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INTRODUCTION

San Francisco’s Planning Department erroneously exempted a project to construct a ten-million gallon biodiesel facility in an urban area from environmental review. This decision was made despite the fact that the facility’s potential air emissions, water discharges, and hazardous material usage could significantly impact the low-income minority community where it was planned. This decision was also at odds with similar projects in California that had undergone environmental review, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s recommendation that these projects be reviewed under the analogous federal requirements. Fortunately, the community discovered this exemption decision in an off-hand reference in meeting minutes before a different agency and was able to appeal the decision. No official notice of this decision was posted or given to the community. Although the Planning Department’s exemption decision, which was eventually set aside, was erroneous, the lack of notice of its decision was legally permissible.

Public agencies that exempt projects from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are not required to record or publish their decisions. Because of this dearth of requirements, large projects, such as the one described above, can be erroneously exempted from CEQA’s environmental assessment requirements without the public’s knowledge. This problem can be remedied. Exemption decisions made for projects that could cause environmental impacts should have notice requirements. Otherwise exemption decisions will remain unchecked and communities will have no way

---


4 See EPA BIODIESEL MANUAL, supra note 2, at 2-3.

to ensure that significant projects undergo environmental review.

This article will initially describe CEQA, its exemptions, and the lack of notice requirements for exemption decisions. Next, this article will set forth the reasons why additional notice provisions are necessary to protect communities from agencies erroneously exempting projects that adversely impact the environment from environmental review. Lastly, this article will propose guidelines for projects that should require additional notice, explain how to implement them, and outline the information the notice should contain.

I. OVERVIEW OF CEQA AND ITS EXEMPTIONS

CEQA has been widely recognized as an effective vehicle for public participation in proceedings that evaluate the environmental impact of projects. This valuable opportunity does not occur when decisions are exempted from CEQA analysis. This section will describe this backdrop by explaining CEQA generally, CEQA's exemptions, and the notice requirements and standards for reviewing exemption decisions.

A. CEQA Generally

"CEQA is a comprehensive legislative scheme designed to provide long-term protection to the environment." To accomplish this, CEQA directs public agencies responsible for regulating activities affecting the environment to give prime consideration to preventing environmental damage when carrying out their duties. A public agency's CEQA analysis must also provide a vehicle for public participation by creating a record that is "sufficient to allow informed decision-making." This requirement promotes public participation, which is
considered "an essential part of the CEQA process." CEQA’s focus on providing information to the public is reiterated throughout its requirements.

A CEQA evaluation begins with an agency deciding what level of analysis CEQA requires for a particular project. An agency’s first step is determining whether a project is a project subject to CEQA review. If the project could be subject to CEQA, the agency’s next step is to determine whether the project is categorically or statutorily exempt from CEQA. If a project fits within a categorical or statutory exemption, no formal evaluation is required, and the project can be implemented without any CEQA evaluation.

If a project is not exempt, the public agency must perform an initial study to determine whether the project will have a significant effect on the environment. If the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the agency prepares a negative declaration. When the project will have a significant impact on the environment, CEQA requires further agency action. The agency may prepare a mitigated negative declaration if revisions to the project made or agreed to by the applicant would avoid or mitigate impacts to a point where clearly no significant impacts would occur. Otherwise, the agency must prepare an environmental impact report, which

that CEQA’s functions are well-served by a commitment to public input).

13 See, e.g., CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21092 (West 2009) (requiring notice of draft negative declaration and environmental impact report to individuals who request a copy). This is also included in local city ordinances. For example, under the San Francisco Administrative Code, one of the purposes of CEQA is to “[p]rovide decision makers and the public with meaningful information regarding the environmental consequences of proposed activities.” S.F., CAL., ADMIN. CODE § 31.02 (2001).
15 See tit. 14, § 15060(c) (listing classes of project subject to CEQA). See also S.F., CAL. ENV’T. CODE § 101 (2003) (providing that San Francisco government decisions must be made according to the precautionary principle).
18 See tit. 14, § 15063. The initial study is the preliminary investigative tool to identify environmental effects and can be part of the basis of a decision whether or not an environmental impact report should be prepared.
19 See id. § 15070. If the initial study does not produce a fair argument of a reasonable possibility of significant adverse environmental impacts, the agency may adopt a negative declaration.
20 See id. § 15070(b). If a project owner agrees to mitigate the project to either eliminate significant impacts or to reduce the impacts where clearly no significant impact would occur, a mitigated negative declaration can be used.
analyzes alternatives to the project and determines whether less harmful alternatives are feasible.

B. CEQA's Exemptions

As described above, CEQA has two categories of exemptions – statutory and categorical. The purpose of these exemptions is to expedite review of and minimize resources spent reviewing emergency projects, required projects, or projects which are unlikely to significantly impact the environment.

Statutory exemptions are exemptions specified by the Legislature that exempt certain types of projects either completely from CEQA, from some CEQA requirements, or from some of the timing rules. Statutory exemptions can apply to projects despite potential environmental impacts. Some statutory exemptions cover specific types of projects such as the issuance of discharge requirements, adoption of coastal plans and programs, and disapproved projects. Other statutory exemptions apply on a case-by-case basis for projects that qualify as ministerial or emergency projects. Ministerial projects are projects like the issuance of permits or licenses that are not discretionary. Emergency projects are projects necessitated from the occurrence of some unexpected event.

Categorical exemptions apply to project categories that the Secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency has found not to have significant effect on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines, found in Title 14 of the California Public Resources Code, § 210080, provide an escape from the EIR requirement despite a project's clear, significant impact.

Ministerial projects can be defined by the particular agency: "Each public agency should, in its implementing regulations or ordinances, provide an identification or itemization of its projects or actions which are deemed ministerial under the applicable laws and ordinances." Title 14, § 15268.

Emergency actions cover "specific actions to prevent or mitigate an emergency" or "[p]rojects undertaken, carried out, or approved by a public agency to maintain, repair, or restore an existing highway damaged by fire, flood, storm, earthquake, land subsidence, gradual earth movement, or landslide, provided that the project is within the existing right of way of that highway and is initiated within one year of the damage occurring." Title 14, § 15269. See also CAL. PUB. RES. CODE §§ 21080(b), 21080.33, 21172 (2009).

