

**Climate Change, the California Environmental Quality Act,  
and General Plan Updates:  
Straightforward Answers to Some Frequently Asked Questions  
California Attorney General's Office**

---

At any given time in this State, well over one hundred California cities and counties are updating their general plans. These are complex, comprehensive, long-term planning documents that can be years in the making. Their preparation requires local governments to balance diverse and sometimes competing interests and, at the same time, comply with the Planning and Zoning Law and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Local governments have decades of experience in applying state planning law and excellent resources to assist them – such as the “General Plan Guidelines” issued by The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).<sup>1</sup> They are also practiced in assessing whether general plans may have significant localized environmental effects, such as degradation of air quality, reductions in the water supply, or growth inducing impacts. The impact of climate change, however, has only fairly recently shown up on the CEQA radar.

The fact that climate change presents a new challenge under CEQA has not stopped local governments from taking action. A substantial number of cities and counties already are addressing climate change in their general plan updates and accompanying CEQA documents. These agencies understand the substantial environmental and administrative benefits of a programmatic approach to climate change. Addressing the problem at the programmatic level allows local governments to consider the “big picture” and – provided it’s done right – allows for the streamlined review of individual projects.<sup>2</sup>

Guidance addressing CEQA, climate change, and general planning is emerging, for example, in the pending CEQA Guideline amendments,<sup>3</sup> comments and settlements by the Attorney General, and in the public discourse, for example, the 2008 series on CEQA and Global Warming organized by the Local Government Commission and sponsored by the Attorney General. In addition, the Attorney General’s staff has met informally with officials and planners from numerous jurisdictions to discuss CEQA requirements and to learn from those who are leading the fight against global warming at the local level.

Still, local governments and their planners have questions. In this document, we attempt to answer some of the most frequently asked of those questions. We hope this document will be useful, and we encourage cities and counties to contact us with any additional questions, concerns, or comments.

- **Can a lead agency find that a general plan update’s climate change-related impacts are too speculative, and therefore avoid determining whether the project’s impacts are significant?**

No. There is nothing speculative about climate change. It’s well understood that (1) greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions increase atmospheric concentrations of GHGs; (2) increased GHG concentrations in the atmosphere exacerbate global warming; (3) a project that adds to the atmospheric load of GHGs adds to the problem.

Making the significance determination plays a critical role in the CEQA process.<sup>4</sup> Where a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency must prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, a finding of significance triggers the obligation to consider alternatives and to impose feasible mitigation.<sup>6</sup> For any project under CEQA, including a general plan update, a lead agency therefore has a fundamental obligation to determine whether the environmental effects of the project, including the project’s contribution to global warming, are significant.

- **In determining the significance of a general plan’s climate change-related effects, must a lead agency estimate GHG emissions?**

Yes. As OPR’s Technical Advisory states:

Lead agencies should make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to calculate, model, or estimate the amount of CO2 and other GHG emissions from a project, including the emissions associated with vehicular traffic, energy consumption, water usage and construction activities.<sup>7</sup>

In the context of a general plan update, relevant emissions include those from government operations, as well as from the local community as a whole. Emissions sources include, for example, transportation, industrial facilities and equipment, residential and commercial development, agriculture, and land conversion.

There are a number of resources available to assist local agencies in estimating their current and projected GHG emissions. For example, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) recently issued protocols for estimating emissions from local government operations, and the agency’s protocol for estimating community-wide emissions is forthcoming.<sup>8</sup> OPR’s Technical Advisory contains a list of modeling tools to estimate GHG emissions. Other sources of helpful information include the white paper issued by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), “CEQA and Climate Change”<sup>9</sup> and the Attorney General’s website,<sup>10</sup> both of which provide information on currently available models for calculating emissions. In addition, many cities and counties are working with the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI)<sup>11</sup> and tapping into the expertise of this State’s many colleges and universities.<sup>12</sup>

- **For climate change, what are the relevant “existing environmental conditions”?**

The CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as “a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions which exist in the area affected by the proposed project.”<sup>13</sup>

For local or regional air pollutants, existing physical conditions are often described in terms of air quality (how much pollutant is in the ambient air averaged over a given period of time), which is fairly directly tied to current emission levels in the relevant “area affected.” The “area affected,” in turn, often is defined by natural features that hold or trap the pollutant until it escapes or breaks down. So, for example, for particulate matter, a lead agency may describe existing physical conditions by discussing annual average PM10 levels, and high PM10 levels averaged over a 24-hour period, detected at various points in the air basin in the preceding years.

