

GUIDE TO
CEQA

Chapters at a Glance

I	Introduction	<i>page 1</i>
II	The Public Policies Explicit and Implicit in CEQA	<i>page 13</i>
III	Agencies Subject to CEQA	<i>page 43</i>
IV	Projects Subject to CEQA	<i>page 69</i>
V	Exempt Activities	<i>page 107</i>
VI	Certified Regulatory Programs	<i>page 167</i>
VII	Application of CEQA	<i>page 181</i>
VIII	The Initial Study	<i>page 237</i>
IX	Negative Declarations	<i>page 249</i>
X	The EIR Process	<i>page 329</i>
XI	Substantive Requirements of Environmental Impact Reports	<i>page 411</i>
XII	Mitigation Measures and Alternatives	<i>page 503</i>
XIII	Means of Avoiding Redundancy in Preparing EIRs	<i>page 601</i>
XIV	Projects Subject to Permit Streamlining Act Time Requirements	<i>page 707</i>
XV	Water Supply Planning and CEQA	<i>page 727</i>
XVI	Judicial Review	<i>page 787</i>
XVII	Judicial Remedies	<i>page 887</i>

Contents

	Preface	xxvii
	About the Authors	xxix
CHAPTER I		
Introduction / 1		
A. CEQA's Substantive Mandate		1
B. Procedural Devices of Environmental Review		2
C. Principles Governing the Interpretation of CEQA		3
1. <i>The Friends of Mammoth Interpretive Principle</i>		3
a. Relationship of the <i>Friends of Mammoth</i> Interpretive Principle to Public Resources Code Section 21003		4
b. Relationship of the <i>Friends of Mammoth</i> Interpretive Principle to Public Resources Code Section 21083.1		4
2. Other California Supreme Court Opinions		5
a. <i>Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553		5
b. <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112		5
c. <i>Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish and Game Commission</i> (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 105		5
3. Interpretive Considerations in CEQA Litigation		6
D. The CEQA Guidelines: Roadmap for Compliance		6
1. Legal Effect of the CEQA Guidelines		7
2. CEQA Guidelines "Updates"		8
a. The 1998 CEQA Guidelines Amendments and the Effect of <i>Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency</i>		9
b. CEQA Guidelines Revisions Apply Prospectively Only		10
E. Implementing Procedures of Individual Agencies		10
F. Sources of Additional Information		11
G. Timeliness of Legal Analysis in This Book		11
CHAPTER II		
The Public Policies Explicit and Implicit in CEQA / 13		
A. General Legislative Policies		13
B. Specific Policies		14
1. Agencies Cannot Approve Projects as Proposed If Feasible Alternatives or Mitigation Can Substantially Lessen Significant Environmental Effects		14
2. Agencies May Conclude That Specific Economic, Social, or Other Considerations May Outweigh a Project's Significant Environmental Effects		15
3. Agencies Must Integrate the CEQA Process with Other Planning and Environmental Procedures		16
4. Environmental Review Must Occur "as Early as Feasible in the Planning Process"		16
a. Project Proponents Should Address Environmental Considerations at the Earliest Feasible Time		17
b. Proper Timing for Environmental Review of Public Projects		18
c. Catalysts for Foreseeable Future Development		25
d. Agencies May Not Predetermine Project Approval or "Precommit" to Proposed Action		27
5. Public Participation—An Essential Part of the CEQA Process		34

Contents

C. Policies Regarding the Role of Environmental Impact Reports	35
1. The EIR Process Informs the Public and the Decisionmakers about the Adverse Environmental Consequences of a Project	35
2. The EIR Process Encourages Public Participation	35
3. The EIR Process Is a Mechanism for Interagency Consultation	36
4. The EIR Process Can Improve Projects by Identifying Feasible Mitigation or Alternatives	36
5. The EIR Process Promotes Agency Accountability	36
D. CEQA and NEPA Compared	37
1. Federal Agencies Need Only “Consider” Environmental Consequences	37
2. Definition of “Environment”	38
3. Procedural Requirements	38
4. Substantive Requirements of Environmental Documents	39
5. Terminology	40
6. Statute of Limitations	40
7. NEPA Decisions May Be Persuasive Authority in CEQA Cases	41

CHAPTER III

Agencies Subject to CEQA / 43

A. CEQA Applies to California “Public Agencies”	43
1. State Agencies	43
2. Local Agencies	43
B. Interagency Division of Labor	44
1. The Lead Agency’s Duties	44
a. Consultation with Responsible Agencies	44
b. Consultation with Trustee Agencies	46
c. Consultation Regarding Formulation of Mitigation Measures	46
d. Other General Consultation Requirements	47
e. Special Consultation Requirements	47
f. Agency Interaction in the Review and Approval of Timber Harvesting Plans	52

2. Duties of Responsible Agencies	53
3. Trustee Agencies	53
C. Identifying the Lead Agency	54
1. Typical Situations	54
2. Cooperative Designation	54
3. OPR Determination	55
4. Cities and LAFCOs	56
D. Cases Involving the Relationship Between Lead Agencies, Responsible Agencies, and Trustee Agencies	56
1. <i>Fall River Wild Trout Foundation v. County of Shasta</i> (3d Dist. 1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 482	56
2. <i>Gentry v. City of Murrieta</i> (4th Dist. 1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359	57
3. <i>Friends of Cuyamaca Valley v. Lake Cuyamaca Recreation & Park District</i> (4th Dist. 1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 419	58
4. <i>Save San Francisco Bay Association v. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission</i> (1st Dist. 1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 908	58
5. <i>City of Sacramento v. State Water Resources Control Board</i> (3d Dist. 1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 960	59
6. <i>City of Redding v. Shasta County Local Agency Formation Commission</i> (3d Dist. 1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1169	60
7. <i>Lexington Hills Association v. State of California</i> (6th Dist. 1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 415	61
8. <i>Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mount Shasta</i> (3d Dist. 1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 433	62
9. <i>Bakman v. Department of Transportation</i> (3d Dist. 1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 665	62
E. Payment of Fees to the Department of Fish and Game	63
1. “De Minimis” Exemption from Fee Payment	64
2. Other Fee Waivers	65
3. Fee Requirement Does Not Violate Proposition 13	65
F. Recovering Costs from Applicant	66

