

ACLU of Wisconsin \* Alaska Community Action on Toxics \* Americas for Conservation \* Arbor Hill Environmental Justice, Inc. \* Ashurst Bar/Smith Community Organization \* Asian Pacific Policy & Planning Council \* Azul \* Bike San Gabriel Valley \* Black Belt Citizens Fighting for Health and Justice \* California Coastal Protection Network \* Californians for Renewable Energy \* Cape Fear River Watch \* Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice/Centro de Acción Comunitaria y Justicia Ambiental \* Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance \* Center for Biological Diversity \* Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment \* The City Project \* Clean Water Action \* Coastal Carolina Riverwatch \* Concerned Citizens of West Baden Community \* Conservation Law Foundation \* Crystal Coast Waterkeeper \* Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice \* Earthjustice \* Environmental and Climate Justice Committee, NAACP, Houston Branch \* Farmworker Justice \* Gasp \* Golden Gate University School of Law, Environmental Law and Justice Clinic \* GreenLatinos \* Human Synergy Works \* Kingdom Living Temple \* Land Loss Project \* Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law \* LatinoJustice PRLDF \* League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) \* Los Angeles Waterkeeper \* NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc. \* NRDC \* New Alpha Community Development Corporation \* New Mexico Environmental Law Center \* North Carolina Environmental Justice Network \* North Shore Waterfront Conservancy of Staten Island \* Open Futures Society \* Original United Citizens of SW Detroit \* PenderWatch & Conservancy \* People Organized for Westside Renewal (POWER) \* Poverty & Race Research Action Council \* Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia \* Rural Empowerment Association for Community Help (REACH) \* San Gabriel Mountains Forever \* Sierra Club \* Southern Alliance for Clean Energy \* Southern Environmental Law Center \* Surfrider \* Waterkeeper Alliance \* WE ACT for Environmental Justice \* West End Revitalization Association \* The Whitney M. Slater Foundation \* Woodberry & Associates

Marc Brenman \* Robert D. Bullard \* Mike Giles \* Ellis Long \* Gregg Macey \* Vernice Miller-Travis \* Byron E. Price \* Mary Leila Schaeffer \* Ellen R. Shaffer \* Beatriz Sosa-Prado

March 14, 2016

Velveta Golightly-Howell  
Director  
Lilian Dorka  
Deputy Director  
Jeryl Covington  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Civil Rights  
Mail Code 1201-A  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20460  
Online and by mail

**Re: Comments on Nondiscrimination in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA-HQ-OA-2013-0031**

Dear Director Golightly-Howell and the Office of Civil Rights,

The undersigned organizations and individuals submit these comments on Nondiscrimination in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OA-2013-0031, 80 Fed. Reg. 77,284 (proposed Dec. 14, 2015). Signatories include community groups that have filed complaints under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VI”), 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, with the Office of Civil Rights (“OCR”) and have substantial experience with the Environmental Protection Agency’s (“EPA”) failure to create and implement a meaningful Title VI compliance and enforcement program. Signatories also include residents of communities struggling with multiple sources of contamination that have long ago stopped filing complaints to challenge discriminatory practices, despairing that EPA lacks the political will to enforce the law. We write, collectively, to emphasize the urgent need for OCR to apply its scarce resources to the critical environmental problems affecting countless communities, rather than weakening civil rights enforcement by eliminating key deadlines and increasing agency discretion.

We write in the midst of a crisis in Flint, Michigan, wondering what might have been different had OCR taken effective enforcement action against the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”) in even one of the many complaints filed against that agency.<sup>1</sup> And there are many other communities that are waiting for OCR to take meaningful action to address their complaints, from Uniontown, Alabama, an 87% African American community