Categorical exemptions apply to project categories that the Secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency has found not to have significant effect on the environment.
Code of Regulations, set forth over thirty categorical exemptions. These exemptions cover a broad array of projects ranging from minor alterations of existing facilities to the construction of certain types of buildings. Like the statutory exemptions, if a project fits within a categorical exemption, no formal evaluation is required, and the project can be implemented without a CEQA evaluation.

However, unlike the statutory exemptions, a project can only be categorically exempt if it does not fit under a listed exception. These exceptions prevent projects from being exempted if there is a reasonable possibility that significant environmental impacts will result due to unusual circumstances. The determination of "whether a circumstance is ‘unusual’ is judged relative to the typical circumstances related to an otherwise typically exempt project." For example, in a case examining whether a categorical exemption for existing facilities applied to a landfill’s plan to dump an additional 3.2 million tons of municipal waste, the court found the exemption did not apply because there was a threat to the environment posed by the eighty acre unlined site “due to numerous circumstances that are unusual [when compared to] existing facilities in general.”

Categorical exemptions also cannot apply if significant cumulative impacts could result from successive projects of same type in the same place. These exceptions also require projects that could impact scenic highways, projects...

31 See tit. 14, §§ 15300-15332. The CEQA Guidelines are careful to explain that categorical exemptions should not be applied to projects that are already determined to be exempt under a statutory exemption. Id. §15300.2.

32 See discussion infra Part II.A (discussing types of projects covered under categorical exemptions).

33 See tit. 14, §§ 15301-15333.

34 See id. § 15061(b).


36 See tit. 14, § 15300.2(c). The application of the “significant effect” exception requires two distinct inquiries. See also Banker’s Hill vs. City of San Diego, 139 Cal. App. 4th 249, 278 (Ct. App. 2006). First, a party must make a “fair argument” that there is a “reasonable possibility” a project will have a significant effect on the environment. Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster, 52 Cal. App. 4th 1165, 1197-98 (Ct. App. 1997). Second, the “change in the environment” must be “due to unusual circumstances.” Banker’s Hill, 139 Cal. App. 4th at 278.

37 Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce v. City of Santa Monica, 101 Cal. App. 4th 786, 801 (Ct. App. 2002). “The test is satisfied where the circumstances of a particular project (i) differ from the general circumstances of the projects covered by a particular categorical exemption, and (ii) those circumstances create an environmental risk that does not exist for the general class of exempt projects.” Azusa, 52 Cal. App. 4th at 1207.

38 See Azusa, 52 Cal. App. 4th at 1187.

39 Id. at 1209 (emphasis added).

40 Tit. 14, § 15300.2(b).

41 CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21084(b) (2009). This exception provides that a project that “may result in damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, historical buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources” cannot be exempted. Id.
located on sites impacted by hazardous wastes and projects that may affect historical resources to undergo environmental review. In addition, in certain situations, agencies cannot exempt projects in sensitive environments.

C. Lack of Notice Requirements for Exemption Decisions

Once a public agency finds that a project is exempt, it is not required to record its decision or the reasons for its decision. An agency also does not have to provide the public with an opportunity to review its decision. If an agency does record its decision, the agency may file a notice of it, called a Notice of Exemption, with the county clerk for local agencies or with the State’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for state agencies. An applicant can also file a notice of an exemption decision as long as the certificate of determination is attached. If a local agency records and files a notice, it must retain the notice for twelve months.

The statute of limitations to appeal an exemption decision is determined by whether or not the notice is filed. If an agency or applicant with either the county clerk of the Office of Planning and Research, there is a thirty-five day statute of limitations period for litigation on CEQA grounds. If the agency or applicant does not file a notice of the exemption decision, the statute of limitations is 180 days from the date the decision is made to carry out or approve the project. Where an agency has not made a formal decision approving the project, the statute of limitations is 180 days from the date the project is commenced.

Although all public agencies are encouraged to make copies of Notices of

42 See id. § 21084(c). Projects cannot be exempt under this provision if they are located on sites the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Secretary for Environmental Protection have identified as affected by hazardous waste pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5.

43 See id. § 21084(e). Projects “that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” cannot be exempted. Id.

44 See tit. 14, § 15300.2(a) (2009). This section includes installing small new facilities, minor public or private alternations in the conditions of land, water or vegetation, and construction of minor structures accessory to existing facilities. Id.

45 See, e.g., id. § 15062 (providing no requirement to write down decision).

46 Id. §§ 15060-15061. See also CalBeach Advocates v. City of Solana Beach, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 9 (Ct. App. 2002) (holding no specified findings required to support an exemption decision); Magan v. County of Kings, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344, 349 (Ct. App. 2002).

47 One court stated that although the city “chose to combine approval processes for the site development, permit and the categorical exemption in a public hearing does not mean the public hearing was mandated by state law or local ordinance.” Ass’n for Prot. of Envtl. Values in Ukiah v. City of Ukiah, 2 Cal. App. 4th 720, 731 (Ct. App. 1991).

48 See tit. 14, § 15062.

49 See CAL. PUB. RES. CODE §§ 21108(b), 21152(b) (West 2009).

50 See id. §§ 21108(c), 21152(c).

51 See id. § 21152(c).

52 Id. § 21167(d). See also tit. 14, § 15112(c)(2).

53 CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21167(d) (West 2009); tit. 14, § 15112(c)(5).
Exemption available on the internet, only the OPR, which handles decisions made by state agencies, is required to make all notices of exemption that it receives electronically available. If the notice is not posted, another way to receive it is to submit a written request before the project is approved. The lead agency is then required to mail the notice. But, notably, even though this requirement exists, there is no requirement that state or local agencies write or file notices in the first place.

The notice provisions are much stronger for projects not exempted from CEQA. Specifically, CEQA requires that a decision for non-exempted projects in the form of either a negative declaration or environmental impact report be recorded and provided to the public for notice and comment. Thus, in contrast with the notice requirements for more extensive CEQA analyses, CEQA does not provide requirements to ensure that interested individuals find out about exemption decisions.

D. Standard for Reviewing Exemption Decisions

If the public discovers an erroneous exemption decision despite the lack of notice requirements, the judicial standard of review requires a careful analysis of the erroneous decision. Agencies are required to construe CEQA exemptions narrowly. As one court summarized, “[e]xemption categories are not to be expanded beyond the reasonable scope of their statutory language.” Categorical exemptions, thus, should be interpreted by agencies to provide the fullest possible environmental protection within the scope of the statutory language.

