposed agency action under subsection (a), another agency may not prepare an environmental document with respect to such proposed agency action.”.

(c) TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.—

(1) LEAD AGENCY.—Section 107(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336a(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “at the earliest practicable time” and inserting “in accordance with subsection (g)(2)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “carry out the proposed agency action” and inserting “carry out the proposed agency action in compliance with the deadlines outlined in subsection (g)”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) by striking “a review” and inserting “an environmental review”; and

(II) by striking “such review” and inserting “such environmental review”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting “(including counties, boroughs, parishes, and other political subdivisions of a State)” after “local agency”; and

(ii) by adding at the end “Such comments from Federal cooperating agencies shall be limited to matters relating to the proposed agency action with respect to which such Federal cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law.”.

(2) ONE DOCUMENT.—Section 107(b) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336a(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “To the extent practicable,” and inserting the following:

“(1) DOCUMENT.—To the extent practicable,”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONSIDERATION TIMING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In preparing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, no Federal agency shall be required to consider any scientific or technical research that becomes publicly available after the earlier of, as applicable—

“(i) the date of receipt of an application with respect to such proposed agency action; and

“(ii) the date of publication of a notice of intent or decision to prepare such environmental document for such proposed agency action.

“(B) APPLICABILITY TO OTHER LAW.—This paragraph does not affect any review of information required under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to comments received during the public comment period as applicable.

“(C) DELAY.—A Federal agency may not delay the issuance of an environmental document or a final agency action, including any decision or determination, on the basis of awaiting new scientific or technical research or information that was not available as of the earlier of the dates described in subparagraph (A).”.

(3) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Section 107(d) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336a(d)) is amended by striking “ac-

tion.” and inserting “action. Where applicable, the statement of purpose and need shall meet the goals of the applicant.”

(4) DEADLINES.—Section 107(g) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336a(g)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (3), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) APPLICATIONS FOR AUTHORIZATIONS.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETE OR INCOMPLETE APPLICATION.—Unless a shorter deadline is specified by law, in connection with a proposed agency action for which an applicant submitted an application for an authorization to an agency, not later than 60 days after the date on which the applicant submits the application to the agency, the agency shall document the receipt of the application and—

“(i) notify the applicant that the application is complete; or

“(ii) notify the applicant that the application is incomplete and request in writing any additional information that the agency needs to determine that the application is complete and begin preparation of an environmental document.

“(B) AGENCY DETERMINATION.—

“(i) COMPLETE DETERMINATION.—If an agency determines an application is complete under subparagraph (A)(i), the agency shall, not later than 60 days after the date on which the agency makes such determination—

“(I) notify the applicant that the agency has determined that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency’s categorical exclusions, is not a major Federal action, or that no further agency action is required;

“(II) issue a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for such proposed agency action; or

“(III) notify the applicant that the agency has determined that preparation of an environmental assessment is necessary.

“(ii) INCOMPLETE DETERMINATION.—If the agency requests additional information under subparagraph (A)(ii), the deadline described in clause (i) shall be based on the date on which the agency receives the additional information instead of the date on which the determination is made.

“(2) COOPERATING AGENCIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after a lead agency issues a notice of intent under paragraph (1)(B)(i)(II) or notifies an applicant under paragraph (1)(B)(i)(III) with respect to a proposed agency action, the lead agency shall—

“(i) identify all agencies that are likely to have environmental review, authorization, or other responsibilities with respect to the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) invite each such agency to become a cooperating agency.

“(B) DEADLINE TO ACCEPT INVITATION.—Not later than 21 days after an agency receives an invitation to become a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A)(ii), such agency shall accept or deny the invitation.

“(C) CONVENING OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.—Not later than 7 days after the deadline described in subparagraph (B) has passed for each agency that received an invitation to become a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A)(ii), the lead agency that sent each such invitation shall convene each agency that accepts such an invitation to coordinate on developing the schedule under subsection (a)(2)(D) for the applicable proposed agency action.

“(D) UNIDENTIFIED AGENCIES.—In the event that an agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed agency action is not identified under subparagraph (A)(i), the lead agency with respect to the proposed agency action shall—

“(i) invite such unidentified agency to become a cooperating agency by not later than 7 days after becoming aware that the agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise; and

“(ii) if such agency accepts the invitation, incorporate such agency into the schedule developed under subsection (a)(2)(D) and update such schedule accordingly by not later than 14 days after the date on which such agency accepts the invitation.”;

(C) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

- (i) by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “REVIEW TIMELINE”; and
- (ii) by striking “(2)” and inserting “(5)”;
- (D) by inserting after paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(4) DEADLINE FOR FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—For any proposed agency action for which an applicant submitted an application for an authorization to an agency, not later than 30 days after completing an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment for the proposed agency action, the lead agency, and any cooperating agency, shall issue a final agency action. The agency issuing such final agency action shall include in the final agency action a performance schedule for the completion of any other outstanding authorizations.”;
- (E) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated)—
 - (i) by striking “the deadline described in paragraph (1)” and inserting “a deadline described in this subsection”; and
 - (ii) by striking “, in consultation with the applicant, to” and inserting “if the applicant approves such extension. If the applicant approves such extension, the lead agency shall”;
- (F) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated)—
 - (i) by striking “A project sponsor may” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a project sponsor may”; and
 - (ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCEPTION.—A project sponsor that approved an extension of a deadline under paragraph (5) may not obtain judicial review of a failure to act in accordance with such deadline under subparagraph (A) unless the lead agency fails to meet the new deadline or is delaying for reasons other than those necessary to complete its review.”; and
- (G) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) CONCURRENT REVIEW.—In carrying out an environmental review, the lead agency and each cooperating agency shall carry out the obligations of that agency under other applicable laws concurrently, and in conjunction, with other required reviews for the proposed agency action, pursuant to the requirements of applicable law, including, if applicable, under this Act.”.
- (d) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—Section 108 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336b) is amended—
 - (1) by striking “When an agency prepares” and inserting the following:

“(a) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—When an agency prepares”;
 - (2) in paragraph (1), by striking “5” and inserting “10”;
 - (3) in paragraph (2), by striking “5” and inserting “10”; and
 - (4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) RELIANCE ON PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—

“(1) ACTIONS THAT ARE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.—A lead agency may satisfy the requirements of this Act with respect to a major Federal action by relying on an environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, or a categorical exclusion determination that the lead agency, another Federal agency, or a project sponsor under the supervision of a Federal agency completed for another major Federal action if the lead agency determines that—

“(A) the new major Federal action is substantially the same as the other major Federal action or, if applicable, an alternative analyzed in such environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; and

“(B) if applicable, the effects of the new major Federal action are substantially the same as the effects analyzed in such environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

“(2) ACTIONS THAT ARE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.—If a new major Federal action is not substantially the same as another major Federal action or an alternative analyzed in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement completed by the lead agency, another Federal agency, or a project sponsor under the supervision of a Federal agency, the lead agency may modify or augment any such previously completed environmental assessment or environmental impact statement as necessary to satisfy the requirements of this Act with respect to the new major Federal action. The lead agency shall make such modified environmental assessment or environmental impact statement publicly available as a new environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.”.
- (e) ADOPTION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.—Section 109 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336c) is amended in the text preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, or that was legislatively enacted by Congress,” after “procedures”.
- (f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 111 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4336e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (13) as paragraphs (2) through (14), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The term ‘authorization’ means any lease, right-of-way, easement, license, permit, approval, finding, determination, or other administrative decision issued by an agency or any interagency consultation that is required or authorized under Federal law in order to construct, modify, or operate a project.”;

(3) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by inserting “, or Congress deems by statute,” after “Federal agency has determined”;

(4) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (iii)—

(I) by inserting “grants (including capitalization grants), cost share awards,” after “loan guarantees,”;

(II) by striking “sufficient” and inserting “complete”; and

(III) by striking “subsequent use of such financial assistance or the”;

(ii) by redesignating clauses (iv) through (vii) as clauses (vi) through (ix), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) farm ownership loans and operating loan guarantees by the Farm Service Agency pursuant to sections 305 and 311 through 319 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act;

“(v) the issuance of an authorization by an agency where the effects of the action or project being permitted or authorized were previously evaluated by another agency in compliance with this Act.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIONS.**—An agency action may not be determined to be a major Federal action solely on the basis of the provision of Federal funds, including a grant, loan, loan guarantee, and funding assistance.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) **REASONABLY FORESEEABLE.**—The term ‘reasonably foreseeable’, with respect to environmental effects of a proposed agency action—

“(A) means effects that share a reasonably close causal relationship to, and are proximately caused by, the immediate project or action under consideration; and

“(B) does not include effects that are—

“(i) speculative;

“(ii) attenuated from the proposed agency action;

“(iii) separate in time or place from the proposed agency action; or

“(iv) in relation to separate existing or potential future projects.”.

