



Environmental Justice at the Local and Regional Level

Legal Background

Cities, counties, and other local governmental entities have an important role to play in ensuring environmental justice for all of California's residents. Under state law:

“[E]nvironmental justice” means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

(Gov. Code, § 65040.12, subd. (e).) Fairness in this context means that the *benefits* of a healthy environment should be available to everyone, and the *burdens* of pollution should not be focused on sensitive populations or on communities that already are experiencing its adverse effects.

Many local governments recognize the advantages of environmental justice; these include healthier children, fewer school days lost to illness and asthma, a more productive workforce, and a cleaner and more sustainable environment. Environmental justice cannot be achieved, however, simply by adopting generalized policies and goals. Instead, environmental justice requires an ongoing commitment to identifying existing and potential problems, and to finding and applying solutions, both in approving specific projects and planning for future development.

There are a number of state laws and programs relating to environmental justice. This document explains two sources of environmental justice-related responsibilities for local governments, which are contained in the Government Code and in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Government Code

Government Code section 11135, subdivision (a) provides in relevant part:

No person in the State of California shall, on the basis of race, national origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, color, or disability, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any financial assistance from the state....

While this provision does not include the words “environmental justice,” in certain circumstances, it can require local agencies to undertake the same consideration of fairness in the distribution of environmental benefits and burdens discussed above. Where, for example, a general plan update is funded by or receives financial assistance from the state or a state agency, the local government should take special care to ensure that the plan's goals, objectives, policies and implementation measures (a) foster equal access to a clean environment and public health benefits (such as parks, sidewalks, and public transportation); and (b) do not result in

concentration of polluting activities near communities that fall into the categories defined in Government Code section 11135.¹ In addition, in formulating its public outreach for the general plan update, the local agency should evaluate whether regulations governing equal “opportunity to participate” and requiring “alternative communication services” (e.g., translations) apply. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 22, §§ 98101, 98211.)

Government Code section 11136 provides for an administrative hearing by a state agency to decide whether a violation of Government Code section 11135 has occurred. If the state agency determines that the local government has violated the statute, it is required to take action to “curtail” state funding in whole or in part to the local agency. (Gov. Code, § 11137.) In addition, a civil action may be brought in state court to enforce section 11135. (Gov. Code, § 11139.)

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Under CEQA, “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects” (Pub. Res. Code, § 21002.) CEQA does not use the term “environmental justice.” Rather, CEQA centers on whether a project may have a significant effect on the physical environment. Under CEQA, human beings are an integral part of the “environment.” An agency is required to find that a “project may have a ‘significant effect on the environment’” if, among other things, “[t]he environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly[.]” (Pub. Res. Code, § 21083, subd. (b)(3); see also CEQA Guidelines,² § 15126.2 [noting that a project may cause a significant effect by bringing people to hazards].) As set out below, by following well-established CEQA principles, local governments can help achieve environmental justice.

CEQA’s Purposes

The importance of a healthy environment for all of California’s residents is reflected in CEQA’s purposes. In passing CEQA, the Legislature determined:

- “The maintenance of a quality environment for the people of this state now and in the future is a matter of statewide concern.” (Pub. Res. Code, § 21000, subd. (a).)
- We must “identify any critical thresholds for the health and safety of the people of the state and take all coordinated actions necessary to prevent such thresholds from being reached.” (*Id.* at subd. (d).)

¹ To support a finding that such concentration will not occur, the local government likely will need to identify candidate communities and assess their current burdens.

² The CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 15000, et seq.) are available at <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/>.

- “[M]ajor consideration [must be] given to preventing environmental damage, while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.” (*Id.* at subd. (g).)
- We must “[t]ake all action necessary to provide the people of this state with clean air and water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities, and freedom from excessive noise.” (Pub. Res. Code, § 21001, subd. (b).)

Specific provisions of CEQA and its Guidelines require that local lead agencies consider how the environmental and public health burdens of a project might specially affect certain communities. Several examples follow.

Environmental Setting and Cumulative Impacts

There are a number of different types of projects that have the potential to cause physical impacts to low-income communities and communities of color. One example is a project that will emit pollution. Where a project will cause pollution, the relevant question under CEQA is whether the environmental effect of the pollution is significant. In making this determination, two long-standing CEQA considerations that may relate to environmental justice are relevant – setting and cumulative impacts.

It is well established that “[t]he significance of an activity depends upon the setting.” (*Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 718 [citing CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subd. (b)]; see also *id.* at 721; CEQA Guidelines, § 15300.2, subd. (a) [noting that availability of listed CEQA exceptions “are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant.”]) For example, a proposed project’s particulate emissions might not be significant if the project will be located in a sparsely populated area, but may be significant if the project will be located in the air shed of a community whose residents may be particularly sensitive to this type of pollution, or already are experiencing higher-than-average asthma rates. A lead agency therefore should take special care to determine whether the project will expose “sensitive receptors” to pollution (see, e.g., CEQA Guidelines, App. G); if it will, the impacts of that pollution are more likely to be significant.³