Questions concerning the scope of an exemption are subject to review by courts. When determining the scope of an exemption, an agency’s failure to “proceed in the manner CEQA provides” is by itself a prejudicial abuse of discretion, whether or not the agency has substantial evidence to bolster its position. In other words, courts “determine de novo whether the agency has employed the correct procedures, scrupulously enforcing all legislatively

---

54 See tit. 14, §§ 15062, 15075, 15085.
55 See CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21159.9(c) (West 2009). Notices available at www.ceqanet.ca.gov.
56 § 21167(f).
57 See, e.g., id. §§ 21091-21092, 21104, 21153. See also tit. 14, §§ 15073, 15075, 15083, 15085.
58 Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce v. City of Santa Monica, 101 Cal. App. 4th 786, 793 (Ct. App. 2002).
59 See Mountain Lion Found. v. Fish & Game Comm’n, 16 Cal. 4th 105, 125 (1997).
mandated CEQA requirements.\footnote{Id. (internal quotations omitted).}

To decide whether an exception to a categorical exemption applies, courts use the fair argument test.\footnote{See Banker’s Hill, Hillcrest, Park West Cmty. Pres. Group v. City of San Diego, 139 Cal. App. 4th 249, 261-67 (Ct. App. 2006). \textit{But see} Valley Advocates v. City of Fresno, 160 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1069-72 (Ct. App. 2008) (refusing to apply the fair argument standard).} For example, a court will apply the fair argument test to determine whether a project creates a reasonable possibility of significant effects due to unusual circumstances. The fair argument standard creates a “low threshold” for further environmental review and “reflects a preference for resolving doubts in favor of environmental review when the question is whether any such review is warranted.”\footnote{Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma, 6 Cal. App. 4th 1307, 1316-17 (Ct. App. 1992).} Although courts can provide meaningful review of erroneous exemption decisions, this review is meaningless if communities never find out about erroneous decisions in the first place.

II. COMMUNITIES NEED ADDITIONAL NOTICE FOR SIGNIFICANT EXEMPTED PROJECTS

Although CEQA exemptions save agency resources by exempting projects that do not impact the environment,\footnote{Stephanie Young, \textit{Categorical Exclusions: Are Agencies Silencing the Public’s Voice?}, 23 NAT. RES. & ENV’T 39, 40 (2009) (“When correctly developed and used, CEs [categorical exclusions] can save agency resources, which have become more limited over the past years as agency budgets have been reduced.”).} these exemptions have erroneously exempted harmful projects from environmental review.\footnote{See id. \textit{See also} Kevin H. Moriarity, \textit{Circumventing the National Environmental Policy Act: Agency Abuse of the Categorical Exclusion}, 79 N.Y.U. L. REV. 2312, 2335 (2004).} Additional notice requirements would provide a check on potentially erroneous decisions and would allow greater public participation in decision-making.\footnote{See Ultramar, Inc. v. S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 17 Cal. App. 4th 689, 705 (Ct. App. 1993) (“we cannot overemphasize the importance of full compliance with all the notice provisions of applicable law, so that there will be maximum public comment and involvement . . . . Given the significance of whatever path is followed, any decision must be subject to full public review before its implementation.”).} Without notice of CEQA exemption decisions, local communities will have no way to ensure that potentially harmful projects in their community are reviewed.\footnote{As the Ninth Circuit recently articulated, “[t]here is no doubt that the failure to undertake an EIS when required to do so constitutes procedural injury to those affected by the environmental impacts of a project.” \textit{Save Strawberry Canyon v. Dept. of Energy}, 613 F. Supp. 2d 1177, 1187 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (citing \textit{Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife}, 504 U.S. 555, 572 n.7 (1992)).}

A. Exemption Categories are Ambiguous and Can Be Interpreted Broadly

Communities should be given notice of decisions to exempt potentially harmful projects to assure that exemptions are correctly applied. Although CEQA directs agencies to narrowly interpret exemptions to ensure protection of
the environment, agencies can interpret and have historically interpreted exemptions more broadly than their intended purpose. Ambiguous language in categorical and some statutory exemptions gives regulators significant interpretive latitude and thus, creates uncertainty in the application of the exemptions.\(^7\) In addition, the extensive list of exemptions is not limited to categories of projects that will never have a significant impact on the environment.\(^7\) Rather, an agency has to decide whether a project that fits the ambiguous boundaries of an exemption could cause environmental impacts.

For example, one category of exemptions, called the “existing facilities exemption”, applies to “the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use.”\(^2\) Cases interpreting terms such as “minor alterations,” “repair,” “maintenance,” or “replacement” of existing facilities demonstrate that there is wide variation in the interpretation of these terms.\(^3\) Indeed, agencies have erroneously applied this exemption to large projects such as the addition of a ten-million gallon biodiesel facility in a poor neighborhood.\(^4\) The existing facilities exemption was also erroneously applied to a landfill accepting an additional 3.2 million tons of waste.\(^5\) Disturbingly, the agency made this decision despite its finding that the existing landfill was leaking, that it may continue leaking, and that additional waste may exacerbate the problem.\(^6\) Although both of these decisions were later rescinded,\(^7\) these examples illustrate how an agency could erroneously apply this vague exemption to projects which could significantly impact the environment.

Other exemptions also contain vague language. One such exemption applies

\(^{70}\) See Daniel P. Selmi, Themes in the Evolution of the State Environmental Policy Acts, 38 URB. LAW 949, 958 (2006) (discussing how the language may “significantly” impact the environment introduces “great uncertainty in application”).

\(^{71}\) See id. at 960 (“[T]he list of exempt projects is long, adding to the complexity of administration. It is also sometimes arbitrary, with some exceptions overtly based on politics rather than on neutral judgments about environmental effects.”).

\(^{72}\) CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15301 (2009). This section provides a list of examples of projects that could be exempted including “[a]dditions to existing structures provided that the additional will not result in an increase of more than: . . . 10,000 square feet if . . . ” certain conditions are met.


\(^{74}\) See discussion supra pp. 1-2 (discussing erroneous interpretation and application to biodiesel facility).

\(^{75}\) See Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster, 52 Cal. App. 4th 1165, 1176-77, 1192-93 (Ct. App. 1997).