(g) **DUTIES.**—Section 204 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4344) is amended in paragraph (4) by inserting “energy,” after “health.”.

SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 112 as section 110A and moving such section so as to appear after section 110; and

(2) by inserting before section 111 the following:

“SEC. 110B. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“(a) **ROLE OF THE COURT.**—In reviewing a claim of whether a final agency action complies with the requirements of this Act, a court—

“(1) shall afford substantial deference to the agency; and

“(2) may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency regarding the environmental effects included in the final agency action or included in the environmental document.

“(b) **REMAND.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If a court holds, under section 706(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, that a final agency action does not comply with the requirements of this Act, the only remedy the court may order, notwithstanding chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, is to remand, without vacatur or injunction, the final agency action to the agency with—

“(A) specific instruction to correct the errors or deficiencies found by the court; and

“(B) a reasonable schedule and deadline to correct such errors or deficiencies, which such deadline may not exceed—

“(i) with regard to an order entered on or after the date of enactment of this section, the date that is 180 days after the date on which the order was entered; and

“(ii) with regard to an order entered before the date of enactment of this section, the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this section.

“(2) CONTINUED EFFECT OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—A final agency action remanded under paragraph (1) shall remain in effect while the Federal agency corrects any errors or deficiencies found by the court.

“(c) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (except as provided in subparagraph (A) with respect to a shorter deadline), a claim described in subsection (a) shall be barred unless—

“(A) such claim is filed not later than 150 days after the final agency action is made public, unless a shorter deadline is specified under law;

“(B) in the case of a final agency action for which there was a public comment period on an environmental document, such claim—

“(i) is filed by a party that submitted a substantive and unique comment during such public comment period by the noticed comment deadline for the environmental document and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the applicable Federal agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks review; and

“(ii) concerns the same subject matter raised in the comment submitted during the public comment period;

“(C) such claim is filed by a party that has suffered or imminently will suffer direct harm from the final agency action; and

“(D) such claim does not challenge the establishment of a categorical exclusion.

“(2) SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—If an agency issues a supplemental environmental document in response to a court order remanding a final agency action, the deadline described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the date on which the agency makes public the agency action for which the supplemental environmental document is prepared. A claim for review of such final agency action shall be limited to information contained in the final supplemental environmental document that was not contained in a previous environmental document for the final agency action.

“(3) ACTIONS FOR USE OF TRIBAL TRUST RESOURCES.—For any final agency action that authorizes or affects the use of lands, minerals, or other resources already held in trust at the time of the final agency action by the United States for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian Tribe—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be no administrative or judicial review of such final agency action based on a claim of failure to comply with the requirements of this Act; and

“(B) subparagraph (A) shall not apply to actions for administrative or judicial review—

“(i) brought by the federally recognized Indian Tribe for which the United States holds the lands, minerals, or other resources in trust; or

“(ii) that involve reasonably foreseeable effects of the final agency action that occur outside the lands, minerals, or other resources held in trust by the United States for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian Tribe.

“(d) DEADLINE FOR RESOLUTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A court shall issue a final judgment on a claim described in subsection (a)—

“(A) as expeditiously as practicable; and

“(B) unless a shorter deadline is specified under Federal law, not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the agency record for the review is filed with the reviewing court, which shall not be more than 60 days after the filing of the claim.

“(2) ACCELERATED DEADLINES.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent a court from further expediting review of a claim described in subsection (a).

“(3) APPEALS.—

“(A) FILING.—A notice of appeal of a final judgment described in this subsection shall be filed not later than 60 days after such final judgment is issued. In the case of a final agency action remanded under subsection (b), the agency and, if applicable, the applicant, shall have the right to appeal during the pendency of the remand.

“(B) DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.—A court shall issue a final decision on an appeal filed under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) as expeditiously as practicable; and

“(ii) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the appeal is filed.

“(e) NO EFFECT ON REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER DEADLINES.—This section shall not affect the right to obtain review under section 107(g)(3).”.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of H.R. 4776 is to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to clarify ambiguous provisions and facilitate a more efficient, effective, and timely environmental review process.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) establishes parameters for assessing and publicly disclosing the environmental impact of all “major federal actions,”¹ which encompass a broad range of governmental activities that impact the American economy. Originally intended to strike an appropriate balance between protecting the environment and promoting economic development, the NEPA process has become increasingly complex, resulting in unwieldy NEPA documents, excessive timelines, and an increase in frivolous litigation.² These delays have imposed significant time and cost burdens, with environmental analysis adding an estimated average of \$4.2 million to project costs.³ The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) recently found that Federal Highway Administration projects, for example, take more than 7 years to get from a notice of intent to the issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD).⁴ This data contrasts sharply with CEQ’s 1981 prediction that agencies would be able to complete EISs in twelve months or less.⁵ Adding to this complexity is the fact that NEPA is the “most frequently litigated environmental statute,” according to the Department of Justice.⁶

On June 2, 2023, President Biden signed into law the Fiscal Responsibility Act (FRA),⁷ which included the first significant NEPA reforms in over 40 years. Those reforms defined ambiguous terms in the statute and set time and page limits for NEPA documents. Unfortunately, rather than abide by the FRA’s significant NEPA and permitting reforms intended to streamline construction in America, speed up timelines for critical infrastructure projects, and reduce the burden on taxpayers by creating efficiencies in the per-

¹ Pub. L. 91–190; 42 U.S.C. 4321–4347, January 1, 1970, as amended by Pub. L. 94–52, July 3, 1975, Pub. L. 94–83, August 9, 1975, and Pub. L. 97–258, § 4(b), September 13, 1982.

² Healthy Forests, Healthy Communities, 2020.

³ NEPA Modernization 101: An Outdated Environmental Law the is Impeding Clean Energy Developments, C3 SOLUTIONS, <https://www.c3solutions.org/policy-paper/nepa-modernization-101/>.

⁴ Council on Environmental Quality, Update to the Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, July 16, 2020, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/07/16/2020-15179/update-to-the-regulations-implementing-the-procedural-provisions-of-the-national-environmental-policy-act> footnote 2-p43305.

⁵ Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations, 46 FR 18026, March 23, 1981, <https://www.energy.gov/nepa/downloads/forty-most-asked-questions-concerning-ceqs-national-environmental-policy-act>.

⁶ Nina M. Hart & Linda Tsang, “National Environmental Policy Act: Judicial Review and Remedies,” Congressional Research Service, September 22, 2021, IF11932.

⁷ Press Release, THE WHITE HOUSE, Bills Signed: H.R. 346, H.R. 3746, June 3, 2023, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefingroom/legislation/2023/06/03/press-release-bills-signed-h-r-346-h-r-3746/>.

mitting process, the Biden administration largely ignored the FRA’s changes, instead choosing to weaponize the NEPA process to delay critical domestic energy projects.

On May 29, 2025, the Supreme Court strongly reaffirmed NEPA’s procedural nature and finite scope with its unanimous decision in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County* (*Seven County*).⁸ In the decision, the Supreme Court held that courts must afford agencies substantial deference when examining whether an agency acted reasonably in determining the appropriate scope and content of an environmental document prepared under NEPA. The Court explained that a NEPA analysis for a given project need not consider the broad effects of separate projects if an agency determines that those upstream and downstream effects are remote in both time and place.⁹ The decision also admonished lower courts not to “substitute [their] judgment for that of the agency as to the environmental consequences of its actions.”¹⁰ *Seven County* was a significant milestone in returning common sense to the NEPA process and in providing long-sought clarity that NEPA review should focus on the project under consideration rather than broader, indirect impacts.