Contents

CHAPTER IV

Projects Subject to CEQA / 69

A. Threshold Questions	69
1. Is the Agency Considering “Approval” of a Proposed Action?	70
a. “Approval” Occurs When the Agency Commits to a Definite Course of Action	70
b. “Approval” for Purposes of Triggering the 180-Day Statute of Limitations	74
c. “Disapproval” Does Not Require CEQA Compliance	75
2. Does the Subject Matter of the Proposed Action Constitute a “Project”?	75
a. “Project” Definition—Public Resources Code Section 21065	75
b. “Project” Definition—CEQA Guidelines Section 15378	77
c. “Project” Definition—Leading Cases	77
B. CEQA Applies to Discretionary Projects	83
1. Environmental Review of Ministerial Actions Is Not Required Because Such Review Would Be Irrelevant	84
2. Building Permits Are “Presumed to Be Ministerial” But May Be Discretionary	85
a. Illustrative Cases	85
3. Issuance of a Demolition Permit Ordinarily Is Presumed to Be Ministerial	88
C. The “Piecemealing” Problem—“Project” Encompasses the “Whole of an Action” Affecting the Environment	89
1. <i>General Principles—Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Commission</i> (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 263	90
2. A Precise Legal Test— <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376	91
3. The Concept of “Independent Utility”— <i>Del Mar Terrace Conservancy, Inc. v. City Council of the City of San Diego</i> (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 712	91
4. Reading <i>Laurel Heights I</i> and <i>Del Mar Terrace</i> Together	92

5. <i>Uncertainty Created by Arviv Enterprises, Inc. v. South Valley Area Planning Commission</i> (2d Dist. 2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1333	93
a. Background	93
b. The Developer’s Lawsuit	94
c. Authors’ View	97
6. Other Illustrative Cases	98
a. <i>Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Committee v. Board of Port Commissioners</i> (1st Dist. 2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344	98
b. <i>San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus</i> (5th Dist. 1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 713	98
c. <i>Surfrider Foundation v. California Coastal Commission</i> (1st Dist. 1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 151	99
d. <i>Black Property Owners Association v. City of Berkeley</i> (1st Dist. 1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 974	99
e. <i>McQueen v. Board of Directors of the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District</i> (6th Dist. 1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1136	100
f. <i>City of Ukiah v. County of Mendocino</i> (1st Dist. 1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 47	100
g. <i>El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth v. County of El Dorado</i> (3d Dist. 2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1591	100
h. <i>Neighbors of Cavitt Ranch v. County of Placer</i> (3d Dist. 2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1092	101
i. <i>Sierra Club v. The West Side Irrigation District</i> (3d Dist. 2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 690	102
D. Types of Projects Held Subject to CEQA	103

CHAPTER V

Exempt Activities / 107

A. Overview	107
1. Statutory Exemptions in Brief	107
2. Categorical Exemptions in Brief	108
3. The “Common Sense” Exemption in Brief	109
4. “Disapproval” Does Not Require CEQA Compliance	109
5. Implied Exemptions Are Disfavored	109

Contents

B. Actions That Do Not Constitute “Projects”	110
1. Boundary Adjustments	111
2. Citizen-Sponsored Ballot Measures	111
C. Statutory and Categorical Exemptions	112
1. In General	112
a. Procedures for Establishing an Exemption	112
b. Notice of Exemption	113
2. Statutory Exemptions	115
a. Ministerial Projects	116
b. Emergency Actions	116
c. Preparation of Planning Documents by Local Governments and State Universities to Comply with California Coastal Act	120
d. Establishing or Modifying Fees or Other Charges	120
e. Ongoing Projects Approved Prior to 1970	120
f. Projects Located Outside California	122
g. Instituting or Increasing Passenger or Commuter Services	123
h. Exemptions Relating to Certain Kinds of Housing Projects	124
i. Projects Consistent with Planning Documents for Which EIRs Have Been Prepared	131
j. Partial Statutory Exemptions	132
k. Other Statutory Exemptions	132
3. Categorical Exemptions	135
a. Exemption Categories May Not Exceed the Reasonable Scope of the Statutory Language	136
b. Three Classes of Projects Cannot Be Categorically Exempt	136
c. An Agency Determines Whether an Exemption Applies During Its Preliminary Review of the Project	136
d. Exceptions to Categorical Exemptions	137
e. Cases Involving the Written Record of the Agency’s Analysis Supporting an Exemption	145
4. Categorical Exemptions Involving Existing Facilities	149
a. Exemption Classes	149
b. “Baseline” Issues Related to Exemptions for Existing Facilities	150

5. Actions to Maintain, Protect, or Restore Natural Resources	155
a. <i>Magan v. County of Kings</i> (5th Dist. 2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 468	155
b. <i>Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish and Game Commission</i> (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 105	156
c. <i>Wildlife Alive v. Chickering</i> (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 190	156
d. <i>International Longshoremen’s & Warehousemen’s Union v. Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County</i> (4th Dist. 1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 265	156
6. Other Categorical Exemptions of Note	156
a. Class 3—CEQA Guidelines Section 15303, New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures	157
b. Class 4—CEQA Guidelines Section 15304, Minor Alterations to Land	157
c. Class 15—CEQA Guidelines Section 15315, Minor Land Divisions	158
d. Class 32—CEQA Guidelines Section 15332, Infill Development Projects	158
7. Standard of Judicial Review of Exemption Determinations	160
a. Conflicting Authorities Regarding the Standard of Review	160
b. Emerging Consensus	164
8. The “Common Sense” Exemption	165

CHAPTER VI

Certified Regulatory Programs / 167

A. In General	167
1. Purpose of Certification	167
2. Requirements for Certification	168
3. Examples of Certified Regulatory Programs	170
B. The Concept of “Functional Equivalence”	171

Contents

C. Limited Scope of Exemption from CEQA Requirements	172
1. <i>Sierra Club v. State Board of Forestry</i> (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 1215.	172
2. <i>Elk County Water District v. Department of Forestry & Fire Protection</i> (1st Dist. 1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1	173
3. <i>Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish and Game Commission</i> (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 105	174
D. Compliance with Certified Regulatory Programs	175
1. Procedural Requirements	175
2. Substantive Requirements	175
3. Agency Interaction in the Review and Approval of Timber Harvesting Plans	176
E. Use of an EIR Substitute by a Responsible Agency	177
F. Judicial Review	178
1. Certification Decisions by the Resources Agency	178
2. Environmental Documents Prepared Pursuant to Certified Regulatory Programs	178
a. Statute of Limitations	178
b. Procedural Obligations of the Parties in Litigation	178
c. Standard of Review	179
CHAPTER VII	
Application of CEQA / 181	
A. The Three-Step Evaluation Process	181
1. Preliminary Review—Is the Project Exempt?	181
2. Initial Study—Will the Project Result in Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts?	181
3. Preparing the Appropriate Environmental Document	182
a. Negative Declarations	182
b. Mitigated Negative Declarations	182
c. Environmental Impact Reports	182
B. Determining “Significant Effect”	184
1. Definition of “Significant Effect”—CEQA Guidelines Section 15382	184
2. Interpretation of “Significance”—Leading Cases	184
a. The Concept of Significance “Covers a Spectrum” from “Not Trivial” to “Momentous”	184
b. Unless Related to an Impact on the Physical Environment, a Social or Economic Impact Is Not a “Significant Effect”	185
c. The Aesthetic Merits of Building Design in an Urbanized Area May Not Be a Significant Environmental Impact	190
d. Unless Related to an Impact on the Physical Environment, an Inconsistency Between the Project and an Applicable Plan Is Not a “Significant Effect”	194
C. Determining the Proper “Baseline” of Environmental Conditions for Purposes of Measuring a Project's Impacts	198
1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125	199
a. <i>Environmental Planning and Information Council v. County of El Dorado</i> (3d Dist. 1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 350	200
b. <i>Christward Ministry v. Superior Court</i> (4th Dist. 1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 180	200
c. <i>Black Property Owners Association v. City of Berkeley</i> (1st Dist. 1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 974	201
d. <i>Fairview Neighbors v. County of Ventura</i> (2d Dist. 1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 238	201
e. <i>County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency</i> (3d Dist. 1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 931	202
f. <i>Riverwatch v. County of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1428	202
g. <i>Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 99	203
h. <i>Fat v. County of Sacramento</i> (3d Dist. 2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1270	205
2. “Baseline” Conditions for a “Subsequent” or “Supplemental” EIR	206
a. <i>Benton v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1st Dist. 1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1467	206
b. <i>Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians v. Rancho California Water Dist.</i> (4th Dist. 1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 425	207