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *In re Mich Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, EPA File No. 01R-94-R5 (EPA OCR 1994) (open complaint against Michigan DEQ regarding the Genesee Power Station, a new wood-waste energy facility in Flint, Michigan); *In re Mich. Dep’t of Env’tl. Qual.*, EPA File No. 05R-98-R5 (EPA OCR 1998) (notorious *Select Steel* case against DEQ regarding the decision to permit a steel recycling plant in Flint, for which EPA made a finding of “no adverse impact” despite facility emissions of toxics such as mercury); *In re Mich. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, EPA File No. 09R-98-R5 (EPA OCR 1998) (complaint regarding DEQ decision to permit incinerator in Dearborn Heights rejected as untimely); *In re Mich. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, EPA File No. 17R-99-R5 (EPA OCR 1999) (complaint against DEQ regarding hazardous waste injection well, dismissed with a finding of “no disparate impact”); *In re Mich. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, EPA File No. 18R-99-R5 (EPA OCR 1999) (complaint against DEQ regarding hazardous waste injection wells, rejected as untimely); *In re Mich. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality*, EPA File No. 21R-99-R5 (EPA OCR 1999) (complaint against DEQ regarding hazardous injection wells dismissed on other grounds); see generally U.S. EPA, Complaints Filed with EPA under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <http://www.epa.gov/ocr/complaints-filed-epa-under-title-vi-civil-rights-act-1964> (last updated Mar. 2, 2016).

living in the shadow of a mountain of coal ash,<sup>2</sup> to Beaumont, Texas, where an ever expanding refinery has encroached on a historic African American neighborhood,<sup>3</sup> and Chaves County, New Mexico, where Latino New Mexicans worry about whether yet another hazardous waste site will pollute their environment.<sup>4</sup> Communities of color and low-income communities across the nation also lack equal access to parks and resources for recreation and healthy, active living.<sup>5</sup>

We note, also, that many of the concerns outlined today echo expansive comments submitted over the past two decades in response to the publication of the Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs (Draft Recipient Guidance) and Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits (Draft Revised Investigation Guidance), 65 Fed. Reg. 39,650 (June 27, 2000) (“Draft Revised Guidance”); Draft Policy Papers Released for Public Comment: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Adversity and Compliance with Environmental Health-Based Thresholds, and Role of Complainants and Recipients in the Title VI Complaints and Resolution Process, 78 Fed. Reg. 24,739 (Apr. 26, 2013) (“Draft Policy Papers”); and, more recently, the

---

<sup>2</sup> See *In re Ala. Dep’t of Envtl. Mgmt.*, EPA File No. 12R-13-R4 (EPA OCR 2013)(accepted for investigation on or about June 27, 2013); see Letter from Vicki Simons, Acting Dir., EPA OCR, to David Ludder (June 27, 2013).

<sup>3</sup> See *In re Tx. Natural Res. Conservation Comm’n*, EPA File No. 01R-00-R6 (EPA OCR 2000)(accepted for investigation on or about June 2003); see Letter from Karen D. Higginbotham, Acting Dir., EPA OCR, to Rev. Roy Malveaux, Exec. Dir., People Against Contaminated Env’ts et al. (June 2003).

<sup>4</sup> See *In re N.M. Env’t Dep’t*, EPA File No. 09R-02-R6 (EPA OCR 2002)(accepted for investigation on June 27, 2005); see Letter from Karen D. Higginbotham, Dir., EPA OCR, to Ron Curry, Sec’y, N.M. Env’t Dep’t (June 27, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Penny Gordon-Larsen et al., *Inequality in the Built Environment Underlies Key Health Disparities in Physical Activity and Obesity*, 117 *Pediatrics* 417 (2006); Lisa M. Powell et al., *Availability of Physical Activity–Related Facilities and Neighborhood Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics: A National Study*, 96 *Am. J. Pub. Health* 1676 (2006); Lisa M. Powell et al., *The Relationship Between Community Physical Activity Settings and Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status*, 1 *Evidence-Based Preventive Med.* 135 (2004); Robert Garcia, *The George Butler Lecture: Social Justice and Leisure*, 46 *J. Leisure Res.* 7 (2013); Robert Garcia & Erica Flores Baltodano, *Free the Beach! Public Access, Equal Justice, and the California Coast*, 2 *Stan. J. C.R. & C.L.* 143 (2005); Chona Sister et al., *Got Green? Addressing Environmental Justice in Park Provision*, 75 *GeoJournal* 229 (2010); Jennifer Wolch et al., *Parks and Park Funding in Los Angeles: An Equity-Mapping Analysis*, 26 *Urb. Geography* 4 (2005); Ming Wen et al., *Spatial Disparities in the Distribution of Parks and Green Spaces in the USA*, 45 *Supp. 1 Annals Behav. Med.* 18 (2013); Dustin T. Duncan et al., *The Geography of Recreational Open Space: Influence of Neighborhood Racial Composition and Neighborhood Poverty*, 90 *J. Urb. Health* 618 (2013). Notably, climate change and policies related to climate change also raise significant issues of civil rights compliance and enforcement. See, e.g., *Envtl. Justice Leadership Forum on Climate Change, Environmental Justice State Guidance: How to Incorporate Equity & Justice into Your State Clean Power Planning Approach* (2016), available at <http://www.ejleadershipforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/EJ-State-Guidance-updated-March-7.pdf>.