\(^{76}\) See id. at 1198-99, 1205-06.

\(^{77}\) See discussion supra p. 1 (discussing San Francisco’s decision to rescind the biodiesel decision). See also Azusa, 52 Cal. App. 4th at 1165 (overturning exemption decision).
to the “replacement or reconstruction of existing structures or facilities where
the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and
will have substantially the same purpose and capacity.”78 This exemption can
extend to the “[r]eplacement of a commercial structure with a new structure of
substantially the same size, purpose, and capacity”79 and the “[r]eplacement or
reconstruction of existing utility systems and/or facilities involving negligible or
no expansion of capacity.”80 The reconstruction of a utility system could allow
a system to operate longer which could significantly impact the neighboring
community. In addition, words like “substantially” and “negligible” in these
examples can be interpreted differently by an affected community and the
proponent of the project.

Another broad exemption covers “construction and location of limited
numbers of new, small facilities or structures”81 including a “store, motel, office,
restaurant or similar structure not involving the use of significant amounts of
hazardous substances, and not exceeding 2500 square feet in floor area.”82 An
additional exemption excludes “minor actions to prevent, minimize, stabilize,
mitigate, or eliminate the release or threat of release of hazardous waste or
hazardous substances.”83 Yet another exemption excludes cogeneration projects
at existing facilities.84 The co-generation exemption has erroneously been used
to exempt a co-generation facility from being constructed on a superfund site.85

Other broadly drafted exemptions apply to projects that impact natural
resources. For example, one exemption applies to annexing land containing
existing facilities with certain exceptions.86 Other exemptions specifically cover
projects that maintain or protect natural resources.87 These exemptions have

78 CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15302 (2009) (discussing the “Replacement or Reconstruction”
exemption).
79 Id. § 15302(b).
80 Id. § 15302(c).
81 Id. § 15303.
82 Id. § 15303(c). Another example under this exemption provides that: “In urbanized areas,
the exemption also applies to up to four such commercial buildings not exceeding 10,000 square feet
in floor area on sites zoned for such use is not involving the use of significant amounts of hazardous
substances where all necessary public services and facilities are available and the surrounding area is
environmentally sensitive.”
83 Id. § 15330. This exemption is entitled “Minor Actions to Prevent, Minimize, Stabilize,
Mitigate or Eliminate the Release or Threat of Release of Hazardous Waste or Hazardous
Substances.”
84 CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15329 (2009). This exemption is entitled “Cogeneration Projects
at Existing Facilities.”
85 The project, which was planned by Roseburg Forest Products, was exempted by Siskiyou
County. The decision was revoked when the local community protested the decision. See Paul
Boerger, Co-Generation Plant Moves Toward CEQA Review Phase, Apr. 11, 2007,
86 tit. 14, § 15319(a).
87 See id. §§ 15307, 15308. These exemptions have been erroneously applied to hunting and
application of exemption to setting of hunting and fishing seasons).
been erroneously applied to exempt a regulation that allowed a large increase of nitrogen oxide emissions from certain facilities. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District also relied on this type of exemption to exempt regulatory amendments governing the solvent content in architectural coatings. After reviewing the record, the court found that the exemption was improperly applied because “there is evidence that the new regulations require lower quality products. As a result, more product will be used which will lead to a net increase in VOC emissions.”

As these examples demonstrate, many categorical exemptions are broadly written and could be erroneously applied to projects that significantly impact the environment. To give communities a check on these potentially erroneous decisions, notice should be required.

B. Additional Notice Requirements Would Help Communities Overburdened by Pollution

Communities that are already significantly impacted by environmental pollution are more likely than other communities to experience harm from proposed projects. Low income and minority communities currently bear more of the cumulative burden of pollution in California and around the nation. Consequently, these communities disproportionately suffer adverse environmental and health impacts associated with industrial pollution. An example of an overburdened community is the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood in San Francisco. This community has endured high levels of industrial development “achieved at extensive costs to environmental health.” Additional pollution such as air emissions are especially concerning in this

---

88 See, e.g., Int’l Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union v. Bd. of Supervisors of San Bernardino County, 171 Cal. Rptr. 875, 881-82 (Cal. Ct. App. 1981). This exemption decision was ultimately struck down by a court, which found that “[m]anifestly, there is a reasonable possibility that doubling the NOx emissions allowed into the atmosphere may have ‘a significant effect on the environment.’” Id.


90 See id. at 658.

91 As aptly noted by one comment, “[e]ven relatively innocuous projects, located in the ‘wrong’ place from an environmental standpoint, can do serious damage.” See Selmi, supra note 70, at 962.


95 Id.
community, which has been designated by the air district as a highly impacted area.\textsuperscript{96}

In overburdened communities, small changes can cause significant environmental problems since the communities have already been impacted by environmental toxins.\textsuperscript{97} These potential cumulative impacts\textsuperscript{98} may not be taken fully into account during a routine exemption review. In addition to experiencing a higher burden of pollution, many of these communities lack a voice in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{99}

Consequently, the lack of notice for exemption decisions has potential environmental justice implications that need to be addressed.\textsuperscript{100} In California, environmental justice has been defined as "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."\textsuperscript{101} One of the principles of environmental justice is that it "demands the right to participate as equal partners at every level of decision making including needs assessment, planning, implementation, enforcement and evaluation."\textsuperscript{102} To advance this principle, environmental justice seeks to "ensure meaningful public participation and promote community-capacity building to allow communities to be effective participants in environmental decision-making processes."\textsuperscript{103} This can be accomplished, in part, by


\textsuperscript{97} See Communities for a Better Env't v. Cal. Res. Agency, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 441, 452-53 (Ct. App. 2002) ("One of the most important environmental lessons that has been learned is that environmental damage often occurs incrementally from a variety of small sources. These sources appear insignificant when considered individually, but assume threatening dimensions when considered collectively with other sources with which they interact.").

\textsuperscript{98} The CEQA Guidelines define "cumulative impacts" as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other impacts... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time." CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15355 (2009).

\textsuperscript{99} See, e.g., Stephen M. Johnson, NEPA and SEPA's in the Quest for Environmental Justice, 30 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 565, 572 (1997) (noting "[i]n many cases minority and low-income communities are disparately impacted by government actions because the communities do not have a voice in the decision-making process, and the communities lack the influence or political power of special interest groups that may support the government action.").