Contents

3. Distinguishing “Baseline” Conditions from “No Project” Conditions	207
4. “Baseline” Issues Related to Relaxation of a Rule or Regulation Designed to Protect the Environment	209
5. “Baseline” Issues Related to Military Base Reuse Plans	209
D. Reliance on Thresholds of Significance and Regulatory Standards	210
1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7	210
2. <i>Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford</i> (5th Dist. 1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692	212
3. <i>Riverwatch v. County of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1428	212
4. <i>National Parks & Conservation Assn. v. County of Riverside</i> (4th Dist. 1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1341	213
5. <i>Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Committee v. Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland</i> (1st Dist. 2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344	213
6. <i>Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency</i> (3d Dist. 2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1099	214
7. <i>Mejia v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 322	214
E. Mandatory Findings of Significance	216
1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15065	216
a. <i>Mira Monte Homeowners Association v. County of Ventura</i> (2d Dist. 1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 357	217
b. <i>Environmental Council of Sacramento v. Board of Supervisors</i> (3d Dist. 1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 428	218
c. <i>Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish and Game Commission</i> (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 105	218
d. <i>Endangered Habitats League v. County of Orange</i> (4th Dist. 2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777	219
2. The 1998 Elimination of Former Appendix G	219
F. Projects for Which EIRs Are Automatically Required	221

G. Special Rules Governing Impacts to Oak Woodlands	222
H. Special Rules Governing Impacts to Historical and Archaeological Resources	223
1. Historical Resources	223
a. Public Resources Code Section 21084.1	223
b. Determining the Significance of Impacts on Historical Resources—CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5	226
c. Mitigating Impacts on Historical Resources	227
2. Archaeological Resources	230
a. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5	231
b. Public Resources Code Section 21083.2	232
c. Rules Governing the Discovery of Human Remains	235

CHAPTER VIII

The Initial Study / 237

A. In General	237
B. Consultation	238
C. Content	238
1. CEQA Guidelines Section 15063	238
2. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G	239
3. Leading Cases Considering the Adequacy of Initial Studies	239
a. <i>Citizens Association for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo</i> (4th Dist. 1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 151	239
b. <i>Christward Ministry v. Superior Court</i> (4th Dist. 1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 180	240
c. <i>Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337	240
d. <i>Gentry v. City of Murrieta</i> (4th Dist. 1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359	241
e. <i>Silveira v. Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary Dist.</i> (1st Dist. 1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 980	243
f. <i>Lighthouse Field Beach Rescue v. City of Santa Cruz</i> (6th Dist. 2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1170	244
4. Initial Study Defects May Not Always Be Cured with Evidence Outside the Study	245

Contents

D. Preparation of Initial Studies in Conjunction with Previous CEQA Documents	247
1. “Tiering” Situations	247
2. Subsequent or Supplemental Environmental Review	248
 CHAPTER IX	
Negative Declarations / 249	
A. The “Fair Argument” Standard	249
1. Evolution of the “Fair Argument” Standard	250
a. The First District Court of Appeal’s Articulation of the “Fair Argument” Rule in Friends of “B” Street and Its Progeny	250
b. Other Appellate Interpretations of the “Fair Argument” Standard	253
2. Judicial Review of the “Substantiality” of Evidence in Support of a Fair Argument	254
a. To Require Preparation of an EIR, Evidence Supporting a Fair Argument That the Project May Result in a Significant Environmental Impact Must Be “Substantial” When Viewed “in Light of the Whole Record”	255
b. The Effect of Omissions in the Agency Record	271
c. Agency Determinations Regarding the Credibility or Reliability of Evidence in Support of a “Fair Argument”	275
3. Public Controversy	277
a. <i>Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337.	278
b. <i>Meridian Ocean Systems, Inc. v. California State Lands Commission</i> (2d Dist. 1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 153	278
c. <i>Perley v. County of Calaveras</i> (3d Dist. 1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 424	278
4. Disagreement Among Expert Opinion	279
5. The “Fair Argument” Standard and Certified Regulatory Programs	279
6. Situations in Which the “Fair Argument” Standard Does Not Apply	280
a. Projects in Furtherance of a Redevelopment Plan	280
b. “Modification” of a Previously Approved Project	281
B. Scope of Review	282
1. The Need to Analyze an Entire Project	282
a. A Negative Declaration May Be Defective If It Mischaracterizes the Proposed Project	283
b. A Negative Declaration Need Not Analyze Existing Aspects of a Project	283
2. Impacts to the Physical Environment	284
a. A Negative Declaration Should Focus on the Project’s Impact on the Existing Environment	284
b. A Negative Declaration May Be Defective If It Artificially Limits the Impact Area	285
3. Indirect Impacts	286
a. <i>Dunn-Edwards Corporation v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District</i> (1st Dist. 1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 644	286
b. <i>County Sanitation District No. 2 v. County of Kern</i> (5th Dist. 2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th	287
c. <i>Heninger v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1st Dist. 1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 601	289
d. <i>Citizens Association for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo</i> (4th Dist. 1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 151	289
e. <i>Sierra Club v. The West Side Irrigation District</i> (3d Dist. 2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 690	289
4. Cumulative Impacts	291
a. The 1998 Guidelines Amendments	291
b. <i>Friends of the Old Trees v. Department of Forestry & Fire Protection</i> (1st Dist. 1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1383	295
c. <i>Gentry v. City of Murrieta</i> (4th Dist. 1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359	295
d. <i>Leonoff v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337.	296
e. <i>Sierra Club v. The West Side Irrigation District</i> (3d Dist. 2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 690	296
C. Contents	296
1. <i>Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Board</i> (3d Dist. 1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 227.	297
2. <i>City of Redlands v. County of San Bernardino</i> (4th Dist. 2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 398	298