H.R. 4776, led by Chairman Bruce Westerman (R–AR) and Jared Golden (D–ME), would build on the FRA reforms and further improve NEPA, including building on key aspects of the *Seven County* decision. The bill clarifies that NEPA is a “purely procedural statute”¹¹ that “does not mandate particular results, but simply prescribes the necessary process,”¹² borrowing language from the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Seven County* and *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*. The legislation prevents duplication of efforts by allowing federal agencies to utilize environmental reviews conducted under other federal or state environmental statutes, so long as they meet the requirements of NEPA. In addition to using state or federal reviews, agencies may utilize or adapt previously completed environmental reviews for new projects, provided that the previously completed reviews were for substantially similar projects.

Since its enactment, NEPA has failed to provide project applicants with the clarity and certainty they need. H.R. 4776 establishes clear procedural deadlines and requirements for agencies to communicate with applicants and other agencies involved in the review process. On top of increased communication requirements, the bill provides certainty that approved agency actions will not be revoked or otherwise modified unless required by courts or allowed under a limited set of clearly defined circumstances. These changes will provide project applicants with the long-term stability and assurance they require to invest in America.

One of the most glaring issues with NEPA is that it does not clearly explain which effects an agency must consider in a review. This omission has led to bloated environmental documents and egregiously long timelines. H.R. 4776 rectifies this issue by clarifying that agencies may consider only those effects proximately

⁸ 605 U.S. ____ (2025), https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-975_m648.pdf.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989), <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/490/332/>.

caused by major federal actions and may not consider effects that are speculative or separate in time or place from the underlying action. By mandating that the alternatives considered in a given NEPA document meet the applicant's purpose and need, the bill also ensures that agencies cannot use NEPA to significantly change proposed projects they disfavor.

As previously discussed, NEPA establishes parameters for assessing and publicly disclosing the environmental impact of all "major federal actions." This term was not defined until the passage of the FRA in 2023. Unfortunately, that definition was not comprehensive enough, as the Biden administration largely ignored the changes. H.R. 4776 would clarify the definition of major federal action by explaining once and for all that agencies may not determine an action to be a major federal action based solely on the provision of federal funds.

The bill also addresses frivolous NEPA claims in several key ways. First, the bill codifies the *Seven County* decision by ensuring that courts do not improperly substitute their judgments for those made by the agencies. Second, the bill clarifies that the only remedy available to courts in deciding NEPA cases is to remand the action back to the lead agency; they may not enjoin or vacate the challenged action. Because NEPA is a purely procedural statute that establishes a process, it stands to reason that if an agency erred in its process, it should go back and complete it, without the underlying action being disqualified or cancelled. Third, important protections are given to Tribal projects, limiting outside groups' ability to stop Tribes from completing projects affecting resources held in trust. Finally, the bill requires that NEPA claims be filed within 150 days after the action is made public and, if a comment period was provided, must be filed by claimants who submitted a comment during the public comment period, have a claim related to their comment, and have been, or imminently will be, harmed by the proposed action. This provision facilitates a timelier litigation process and ensures that agencies are, at the very least, given the opportunity to address deficiencies before being sued.

COMMITTEE ACTION

H.R. 4776 was introduced on July 25, 2025, by Representative Bruce Westerman (R-AR). The bill was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On September 10, 2025, the Committee on Natural Resources held a hearing on the bill. On November 20, 2025, the Committee on Natural Resources met to consider the bill. Chairman Bruce Westerman (R-AR) offered an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Westerman_042 ANS. The Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute, as amended, was agreed to by voice vote. Rep. Jeff Hurd (R-CO) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Hurd_032. The amendment was agreed to by voice vote. Rep. Jared Golden (D-ME) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Golden_02. The amendment was agreed to by voice vote. Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #1. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 1

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #1 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO			
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	24	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #3. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 18 yeas to 23 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 2

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #3 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	18	23	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #13. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 16 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 3

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #13 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI		X	
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	16	25	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #26. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 4

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #26 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	24	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #30. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 5

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #30 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI		X	
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	24	

Rep. Teresa Leger Fernandez (D–NM) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Leger Fernandez #15. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 16 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 6

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Leger Fernandez #15 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV		X	
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	16	25	

Rep. Teresa Leger Fernandez (D–NM) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Leger Fernandez #16. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 7

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Leger Fernandez #16 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV		X	
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	24	

Rep. Dave Min (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Min #17. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 8

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Min #17 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman),
 "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ			
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI				Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	24	

Rep. Maxine Dexter (D-OR) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Dexter #23. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 9

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Dexter #23 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Rep. Maxine Dexter (D-OR) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Dexter #29. The amendment was withdrawn. Rep. Seth Magaziner (D-RI) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Magaziner #6. The amendment was withdrawn. Rep. Seth Magaziner (D-RI) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Magaziner #7. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 10

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Magaziner #7 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Rep. Seth Magaziner (D-RI) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Magaziner #8. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 11

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Magaziner #8 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Rep. Seth Magaziner (D-RI) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Magaziner #9. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 12

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Magaziner #9 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Rep. Emily Randall (D-WA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Randall #20. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 13

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Randall #20 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Rep. Emily Randall (D-WA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Randall #22. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 20 yeas to 23 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 14

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Randall #22 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), *"Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act"* or the *"SPEED Act"*

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME	X		
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	20	23	

Rep. Emily Randall (D-WA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Randall #31. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 26 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 15

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Randall #31 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), *"Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act"* or the *"SPEED Act"*

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI		X	
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	26	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Ansari #9. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 18 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 16

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Ansari #9 amendment offered by Ranking Member Huffman** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	18	25	

Rep. Luz Rivas (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Rivas #11. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 20 yeas to 23 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 17

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Rivas #11 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME	X		
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	20	23	

Rep. Luz Rivas (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Rivas #12. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 20 yeas to 23 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 18

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Rivas #12 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME	X		
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	20	23	

Rep. Adelita Grijalva (D-AZ) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Grijalva #14. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 17 yeas to 26 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 19

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Grijalva #14 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV		X	
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	17	26	

Rep. Julia Brownley (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Brownley #24 revised. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 18 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 20

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Brownley #24 Revised amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	18	25	

Rep. Julia Brownley (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Brownley #25. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 18 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 21

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Brownley #25 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	18	25	

Rep. Susie Lee (D–NV) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Lee #2. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 19 yeas to 24 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 22

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Lee #2 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman),
 "Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	19	24	

Ranking Member Jared Huffman (D-CA) offered an amendment to the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute designated Huffman #28. The amendment was not agreed to by a roll call vote of 18 yeas to 25 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 23

Meeting on / Amendment on: **Huffman #28 amendment** to Westerman_042 ANS to H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman), "*Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act*" or the "*SPEED Act*"

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman		X		Mr. Huffman, CA	X		
Mr. Wittman, VA		X		Mr. Neguse, CO	X		
Mr. McClintock, CA		X		Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM	X		
Mr. Gosar, AZ		X		Ms. Stansbury, NM	X		
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR	X		
Mr. LaMalfa, CA		X		Mr. Magaziner, RI	X		
Mr. Webster, FL		X		Mr. Golden, ME		X	
Mr. Fulcher, ID		X		Mr. Min, CA	X		
Mr. Stauber, MN		X		Ms. Dexter, OR	X		
Mr. Tiffany, WI		X		Mr. Hernández, PR	X		
Ms. Boebert, CO		X		Ms. Randall, WA	X		
Mr. Bentz, OR		X		Ms. Ansari, AZ	X		
Ms. Kiggans, VA		X		Ms. Elfreth, MD	X		
Mr. Hunt, TX		X		Mr. Gray, CA		X	
Mr. Collins, GA		X		Ms. Rivas, CA	X		
Ms. Hageman, WY		X		Ms. Grijalva, AZ	X		
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI	X		
Mr. Walberg, MI		X		Mr. Soto, FL	X		
Mr. Ezell, MS		X		Ms. Brownley, CA	X		
Ms. Maloy, UT		X		Ms. Lee, NV	X		
Mr. McDowell, NC		X					
Mr. Crank, CO		X					
Mr. Begich, AK		X					
Mr. Hurd, CO		X					
Mr. Kennedy, UT		X		TOTAL:	18	25	