\textsuperscript{100} In determining whether the application of an exemption is appropriate, courts will consider the project's location. See, e.g., Lewis v. Seventeenth Dist. Agric. Ass'n, 165 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825-26 (Ct. App. 1985) (finding application of the exemption was improper due to the proximity of residential area).

\textsuperscript{101} See CAL. GOV'T CODE § 65040.12 (West 2009).


procedures that "ensure that public documents, notices, and public hearings relating to human health or the environment, are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public."\(^{104}\)

Work still needs to be done to ensure that the most vulnerable communities are treated with respect in environmental decisions.\(^{105}\) Procedural protections have been required to accommodate environmental justice concerns\(^{106}\) and should be made to protect communities from the overbroad application of exemptions. Creating additional CEQA notice requirements is especially important since CEQA is one of the most useful tools against harmful land uses.\(^{107}\)

### C. Notice Would Further CEQA’s Purpose

One of CEQA’s central purposes is to promote government accountability and transparency.\(^{108}\) Requiring additional notice for exemption decisions would advance this purpose.\(^{109}\) Without any accountability, the public cannot be assured that agencies will make correct exemption decisions. As the California Supreme Court noted: “[a]t the very least, however, the People have a right to expect that those who must decide will approach their task neutrally, with no parochial interest at stake.”\(^{110}\) It may be difficult to trust a local government “to put regional environmental considerations above the narrow selfish interests of their city” when the local government forms a relationship with a developer.\(^{111}\) Opportunities for public review of decisions are thus important to demonstrate

---

\(^{104}\) Id. at 1.


\(^{108}\) Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15201 (2009) ("Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement"). Cases have also emphasized this requirement. See, e.g., Save Tara v. City of West Hollywood, 45 Cal. 4th 116, 136 (2008) (discussing “CEQA’s goal of environmental transparency in environmental decision-making”).


\(^{109}\) See Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Comm’n of Ventura County, 13 Cal. 3d 263, 283 (1975). See also Pugsley, supra note 11, at 1 (discussing case).

\(^{111}\) See Bozung, 13 Cal. 3d at 283. As one court stated: “[P]ublic review provides the dual purpose of bolstering the public’s confidence in the agency’s decision and providing the agency with information from a variety of experts and sources.” Schoen v. Cal. Dept. of Forestry and Fire Prot., 58 Cal. App. 4th 556, 573 (Ct. App. 1997).
to the public that environmental impacts are fairly taken into account.112

Public participation can also lead to better decisions for the community and the environment.113 This is partly because measures protecting the right to public participation help ensure that environmental impacts will actually be evaluated.114 Increased access could also help develop positive participation from the community.115 As a result, public participation can provide accountability for government decision-making116 and provide a valuable review of decisions.117

D. Changing CEQA Could Influence Other Regulatory Schemes

Changing CEQA's notice requirements for exemptions could also influence other statutes that also lack notice for exemption decisions.118 Like CEQA, exemption decisions under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA")

---

112 As the California Supreme Court has noted, the transparency functions of the CEQA process serve to "demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has in fact analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action." No Oil Inc. v. City of Los Angeles, 13 Cal. 3d 68, 86 (1974).

113 See Thomas Dietz & Paul C. Stern, Panel on Public Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making 76-85 (Nat'l Academies Press 2008). This study found public participation can lead to better federal agency decisions. The same has been said with respect to NEPA. See, e.g., Sharon Buccino, Expedited NEPA Review for Alternative Energy Projects, 39 EnvTL. L. Rep. 10,581, 10,583 (2009) (stating that she sees NEPA as a "fundamental tool for both the environmental review and public participation that we rely on to produce both informed government decisions and decisions that are accepted by the people who are affected by them").

114 See Selmi, supra note 70, at 979-80 ("[t]he public commenting process can help ensure the fulfillment of this purpose by insisting on a kind of rational dialogue about environmental impacts").

115 See Stephanie Tai, Three Asymmetries of Informed Environmental Decision-making, 78 Temp. L. Rev. 659, 678 (2005) ("Public participation mechanisms are seen as a step towards the development of civic virtues by providing a means for citizens to become involved in the regulatory decision-making process.").

116 See David E. Seidemann, Insufficient Accountability: Case Study of the Recycling Plan of a Public Interest Research Group, 3 Buff. Envtl. L.J. 221, 222 (1995) ("Over the past several decades, as the public's faith in the capacity of government and industry to behave responsibly has diminished, the public has turned increasingly to environmental advocacy groups for help in holding government and industry accountable. Environmental groups have become useful watchdogs because they have both the technical expertise and the inclination to monitor those segments of society in which the public has lost faith . . . .").

117 See Jonathan Poisner, A Civic Republican Perspective on the National Environmental Policy Act's Process for Citizen Participation, 26 Envtl. L. 53, 79 (1996) ("NEPA public participation takes the form of pseudo peer review science, in which the agency uses public participation to ensure that agency experts have, indeed, considered all the relevant information.").

118 See e.g., Kenneth S. Weiner, NEPA and State NEPAs: Learning From the Past, Foresight for the Future, 39 Envtl. L. Rep. 10,675, 10,678 (2009) (describing how state environmental assessment acts influenced the 1978 NEPA amendments); Stephen M. Johnson, NEPA and SEPA's in the Quest for Environmental Justice, 30 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 565, 568 (1997) ("[W]hen Congress enacted NEPA it envisioned NEPA as a model for state environmental review laws, but in the truest sense of cooperative federalism, state laws can now be used as models for changes to NEPA.").
should have additional notice requirements. Under NEPA requirements, each federal agency defines categories of projects within its jurisdiction that “do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment” to be excluded from NEPA’s requirements. Similar to CEQA’s exceptions, NEPA provides a safeguard to prevent projects that may have a significant environmental effect from being exempted from review. This safeguard’s usefulness, however, can be limited because it is defined using ambiguous terms such as “extraordinary” which are subject to differing interpretation. In addition, the safeguard only applies to some of exempted projects.