Contents

D. Procedural Requirements	298
1. Time Limits	298
2. Public Notice and Review of a Proposed Negative Declaration	299
a. Notice of Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration	299
b. Cases Interpreting Notice Requirements	302
c. Submitting Copies to the State Clearinghouse for Review and Comment by State Agencies	305
d. Consultation with State Responsible or Trustee Agencies	305
e. Consultation with State Agencies Pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act	306
f. Consultation with Transportation Planning Agencies for Projects of “Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance”	307
g. Special Rules for Projects Located Near Schools or Involving the Purchase of School Sites	308
3. Adopting a Proposed Negative Declaration	310
4. Notice of Determination	311
E. Mitigated Negative Declarations	312
1. Public Resources Code Section 21064.5	313
2. Application of the “Fair Argument” Test in Situations Involving Mitigated Negative Declarations	313
a. <i>San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. Metropolitan Water District</i> (4th Dist. 1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 382	313
b. <i>Baldwin v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 819	317
c. <i>Arviv Enterprises, Inc. v. South Valley Area Planning Commission</i> (2d Dist. 2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1333	317
d. <i>Architectural Heritage Association v. County of Monterey</i> (6th Dist. 2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1095	318
3. Public Review of Mitigated Negative Declarations	319
4. Recirculation	320
a. CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5	321
b. CEQA Guidelines Section 15074.1 and Public Resources Code Section 21080, Subdivision (f) and (g)	322
c. <i>Long Beach Savings & Loan Assn. v. Long Beach Redevelopment Agency</i> (2d Dist. 1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 249	323

5. Deferral of Mitigation	324
a. <i>Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino</i> (1st Dist. 1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296	324
b. <i>Schaeffer Land Trust v. San Jose City Council</i> (6th Dist. 1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 612	325
c. <i>Gentry v. City of Murrieta</i> (4th Dist. 1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359	325
6. Interagency Consultation Regarding Mitigation Measures	326
7. A Mitigated Negative Declaration Requires Adoption of a Mitigation “Reporting or Monitoring Program”	327
F. Use of Negative Declarations by Responsible Agencies	327

CHAPTER X

The EIR Process / 329

A. Decision to Prepare an EIR	329
B. Time of Preparation	329
C. Determining the Scope of an EIR	330
1. The “Notice of Preparation”	331
2. Responses to the Notice of Preparation	331
3. Early Consultation	332
4. Scoping Meetings	332
5. “Scoping” a Reasonable Range of Alternatives	333
6. Reliance on Previously Prepared Environmental Documents	333
a. Program EIRs	333
b. Master EIRs	334
c. Tiering	334
d. Reliance on EIRs for General Plans, Community Plans, or Zoning Actions	334
e. Use of an EIR for an Earlier Project	335
7. Special Consultation Requirements for Specific Kinds of Projects	335
a. Sites Affected by Hazardous Wastes	335
b. Projects of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance	335
c. School Projects	336
d. Consultation with Public Water Systems	337

Contents

D. Preparing the Draft EIR	337	3. <i>Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Commission</i> (1st Dist. 1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1043	359
1. “Independent Review and Analysis”	338	4. Appellate Decisions Issued After <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association of San Francisco, Inc. v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112	360
a. Public Resources Code Section 21082.1 and <i>Friends of La Vina v. County of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1446	338	a. <i>Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1252	360
b. <i>People v. County of Kern</i> (5th Dist. 1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 761	339	b. <i>Chaparral Greens v. City of Chula Vista</i> (4th Dist. 1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1134	361
c. <i>Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino</i> (1st Dist. 1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296	339	c. <i>Fort Mojave Indian Tribe v. California Department of Health Services</i> (2d Dist. 1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1574	363
d. <i>Gentry v. City of Murrieta</i> (4th Dist. 1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1359	340	d. <i>Cadiz Land Co. v. Rail Cycle</i> (4th Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 74 and <i>Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 99	364
2. Submitting Copies to the State Clearinghouse for Review and Comment by State Agencies	340	I. Evaluation and Response to Comments	371
E. Notice of Completion	341	1. Agency Discretion to Determine Extent of Response	372
F. Public Notice	341	2. Responding to Mitigation Proposals	373
1. The Notice Contents	342	J. Preparation of Final EIR	374
2. Public Comment Period	343	K. Certification of Final EIR	374
3. Statutory Notice Requirements	343	1. <i>Environmental Council of Sacramento v. Board of Supervisors</i> (3d Dist. 1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 428	374
4. Constitutional Notice Requirements	344	2. Public Resources Code Section 21082.2, Subdivision (e)	375
a. Implications for Legislative vs. Adjudicatory Actions	345	3. Decision-making Body	375
b. Classifying Actions as Either “Legislative” or “Adjudicatory”	345	4. The Obligation to “Review and Consider” the Final EIR Cannot Be Delegated	376
G. Public Review	348	5. An Appeal from Certification of an EIR by an Unelected Body Must Be Decided by Majority Vote of the Elected Body	376
1. Public Access and Public Review	348	6. Projects Involving School Sites	378
2. Public Comments	349	L. Findings	379
3. Public Hearings	350	1. <i>Topanga Association for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles</i> (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506	380
4. Comments by Reviewing Agencies	350	2. Three Possible Findings	381
H. Recirculation of an EIR	351		
1. General Principles Governing Recirculation	351		
a. “Significant New Information”—Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and <i>Laurel Heights II</i>	352		
b. Responses to Comments After Recirculation—CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5	355		
c. Relationship of CEQA Guidelines Section 15120, Subdivision (c), to Section 15088.5, Subdivision (a)(4)—Attempts to Cure Major Defects Trigger Recirculation	356		
2. An In-Depth Look at <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association of San Francisco, Inc. v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112	357		

Contents

3. Rejecting Alternatives or Mitigation Measures—Findings of Infeasibility	382
a. <i>Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors</i> (2d Dist. 1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1167	382
b. <i>Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors</i> (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 553	382
c. <i>Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (1st Dist. 1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 893	383
d. <i>San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (1st Dist. 2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 656	383
e. <i>Association of Irrigated Residents v. County of Madera</i> (5th Dist. 2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1383	384
f. <i>City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 410	384
g. <i>Sierra Club v. County of Napa</i> (1st Dist. 2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490	385
h. <i>Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland</i> (1st Dist. 1993) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704	386
4. Agency Decision-making Bodies Cannot Delegate Their Obligation to Issue Findings	386
5. Responsible Agencies Must Adopt Their Own Findings	387
6. An Agency Must Issue “Express” Findings	387
7. Agencies Should Mitigate Impacts That Are Within Their Responsibility	388
8. Agencies Need Only Adopt Mitigation Measures or Alternatives in Order to Substantially Lessen Significant Effects	389
9. “Brief” or “Conclusory” Findings Are Acceptable in Limited Circumstances	390
a. <i>Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School District</i> (2d Dist. 1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 826	390
b. <i>City of Poway v. City of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 1037	390
c. <i>No Slo Transit, Inc. v. City of Long Beach</i> (2d Dist. 1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 241	391
d. <i>San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (1st Dist. 1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1502	391