The bill, as amended, was ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a roll call vote of 25 yeas to 18 nays, as follows:

Committee on Natural Resources

U.S. House of Representatives

119th Congress

Date: November 20, 2025

Recorded Vote #: 24

Meeting on / Amendment on: **On Favorably Reporting, as amended, H.R. 4776 (Rep. Westerman),
"Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act" or the "SPEED Act"**

MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres	MEMBERS	Yea	Nay	Pres
Mr. Westerman, AR, Chairman	X			Mr. Huffman, CA		X	
Mr. Wittman, VA	X			Mr. Neguse, CO		X	
Mr. McClintock, CA	X			Ms. Leger Fernandez, NM		X	
Mr. Gosar, AZ	X			Ms. Stansbury, NM		X	
Mrs. Radewagen, AS				Ms. Hoyle, OR		X	
Mr. LaMalfa, CA	X			Mr. Magaziner, RI		X	
Mr. Webster, FL	X			Mr. Golden, ME	X		
Mr. Fulcher, ID	X			Mr. Min, CA		X	
Mr. Stauber, MN	X			Ms. Dexter, OR		X	
Mr. Tiffany, WI	X			Mr. Hernández, PR		X	
Ms. Boebert, CO	X			Ms. Randall, WA		X	
Mr. Bentz, OR	X			Ms. Ansari, AZ		X	
Ms. Kiggans, VA	X			Ms. Elfreth, MD		X	
Mr. Hunt, TX	X			Mr. Gray, CA	X		
Mr. Collins, GA	X			Ms. Rivas, CA		X	
Ms. Hageman, WY	X			Ms. Grijalva, AZ		X	
Mr. Amodei, NV				Mrs. Dingell, MI		X	
Mr. Walberg, MI	X			Mr. Soto, FL		X	
Mr. Ezell, MS	X			Ms. Brownley, CA		X	
Ms. Maloy, UT	X			Ms. Lee, NV		X	
Mr. McDowell, NC	X						
Mr. Crank, CO	X						
Mr. Begich, AK	X						
Mr. Hurd, CO	X						
Mr. Kennedy, UT	X			TOTAL:	25	18	

HEARINGS

For the purposes of clause 3(c)(6) of House rule XIII, the following hearing was used to develop or consider this measure: hearing by the Committee on Natural Resources held on September 10, 2025.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title

- Names the bill the “Standardizing Permitting and Expediting Economic Development Act” or the “SPEED Act.”

Section 2. NEPA reform

- Clarifies that NEPA is a purely procedural statute that does not mandate particular results but simply prescribes the necessary process.
- Prevents duplication by allowing federal agencies to utilize environmental reviews conducted under other federal, state, or Tribal environmental statutes, so long as they meet the requirements of NEPA.
- Stipulates that agencies may consider only those effects that are proximately caused by the major federal action and may not consider effects that are speculative or separate in time or place from the major federal action.
- Prohibits agencies from revoking or modifying previously issued authorizations unless required by a court order or for other narrowly defined reasons.
- Requires the alternatives considered in the environmental document to meet the purpose and need of the applicant, ensuring that agencies cannot use NEPA to change the purpose of a proposed project.
- Defines “major federal action” under NEPA, clarifying that agencies may not determine an action to be a major federal action based solely on the provision of federal funds.
- Establishes a presumption that when a Tribe-sponsored project affecting trust resources requires the exploration of a no action alternative, the effects of the no action alternative will be negative for the Tribe.
- Requires agencies to notify applicants within 60 days of receiving a project application whether the application received is complete. If the application is complete, agencies then have 60 days to either begin the environmental review process or inform the applicant that their project is exempt from NEPA.
- Creates a process whereby lead agencies must identify other agencies that are likely to have responsibilities related to environmental reviews, authorizations etc. relating to the proposed agency action and invite them to act as cooperating agencies. The lead agency is then required to convene with cooperating agencies and develop a coordinated schedule for the purpose of streamlining the review process.
- Requires the lead agency and any cooperating agency to issue, not later than 30 days after completing an environmental review, a final agency action along with a performance schedule for any outstanding authorizations.

- Requires the project applicant's approval for an agency to extend the deadlines in this section.
- Directs the lead agency and cooperating agencies to carry out necessary reviews and other obligations related to the proposed action concurrently and in conjunction with one another.
- Allows lead agencies to use or adapt a previously completed environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, or categorical exclusion for a new project, so long as the new project is substantially the same as the one already reviewed.

Section 3. Judicial review

- Directs the courts to afford substantial deference to agencies when determining whether a final agency action complied with NEPA.
- Mandates that the only remedy available to courts in deciding NEPA cases is to remand the action back to the lead agency; courts may not enjoin or vacate the agency action under NEPA. Gives agencies 180 days to address any deficiencies upon remand.
- Requires that NEPA claims be filed within 150 days after the action is made public and that the claimant must have submitted a "unique and substantive" comment during the public comment period in relation to the claim. Additionally, to file a lawsuit, plaintiffs must show that they have been, or imminently will be, directly harmed by the action.
- Requires any lawsuit filed on a supplemental environmental document to be based on new information in the supplemental document.
- Unless a case is filed by a federally recognized Indian Tribe, parts of major federal actions that solely affect resources held in trust for Tribes are not subject to administrative or judicial review on the basis of failure to comply with NEPA.
- Directs courts to resolve NEPA-related cases within 180 days and requires appeals to be filed within 60 days of a decision. Courts must resolve such appeals within 180 days.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regarding clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Natural Resources' oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the body of this report.

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

As required by clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII, the general performance goal or objective of this bill is to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to clarify ambiguous provisions and facilitate a more efficient, effective, and timely environmental review process.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY, ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY, AND TAX EXPENDITURES

In compliance with clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee adopts as its own the estimate of new budget authority, entitlement authority, or tax expenditures or revenues contained in the cost estimate prepared by

the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of House rule XIII, the Committee adopts as its own the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

EARMARK STATEMENT

This bill does not contain any Congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined under clause 9(e), 9(f), and 9(g) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT STATEMENT

The Committee adopts as its own the estimate of the Federal mandates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 423 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

EXISTING PROGRAMS

Directed Rule Making. This bill does not contain any directed rule makings.

Duplication of Existing Programs. This bill does not establish or reauthorize a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another program. Such program was not included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139 or identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95–220, as amended by Public Law 98–169) as relating to other programs.

APPLICABILITY TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee finds that the legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act.

PREEMPTION OF STATE, LOCAL OR TRIBAL LAW

Any preemptive effect of this bill over state, local, or tribal law is intended to be consistent with the bill's purposes and text and the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of the U.S. Constitution.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

* * * * *

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. **[The purposes]** (a) *The purposes of this Act are: 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.*

(b) *This Act is a purely procedural statute intended to ensure Federal agencies consider the environmental impacts of their actions during the decisionmaking process. This Act does not mandate particular results, and only prescribes a process. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to mandate any specific environmental outcome or result, nor shall this Act be interpreted to confer substantive rights or impose substantive duties beyond procedural requirements.*

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

* * * * *

SEC. 106. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW; SCOPE OF REVIEW.

(a) **THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.**—An agency is not required to prepare an environmental document with respect to a proposed agency action if—

(1) the proposed agency action is not a final agency action within the meaning of such term in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency's categorical exclusions, another agency's categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law;

(3) the preparation of such document would clearly and fundamentally conflict with the requirements of another provision of law; **[or]**

(4) the proposed agency action is a nondiscretionary action with respect to which such agency does not have authority to take environmental factors into consideration in determining whether to take the proposed **[action.] action;**

(5) *the agency determines the proposed agency action is an action for which such agency's compliance with another statute's requirements serves the function of agency compliance with this Act with respect to such action; or*

(6) *the proposed agency action relates to a project or action that has already been reviewed pursuant to a State environmental review statute or a Tribal environmental review statute, ordinance, resolution, regulation, or formally adopted policy and the lead agency determines such review serves the function of agency compliance with this Act.*

(b) **LEVELS OF REVIEW.**—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action requiring an environmental document that has a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—An agency shall prepare an environmental assessment with respect to a proposed agency action that **【does not】** *is not likely to* have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment, or if the significance of such effect is unknown, unless the agency finds that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency's categorical exclusions, another agency's categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law. Such environmental assessment shall be a concise public document prepared by a Federal agency to set forth the basis of such agency's finding of no significant impact or determination that an environmental impact statement is necessary.