In addition, CEQA requires a lead agency to consider whether a project’s effects, while they might appear limited on their own, are “cumulatively considerable” and therefore significant. (Pub. Res. Code, § 21083, subd. (b)(3).) “[C]umulatively considerable’ means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” (*Id.*) This requires a local lead agency to determine whether pollution from a

³ “[A] number of studies have reported increased sensitivity to pollution, for communities with low income levels, low education levels, and other biological and social factors. This combination of multiple pollutants and increased sensitivity in these communities can result in a higher cumulative pollution impact.” Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, *Cumulative Impacts: Building a Scientific Foundation* (Dec. 2010), Exec. Summary, p. ix, available at <http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/cipa123110.html>.

proposed project will have significant effects on any nearby communities, when considered together with any pollution burdens those communities already are bearing, or may bear from probable future projects. Accordingly, the fact that an area already is polluted makes it *more likely* that any additional, unmitigated pollution will be significant. Where there already is a high pollution burden on a community, the “relevant question” is “whether any additional amount” of pollution “should be considered significant in light of the serious nature” of the existing problem. (*Hanford, supra*, 221 Cal.App.3d at 661; see also *Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. City of Los Angeles* (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 1019, 1025 [holding that “the relevant issue ... is not the relative amount of traffic noise resulting from the project when compared to existing traffic noise, but whether any additional amount of traffic noise should be considered significant in light of the serious nature of the traffic noise problem already existing around the schools.”])

The Role of Social and Economic Impacts Under CEQA

Although CEQA focuses on impacts to the physical environment, economic and social effects may be relevant in determining significance under CEQA in two ways. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15064, subd. (e), 15131.) First, as the CEQA Guidelines note, social or economic impacts may lead to physical changes to the environment that are significant. (*Id.* at §§ 15064, subd. (e), 15131, subd. (a).) To illustrate, if a proposed development project may cause economic harm to a community’s existing businesses, and if that could in turn “result in business closures and physical deterioration” of that community, then the agency “should consider these problems to the extent that potential is demonstrated to be an indirect environmental effect of the proposed project.” (See *Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mt. Shasta* (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 433, 446.)

Second, the economic and social effects of a physical change to the environment may be considered in determining whether that physical change is significant. (*Id.* at §§ 15064, subd. (e), 15131, subd. (b).) The CEQA Guidelines illustrate: “For example, if the construction of a new freeway or rail line divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the effect would be significant.” (*Id.* at § 15131, subd. (b); see also *id.* at § 15382 [“A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.”])

Alternatives and Mitigation

CEQA’s “substantive mandate” prohibits agencies from approving projects with significant environmental effects if there are feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would substantially lessen or avoid those effects. (*Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish and Game Commission* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 105, 134.) Where a local agency has determined that a project may cause significant impacts to a particular community or sensitive subgroup, the alternative and mitigation analyses should address ways to reduce or eliminate the project’s impacts to that community or subgroup. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15041, subd. (a) [noting need for “nexus” between required changes and project’s impacts].)

Depending on the circumstances of the project, the local agency may be required to consider alternative project locations (see *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 404) or alternative project designs (see *Citizens of Goleta*

Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167, 1183) that could reduce or eliminate the effects of the project on the affected community.

The lead agency should discuss and develop mitigation in a process that is accessible to the public and the affected community. “Fundamentally, the development of mitigation measures, as envisioned by CEQA, is not meant to be a bilateral negotiation between a project proponent and the lead agency after project approval; but rather, an open process that also involves other interested agencies and the public.” (*Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 93.) Further, “[m]itigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4, subd. (a)(2).)

As part of the enforcement process, “[i]n order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented,” the local agency must also adopt a program for mitigation monitoring or reporting. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15097, subd. (a).) “The purpose of these [monitoring and reporting] requirements is to ensure that feasible mitigation measures will actually be implemented as a condition of development, and not merely adopted and then neglected or disregarded.” (*Federation of Hillside and Canyon Assns. v. City of Los Angeles* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1252, 1261.) Where a local agency adopts a monitoring or reporting program related to the mitigation of impacts to a particular community or sensitive subgroup, its monitoring and reporting necessarily should focus on data from that community or subgroup.

Transparency in Statements of Overriding Consideration

Under CEQA, a local government is charged with the important task of “determining whether and how a project should be approved,” and must exercise its own best judgment to “balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors and in particular the goal of providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15021, subd. (d).) A local agency has discretion to approve a project even where, after application of all feasible mitigation, the project will have unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. (*Id.* at § 15093.) When the agency does so, however, it must be clear and transparent about the balance it has struck.

To satisfy CEQA’s public information and informed decision making purposes, in making a statement of overriding considerations, the agency should clearly state not only the “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits” that, in its view, warrant approval of the project, but also the project’s “unavoidable adverse environmental effects[.]” (*Id.* at subd. (a).) If, for example, the benefits of the project will be enjoyed widely, but the environmental burdens of a project will be felt particularly by the neighboring communities, this should be set out plainly in the statement of overriding considerations.

* * * *

The Attorney General's Office appreciates the leadership role that local governments have played, and will continue to play, in ensuring that environmental justice is achieved for all of California's residents. Additional information about environmental justice may be found on the Attorney General's website at <http://oag.ca.gov/environment>.