Like CEQA, NEPA lacks basic procedural requirements for exemption decisions, and projects can be improperly exempted from NEPA without the public’s knowledge. In particular, federal agencies do not always have to publish information supporting an exemption decision. Thus, an environmentally significant NEPA project could be exempted without the public’s knowledge. NEPA’s categorical exemptions can be interpreted to include projects which could seriously impact the environment. In particular, the state’s Forest Service has been extensively criticized for its broad categorical exclusions. Although at least one of these exclusions have been found to be

---

119 There are notable differences between the categorical exemptions in NEPA and CEQA. For example, NEPA’s categorical exemptions can be created by individual agencies while CEQA directly references the creation of categorical exemptions. Compare 40 C.F.R. § 1500.4 (2009) with CAL. PUB. RES. CODE § 21084(a) (2009).

120 See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.4, 1508.4.

121 See id. § 1508.4. Under this provision, if “extraordinary circumstances” are present, the agency must complete additional analysis and documentation either through an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

122 The Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”) has interpreted the categorical exclusions Congress passed for oil and gas exploration and development activities as not being subject to the “extraordinary circumstances” analysis that limits the use of other categorical exemptions. See Young, supra note 66, at 42 (discussing BLM interpretation of Pub. L. No. 109-58, 119 Stat. 594 (2005)).

123 See Uma Outka, NEPA and Environmental Justice: Integration, Implementation, and Judicial Review, 33 B.C. ENVTL. AFF. L. REV. 601, 615 (2006) (suggesting that projects which could have environmental impact could be exempt).

124 See, e.g., §§ 6.203, 6.204 (not requiring notice for exemption decisions, and not requiring that all exemption decisions are recorded).


126 See Young, supra note 66, at 40. (“in recent years, agencies have expanded the use of CEs beyond their intended purpose and have approved CEs for activities that raise serious concerns regarding the impact these actions will have on the environment”).

an illegal interpretation of NEPA,128 most of them are still effective.

Some states that have enacted requirements similar to CEQA and NEPA also have issues with notice for exemption decisions.129 These states have exempted large proposals like alternative energy projects130 and have ambiguous thresholds for determining whether projects are exempt.131 This has led to uncertain and unreliable results,132 which may not have correlate to the likelihood that a project will impact the environment.133 Requiring public notice for these types of exemption decisions will address some of this uncertainty. A change to CEQA’s notice requirements could provide a model for this next step.

E. Requiring Notice is the Easiest Way to Protect Against Erroneous Exemption Decisions

Another possible way to fix the problem of environmentally significant projects being exempted from CEQA is to eliminate controversial categorical exemptions.134 While it is true some exemption categories need to be narrowed,135 this piecemeal approach would likely take significant time and
resources, and is unlikely to eliminate the issue of overbroad application of exemptions. Requiring notice provides a much more efficient alternative.

In a challenge to the validity of a CEQA exemption, a court would determine whether an exemption is facially invalid under the statute. To answer this inquiry, the court would evaluate whether the regulation is within the agency's authority, considering that the Legislature passed CEQA to provide the fullest environmental protection possible. To be considered improper, a CEQA exemption must apply to a category of projects that generally could significantly affect the environment. This type of challenge would likely strike down some poorly drafted exemptions. But, since CEQA exemptions are often written to encompass a wide-range of projects, it would be difficult to show that an exemption was aimed at a class of projects likely to significantly affect the environment.

NEPA exemptions are generally more specific, and therefore potentially easier to strike down under this theory. However, establishing standing in these types of cases is incredibly difficult. The U.S. Supreme Court recently examined procedural concerns related to NEPA exemptions in Summers v. Earth Institute. In Summers, environmental groups challenged the lack of procedural requirements for NEPA categorical exemptions for fire-rehabilitation activities on areas less than 4,200 acres and salvage-timber sales of 250 acres or

---

136 See, e.g., Communities for a Better Env't v. Cal. Res. Agency, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 441, 446 (Ct. App. 2002) (at issue was "whether the subject Guidelines, which public agencies must follow to implement CEQA, facially violate CEQA statutes and case law").

137 See CAL. GOVT. CODE § 11342.2 (2009). This section provides that "[w]henever by the express or implied terms of any statute a state agency has authority to adopt regulations to implement, interpret, make specific or otherwise carry out the provisions of the statute, no regulation adopted is valid or effective unless consistent and not in conflict with the statute and reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute." See also Henning v. Div. of Occupational Safety & Health, 268 Cal. Rptr. 476, 481 (Ct. App. 1990).

138 Communities for a Better Env't, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d at 449 (citing Laurel Heights and other cases) ("the 'foremost principle' in interpreting CEQA is that the Legislature intended the act to be read so as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language").

139 See id. at 462-64 (finding that infill categorical exemption was valid because projects generally did not significantly affect the environment).

140 Drafting issues occur within other exemptions. For example, one exemption from the definition of project problematically used the wrong disjunctive. When examining this, the court stated that "[t]his blanket exclusion cuts too broad a swath; in an Alice-In-Wonderland kind of way, it could arguably be stretched to encompass the very approval of the project. Even the proponent of this Guideline recognizes the impermissibly broad nature of this measure . . . ." Id. at 461.

141 See discussion supra Part II.A (discussing exemptions that could be interpreted too broadly).

142 See discussion supra Part II.D (discussing types of Forest Service categorical exemptions).

143 See Summers v. Earth Island Inst., 129 S. Ct. 1142, 1151 (2009) (finding that environmental groups lacked standing to challenge environmental regulations for procedural defect without an affidavit showing that the application of the regulations to specific projects threatened imminent and concrete harm to their members).

144 See id. at 1151.
Additional Notice Requirements

less. This challenge failed on standing grounds, demonstrating that a legislative change to procedural requirements, especially for NEPA, may be easier to obtain than a judicially mandated change.

While a judicial approach could eliminate facially invalid exemptions, it will not eliminate the problem of broad application of valid categorical exemptions. Many exemptions will still contain ambiguous terms that can be interpreted too broadly.

Therefore additional notice is a better method for providing a check on the application of exemptions. Plus, as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has recognized, "[m]eaningful public participation is based on the proposition that people should have a say in decisions which affect their lives in a significant way." To effectively accomplish this, the process must "[s]eek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected." Additional notice would not only involve the community, it could also lead to better, more thoughtful decisions.

III. PROPOSAL FOR NOTICE FOR CERTAIN EXEMPTION DECISIONS

This proposal to provide notice for certain exemption decisions includes three elements: definitions of which types of projects fall under the notice requirement, methods to ensure notice is accessible and understandable for communities, and requirements for the information contained in the notice. These three elements are necessary to ensure that adequate notice is provided to community members about projects that may concern them.

