

Pat Childers comment received by e-mail 4/6/07:

I have read several pages of the draft "Citizen's Guide to NEPA." While I do appreciate the incorporation of Section 101 in explaining The Act and how it is intended, I believe that a good definition of "environment" is also very appropriate. Since (1) Section 101 clearly describes "man and nature can exist in productive harmony;" (2) Section 102(C) states "Include....actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment....;" and (3) the CEQ has defined Human Environment in 1508.14, excluding a definition of environment or more importantly "Human Environment," does not present to the citizens of the United States a very clear intent of NEPA. The Supreme Court made that intent very clear, why not make it very clear in the "Citizen's Guide to NEPA." The use of the word "significantly" in Section 102(C) also seems to be ignored by many of the Federal agencies in their deliberations of NEPA.

Finally, I firmly believe that I am not picking and choosing sections of The Act to promote my agenda, but I do believe that many agencies have picked and chosen sections of The Act to use in their decisions. Please communicate with me on this issue.

Representative Pat Childers