M. Mitigation Reporting or Monitoring Requirement	391
1. Implementing Mitigation Measures	392
a. <i>Christward Ministry v. County of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 31	393
b. <i>Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations et al. v. City of Los Angeles et al.</i> (2d Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1252	393
2. Agencies May Adopt a Monitoring or a Reporting Program	394
3. Standardized Monitoring or Reporting Programs	394
4. Relationship Between Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies	395
5. Projects of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance	396
6. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Need Not Be in the EIR	396
N. Statement of Overriding Considerations	397
1. A Statement of Overriding Considerations Must Be Supported by Substantial Evidence	398
2. Challenging Evidentiary Bases for Statements of Overriding Considerations	399
3. Determining When Statements of Overriding Considerations Are Required	400
4. Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations When the Necessary Mitigation Measures Are Within Domain of a Responsible Agency	403
O. Project Approval	403
1. Balancing Environmental Values and Public Objectives	404
2. Approving Projects Involving the Purchase of a School Site	404
3. Authority to Disapprove Projects	406
P. Notice of Determination	406
Q. Disposition of a Final EIR	408
R. Payment of Fees to the Department of Fish and Game	408
S. Approval by Responsible Agency	409

Contents

CHAPTER XI

Substantive Requirements of Environmental Impact Reports / 411

A. Lead Agencies’ Duties with Respect to EIRs	411
B. Format and Substance of an EIR	411
1. Lead Agencies Should Focus on Potentially Significant Effects	412
2. Mandatory Contents of a Draft EIR	413
a. Brief Summary	413
b. Project Description	414
c. Description of the Project’s Environmental Setting	433
d. Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project	439
e. Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects	455
f. Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects—General Principles	455
g. Alternatives to the Proposed Action—General Principles	458
h. Significant Irreversible Changes	460
i. Growth-Inducing Impacts	460
j. Effects Found Not to Be Significant	465
k. Organizations and Persons Consulted	465
l. Cumulative Impacts	465
m. Economic and Social Effects	486
C. Contents of a Final EIR	492
D. What Constitutes an Adequate EIR—A Summary	492
1. Sufficiently Detailed Analysis	492
a. <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376	493
b. <i>Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford</i> (5th Dist. 1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692	494
c. <i>San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus</i> (5th Dist. 1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 713	494

d. <i>Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School District</i> (2d Dist. 1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 826	495
e. <i>Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus</i> (5th Dist. 1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 182	495
f. <i>Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors</i> (1st Dist. 2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 342	496
g. <i>Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Committee v. Board of Port Commissioners</i> (1st Dist. 2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344	497
h. <i>Californians for Alternatives to Toxics v. Department of Food and Agriculture</i> (1st Dist. 2005) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1	498
2. Disagreement Among Experts Does Not Invalidate an EIR	499
3. Avoiding Undue Cross-Referencing	500

CHAPTER XII

Mitigation Measures and Alternatives / 503

A. Authority to Impose Mitigation Measures	503
1. Condemnation— <i>Golden Gate Bridge District v. Muzzi</i> (1st Dist. 1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 707	504
2. “Extraterritorial” Condemnation— <i>Kenneth Mebane Ranches v. Superior Court</i> (5th Dist. 1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 276	504
3. Relationship to the Coastal Act— <i>Sierra Club v. California Coastal Commission</i> (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 839, 858–860	505
4. Relationship to Vehicle Code Section 9400.8— <i>County Sanitation District No. 2 v. County of Kern</i> (5th Dist. 2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1544	506
5. Relationship to Ellis Act— <i>First Presbyterian Church v. City of Berkeley</i> (1st Dist. 1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1241	507

Contents

6. Imposing Mitigation Measures on Religious Uses— <i>Lucas Valley Homeowners Association v. County of Marin</i> (1st Dist. 1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 130 and the “Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000”	508
a. <i>San Jose Christian College v. City of Morgan Hill</i> (9th Cir. 2004) 360 F. 3d 1024	509
b. <i>Cottonwood Christian Ctr. v. Cypress Redevelopment Agency</i> (C.D. Cal. 2002) 218 F. Supp. 2d 1203	510
c. <i>Ventura County Christian High School v. City of San Buenaventura</i> (C.D. Cal. 2002) 233 F. Supp. 2d 1241	511
d. Summary of RLUIPA Cases	511
B. Authority to Delete or Modify Previously Adopted Mitigation Measures	512
C. Mitigation Measures Must Address Only the Impacts Caused by a Project	517
1. U.S. Supreme Court Cases Interpreting Constitutional Limitations on Mitigation Measures	517
a. The “Nexus” Requirement— <i>Nollan v. California Coastal Commission</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 825	517
b. The “Rough Proportionality” Standard— <i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 374	518
2. California Supreme Court Interpretation of Constitutional Limits on Mitigation— <i>Ehrlich v. City of Culver City</i> (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 854	519
3. CEQA Implications of <i>Nollan, Dolan, and Ehrlich</i>	524
4. The Ninth Circuit’s Application of <i>Nollan</i> and <i>Dolan</i> — <i>Garneau v. City of Seattle</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F. 3d 802	526
D. Statutory Restrictions on Mitigation	528
1. Housing Projects	528
a. Public Resources Code Section 21159.26	529
b. Government Code Section 65589.5, Subdivision (j).	529
c. Government Code Section 65863	529
d. Government Code Section 66474.2	530
2. Projects Affecting Archaeological or Historical Resources	530
3. Impacts on Endangered and Threatened Species	531
4. Impacts to School Facilities	532
a. Legal Framework	533
b. Legally Permissible Means for Funding School Facilities Other Than Impact Fees.	538
5. Trip Reduction Programs	541
E. Standards for the Adequacy of Mitigation Measures	542
1. Mitigation for Expansion and Relocation of Medical Research Facility— <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California</i> (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376	542
2. Substantial Evidence Must Support the Finding That Mitigation Measures Are Required in, or Incorporated into, the Project— <i>Federation of Hillside & Canyon Associations v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1252	544
3. CEQA Is Concerned with Feasible Mitigation Measures— <i>Concerned Citizens of South Central Los Angeles v. Los Angeles Unified School District</i> (2d Dist. 1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 826	545
4. Similar Mitigation Is Not Necessarily Required for All Similar Projects— <i>Del Mar Terrace Conservancy, Inc. v. City Council of the City of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 712	546
5. CEQA Does Not Require Agencies to Impose Measures to Mitigate Social or Economic Impacts— <i>San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco</i> (1st Dist. 1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1502	547
6. Offsite Mitigation— <i>La Costa Beach Homeowners’ Assn. v. California Coastal Com.</i> (2d Dist. 2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 804	548
7. Preservation as Mitigation— <i>Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine</i> (4th Dist. 2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1261 and <i>Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside</i> (4th Dist. 2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 477	549