With GHGs, we’re dealing with a global pollutant. The “area affected” is both the atmosphere and every place that is affected by climate change, including not just the area immediately around the project, but the region and the State (and indeed the planet). The existing “physical conditions” that we care about are the current atmospheric concentrations of GHGs and the existing climate that reflects those concentrations.

Unlike more localized, ambient air pollutants which dissipate or break down over a relatively short period of time (hours, days or weeks), GHGs accumulate in the atmosphere, persisting for decades and in some cases millennia. The overwhelming scientific consensus is that in order to avoid disruptive and potentially catastrophic climate change, then it’s not enough simply to stabilize our annual GHG emissions. The science tells us that we must immediately and substantially reduce these emissions.

- **If a lead agency agrees to comply with AB 32 regulations when they become operative (in 2012), can the agency determine that the GHG-related impacts of its general plan will be less than significant?**

No. CEQA is not a mechanism merely to ensure compliance with other laws, and, in addition, it does not allow agencies to defer mitigation to a later date. CEQA requires lead agencies to consider the significant environmental effects of their actions and to mitigate them today, if feasible.

The decisions that we make today do matter. Putting off the problem will only increase the costs of any solution. Moreover, delay may put a solution out of reach at any price. The experts tell us that the later we put off taking real action to reduce our GHG emissions, the less likely we will be able to stabilize atmospheric concentrations at a level that will avoid dangerous climate change.

- **Since climate change is a global phenomenon, how can a lead agency determine whether the GHG emissions associated with its general plan are significant?**

The question for the lead agency is whether the GHG emissions from the project – the general plan update – are considerable when viewed in connection with the GHG emissions from past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.<sup>14</sup> The effects of GHG emissions from past projects and from current projects to date are reflected in current atmospheric concentrations of GHGs and current climate, and the effects of future emissions of GHGs, whether from current projects or existing projects, can be predicted based on models showing future atmospheric GHG concentrations under different emissions scenarios, and different resulting climate effects.

A single local agency can't, of course, solve the climate problem. But that agency can do its fair share, making sure that the GHG emissions from projects in its jurisdiction and subject to its general plan are on an emissions trajectory that, if adopted on a larger scale, is consistent with avoiding dangerous climate change.

Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-3-05, which commits California to reducing its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and to eighty percent below 1990 levels by 2050, is grounded in the science that tells us what we must do to achieve our long-term climate stabilization objective. The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), which codifies the 2020 target and tasks ARB with developing a plan to achieve this target, is a necessary step toward stabilization.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, the targets set in AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05 can inform the CEQA analysis .

One reasonable option for the lead agency is to create community-wide GHG emissions targets for the years governed by the general plan. The community-wide targets should align with an emissions trajectory that reflects aggressive GHG mitigation in the near term and California's interim (2020)<sup>16</sup> and long-term (2050) GHG emissions limits set forth in AB 32 and the Executive Order.

To illustrate, we can imagine a hypothetical city that has grown in a manner roughly proportional to the state and is updating its general plan through 2035. The city had emissions of 1,000,000 million metric tons (MMT) in 1990 and 1,150,000 MMT in 2008. The city could set an emission reduction target for 2014 of 1,075,000 MMT, for 2020 of 1,000,000 MMT, and for 2035 of 600,000 MMT, with appropriate emission benchmarks in between. Under these circumstances, the city could in its discretion determine that an alternative that achieves these targets would have less than significant climate change impacts.

- **Is a lead agency required to disclose and analyze the full development allowed under the general plan?**

Yes. The lead agency must disclose and analyze the full extent of the development allowed by the proposed amended general plan,<sup>17</sup> including associated GHG emissions.

