

**?** **What are the differences between the federal National Environmental Policy Act process and the state Energy Facility Siting process?**

NEPA	EFSC
Impact-based review	Standards-based review
Lead agency identifies preferred alternatives and can require developer to look at different alternatives than submitted	EFSC can only evaluate what is submitted by the applicant
Lead agency must always describe and analyze a no action alternative	EFSC can only deny a project if the applicant has not met the burden of proof that the application complies with each standard
Impacts that are evaluated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological</li> <li>• Aesthetic</li> <li>• Historic</li> <li>• Cultural</li> <li>• Economic</li> <li>• Social</li> <li>• Health impacts</li> </ul>	Standards that are evaluated (includes important state resources)  Applicable to all projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizational expertise</li> <li>• Structural</li> <li>• Soil Protection</li> <li>• Land Use</li> <li>• Protected Areas</li> <li>• Retirement and Financial Assurance</li> <li>• Fish and Wildlife Habitat</li> <li>• Threatened and Endangered Species</li> <li>• Scenic Resources</li> <li>• Historic, Cultural and Archeological Resources</li> <li>• Recreation</li> <li>• Public Services</li> <li>• Waste Minimization</li> <li>• Wildfire</li> <li>• Noise</li> </ul> Facility specific standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for facility (pipelines and transmission lines)</li> <li>• Specific Standards for Wind Facilities</li> <li>• Specific Standards for Transmission Lines</li> <li>• Carbon Dioxide Standard</li> </ul>
State agencies may participate but are not reimbursed for their time	State agencies are an integral part of the review and are eligible for reimbursement for their time