145 Id. at 1142-43.
146 To be invalid, an exemption would have to apply to a class of projects that generally significantly affects the environment. See, e.g., Downey v. Crabtree, 100 F.3d 662, 666 (9th Cir. 1996) (regulations are evaluated under Chevron 2-step analysis). See also Communities for a Better Envt. v. Cal. Res. Agency, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 441, 446 (Ct. App. 2002) (at issue was "whether the subject Guidelines, which public agencies must follow to implement CEQA, facially violate CEQA statutes and case law").
147 CEQA exemptions are supposed to be narrowly interpreted. As one court noted: "a term [in an exemption] that does not have a clearly established meaning . . . should not be so broadly interpreted so to include a class of businesses that will not normally satisfy the statutory requirements for a categorical exemption." Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster, 52 Cal. App. 4th 1165, 1192-93 (Cal. Ct. App. 1997).
148 See discussion supra Part II.A (many problems with CEQA exemptions are in the application of the exemptions).
150 See id. at 54.
151 See Young, supra note 66, at 40 ("Public input also offers the agency an opportunity to understand a community's values so it can better seek to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts from agency decisions").
A. Notice Should be Required for Projects that Could Impact Communities

A community would receive notice of exempted projects that could impact the environment. Limiting notice requirements to potentially problematic projects makes sense because information about all exempted projects would inundate a community with futile information and would create a larger administrative burden than necessary.

Under California law, many projects can be potentially subject to CEQA. This includes projects that are unlikely to concern a local community such as educational or training programs requiring no physical changes. CEQA exemptions, therefore, play an important role by preserving administrative resources for projects which could potentially harm the environment. This goal, however, is not meant to sacrifice the ability of the public to participate in decisions that may negatively impact their environment. To balance between a local community's need for notice of significant projects and preservation of administrative resources, the proposal for notice of exemption decisions should only include projects that could potentially increase pollution or have other environmental impacts.

The categories of projects that require notice will need to be clearly defined to minimize opposition. CEQA legislation that is perceived to lengthen, complicate, or introduce ambiguities into the process will also likely be challenged by the business community. From a business perspective, uncertainties in regulatory requirements are often costly for businesses which value predictability. There also may be a concern that increasing the breadth of the notice provisions will lead to more litigation. These thresholds also need to be established in such a way that project designers cannot circumvent

152 See id. at 43 ("agencies should not apply a CE (spell out categorical exemption) without providing an opportunity for public comment if there is significant disagreement over whether the CE should apply").

153 See CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15322 (2009) (exempting the "adoption, alteration, or termination of educational or training programs which involve no physical alteration in the area affected").

154 See generally Moriarty, supra note 127 (categorical exemptions are meant to preserve agency resources).

155 See discussion supra Part II (discussing the importance of public participation under CEQA and NEPA).


157 See John Watts, Reconciling Environmental Protection with the Need for Certainty: Significance Thresholds for CEQA, 22 ECOLOGY L.Q. 213, 216 (1995) ("CEQA's primary burden on business is not the direct cost of EIRs . . . but instead the uncertainty that the statute engenders. Businesses often do not know how long EIR review will take . . . ").

158 See Selmi, supra note 70, at 955 ("there appears to be a relationship between the breadth of the SEPA's coverage and the amount of litigation that the SEPA generates").
the notice requirements.  

Some areas already require notice for certain types of exemption decisions. In San Francisco, notice is required for exemption determinations involving "historical resources," "any demolition of an existing structure," historical resource restoration, and in-fill development projects. This ordinance provides an example of how to define the categories of projects requiring additional notice.

Here, the focus of additional notice requirements should be on the project’s use and creation of hazardous waste, air pollution, water discharges, traffic, and noise. Communities would receive notice of any exempted projects: (i) that increase hazardous materials usage or creation by more than a certain volume such as fifty gallons; (ii) increase air emissions by a certain amount (such as more than 50 pounds per year of all hazardous air pollutant); or (iii) increase water discharges or spill potential of hazardous materials to a local waterway.

Additionally, communities would be given notice of projects being done at industrial facilities or plants that are required to be capitalized. Projects that are capitalized are material projects that generally increase productivity of a facility. Industrial facilities like landfills and power plants are already more likely to impact the environment than other facilities due to the nature of their business. At such facilities, there is often a direct link between increased productivity and increased pollution. Thus, there is generally a correlation

---

159 See Watts, supra note 157, at 245 (discussing how projects in states with thresholds are "frequently designed so as to just barely avoid the threshold for review.").

160 See S.F., CAL., ADMIN. CODE (2001) (providing that "[w]ritten determinations of categorical exemptions for these types of projects shall be posted in the offices of the Planning Department and shall be mailed to any individuals or organizations that have previously requested such notice in writing").

161 See, e.g., id. (proposing that "[t]o determine if the application of a CE may be controversial [and public comment should be provided], an agency should examine the record of public input in previously proposed actions that were similar and analyze the extent of disagreement over possible environmental effects").

162 The particular trigger values should depend on the type of industries in the area. For example, emitting one ton of mercury in the air will likely be seen as more harmful than emitting one ton of carbon monoxide.


165 This was recognized by the Azusa court which found that the definition of facilities in categorical exemptions should not extend to class of businesses that normally would have a significant effect on the environment. See Azusa Land Reclamation Co. v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster, 52 Cal. App. 4th 1165, 1192-93 (Ct. App. 1997).

between the capitalization of a project and the increased potential environmental impact to the community.\textsuperscript{167}

In addition to providing pollution-based and cost-based thresholds, certain communities may also be concerned with projects that impact natural resources. To accommodate these and other concerns, the categories of exempted projects requiring additional notice should be publicly available, preferably on each agency’s website. Then, the public would have an opportunity to petition the agency to require notice for other types of projects since different communities have different priorities. After all, local community members have the best knowledge of what impacts concern them.\textsuperscript{168} Thus, communities should be provided an opportunity to designate the types of projects they want notice of to address their specific concerns.