(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In making a determination under this subsection, an agency—

(A) may make use of any reliable data source; and

【(B) is not required to undertake new scientific or technical research unless the new scientific or technical research is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall costs and time frame of obtaining it are not unreasonable.】

(B) is not required to—

(i) undertake new scientific or technical research unless the new scientific or technical research is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall costs and time frame of obtaining it are not unreasonable; or

(ii) undertake new scientific or technical research after the receipt of an application, as applicable, with respect to a proposed agency action.

(c) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—*In preparing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, a Federal agency—*

(1) may consider only those effects that share a reasonably close causal relationship to, and are proximately caused by, the immediate project or action under consideration; and

(2) may not consider effects that are speculative, attenuated from the project or action, separate in time or place from the project or action, or in relation to separate existing or potential future projects or actions.

(d) CERTAINTY.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—A Federal agency may not rescind, withdraw, amend, alter, or otherwise render ineffective any environmental document completed under this Act for a project or action where there is an applicant unless the Federal agency has been so ordered by a court or the applicant has agreed in writing to such rescission, withdrawal, amendment, or alteration.

(2) AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection or existing law, a Federal agency may not revoke, rescind,

withdraw, terminate, suspend, amend, alter, or take any other action to interfere with an authorization unless—

(i) the Federal agency is required to take such action by order of a court of competent jurisdiction;

(ii) the holder of the authorization has materially breached the terms of the authorization, or otherwise violated applicable law;

(iii) the authorization was obtained through fraud, intentional concealment, or material misrepresentation;

(iv) such action is necessary to prevent specific, immediate, substantial, and proximate harm or damage to life, property, national security, or defense that was not considered in the underlying environmental review process or final agency action for the authorization; or

(v) the Federal agency has received a request from the holder of the authorization or project sponsor to take such action.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—*The actions described in subparagraph (A) shall be, as appropriate and where feasible, supported by clear and convincing evidence and reasonably limited in duration and scope by the agency to address the specific issue such action is intended to address.*

(C) NOTICE.—*Before an agency takes an action described in subparagraph (A), the agency shall notify the holder of the authorization and the project sponsor in writing of such action, including by providing a detailed explanation of the action, identifying the statutory authority relied upon for the action, and providing the evidence supporting the action.*

(D) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—*An action described in subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.*

(ii) VENUE.—*A person seeking judicial review of an action described in subparagraph (A) may only obtain review of such action in the United States court of appeals for any circuit wherein the project for which the authorization was issued is located.*

(iii) PETITIONS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—*No Federal agency may petition a court for vacatur or voluntary remand of an authorization unless the holder of the authorization or the project sponsor consents in writing to such a petition.*

(E) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—*Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to provide any Federal agency new, enhanced, or expanded authority, or to limit any existing authority, concerning any authorization.*

(e) PRESUMPTION OF NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF TAKING NO ACTION RELATING TO TRIBAL TRUST RESOURCES.—*For any proposed agency action carried out on, or directly affecting, tribal trust resources (including lands and minerals) that is initiated by the federally recognized Indian Tribe for which the United States holds the affected resources in trust, and for which an environmental document was prepared that included consideration of a no action alternative,*

there shall be a presumption that the effects of taking no action will be negative for the federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(f) EFFECT OF THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS ON OTHER AGENCIES.—If a lead agency determines an environmental document is not required to be prepared with respect to a proposed agency action under subsection (a), another agency may not prepare an environmental document with respect to such proposed agency action.

SEC. 107. TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.

(a) LEAD AGENCY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If there are two or more participating Federal agencies, such agencies shall determine, by letter or memorandum, which agency shall be the lead agency based on consideration of the—

- (i) magnitude of agency's involvement;
- (ii) project approval or disapproval authority;
- (iii) expertise concerning the action's environmental effects;
- (iv) duration of agency's involvement; and
- (v) sequence of agency's involvement.

(B) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the participating Federal agencies may appoint such State, Tribal, or local agencies as joint lead agencies as the involved Federal agencies shall determine appropriate. Joint lead agencies shall jointly fulfill the role described in paragraph (2).

(2) ROLE.—A lead agency shall, with respect to a proposed agency action—

(A) supervise the preparation of an environmental document if, with respect to such proposed agency action, there is more than one participating Federal agency;

(B) request the participation of each cooperating agency **[at the earliest practicable time]** *in accordance with subsection (g)(2)*;

(C) in preparing an environmental document, give consideration to any analysis or proposal created by a cooperating agency;

(D) develop a schedule, in consultation with each cooperating agency, the applicant, and such other entities as the lead agency determines appropriate, for completion of any environmental review, permit, or authorization required to **[carry out the proposed agency action]** *carry out the proposed agency action in compliance with the deadlines outlined in subsection (g)*;

(E) if the lead agency determines that **[a review]** *an environmental review*, permit, or authorization will not be completed in accordance with the schedule developed under subparagraph (D), notify the agency responsible for issuing **[such review]** *such environmental review*, permit, or authorization of the discrepancy and request that such agency take such measures as such agency determines appropriate to comply with such schedule; and

(F) meet with a cooperating agency that requests such a meeting.

(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The lead agency may, with respect to a proposed agency action, designate any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency (*including counties, boroughs, parishes, and other political subdivisions of a State*) that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal to serve as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency may, not later than a date specified in the schedule established by the lead agency, submit comments to the lead agency. *Such comments from Federal cooperating agencies shall be limited to matters relating to the proposed agency action with respect to which such Federal cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law.*

(4) REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION.—Any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency with respect to a proposed agency action under paragraph (1) may submit a written request for such a designation to a participating Federal agency. An agency that receives a request under this paragraph shall transmit such request to each participating Federal agency and to the Council.

(5) COUNCIL DESIGNATION.—

(A) REQUEST.—If the participating Federal agencies are unable to agree on the designation of a lead agency within 45 days of the request under paragraph (4), then the Federal, State, Tribal or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency may request that the Council designate a lead agency. Such request shall consist of—

(i) a precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed agency action; and

(ii) a detailed statement with respect to each participating Federal agency and each factor listed in paragraph (1) regarding which agency should serve as lead agency.

(B) TRANSMISSION.—The Council shall transmit a request received under subparagraph (A) to each participating Federal agency.

(C) RESPONSE.—A participating Federal agency may, not later than 20 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), submit to the Council a response to such request.

(D) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 40 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), the Council shall designate the lead agency with respect to the relevant proposed agency action.

(b) ONE DOCUMENT.—**[To the extent practicable,]**

(1) DOCUMENT.—*To the extent practicable*, if a proposed agency action will require action by more than one Federal agency and the lead agency has determined that it requires preparation of an environmental document, the lead and cooperating agencies shall evaluate the proposal in a single environmental document.

(2) CONSIDERATION TIMING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—*In preparing an environmental document for a proposed agency action, no Federal agency shall*

be required to consider any scientific or technical research that becomes publicly available after the earlier of, as applicable—

(i) the date of receipt of an application with respect to such proposed agency action; and

(ii) the date of publication of a notice of intent or decision to prepare such environmental document for such proposed agency action.

(B) APPLICABILITY TO OTHER LAW.—This paragraph does not affect any review of information required under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to comments received during the public comment period as applicable.

(C) DELAY.—A Federal agency may not delay the issuance of an environmental document or a final agency action, including any decision or determination, on the basis of awaiting new scientific or technical research or information that was not available as of the earlier of the dates described in subparagraph (A).

(c) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement under section 102 shall include a request for public comment on alternatives or impacts and on relevant information, studies, or analyses with respect to the proposed agency action.