Contents

F. Deferral of the Formulation of Specific Mitigation Strategies Until After Project Approval	551
1. Performance Standards in Connection with “First Tier” or “Program” Level Approvals	552
a. <i>Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford</i> (5th Dist. 1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692	552
b. <i>Rio Vista Farm Bureau Center v. County of Solano</i> (1st Dist. 1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 351	552
2. Performance Standards in Connection with Approvals Based on Project-Specific EIRs and Negative Declarations	554
a. <i>Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino</i> (1st Dist. 1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 296	554
b. <i>Sacramento Old City Association v. City Council of Sacramento</i> (3d Dist. 1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011	555
c. <i>Dry Creek Citizens Coalition v. County of Tulare</i> (5th Dist. 1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 20	556
d. <i>Fairview Neighbors et al. v. County of Ventura</i> (2d Dist. 1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 238	557
e. <i>Endangered Habitats League v. County of Orange</i> (4th Dist. 2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777	557
G. Payment of Fees as a Form of Mitigation	559
1. An Agency May Properly Rely on Fee Programs as Mitigation Where the Agency Reasonably Expects That Such Fees Actually Will Be Used for Mitigation	559
2. A Lack of Substantial Evidence That Fees Actually Will Be Spent on Mitigation May Invalidate a Finding That the Impact at Issue Has Been Rendered Less Than Significant.	561
H. Environmental Effects of Mitigation Measures	562
I. Analysis of Alternatives	563
1. Evaluating a “Reasonable Range” of Alternatives	564
a. <i>Village Laguna of Laguna Beach v. Board of Supervisors</i> (4th Dist. 1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1022	564
b. <i>Mann v. Community Redevelopment Agency</i> (2d Dist. 1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1143	564
c. <i>Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland</i> (1st Dist. 1993) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704	564
d. <i>Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma County Water Agency</i> (1st Dist. 2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859	565
e. <i>Marin Municipal Water District v. KG Land California Corporation</i> (1st Dist. 1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1652	566
f. <i>Kootenai Tribe of Idaho v. Veneman</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 313 F. 3d 1094	566
g. <i>Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Commission</i> (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 105	567
2. Level of Detail Required in Analyzing Alternatives	567
3. Formulation of Alternatives	568
4. Economic Feasibility	568
5. Alternative Locations	569
6. NEPA Cases Emphasize the Role of Alternatives Analysis	570
7. Important Cases Involving the Analysis of Alternatives	571
a. Need for “Meaningful Detail” in the Analysis of Alternatives— <i>Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. The Regents of the University of California</i> (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376	571
b. “Quantitative, Comparative Analysis” Required for an EIR for Energy Facility— <i>Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford</i> (5th Dist. 1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692	573
c. Less Detailed Analysis Required for Plan-Level EIRs— <i>Al Larson Boat Shop, Inc. v. Board of Harbor Commissioners</i> (2d Dist. 1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 729	574
d. <i>Goleta I</i> and <i>Goleta II</i> : Applying the “Rule of Reason” in Determining When to Analyze “Off-site Alternatives”	575
e. Other Cases Involving Off-site Alternatives	581
8. The Importance of Articulating Proper Project Objectives in Formulating a Range of Reasonable Alternatives	588
a. <i>City of Santee v. County of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1438	589
b. <i>Sequoiah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland</i> (1st Dist. 1993) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704	589
c. <i>Sierra Club v. County of Napa</i> (1st Dist. 2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490	589

Contents

9. Instructive NEPA Cases and Regulations	590
a. <i>Save the Niobara River Association, Inc. v. Andrus</i> (D. Neb. 1977) 483 F. Supp. 844.	591
b. <i>Carmel-by-the-Sea v. U.S. Department of Transportation</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 123 F. 3d 1142	591
c. <i>Westlands Water District v. United States Department of Interior</i> (9th Cir. 2004) 376 F. 3d 853	593
10. Corps' NEPA Compliance in Conjunction with Clean Water Act Section 404 Permitting	594
11. The "No Project" Alternative	595
a. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, Subdivision (e), Supersedes <i>Dusek v. Anaheim Redevelopment Agency</i> (4th Dist. 1986) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1029.	596
b. <i>Planning & Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources</i> (3d Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 892.	597

CHAPTER XIII

Means of Avoiding Redundancy in Preparing EIRs / 601

A. Overview	601
1. EIR Types	601
2. "Tiering"	601
3. Procedural Means of Shortening EIRs	602
4. Combined EIR/EIS	602
B. Project EIR	602
C. EIR as Part of a General Plan	603
D. Major Tools and Processes: Tiering, Master EIRs, Projects Consistent with General Plans, Community Plans, and Zoning, and Program EIRs	603
1. Tiering	603
a. Tiering Defined	604
b. The Purposes of Tiering	604
c. Tiering Requirements	604
d. Leading Cases Regarding Tiering Issues	610
e. Relationship of Tiering Principles to Projects Consistent with General Plans, Community Plans, and Zoning	615

2. Master EIRs	616
a. The Purpose of Master EIRs	616
b. Types of Projects for Which a Master EIR May Be Prepared.	617
c. Master EIR Contents	617
3. Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183: Projects Consistent with General Plans, Community Plans, and Zoning	629
a. Streamlined Review of Certain "Consistent" Projects	629
b. Two Important Limitations	631
c. "Effects on the Environment Which Are Peculiar to the Project"	632
4. Program EIRs	636
a. "Program" EIRs vs. "First Tier" EIRs	637
b. Program EIRs Functioning as "First Tier" Documents Need Not Provide Detailed, Site-Specific Analysis	643
c. How Much Review, If Any, Is Required for Later Activities?	651
5. A Comparison of These Means: Tiering, Master EIRs, Sections 21083.3 and 15183, and Program EIRs	655
a. "Master" EIRs vs. "Tiering"	655
b. Section 21083.3 vs. "Tiering"	658
c. Parallel or Intersecting Processes?	658
d. Some Procedural Differences	659
E. Staged EIRs for Large Capital Projects	662
1. Purpose	662
2. Procedure	663
3. Interpretation— <i>A Local and Regional Monitor v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 630.	663
F. Subsequent EIRs and Supplements to EIRs, and Addenda to EIRs and Negative Declarations	665
1. Subsequent EIRs and Supplements to EIRs	665
a. What's the Difference?	665
b. Public Resources Code Section 21166	666

Contents

c. Section 21166 and Its Implementing Guidelines Apply Only After “Certification” of a Final EIR	668
d. Is It a “New Project” or a “Change to a Previous Project”?	669
e. Notice and Public Review	669
f. Scope of Potential Legal Challenges	670
2. Addenda to EIRs or Negative Declarations	687
a. Addenda to EIRs	687
b. Addenda to Negative Declarations	688
c. Procedure for Preparing an Addendum	688
d. Preparation of an Addendum by a Responsible Agency	688
G. Procedural Means of Shortening EIRs	689
1. Use of EIR Prepared for an Earlier Project—CEQA Guidelines Section 15153.	689
a. Use of a Previously Prepared EIR Pursuant to Section 15153 Cannot, by Itself, Justify Use of a Negative Declaration	689
b. <i>Emmington v. Solano County Redevelopment Agency</i> (1st Dist. 1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 491	690
2. Incorporation by Reference	690
3. Master Environmental Assessments	691
4. Special Situations	692
a. Redevelopment Projects	692
b. Small Multi-Family or Mixed-Use Development in Specified Circumstances	695
c. Residential Projects Undertaken Pursuant to a Specific Plan	696
d. State-Mandated Local Projects	696
e. Environmentally Mandated Projects	696
f. Special Rules for EIRs for Military Base Reuse Plans	699
g. Special Rules for Transportation Planning Agencies	702
H. Combined EIR/EIS	702
1. NEPA Document Ready Before CEQA Document	703
2. CEQA Document Ready Before NEPA Document	704

