

Rob Laurent
118 ½ Center St.
Findlay, Ohio 45840

After reading the suggestions for improvement made by the Task Force, I have come to the conclusion that all of them are pertinent to the existing problems with the NEPA process. The only problem that I still see is that in recommendation 1.1, the recommendation is too vague. What constitutes a project that requires substantial planning, time, resources, or expenditures? Substantial should be defined somewhere in the document so time and money spent on reviewing EIS's is not wasted on projects that do not warrant an EIS.

Despite the problem with recommendation 1.1 I feel that the rest of the recommendations will be very effective. Recommendation 4.1 is a good one because it outlines the standing that one must have in order to file a suit. Again, this will eliminate time wasted on litigation, instead of following through with a project. Another impressive recommendation is that of 5.1, in which only feasible alternatives are to be included in the EIS in order to shorten the length of the document and to minimize wasted time investigating unrealistic alternatives.

Overall, I feel that the recommendations will be nothing but positive in improving the Environmental Impact Statement procedures.