(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Each environmental document shall include a statement of purpose and need that briefly summarizes the underlying purpose and need for the proposed agency [action.] *action. Where applicable, the statement of purpose and need shall meet the goals of the applicant.*

(e) PAGE LIMITS.—

(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an environmental impact statement shall not exceed 150 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

(B) EXTRAORDINARY COMPLEXITY.—An environmental impact statement for a proposed agency action of extraordinary complexity shall not exceed 300 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—An environmental assessment shall not exceed 75 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

(f) SPONSOR PREPARATION.—A lead agency shall prescribe procedures to allow a project sponsor to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the supervision of the agency. Such agency may provide such sponsor with appropriate guidance and assist in the preparation. The lead agency shall independently evaluate the environmental document and shall take responsibility for the contents.

(g) DEADLINES.—

(1) APPLICATIONS FOR AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETE OR INCOMPLETE APPLICATION.—*Unless a shorter deadline is specified by law, in connection with a proposed agency action for which an applicant submitted an application for an authorization to an agency, not later than 60 days after the date on which the*

applicant submits the application to the agency, the agency shall document the receipt of the application and—

(i) notify the applicant that the application is complete; or

(ii) notify the applicant that the application is incomplete and request in writing any additional information that the agency needs to determine that the application is complete and begin preparation of an environmental document.

(B) AGENCY DETERMINATION.—

(i) COMPLETE DETERMINATION.—If an agency determines an application is complete under subparagraph (A)(i), the agency shall, not later than 60 days after the date on which the agency makes such determination—

(I) notify the applicant that the agency has determined that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency's categorical exclusions, is not a major Federal action, or that no further agency action is required;

(II) issue a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for such proposed agency action; or

(III) notify the applicant that the agency has determined that preparation of an environmental assessment is necessary.

(ii) INCOMPLETE DETERMINATION.—If the agency requests additional information under subparagraph (A)(ii), the deadline described in clause (i) shall be based on the date on which the agency receives the additional information instead of the date on which the determination is made.

(2) COOPERATING AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after a lead agency issues a notice of intent under paragraph (1)(B)(i)(II) or notifies an applicant under paragraph (1)(B)(i)(III) with respect to a proposed agency action, the lead agency shall—

(i) identify all agencies that are likely to have environmental review, authorization, or other responsibilities with respect to the proposed agency action; and

(ii) invite each such agency to become a cooperating agency.

(B) DEADLINE TO ACCEPT INVITATION.—Not later than 21 days after an agency receives an invitation to become a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A)(ii), such agency shall accept or deny the invitation.

(C) CONVENING OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.—Not later than 7 days after the deadline described in subparagraph (B) has passed for each agency that received an invitation to become a cooperating agency under subparagraph (A)(ii), the lead agency that sent each such invitation shall convene each agency that accepts such an invitation to coordinate on developing the schedule under subsection (a)(2)(D) for the applicable proposed agency action.

(D) UNIDENTIFIED AGENCIES.—In the event that an agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed agency action is not identified under subparagraph (A)(i), the lead agency with respect to the proposed agency action shall—

(i) invite such unidentified agency to become a co-operating agency by not later than 7 days after becoming aware that the agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise; and

(ii) if such agency accepts the invitation, incorporate such agency into the schedule developed under subsection (a)(2)(D) and update such schedule accordingly by not later than 14 days after the date on which such agency accepts the invitation.

[(1) IN GENERAL.—] (3) REVIEW TIMELINE.—Except as provided in paragraph **[(2)] (5)**, with respect to a proposed agency action, a lead agency shall complete, as applicable—

(A) the environmental impact statement not later than the date that is 2 years after the sooner of, as applicable—

(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 102(2)(C) requires the issuance of an environmental impact statement with respect to such action;

(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for such action; and

(B) the environmental assessment not later than the date that is 1 year after the sooner of, as applicable—

(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 106(b)(2) requires the preparation of an environmental assessment with respect to such action;

(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment for such action.

(4) DEADLINE FOR FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—*For any proposed agency action for which an applicant submitted an application for an authorization to an agency, not later than 30 days after completing an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment for the proposed agency action, the lead agency, and any cooperating agency, shall issue a final agency action. The agency issuing such final agency action shall include in the final agency action a performance schedule for the completion of any other outstanding authorizations.*

[(2)] (5) DELAY.—A lead agency that determines it is not able to meet **[the deadline described in paragraph (1)] a deadline described in this subsection** may extend such deadline**[, in consultation with the applicant, to]** *if the applicant approves such extension. If the applicant approves such extension, the lead agency shall establish a new deadline that provides only*

so much additional time as is necessary to complete such environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

[(3)] (6) PETITION TO COURT.—

(A) **RIGHT TO PETITION.**—**[A project sponsor may]** *Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a project sponsor may obtain a review of an alleged failure by an agency to act in accordance with an applicable deadline under this section by filing a written petition with a court of competent jurisdiction seeking an order under subparagraph (B).*

(B) **COURT ORDER.**—If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that an agency has failed to act in accordance with an applicable deadline, the court shall set a schedule and deadline for the agency to act as soon as practicable, which shall not exceed 90 days from the date on which the order of the court is issued, unless the court determines a longer time period is necessary to comply with applicable law.

(C) **EXCEPTION.**—*A project sponsor that approved an extension of a deadline under paragraph (5) may not obtain judicial review of a failure to act in accordance with such deadline under subparagraph (A) unless the lead agency fails to meet the new deadline or is delaying for reasons other than those necessary to complete its review.*

(7) **CONCURRENT REVIEW.**—*In carrying out an environmental review, the lead agency and each cooperating agency shall carry out the obligations of that agency under other applicable laws concurrently, and in conjunction, with other required reviews for the proposed agency action, pursuant to the requirements of applicable law, including, if applicable, under this Act.*

(h) REPORT.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each lead agency shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

(A) identifies any environmental assessment and environmental impact statement that such lead agency did not complete by the deadline described in subsection (g); and

(B) provides an explanation for any failure to meet such deadline.

(2) **INCLUSIONS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify, as applicable—

(A) the office, bureau, division, unit, or other entity within the Federal agency responsible for each such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement;

(B) the date on which—

(i) such lead agency notified the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for the major Federal action is complete;

(ii) such lead agency began the scoping for the major Federal action; or

(iii) such lead agency issued a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the major Federal action; and

(C) when such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement is expected to be complete.

SEC. 108. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

【When an agency prepares】 (a) *PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.*—*When an agency prepares a programmatic environmental document for which judicial review was available, the agency may rely on the analysis included in the programmatic environmental document in a subsequent environmental document for related actions as follows:*

(1) Within **【5】** 10 years and without additional review of the analysis in the programmatic environmental document, unless there are substantial new circumstances or information about the significance of adverse effects that bear on the analysis.

(2) After **【5】** 10 years, so long as the agency reevaluates the analysis in the programmatic environmental document and any underlying assumption to ensure reliance on the analysis remains valid.

(b) *RELIANCE ON PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.*—

(1) *ACTIONS THAT ARE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.*—*A lead agency may satisfy the requirements of this Act with respect to a major Federal action by relying on an environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, or a categorical exclusion determination that the lead agency, another Federal agency, or a project sponsor under the supervision of a Federal agency completed for another major Federal action if the lead agency determines that—*

(A) *the new major Federal action is substantially the same as the other major Federal action or, if applicable, an alternative analyzed in such environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; and*

(B) *if applicable, the effects of the new major Federal action are substantially the same as the effects analyzed in such environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.*

(2) *ACTIONS THAT ARE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME.*—*If a new major Federal action is not substantially the same as another major Federal action or an alternative analyzed in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement completed by the lead agency, another Federal agency, or a project sponsor under the supervision of a Federal agency, the lead agency may modify or augment any such previously completed environmental assessment or environmental impact statement as necessary to satisfy the requirements of this Act with respect to the new major Federal action. The lead agency shall make such modified environmental assessment or environmental impact statement publicly available as a new environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.*

SEC. 109. ADOPTION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.