CHAPTER XIV / 707

Projects Subject to Permit Streamlining Act Time Requirements

A. The Basic Framework of PSA	707
1. Purpose of PSA	707
2. PSA Applies Only to “Development Projects”	708
a. “Development Project”	708
b. Quasi-Adjudicatory vs. Quasi-Legislative and Legislative Actions	709
c. “Permit to Operate” Is Not a Development Project	710
B. Time Lines Under PSA	710
1. CEQA Sets PSA Clock	710
2. CEQA Time Lines	711
3. An Agency Cannot Disapprove a Project Solely Because of the Agency’s Inability to Meet PSA Deadlines	712
C. Processing Applications Under PSA	712
1. Information Required	712
2. Receipt for Filing	712
3. Complete Applications	713
4. Disagreement Regarding Completeness	713
5. Requests for Additional Information	713
6. Preparation of the Initial Study	714
D. Extending Time Lines	714
1. Permissible Extensions	714
a. PSA Deadlines	714
b. CEQA Deadlines	714
2. Delaying Initiation of PSA Deadlines by Mutual Consent	715
a. Example of Permissible Delay in Meeting CEQA Deadlines	716
b. Example of Impermissible Delay in Meeting CEQA Deadlines	716
3. Waivers of PSA Time Lines Are Not Permitted	717

Contents

E. Notice	718
1. Notice of Deemed Approval	719
2. Due Process	719
3. Lingering Uncertainty	720
4. Notice of Environmental Permits	721
F. Challenges to Deemed Approvals	722
1. Administrative Appeals Apply	722
2. CEQA Challenges Still May Be Available	722
G. Enforcing a Deemed Approved Permit	723
1. Hurdles in Obtaining a Deemed Approved Permit	723
2. Hurdles in Enforcing a Deemed Approved Permit	725

CHAPTER XV / 727

Water Supply Planning and CEQA

A. Legislation Integrating Land Use and Water Supply Planning	729
1. The “Duty to Serve”	729
2. Inter-agency Consultation During General Plan Updates	730
3. Urban Water Management Planning Act	731
a. In General	731
b. Description of the Agency’s Service Area	732
c. Water Supply	732
d. Water Demand	734
e. Comparing Water Supply and Demand	735
f. Water Shortage Contingency Planning	735
g. Recycled Water	736
h. Future Water Supply Projects	737
i. Water Quality	737
j. Population Growth	737
k. Summary	738

4. Water Supply Assessments and Verifications	738
a. Purpose and Goals	738
b. Understanding Key Differences Between Water Supply Assessments and Water Supply Verifications	739
c. Definitions	739
d. Who Prepares the Assessments and Verifications?	741
e. When to Prepare the Assessments and Verifications	742
f. What Information Must Be Included?	743
g. Relying on Previously Prepared UWMs, Assessments, and Verifications	745
h. Inclusion in Environmental Documents	746
i. Effect of an Insufficiency Determination	747
j. Legal Challenge	749
k. 499-Unit Developments	751
l. San Diego	751
m. Caveats	752

B. Proper Timing of Land Use and Water Supply Planning Under CEQA	753
1. <i>Santiago Water Dist. v. County of Orange</i> (4th Dist. 1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 818.	753
2. <i>Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus</i> (5th Dist. 1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 182	754
3. <i>Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors</i> (1st Dist. 2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 342.	756
4. <i>County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency</i> (3d Dist. 1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 931.	758
a. Factual Background	759
b. The Court’s Reasoning	759
5. Integration of Water Supply and Land Use Planning Must Occur at the General Plan Level: Reconciling <i>Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus</i> (5th Dist. 1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 182 and <i>County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency</i> (3d Dist. 1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 931.	761
a. The Land Use and Water Supply Planning Link Should Be Addressed in General Plan EIRs.	761
b. General Plans Should Use Long Time Horizons	762

Contents

c. Water Suppliers Should Start Work Immediately Following the Adoption of a General Plan	762
d. EIRs Must Examine the Responsibilities of Other Agencies	763
e. Proper Mitigation When New Supplies Are Required	763
C. Managing the Uncertainty of Water Law in Environmental Review	764
1. <i>Planning and Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources</i> (3d Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 892	764
2. <i>Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma County Water Agency</i> (1st Dist. 2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859	767
3. <i>Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. County of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 715	769
a. Factual Background	769
b. The Court's Reasoning	770
c. The Court's Conclusions	771
4. <i>Friends of the Santa Clara River v. Castaic Lake Water Agency</i> (2d Dist. 2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1373	773
5. <i>California Oak Foundation v. City of Santa Clarita</i> (2d Dist. 2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1219	774
a. Factual and Legal Background	774
b. The Court's Reasoning	776
D. CEQA and Groundwater Impact Assessment	778
1. <i>Cadiz Land Co. v. Rail Cycle</i> (4th Dist. 2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 74	778
2. <i>Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey Bay County Board of Supervisors</i> (6th Dist. 2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 99	779
a. Factual Background	780
b. The Court's Reasoning	782
3. Practical Conclusions to Be Drawn from <i>Cadiz and Save Our Peninsula Committee</i>	785
E. Concluding Comments	786

CHAPTER XVI

Judicial Review / 787

A. Statutes of Limitations	787
1. Notices of Determination Trigger a 30-Day Limitations Period	787
a. Filing and Posting Requirements for Local Agencies	788
b. Filing and Posting Requirements for State Agencies	788
c. Notices of Determination for Phased Projects	788
2. Notices of Exemption Trigger a 35-Day Limitations Period	788
3. Statutes of Limitations Are Strictly Construed	789
4. CEQA Statutes of Limitations Are Not Extended Simply Because CEQA Claims Are Joined to Non-CEQA Claims	789
5. "Approval" Triggers a Statute of Limitations— <i>City of Chula Vista v. County of San Diego</i> (4th Dist. 1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1713	791
6. Amendment of Pleadings to Add Petitioner(s) May "Relate Back" in Some CEQA Cases	792
7. Amendment of Pleadings to Add an Indispensable Party Does Not "Relate Back" to Original Petition	792
8. Public Resources Code Section 21167.6.5	793
a. Section 21167.6.5 as Originally Enacted in 2002	793
b. 2004 Amendments to Section 21167.6.5	794
c. Conclusions	795
d. <i>Deltakeeper v. Oakdale Irrigation District</i> (3d Dist. 2002) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1092	795
9. Payment of Fees to the Department of Fish and Game May Be Required in Order to Rely on Statute of Limitations	797
10. Expiration of the Limitations Period Without the Filing of a Lawsuit Creates a Conclusive Presumption of Adequate CEQA Compliance	797
11. Laches	797

