United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240

JUL 15 2005

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

PEP – ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT MEMORANDUM NO. ESM05-2

To: Heads of Bureaus and Offices

From: Willie R. Taylor, Director
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

Subject: Guidance on Consideration in Cumulative Effects Analysis

The requirements in this Environmental Statement Memorandum (ESM) are being issued under the authority provided to the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance (OEPC) by 381 Departmental Manual (DM) 4.5B, to convey instructions and guidance through its Environmental Memoranda Series, and by 516 DM 6.2, which authorizes OEPC to provide advice and assistance to the Department on matters pertaining to environmental quality and for overseeing and coordinating the Department's compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, and 516 DM 4.22, which authorizes OEPC to provide further guidance concerning NEPA.

1. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit the CEQ's guidance on the consideration of past actions in cumulative effects analysis contained in its memorandum, dated June 24, 2005 (CEQ memo attached).

2. Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative impact, as defined in the CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1508.7, is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of which agency (Federal or non-Federal), or person undertakes such other actions.

The CEQ memorandum provides guidance on the extent to which agencies of the Federal government are required to analyze the environmental impacts of past actions when they describe the cumulative environmental impact of a proposed action under NEPA. Agencies must continue to consider the aggregate effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in determining cumulative impact on the affected environment.

Attachment

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

June 24, 2005

MEMORANDUM

FROM: JAMES L. CONNAUGHTON
CHAIRMAN

TO: HEADS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

RE: GUIDANCE ON THE CONSIDERATION OF PAST ACTIONS IN CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS

I. Introduction

In this Memorandum, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) provides guidance on the extent to which agencies of the Federal government are required to analyze the environmental effects of past actions when they describe the cumulative environmental effect of a proposed action in accordance with Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4332, and the CEQ Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA, 40 C.F.R. parts 1500-1508. CEQ's interpretation of NEPA is entitled to deference. *Andrus v. Sierra Club*, 442 U.S. 347, 358 (1979).

II. Guidance

The environmental analysis required under NEPA is forward-looking, in that it focuses on the potential impacts of the proposed action that an agency is considering. Thus, review of past actions is required to the extent that this review informs agency decisionmaking regarding the proposed action. This can occur in two ways:

First, the effects of past actions may warrant consideration in the analysis of the cumulative effects of a proposal for agency action. CEQ interprets NEPA and CEQ's NEPA regulations on cumulative effects as requiring analysis and a concise description of the identifiable present effects of past actions to the extent that they are relevant and useful in analyzing whether the reasonably foreseeable effects of the agency proposal for action and its alternatives may have a continuing, additive and significant relationship to those effects. In determining what information is necessary for a cumulative effects analysis, agencies should use scoping to focus on the extent to which information is "relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts," is "essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives," and can be obtained without exorbitant cost. 40 CFR 1502.22. Based on scoping, agencies have discretion to determine whether, and to what extent, information about the specific nature, design, or present effects of a past action is useful for the agency's analysis of the effects of a proposal for agency action and its reasonable alternatives.

Agencies are not required to list or analyze the effects of individual past actions unless such information is necessary to describe the cumulative effect of all past actions combined. Agencies retain substantial discretion as to the extent of such inquiry and the appropriate level of explanation. *Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council*, 490 U.S. 360, 376-77 (1989). Generally, agencies can conduct an adequate cumulative effects analysis by focusing on the current aggregate effects of past actions without delving into the historical details of individual past actions.

Second, experience with and information about past direct and indirect effects of individual past actions may also be useful in illuminating or predicting the direct and indirect effects of a proposed action. However, these effects of past actions may have no cumulative relationship to the effects of the proposed action. Therefore, agencies should clearly distinguish analysis of direct and indirect effects based on information about past actions from a cumulative effects analysis of past actions.

III. Discussion

The CEQ regulations for the implementation of NEPA define cumulative effects consistent with the Supreme Court's reading of NEPA in *Kleppe v. Sierra Club*, 427 U.S. 390, 413-414 (1976). "Cumulative impact" is defined in CEQ's NEPA regulations as the "impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions . . ." 40 CFR 1508.7. CEQ interprets this regulation as referring only to the cumulative impact of the direct and indirect effects of the proposed action and its alternatives when added to the aggregate effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

Agencies should be guided in their cumulative effects analysis by the scoping process, in which agencies identify the scope and "significant" issues to be addressed in an environmental impact statement. 40 CFR 1500.1(b), 1500.4(g), 1501.7, 1508.25. In the context of scoping, agencies typically decide the extent to which "it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment." 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7). Agencies should ensure that their NEPA process produces environmental information that is useful to decisionmakers and the public by reducing the "accumulation of extraneous background data" and by "emphasiz[ing] real environmental issues and alternatives." 40 CFR 1500.2(b). Accordingly, the NEPA process requires agencies to identify "the significant environmental issues deserving study and deemphasizing insignificant issues, narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement" at an early stage of agency planning. 40 CFR 15001.1(d). The Supreme Court has also emphasized that agencies may properly limit the scope of their cumulative effects analysis based on practical considerations. *Kleppe*, 427 U.S at 414. The CEQ regulations provide for explicit documentation of such practical considerations when there is incomplete or unavailable information that is relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts. 40 CFR 1502.22. The extent and form of the information needed to analyze appropriately the cumulative effects of a proposed action and alternatives under NEPA varies widely and must be determined by the federal agency proposing the action on a case-by-case basis.