This narrowly tailored proposal, which requires notice for only potentially harmful projects, has a greater likelihood of being enacted that a broad notice requirement. As demonstrated by the California Legislature’s recent actions, the focus of current legislation has been on streamlining the CEQA process, not increasing the requirements.\textsuperscript{169} This focus is partly a result of the budget shortfall and other resource related concerns.\textsuperscript{170} Therefore, legislation that achieves a balance between protecting the community and not making CEQA implementation too onerous will be better received.\textsuperscript{171}

\textbf{B. Notices Should be Accessible and Requirements Should be Easy to Implement}

A limited requirement for additional notice could accommodate the concerns of overbroad application of the exemptions while alleviating the concerns of additional administrative burdens.\textsuperscript{172} The notice provisions need to achieve a balance between predictability and comprehensiveness.\textsuperscript{173}

The internet can facilitate administration of many of these new notice requirements. Initially, interested community members register over the internet for notice of exempted projects in the specific neighborhoods that they are directly tied to production).\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{168} See discussion \textit{supra} Part II.C (describing why involvement of the local community is beneficial to decision-making).


\textsuperscript{170} See, e.g., Judy Lin, Deal Reached to Close California’s $26 Billion Budget Deficit, \textit{ASSOCIATED PRESS} (July 20, 2009).

\textsuperscript{171} See \textit{ECCLESTON, supra} note 125, at 132 (describing criticisms of having more procedural requirements).

\textsuperscript{172} See \textit{ECCLESTON, supra} note 125, at 132 (advocating additional procedural requirements for some controversial exemption decisions).

\textsuperscript{173} See Selmi, \textit{supra} note 70, at 962 (stating that predictability and comprehensiveness “clash on the issue of crafting the appropriate threshold”).

\textsuperscript{168} See \textit{discussion supra} Part II.C (describing why involvement of the local community is beneficial to decision-making).


\textsuperscript{170} See, e.g., Judy Lin, Deal Reached to Close California’s $26 Billion Budget Deficit, \textit{ASSOCIATED PRESS} (July 20, 2009).

\textsuperscript{171} See \textit{ECCLESTON, supra} note 125, at 132 (describing criticisms of having more procedural requirements).

\textsuperscript{172} See \textit{ECCLESTON, supra} note 125, at 132 (advocating additional procedural requirements for some controversial exemption decisions).

\textsuperscript{173} See Selmi, \textit{supra} note 70, at 962 (stating that predictability and comprehensiveness “clash on the issue of crafting the appropriate threshold”).
interested in.\textsuperscript{174} The local agency maintains this list electronically. Then, when an exempted project falls under the notice requirements, the notice is automatically sent via e-mail to the list of interested parties. The agency also posts a reference on its website so interested individuals not on the mailing list also have access to the notice information. This electronic process is similar to notices currently given by other California agencies, which work well in practice.\textsuperscript{175} This process is also consistent with the encouragement agencies are given to post things on the internet.\textsuperscript{176} In addition to the electronic notice, the notice requirements will include a process by which interested community members can receive notice by mail, in different languages and view posted information in the community.\textsuperscript{177}

\section*{C. Notice Should Describe the Project and Related Environmental Information}

The notice under this proposal does not have to be as detailed as a negative declaration or an environmental impact report, but it needs to be understandable to the public.\textsuperscript{178} Some of the exemption notices provided by federal agencies put as much administrative burden on an agency as a full assessment.\textsuperscript{179} Similarly, some critics think notice requirements defeat the purpose of having exemptions, which are supposed to require less paperwork.\textsuperscript{180} This proposal, however, requires much less paperwork than either a negative declaration or an environmental impact report.

Nevertheless, an exemption notice will be required to clearly define the project. In particular, an exemption notice should demonstrate that the agency considered the entire project. A project includes the "whole of an action" that may result in either a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment.\textsuperscript{181} The public should be assured that the agency did not divide a

\textsuperscript{174} This could be organized by particular zip codes.

\textsuperscript{175} See, e.g., California Energy Commission, Hot Topics, http://www.energy.ca.gov (last visited Oct. 18, 2009) (providing notice to interested community members for each project that is evaluated).

\textsuperscript{176} See, e.g., S.F., CAL. ADMIN CODE § 67.29-2 (1999) (encouraging agencies to make as much information as possible available on the internet).

\textsuperscript{177} See El Pueblo Para el Aire y Agua Limpio v. County of Kings, 22 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,357, 366,045 (Cal. App. Dep't Super. Ct. 1991) (finding that lack of translation precluded meaningful public involvement under CEQA for community where 95\% of the residents are Latino).

\textsuperscript{178} Documents that are not easy to understand have presented problems. See David S. Mattern, \textit{Reader-Friendly Environmental Documents: Opportunity or Oxymoron?}, 39 ENVTL. LAW. RPTR. 10,624, 10,624 (2009) ("[t]he public, agencies, and NEPA practitioners agree that most documents are difficult to understand and hard to use").

\textsuperscript{179} See Moriarty, supra note 127, at 2325.

\textsuperscript{180} ECCLESTON, \textit{Supra} note 125, at 132.

\textsuperscript{181} See CAL. CODE REGS. tit. 14, § 15378(a) (2009). See also id. §15062(a) (an entire project needs to be considered).
project into smaller projects to avoid environmental review.\textsuperscript{182}

In addition, an exemption notice needs to describe generally the potential air, water, and hazardous waste impacts, and why notice is required by the proposed notice requirement. Finally, the notice should give clear information related to the location of the projects and information as to how decisions can be appealed. Some of this information could be filled out on a standard exemption form generated by the agency. Requiring this basic information for the notice is necessary to enable community members to review whether or not there is an issue with the application of the exemption.

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

Agencies are currently not required to give notice of decision to exempt projects from CEQA. The dearth of requirements means that exemption decisions are currently largely unchecked and communities have no way to ensure that significant projects undergo environmental review. To remedy this problem, CEQA exemption decisions that apply to projects that could potentially increase pollution over a certain threshold, are capitalized at industrial facilities, or cause other environmental impacts should have notice requirements. These additional notice requirements will fill CEQA’s notice requirement gap by providing a check on potentially erroneous decisions and allowing greater public participation in decision-making.

---

\textsuperscript{182} See, e.g., McQueen v. Bd. of Directors of Mid-Peninsula Reg’l Open Space Dist., 202 Cal. App. 3d 1136, 1144 (Ct. App. 1988) (finding that the agency had too narrowly defined the project); Orinda Ass’n v. Bd. of Supervisors, 182 Cal. App. 3d 1145, 1171-72 (Ct. App. 1986).