This doesn't mean that the lead agency shouldn't discuss the range of development that is likely to occur as a practical matter, noting, for example, the probable effect of market forces. But the lead agency can't rely on the fact that full build out may not occur, or that its timing is uncertain, to avoid its obligation to disclose the impacts of the development that the general plan would permit. Any other approach would seriously underestimate the potential impact of the general plan update and is inconsistent with CEQA's purposes.

- **What types of alternatives should the lead agency consider?**

A city or county should, if feasible, evaluate at least one alternative that would ensure that the community contributes to a lower-carbon future. Such an alternative might include one or more of the following options:

- higher density development that focuses growth within existing urban areas;
- policies and programs to facilitate and increase biking, walking, and public transportation and reduce vehicle miles traveled;
- the creation of “complete neighborhoods” where local services, schools, and parks are within walking distance of residences;
- incentives for mixed-use development;
- in rural communities, creation of regional service centers to reduce vehicle miles traveled;
- energy efficiency and renewable energy financing (see, e.g., AB 811)<sup>18</sup>
- policies for preservation of agricultural and forested land serving as carbon sinks;
- requirements and ordinances that mandate energy and water conservation and green building practices; and
- requirements for carbon and nitrogen-efficient agricultural practices.

Each local government must use its own good judgment to select the suite of measures that best serves that community.

- **Can a lead agency rely on policies and measures that simply “encourage” GHG efficiency and emissions reductions?**

No. Mitigation measures must be “fully enforceable.”<sup>19</sup> Adequate mitigation does not, for example, merely “encourage” or “support” carpools and transit options, green building practices, and development in urban centers. While a menu of hortatory GHG policies is positive, it does not count as adequate mitigation because there is no certainty that the policies will be implemented.

There are many concrete mitigation measures appropriate for inclusion in a general plan and EIR that can be enforced as conditions of approval or through ordinances. Examples are described in a variety of sources, including the CAPCOA's white paper,<sup>20</sup> OPR's Technical Advisory,<sup>21</sup> and the mitigation list on the Attorney General's website.<sup>22</sup> Lead agencies should also consider consulting with other cities and counties that have recently completed general plan updates or are working on Climate Action Plans.<sup>23</sup>

- **Is a “Climate Action Plan” reasonable mitigation?**

Yes. To allow for streamlined review of subsequent individual projects, we recommend that the Climate Action Plan include the following elements: an emissions inventory (to assist in developing appropriate emission targets and mitigation measures); emission targets that apply at reasonable intervals through the life of the plan; enforceable GHG control measures; monitoring and reporting (to ensure that targets are met); and mechanisms to allow for the revision of the plan, if necessary, to stay on target.<sup>24</sup>

If a city or county intends to rely on a Climate Action Plan as a centerpiece of its mitigation strategy, it should prepare the Climate Action Plan at the same time as its general plan update and EIR. This is consistent with CEQA’s mandate that a lead agency must conduct environmental review at the earliest stages in the planning process and that it not defer mitigation. In addition, we strongly urge agencies to incorporate any Climate Action Plans into their general plans to ensure that their provisions are applied to every relevant project.

- **Is a lead agency also required to analyze how future climate change may affect development under the general plan?**

Yes. CEQA requires a lead agency to consider the effects of bringing people and development into an area that may present hazards. The CEQA Guidelines note the very relevant example that “an EIR on a subdivision astride an active fault line should identify as a significant effect the seismic hazard to future occupants of the subdivision.”<sup>25</sup>

Lead agencies should disclose any areas governed by the general plan that may be particularly affected by global warming, e.g.: coastal areas that may be subject to increased erosion, sea level rise, or flooding; areas adjacent to forested lands that may be at increased risk from wildfire; or communities that may suffer public health impacts caused or exacerbated by projected extreme heat events and increased temperatures. General plan policies should reflect these risks and minimize the hazards for current and future development.

---

## **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of requirements under general planning law, see OPR’s General Plan Guidelines (2003). OPR is in the process of updating these Guidelines. For more information, visit OPR’s website at <http://www.opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=planning/gpg.html>.