The analysis of cumulative effects begins with consideration of the direct and indirect effects on the environment that are expected or likely to result from the alternative proposals for

Recycled Paper

agency action. Agencies then look for present effects of past actions that are, in the judgment of the agency, relevant and useful because they have a significant cause-and-effect relationship with the direct and indirect effects of the proposal for agency action and its alternatives. CEQ regulations do not require the consideration of the individual effects of all past actions to determine the present effects of past actions. Once the agency has identified those present effects of past actions that warrant consideration, the agency assesses the extent that the effects of the proposal for agency action or its alternatives will add to, modify, or mitigate those effects. The final analysis documents an agency assessment of the cumulative effects of the actions considered (including past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions) on the affected environment.

With respect to past actions, during the scoping process and subsequent preparation of the analysis, the agency must determine what information regarding past actions is useful and relevant to the required analysis of cumulative effects. Cataloging past actions and specific information about the direct and indirect effects of their design and implementation could in some contexts be useful to predict the cumulative effects of the proposal. The CEQ regulations, however, do not require agencies to catalogue or exhaustively list and analyze all individual past actions. Simply because information about past actions may be available or obtained with reasonable effort does not mean that it is relevant and necessary to inform decisionmaking.

IV. Tools for NEPA Practitioners

a. Scoping:

It is not practical to analyze how the cumulative effects of an action interact with the universe; the analysis of environmental effects must focus on the aggregate effects of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions that are truly meaningful. Thus, analysts must narrow the focus of the cumulative effects analysis to effects of significance to the proposal for agency action and its alternatives, based on thorough scoping. A specific objective of scoping is to save time in the overall process by helping to ensure that draft statements adequately address the effects of the proposed action and alternatives that should be addressed. See Scoping Guidance (CEQ 1981) (http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/guidance.html). Scoping provides the agency the opportunity to focus in on those cumulative effects that may be significant. The scope of the cumulative impact analysis is related to the magnitude of the environmental impacts of the proposed action. Proposed actions of limited scope typically do not require as comprehensive an assessment of cumulative impacts as proposed actions that have significant environmental impacts over a large area. Proposed actions that are typically finalized with a finding of no significant impact usually involve only a limited cumulative impact assessment to confirm that the effects of the proposed action do not reach a point of significant environmental impacts. Except in extraordinary circumstances, proposed actions that are categorically excluded from NEPA analysis do not involve cumulative impact analyses.

b. Incomplete and Unavailable Information:

The purpose of 40 CFR 1502.22 is to disclose the fact of incomplete or unavailable information, to acquire information if it is "relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts" and "essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives," and to advance decision-making

Recycled Paper

even in the absence of all information regarding reasonably foreseeable effects. The focus of this provision is, first and foremost, on "significant adverse impacts." The agency must find that the incomplete information is relevant to a "reasonably foreseeable" and "significant" impact before the agency is required to comply with 40 CFR 1502.22. If the incomplete cumulative effects information meets that threshold, the agency must consider the "overall costs" of obtaining the information. 40 CFR 1502.22(a). The term "overall costs" encompasses financial costs and other costs such as costs in terms of time (delay), program and personnel commitments. The requirement to determine if the "overall costs" of obtaining information is exorbitant should not be interpreted as a requirement to weigh the cost of obtaining the information against the severity of the effects, or to perform a cost-benefit analysis. Rather, the agency must assess overall costs in light of agency environmental program needs.

c. Programmatic Evaluations

In geographic settings where several Federal actions are likely to have effects on the same environmental resources it may be advisable for the lead Federal agencies to cooperate to provide historical or other baseline information relating to the resources. This can be done either through a programmatic NEPA analysis or can be done separately, such as through a joint inventory or planning study. The results can then be incorporated by reference into NEPA documents prepared for specific Federal actions so long as the programmatic analysis or study is reasonably available to the interested public.

d. Environmental Management Systems:

Agencies are encouraged at their discretion to consider whether programmatic coordination of cumulative effects analysis can be assisted through implementation of environmental management systems (EMS). See Executive Order 13148, 65 Fed. Reg. 24,595 (April 21, 2000); Memorandum from the Chairman of CEQ and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to heads of all Federal agencies (http://www.whitehouse.gov/ceq/memoranda01.html). Pursuant to Executive Order 13148, agencies that choose to use an EMS to improve their cumulative analysis may find that the EMS can be designed and implemented to more efficiently meet NEPA requirements, improve public participation in the NEPA process, and provide a framework for cumulative effects analysis and adaptive management. By managing information collection on an ongoing basis, an EMS can provide a more systematic approach to agencies' identification and management of environmental conditions and obligations. Agencies can use an EMS to confirm assumptions, track performance, and increase confidence in their assessment of cumulative environmental effects.

d. Direct and Indirect Effects:

In some cases, based on scoping, information about the effects of past actions that were similar to the proposed action may be useful in describing the possible effects of the proposed action. In these circumstances, agencies should consider using available information about the effects of individual past actions that help illuminate or predict the direct or indirect effects of the proposed action and its alternatives. Agencies should clearly distinguish their use of past experience in direct and indirect effects analysis from their cumulative effects analysis.

Recycled Paper