Contents

B. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies	798	2. Discretion to Decide Moot Cases	822
1. Exhaustion Requirements Are “Jurisdictional”	798	a. Issues of Public Interest	822
2. Purposes of the Exhaustion Doctrine	799	b. Recurring Controversy	822
3. Exhaustion Is Required Only with Regard to the Agency with Final Decision-making Authority	800	c. Material Question	823
4. Reconsideration of an Agency Action Generally Is Not a Prerequisite to Judicial Review	800	3. Dismissal of the Appeal or Reversal of the Judgment	823
5. Public Resources Code Section 21177 Codified the Exhaustion Doctrine and Its Exceptions	801	E. Standard of Review	824
a. “Issue” Exhaustion	801	1. Public Resources Code Sections 21168 and 21168.5	824
b. “Identity” Exhaustion	803	2. Courts Must Defer to Agencies’ Substantive Judgments While Requiring Strict Compliance with CEQA’s Mandatory Procedures	825
c. Exhaustion May Occur After the Close of the Public Comment Period	804	3. What Constitutes a “Prejudicial Abuse of Discretion”?	826
d. What Constitutes an “Administrative Remedy”?	804	4. Judicial Review in CEQA Actions Generally Is Confined to Evidence Contained in the Agency’s Record of Proceedings	828
e. Exceptions to the Exhaustion Doctrine	806	a. Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5	828
6. Agency Regulations or Ordinances May Affect Exhaustion Requirements	811	b. Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085	829
7. Government Code Section 65009 May Limit Challenges to Local Planning and Zoning Decisions Based on Non-CEQA Theories	812	c. <i>Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court</i> (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559	829
C. Standing	812	d. Possible Exceptions to the General Rule Prohibiting Consideration of Extra-Record Evidence Should Be Narrowly Construed	833
1. A “Beneficial Interest” Standing Versus “Citizen’s Action” Standing	813	e. Court of Appeal Opinions Issued After <i>Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court</i> (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559	834
2. In General, Standing Under CEQA Has Been Construed Liberally	816	5. The Effect of Error on the Outcome of Litigation	842
3. Geographic Nexus	816	a. Public Resources Code Section 21005	843
4. Petitioners’ Interests Must Not Be Merely Competitive in Character	817	b. Guidance from the Supreme Court— <i>Sierra Club v. State Board of Forestry</i> (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 1215	844
D. Mootness	820	F. Procedural Requirements During Litigation	852
1. Completed or Partially Completed Projects	820	1. Filing and Serving the Petition for Writ of Mandate	852
a. <i>Hixon v. County of Los Angeles</i> (2d Dist. 1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 370	820	a. The Respondent Agency Must Be Served within Ten Business Days of Filing the Petition	852
b. <i>Woodward Park Homeowners Association v. Garreks, Inc.</i> (5th Dist. 2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 880	820	b. Real Parties in Interest Must Be Served within Twenty Business Days of Service on the Respondent Agency	853
c. <i>Arviv Enterprises, Inc. v. South Valley Area Planning Commission</i> (2d Dist. 2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1333	821		

Contents

c. Respondents Must Supply Petitioners with a List of Interested Agencies, and Petitioners Must Notify Such Agencies of the Pending Litigation	853
d. Initial Pleadings Must Be Served on the Office of the Attorney General within Ten Calendar Days of Filing	853
2. Preparing the Record of Proceedings	854
a. Timing Issues Arising Under Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, Subdivision (b)(2)	855
b. Costs of Preparing the Record	857
c. Contents of the Record—Interpreting Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, Subdivision (e)	858
d. Organization of the Record	870
e. Appeals	870
3. Settlement Conferences	870
4. Statements of Issues	871
5. Responsive Pleadings	871
6. Severance Motions	873
7. Requesting and Scheduling a Hearing	873
a. 90-Day Rule Applies to Actions Challenging Decisions Pursuant to Certified Regulatory Programs	876
b. 90-Day Rule May Be Tolerated If Trial Court Fails to Give Statutorily Required Notice of Transfer	876
c. 90-Day Rule Is Not Tolerated If Trial Court Gives Notice of Transfer	877
8. Statutory Preference for CEQA Cases	878
9. “CEQA Judges”	878
10. Challenging a “Pattern or Practice” of Purported CEQA Violations in One Lawsuit	879
11. Optional Mediation Procedures	880
12. Indemnification Agreements Between Agencies and Applicants	881
a. Indemnification Under the Subdivision Map Act	881
b. Indemnification Under CEQA	882
c. Indemnification in Other Land Use Contexts	886

CHAPTER XVII / 887

Judicial Remedies

A. Injunctive Relief	887
1. Preliminary Injunctions	887
2. Stays Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, Subdivision (g)	888
3. Posting a Bond or “Undertaking” in Environmental Cases	889
a. Code of Civil Procedure Section 529	889
b. Code of Civil Procedure Sections 529.1 and 529.2	891
c. Authors’ View	892
B. Issues to Be Addressed by a Court in CEQA Litigation	893
C. Peremptory Writs of Mandate	894
1. Public Resources Code Section 21168.9, Subdivision (a)(1)	895
2. Public Resources Code Section 21168.9, Subdivision (a)(2)	895
3. Public Resources Code Section 21168.9, Subdivision (a)(3)	899
4. Public Resources Code Section 21168.9, Subdivision (b)	900
5. Public Resources Code Section 21168.9, Subdivision (c)	900
6. <i>Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District</i> (6th Dist. 1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109	901
D. The Propriety of Interlocutory Relief	902
E. Continuing Court Jurisdiction	904
F. Recovery of Litigation Costs	907
G. Attorneys’ Fees Awards to “Successful Parties”	908
1. Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5 Codifies the Equitable “Private Attorney General” Doctrine	909

Contents

2. Prerequisites to an Attorneys' Fees Award Under Section 1021.5	910
a. Successful Party	910
b. Important Rights	911
c. Significant Benefit to the General Public or a Large Class of Persons	912
d. The Necessity and Burden of Private Enforcement	916
H. Considerations on Appeal	921
H. Considerations on Appeal	921
Notes	923

Appendices / 1081

I. CEQA Process Flow Chart	1083
II. Cross References for Some CEQA Guidelines Sections	1085
III. The New and Improved CEQA Guidelines Revisions: Important Guidance for Controversial Issues	1087
IV. California Water Code Provisions Enacted as Part of Senate Bill No. 901	1093
V. Vehicle Trip Reduction Plans as Mitigation	1101
List of Acronyms	1111
Table of Authorities	1113
Index	1145