<sup>2</sup>OPR has noted the environmental and administrative advantages of addressing GHG emissions at the plan level, rather than leaving the analysis to be done project-by-project. See OPR, Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments, Introduction at p. 2

---

(Jan. 8, 2009), available at [http://opr.ca.gov/download.php?dl=Workshop\\_Announcement.pdf](http://opr.ca.gov/download.php?dl=Workshop_Announcement.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> OPR issued its Preliminary Draft CEQA Guidelines Amendments on January 8, 2009. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code, § 21083.05 (SB 97), OPR must prepare its final proposed guidelines by July 1, 2009, and the Resources Agency must certify and adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14 (hereinafter “CEQA Guidelines”), § 15064, subd. (a).

<sup>5</sup> CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subd. (f)(1).

<sup>6</sup> CEQA Guidelines, § 15021, subd. (a).

<sup>7</sup> OPR, CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review (June 2008), available at <http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> ARB’s protocols for estimating the emissions from local government operations are available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/localgov.htm>.

<sup>9</sup> CAPCOA, CEQA and Climate Change, Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (January 2008) (hereinafter, “CAPCOA white paper”), available at <http://www.capcoa.org/>.

<sup>10</sup> [http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa/modeling\\_tools.php](http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa/modeling_tools.php)

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.iclei-usa.org>

<sup>12</sup> For example, U.C. Davis has made its modeling tool, UPlan, available at <http://ice.ucdavis.edu/doc/uplan>; San Diego School of Law’s Energy Policy Initiatives Center has prepared a GHG emissions inventory report for San Diego County <http://www.sandiego.edu/EPIC/news/frontnews.php?id=31>; and Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo City and Regional Planning Department is in the process of preparing a Climate Action Plan for the City of Benicia, see <http://www.beniciaclimateactionplan.com/files/about.html>.

<sup>13</sup> CEQA Guidelines, § 15002, subd. (g).

<sup>14</sup> CEQA Guidelines, § 15064(h)(1).

<sup>15</sup> See ARB, Scoping Plan at pp. 117-120, available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/psp.pdf>. (ARB approved the Proposed Scoping Plan on December 11, 2008.)

<sup>16</sup> In the Scoping Plan, ARB encourages local governments to adopt emissions reduction goals for 2020 “that parallel the State commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 15 percent from current levels . . . .” Scoping Plan at p. 27; see *id.* at Appendix C, p. C-50. For the State, 15 percent below current levels is approximately equivalent to 1990 levels. *Id.* at p. ES-1. Where a city or county has grown roughly at

---

the same rate as the State, its own 1990 emissions may be an appropriate 2020 benchmark. Moreover, since AB 32's 2020 target represents the State's *maximum* GHG emissions for 2020 (see Health & Safety Code, § 38505, subd. (n)), and since the 2050 target will require substantial changes in our carbon efficiency, local governments may consider whether they can set an even more aggressive target for 2020. See Scoping Plan, Appendix C, p. C-50 [noting that local governments that "meet or exceed" the equivalent of a 15 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2020 should be recognized].

<sup>17</sup> *Christward Ministry v. Superior Court* (1986) 184 Cal.App.3d 180, 194 [EIR must consider future development permitted by general plan amendment]; see also CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126 [impact from all phases of the project], 15358, subd. (a) [direct and indirect impacts].

<sup>18</sup> See the City of Palm Desert's Energy Independence Loan Program at <http://www.ab811.org>.

<sup>19</sup> Pub. Res. Code, § 21081.6, subd. (b); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (d); see also *Federation of Hillside and Canyon Assocs.* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1252, 1261 [general plan EIR defective where there was no substantial evidence that mitigation measures would "actually be implemented"].

<sup>20</sup> CAPCOA white paper at pp. 79-87 and Appendix B-1.

<sup>21</sup> OPR Technical Advisory, Attachment 3.

<sup>22</sup> See [http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW\\_mitigation\\_measures.pdf](http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf) [mitigation list]; [http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/green\\_building.pdf](http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/green_building.pdf) [list of local green building ordinances].

<sup>23</sup> See [http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/City\\_and\\_County\\_Plans\\_Addressing\\_Climate\\_Change.pdf](http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/City_and_County_Plans_Addressing_Climate_Change.pdf).

<sup>24</sup> See Scoping Plan, Appendix C, at p. C-49.

<sup>25</sup> CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2, subd. (a).