An agency may adopt a categorical exclusion listed in another agency's NEPA procedures, or that was legislatively enacted by Congress, for a category of proposed agency actions for which the categorical exclusion was established consistent with this paragraph. The agency shall—

(1) identify the categorical exclusion listed in another agency's NEPA procedures that covers a category of proposed actions or related actions;

- (2) consult with the agency that established the categorical exclusion to ensure that the proposed adoption of the categorical exclusion to a category of actions is appropriate;
- (3) identify to the public the categorical exclusion that the agency plans to use for its proposed actions; and
- (4) document adoption of the categorical exclusion.

* * * * *

SEC. [112.] 110A. PROJECT SPONSOR OPT-IN FEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.

(a) PROCESS.—

(1) **PROJECT SPONSOR.**—A project sponsor that intends to pay a fee under this section for the preparation, or supervision of the preparation, of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for a project shall submit to the Council—

(A) a description of the project; and

(B) a declaration of whether the project sponsor intends to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under section 107(f).

(2) **COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.**—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the Council receives information described in paragraph (1) from a project sponsor, the Council shall provide to the project sponsor notice of the amount of the fee to be paid under this section, as determined under subsection (b).

(3) **PAYMENT OF FEE.**—A project sponsor may pay a fee under this section after receipt of the notice described in paragraph (2).

(4) **DEADLINE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS FOR WHICH A FEE IS PAID.**—Notwithstanding section 107(g)(1)—

(A) an environmental assessment for which a fee is paid under this section shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date on which the fee is paid; and

(B) an environmental impact statement for which a fee is paid under this section shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date of publication of the notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement.

(b) FEE AMOUNT.—The amount of a fee under this section shall be—

(1) 125 percent of the anticipated costs to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement; and

(2) in the case of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement to be prepared in whole or in part by a project sponsor under section 107(f), 125 percent of the anticipated costs to supervise preparation of, and, as applicable, prepare, the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

SEC. 110B. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) ROLE OF THE COURT.—*In reviewing a claim of whether a final agency action complies with the requirements of this Act, a court—*

(1) shall afford substantial deference to the agency; and

(2) may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency regarding the environmental effects included in the final agency action or included in the environmental document.

(b) REMAND.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—If a court holds, under section 706(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, that a final agency action does not comply with the requirements of this Act, the only remedy the court may order, notwithstanding chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, is to remand, without vacatur or injunction, the final agency action to the agency with—

(A) specific instruction to correct the errors or deficiencies found by the court; and

(B) a reasonable schedule and deadline to correct such errors or deficiencies, which such deadline may not exceed—

(i) with regard to an order entered on or after the date of enactment of this section, the date that is 180 days after the date on which the order was entered; and

(ii) with regard to an order entered before the date of enactment of this section, the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this section.

(2) *CONTINUED EFFECT OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.*—A final agency action remanded under paragraph (1) shall remain in effect while the Federal agency corrects any errors or deficiencies found by the court.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (except as provided in subparagraph (A) with respect to a shorter deadline), a claim described in subsection (a) shall be barred unless—

(A) such claim is filed not later than 150 days after the final agency action is made public, unless a shorter deadline is specified under law;

(B) in the case of a final agency action for which there was a public comment period on an environmental document, such claim—

(i) is filed by a party that submitted a substantive and unique comment during such public comment period by the noticed comment deadline for the environmental document and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the applicable Federal agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks review; and

(ii) concerns the same subject matter raised in the comment submitted during the public comment period;

(C) such claim is filed by a party that has suffered or imminently will suffer direct harm from the final agency action; and

(D) such claim does not challenge the establishment of a categorical exclusion.

(2) *SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.*—If an agency issues a supplemental environmental document in response to a court order remanding a final agency action, the deadline described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the date on which the agency makes public the agency action for which the supplemental environmental document is prepared. A claim for review of such final agency action shall be limited to information contained in the final supplemental environmental docu-

ment that was not contained in a previous environmental document for the final agency action.

(3) **ACTIONS FOR USE OF TRIBAL TRUST RESOURCES.**—For any final agency action that authorizes or affects the use of lands, minerals, or other resources already held in trust at the time of the final agency action by the United States for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian Tribe—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be no administrative or judicial review of such final agency action based on a claim of failure to comply with the requirements of this Act; and

(B) subparagraph (A) shall not apply to actions for administrative or judicial review—

(i) brought by the federally recognized Indian Tribe for which the United States holds the lands, minerals, or other resources in trust; or

(ii) that involve reasonably foreseeable effects of the final agency action that occur outside the lands, minerals, or other resources held in trust by the United States for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(d) **DEADLINE FOR RESOLUTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A court shall issue a final judgment on a claim described in subsection (a)—

(A) as expeditiously as practicable; and

(B) unless a shorter deadline is specified under Federal law, not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the agency record for the review is filed with the reviewing court, which shall not be more than 60 days after the filing of the claim.

(2) **ACCELERATED DEADLINES.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent a court from further expediting review of a claim described in subsection (a).

(3) **APPEALS.**—

(A) **FILING.**—A notice of appeal of a final judgment described in this subsection shall be filed not later than 60 days after such final judgment is issued. In the case of a final agency action remanded under subsection (b), the agency and, if applicable, the applicant, shall have the right to appeal during the pendency of the remand.

(B) **DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.**—A court shall issue a final decision on an appeal filed under subparagraph (A)—

(i) as expeditiously as practicable; and

(ii) not later than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the appeal is filed.

(e) **NO EFFECT ON REVIEW OF COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER DEADLINES.**—This section shall not affect the right to obtain review under section 107(g)(3).

SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The term “authorization” means any lease, right-of-way, easement, license, permit, approval, finding, determination, or other administrative decision issued by an agency or any interagency consultation that is required or au-

thorized under Federal law in order to construct, modify, or operate a project.

[(1)] (2) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The term “categorical exclusion” means a category of actions that a Federal agency has determined, *or Congress deems by statute*, normally does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C).

[(2)] (3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term “cooperating agency” means any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has been designated as a cooperating agency under section 107(a)(3).

[(3)] (4) COUNCIL.—The term “Council” means the Council on Environmental Quality established in title II.

[(4)] (5) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term “environmental assessment” means an environmental assessment prepared under section 106(b)(2).

[(5)] (6) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term “environmental document” means an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a finding of no significant impact.

[(6)] (7) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term “environmental impact statement” means a detailed written statement that is required by section 102(2)(C).

[(7)] (8) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term “finding of no significant impact” means a determination by a Federal agency that a proposed agency action does not require the issuance of an environmental impact statement.

[(8)] (9) PARTICIPATING FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “participating Federal agency” means a Federal agency participating in an environmental review or authorization of an action.

[(9)] (10) LEAD AGENCY.—The term “lead agency” means, with respect to a proposed agency action—

(A) the agency that proposed such action; or

(B) if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to such action, the agency designated under section 107(a)(1).

[(10)] (11) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “major Federal action” means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “major Federal action” does not include—

(i) a non-Federal action—

(I) with no or minimal Federal funding; or

(II) with no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project;

(ii) funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

(iii) loans, loan guarantees, *grants (including capitalization grants)*, *cost share awards*, or other forms of

financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise **[(sufficient)]** *complete* control and responsibility over the **[(subsequent use of such financial assistance or the)]** effect of the action;

(iv) farm ownership loans and operating loan guarantees by the Farm Service Agency pursuant to sections 305 and 311 through 319 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act;

(v) the issuance of an authorization by an agency where the effects of the action or project being permitted or authorized were previously evaluated by another agency in compliance with this Act;

[(iv)] *(vi)* business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

[(v)] *(vii)* bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions;

[(vi)] *(viii)* extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States; or

[(vii)] *(ix)* activities or decisions that are non-discretionary and made in accordance with the agency's statutory authority.

(C) ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIONS.—An agency action may not be determined to be a major Federal action solely on the basis of the provision of Federal funds, including a grant, loan, loan guarantee, and funding assistance.

[(11)] (12) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term “programmatic environmental document” means an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment analyzing all or some of the environmental effects of a policy, program, plan, or group of related actions.

[(12)] (13) PROPOSAL.—The term “proposal” means a proposed action at a stage when an agency has a goal, is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal, and can meaningfully evaluate its effects.

