

C. Humphrey: So Ken Bogdan and Richard Hardt just provided you with an overview of cumulative effects, and then they also went through the 7-step approach that's described in the BLM NEPA Handbook. Now you know here at the Training Center we like to tell you what we're gonna tell you, and then we tell you, and then we tell you what we told you? We're gonna do something different this time. Instead of us telling you again what we just told you, we're gonna let you take an ungraded self-assessment to see if you learned the important concepts.

Now after you answer each question, you just select the appropriate button and the instructors will let you know if your answer was correct or not and why. So if you're ready, let's get started, and if not, let's try anyway.

Question 1

R. Hardt: The correct answer is section 6.8.3 on page 57 of the BLM NEPA Handbook. If you haven't read it before, now is the time.

Question 2

K. Bogdan: The correct answer is 40 CFR 1508.7. This definition is repeated in the BLM NEPA Handbook in Section 6.8.3, so you should already be familiar with it.

Question 3

R. Hardt: If you answered past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions then you are correct. The CEQ Regulations explain that your analysis of cumulative effects needs to address the effects of all of these.

Question 4

K. Bogdan: If you answered True, sorry, that's not correct. In addition to analyzing the cumulative effects in an EIS, we also need to analyze this in an EA supporting the conclusion on whether it constitutes a significant impact. Also, don't forget, cumulative effects are important when reviewing whether there are extraordinary circumstances precluding the use of a categorical exclusion.

R. Hardt: If you answered False, that's correct. In addition to analysis in an EIS, we need to analyze cumulative effects when preparing an EA to consider whether they constitute a significant impact. Also, we must consider cumulative effects in reviewing whether there are extraordinary circumstances precluding the use of a categorical exclusion.

Question 5

R. Hardt: If you answered True, I'm sorry but that's not correct. We are concerned about the incremental impact of our actions when added to the impact of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. If there is no incremental effect from our action, our analysis is finished.

K. Bogdan: If you answered False, that's correct. We are concerned about the incremental impact of our action when added to the impact of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future action. If there's no incremental effect, that means neither a direct or indirect effect from our action, our analysis is finished.

Question 6

R. Hardt: If you answered True, that's correct. The effects of the action, especially indirect effects, often extend beyond the duration of the action itself. For example, a prescribed burn may be completed in a single day, but the effects of the burn on wildlife habitat can last for years or decades.

K. Bogdan: If you answered False, I'm sorry, that's not correct. The effects of the action, especially indirect effects, often extend beyond the duration of the action itself. For example, a prescribed burn may be complete in a single day, but the effects of the burn on wildlife habitat or other resources can last for years and possibly even decades.

Question 7

R. Hardt: If you answered D, that's correct. The BLM NEPA Handbook explains you are not required to speculate about future actions that are merely possible but not highly probable based on the information available to you. This land exchange is merely a rumor for which there is no decision. There is no funding or formal proposal or which is highly probable based on known opportunities or trends.

K. Bogdan: If you answered A, I'm sorry, that's not correct. The BLM NEPA Handbook explains that reasonably foreseeable future actions include those which have a formal proposal. Completed NEPA analysis constitutes a formal proposal, so you *would* need to include this in your cumulative effects analysis.

R. Hardt: If you answered B, I'm sorry, that's not correct. The BLM NEPA Handbook explains that reasonably foreseeable future actions include those for which there are funding or formal proposals, so you *would* need to include this in your cumulative effects analysis.

K. Bogdan: If you answered C, sorry, that's not correct. The BLM NEPA Handbook explains that reasonably foreseeable actions include those that are highly probable, based on known opportunities or trends, even if there are no existing decisions or funding or formal proposals, so you *would* need to include this in your cumulative effects analysis.