cations of decisions already made.)

Each month's accumulation of statements is listed and summarized in a publication from the CEQ, the *102 Monitor,* named after section 102 of NEPA which requires them. The latest selection begins with a 48-page discussion from the Department of Agriculture on its annual fire ant spraying program and ends with a 13-page document from the DOT concerning the repaving of 4.4 miles of roadway in Lafayette County, Wisconsin. Although most of the 200 statements in between run no more than 100 pages, there are exceptions: The final impact statement on the trans-Alaska pipeline, released late last month, fills nine volumes and weighs 18 pounds. Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton describes this weighty compilation as the most thorough examination of environmental effects that "any work of man has ever had." In any case it is one of the longest and, from all appearances, a great improvement over the first try—a 200-page paper so poor that even the Army Corps of Engineers found itself complaining about it last year.

As might be expected, such a massive new occupation as the writing of impact statements has brought with it some difficult learning experiences and even some organizational changes in a number of departments and bureaus. Each of more than 40 agencies has had to compose complex guidelines for writing its statements, and then has had to train hundreds of professional and clerical employees to use the guidelines. Some agencies, like the AEC, have had to start from scratch a second time, after a federal court ruling, in effect, invalidated the first set.

Throughout the Executive Branch the advent of NEPA has also fostered the appearance of new offices of environmental affairs and improved the fortunes of old ones, as agency heads have come to recognize that a deftly written impact statement can make all the difference between smooth sailing for a program and complete paralysis. Now, hardly a federal agency is without an environmental office, and those that lack one have not escaped NEPA's grasp entirely. The Securities and Exchange Commission, for example, requires corporate stock prospectuses to disclose a company's expenditures for meeting pollution control regulations and to own up to environmental lawsuits hanging over it.

Rough estimates of what complying with NEPA has cost the government in manpower and dollars are impressive but nonetheless small compared with overall budgets and employment. The AEC, for example, has 200 employees doing nothing but writing its own impact statements and reviewing scores of them from other agencies. (Any given statement generates anywhere from 5 to 35 sets of comments from sister agencies.) Atomic Energy Commission chairman James R. Schlesinger estimates that this effort will cost the commission about $6 million in fiscal 1973, or less than 1 percent of the AEC budget.

The Agriculture Department estimates that impact studies and statements for the Forest Service, pesticide programs, flood-control projects, and a wide assortment of other projects will cost $2 million this year. The Interior Department predicts an outlay of $8 million and the diversion of 400 to 600 man-years to NEPA activities. An added expense for the Interior Department is a new computer system to keep track of hundreds of NEPA documents circulating through its Washington headquarters and field offices scattered across the country.

There is a widespread feeling in Washington, and not just among environmentalists, that all this prodigious labor must have had a salutory effect on the federal bureaucracy, that it has been or will be something of a consciousness-raising experience. As Russell Train told a recent Senate hearing, the result of the mandatory analyses and the interagency consultations "can only be more informed decision-making." Despite some complaints about the assiduousness with which the courts have been enforcing NEPA, Interior Secretary Morton and AEC Chairman Schlesinger have voiced similar thoughts. Roger Cramton, the chairman of an

Court Affirms AEC Authority

The Supreme Court on 3 April said no to states that want to set radioactive effluent standards for nuclear power plants that are more restrictive than those of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC).

The seven to two decision culminated a suit brought by the Northern States Power Company of Minnesota. The company sought to invalidate state regulations that set allowable radioactive emissions at about 2 percent of those permitted by the AEC. The brief, unsigned order affirmed the argument of lower courts that it was the intention of Congress to make power plant radiation standards the "exclusive responsibility" of the AEC.

Several states have been inducing utilities to conform with standards that go beyond those of the AEC, but Minnesota is the only one in which a company has brought the matter to court.

The AEC announced last June that it planned to lower the ceiling for radioactive emissions to about 1 percent of what is presently allowed, which would bring them roughly in conformity with the tighter state standards. Nonetheless, many state officials are upset by the court decision. A spokesman for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency said that the state and the AEC still differ over permissible emissions for various isotopes. Further, he says, the court decision runs against the state's approach, which is to work with each company individually to bring emissions down to the lowest practicable level.

A lawyer for Pennsylvania's Office of Radiological Health, which also has its own emission standards for nuclear power plants, says that the decision has seriously undercut states' potential to exert pressure on the AEC to improve its standards.

Power companies have generally shown a willingness to cooperate with state guidelines while the authority of states in this area awaited clarification. Continued voluntary compliance is in doubt now that states have no legal recourse.

Several members of Congress have introduced bills that would give states clear authority to lay on restrictions for radioactive emissions above and beyond those of the AEC. These are now sitting in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and there is no evidence that the recent Supreme Court decision will hasten action.—C.H.