[(13)] (14) SPECIAL EXPERTISE.—The term “special expertise” means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.

(15) REASONABLY FORESEEABLE.—*The term “reasonably foreseeable”, with respect to environmental effects of a proposed agency action—*

(A) means effects that share a reasonably close causal relationship to, and are proximately caused by, the immediate project or action under consideration; and

(B) does not include effects that are—

(i) speculative;

(ii) attenuated from the proposed agency action;

(iii) separate in time or place from the proposed agency action; or

(iv) in relation to separate existing or potential future projects.

TITLE II—COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

* * * * *

SEC. 204. It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report required by section 201;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in the quality of the environment both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in title I of this Act, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

(3) to review and appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in title I of this Act for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet the conservation, social, economic, health, *energy*, and other requirements and goals of the Nation;

(5) to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, research, and analyses relating to ecological systems and environmental quality;

(6) to document and define changes in the natural environment, including the plant and animal systems, and to accumulate necessary data and other information for a continuing analysis of these changes or trends and an interpretation of their underlying causes;

(7) to report at least once each year to the President on the state and condition of the environment; and

(8) to make and furnish such studies, reports, thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request.

* * * * *

DISSENTING VIEWS

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the federal government to consider the environmental effects of proposed major federal actions, ensuring federal projects and permitting decisions are informed and transparent to the public. NEPA also requires agencies to evaluate alternatives and public input, publicly disclose this information before taking final action, and provides a structure for coordinating permitting decisions. Committee Democrats believe any reforms to NEPA must prioritize a permitting process that is efficient, effective, and accelerates clean energy development and other essential infrastructure, while respecting communities, public input, tribal sovereignty, and tribal consultation.

Since President Nixon signed NEPA into law in 1970, NEPA has democratized the federal decision-making process, giving the public a chance to influence actions that shape the environment in which Americans live, work, and play. The NEPA public input process has improved myriad projects in small and large ways. Members of the public, tribes, local governments, and organizations have suggested useful alternatives and identified critical errors in underlying data or analysis.¹ Research shows that public comment plays a meaningful role in shaping federal decision-making, substantively altering decisions in 62 percent of analyzed environmental impact statements; federal decision-makers credited public comment as the reason every time they modified a mitigation plan or selected a new preferred alternative.²

The NEPA process has measurably improved major infrastructure projects across the country. Examples include improving port operational efficiency (Choctaw Point Shipping Terminal, Alabama); lowering project costs, saving time, and reducing environmental disturbances (Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, California); and improving public safety (I-70 Mountain Corridor, Colorado).³ To quote the Environmental Law Institute, “because of NEPA, bad decisions have sometimes been avoided and good decisions often have been made better.”⁴

Projects that experience significant NEPA delays are the exception, not the norm. According to numerous studies, when delays occur, the most common causes are agency capacity, including staff, expertise, funding, or technology; delays attributable to the project applicant, including waiting for information, changed plans of operation, and shifting priorities; and compliance with other laws and coordination with other permitting authorities, including state and

¹Environmental Law Institute, *Nepa Success Stories: Celebrating 40 Years of Transparency and Open Government* (August 2010).

²Ashley Stava et al, *Quantifying the substantive influence of public comment on United States federal environmental decisions under NEPA*, *Environmental Research Letters* (June 10, 2025).

³NRDC, *Never Eliminate Public Advice: NEPA Success Stories* (February 1, 2015).

⁴*Supra* note 1.

local governments.⁵ Litigation can cause additional delays at the end of a permitting process, but NEPA-related claims are also rare compared to challenges under other statutes: a 2020 study found that only one in every 450 NEPA reviews is ever challenged in court.⁶

NEPA and the permitting process have already undergone significant changes in the last two years, including statutory changes through enactment of the 2023 Fiscal Responsibility Act (FRA), major regulatory changes during President Trump's second term, and judicial changes related to the Supreme Court case *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County*. Notably, the FRA amendments added 1- and 2-year judicially enforceable timelines for completing an environmental assessment and an environmental impact statement (EIS), respectively.

Under the previous administration, Committee Democrats championed a historic investment of over \$1 billion for federal permitting offices across several federal agencies through the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). This investment had a significant positive impact on federal environmental reviews and addressed legitimate, evidence-based challenges. According to the Biden administration, as of January 2025, the \$1 billion investment, along with the utilization of other commonsense authorities, reduced the median time needed to complete an EIS (from notice of intent to final EIS) by 28 percent compared to the first Trump administration. The median time was 2.2 years in 2024, compared to 3.6 years in 2019.⁷ Despite the clear benefits of adequately funding our agencies, Republicans want to continue slashing funding while avoiding proper analysis and community input. The recently enacted H.R. 1 rescinded unspent funds appropriated through the IRA, including for permitting staff and technology upgrades. Additionally, agency reductions-in-force and voluntary resignations appear to be having a significant impact on permitting, with project developers reporting significant frustration over the lack of agency staffing.

On top of these recent changes, the Trump administration's regulatory chaos has created significant uncertainty in the permitting process, including by repealing the unifying Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations that helped provide consistent NEPA procedures across the federal government, and using a legally dubious "energy emergency" and other claims to skirt essential permitting requirements. Many of these actions are facing litigation, and the Trump administration is losing in court, adding to further uncertainty and chaos. In May, 15 state Attorneys General sued the Trump administration over its "energy emergency" declaration, arguing the order's direction to bypass federal review is illegal. And in August, a federal judge ordered the Governor of Florida and the Trump administration to begin dismantling the so-called Alligator Alcatraz detention center based on their failure to conduct NEPA analysis and other violations of law.

⁵ House Committee on Natural Resources, Testimony of Dr. Jamie Pleune, "The Biden Administration's Executive Overreach and its Impact on American Energy Independence," 118th Cong. (May 11, 2023).

⁶ Lewis and Clark Law School, Measuring the NEPA Litigation Burden, 2020.

⁷ CEQ, Environmental Impact Statement Timelines, January 13, 2025.

Despite all these changes, the majority's oversight of NEPA has been virtually non-existent, even while pursuing a major overhaul of this foundational law. Furthermore, they have not been able to answer basic questions raised by Democrats about the impact of the SPEED Act, should it become law. For example, the bill, as written, could waive NEPA requirements for all Department of Transportation federal highway projects, and the majority has not shared whether this is the intent or even whether they understand the potential impact. Before NEPA, federal highways cut through many low-income communities and communities of color, often without input from the people who lived there. NEPA was passed in part to stop that pattern by ensuring the federal government considers these environmental justice impacts and gives communities a voice before proceeding with major projects. Waiving this review is a shortsighted step in the wrong direction and will actively put vulnerable communities in harm's way.

The SPEED Act further undermines NEPA by shifting its focus away from informed, balanced decision-making. The bill fundamentally restructures NEPA to reduce the number of projects that trigger NEPA review, narrow the quality of environmental analysis and public input that remain, and sharply limit judicial oversight, making it harder to challenge unlawful decisions and easier for polluters to advance harmful projects. Specifically, the legislation makes judicial review, the only avenue for accountability, essentially meaningless—both by preventing courts from stopping projects even when agencies rely on faulty or non-existent analysis and by imposing overly restrictive standing requirements that shut affected communities out of the process while possibly even lengthening and complicating litigation. The bill's efforts to limit the scope of environmental analysis go far beyond *Seven County Infrastructure*. Its limitations on considering new science put blinders on agency analysis, leading to poor decision-making and likely increased legal risk. Democrats offered amendments to correct many of these problems, but they were all rejected by Republicans.

While undermining core safeguards for communities, the SPEED Act also fails to provide meaningful permitting certainty for virtually all clean energy projects that are currently being stalled or blocked by the Trump administration. I appreciate efforts to improve the legislation throughout the process, but the SPEED Act still does not address the many ways the Trump administration is stopping renewable energy projects from being permitted in the first place. Amendments added in hopes of ensuring previously enacted permits cannot later be revoked will still not make a meaningful difference for clean energy deployment in the first place, and do not help projects that have already had permits overturned by this administration.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the SPEED Act.

JARED HUFFMAN,
Ranking Member.