draft “External Compliance and Complaints Program Strategic Plan: Fiscal Year 2015-2020”<sup>6</sup> (“Strategic Plan”); among other documents, and we refer OCR to the many comments from community-based stakeholders in the administrative record of those proceedings. Unfortunately, despite the passage of time and recent steps in the right direction, these comments remain relevant today.<sup>7</sup>

We submit these comments with the hope that EPA has the will to take the additional steps necessary to develop a true “Model Civil Rights Program,” which will require EPA to enact a number of critical reforms to finalize legal standards that are consistent with civil rights law; use its affirmative authority to ensure compliance and enforce Title VI and its regulations; bring greater transparency to its work; foster relationships with community stakeholders and adopt practices that are consistent with principles of environmental justice; coordinate Title VI compliance and enforcement with delegated programs, EPA’s regional programs, and other federal agencies; and secure remedial measures that achieve compliance.<sup>8</sup> Based on our extensive review, we have concluded that the proposed rulemaking is a diversion from these needed reforms, particularly the resolution of legal standards, and will weaken OCR’s civil rights enforcement efforts. Instead, EPA should strengthen its program by clarifying that it will not apply a rebuttable presumption and by finalizing guidance with legal standards that are consistent with civil rights law.<sup>9</sup>

## **I. THE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING**

---

<sup>6</sup> U.S. EPA, Office of Civil Rights, External Compliance and Complaints Program Strategic Plan: Fiscal Year 2015-2020 (2015), *available at* [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/strategic\\_plan.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/strategic_plan.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> *See, e.g.*, Ctr. on Race, Poverty & the Env’t. & Cal. Rural Legal Assistance Found., Comments on Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits and Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs (Aug. 26, 2000), *available at* <https://www.hitpages.com/doc/4565208953520128/1> (“CRPE Comments”); Advocates for Env’tl Human Rights et al., Comments on EPA’s Draft Plan EJ 2014 Supplement (July 3, 2012), attached hereto as Ex. 1; Cal. Rural Legal Asst. Found. et al., Comments on EPA’s Draft Policy Papers (Mar. 22, 2013) (“Comments on Draft Policy Papers”), attached hereto as Ex. 2; Letter from Marianne Engelman Lado, Managing Atty., Earthjustice, to Gina McCarthy, Adm’r, EPA & Gwendolyn Keyes Fleming, Chief of Staff, EPA (Nov. 5, 2013), attached hereto as Ex. 3; Letter from Marianne Engelman Lado, Managing Atty., Earthjustice, to Gina McCarthy, Adm’r, EPA & Gwendolyn Keyes Fleming, Chief of Staff, EPA (Nov. 24, 2014), attached hereto as Ex. 4; Ashurst Bar/Smith Cmty. Org. et al., Comments on External Compliance and Complaints Program Strategic Plan: Fiscal Year 2015-2020 (Oct. 27, 2015), attached hereto as Ex. 5.

<sup>8</sup> *See* Stakeholder Comments, *id.*

<sup>9</sup> *See* Comments on Draft Policy Papers, Ex. 2; Draft Papers, 78 Fed. Reg. at 24,740.

**A. EPA’s Proposal to Rescind Regulatory Deadlines is Arbitrary and Capricious and Serves No Legitimate Purpose.**

We strongly oppose the proposal to remove deadlines from EPA’s Title VI regulations, because doing so would weaken accountability for investigating and processing Title VI complaints in a timely way. This action will not strengthen the overall process of considering and investigating Title VI complaints and post-award compliance reviews. Given EPA’s poor record of resolving Title VI complaints within the current enumerated time frames, replacing mandatory deadlines with greater discretion and a vaguer standard can only be interpreted as an effort to evade accountability rather than improve the timeliness of the agency’s responsiveness to complaints.

The existing regulations provide concrete deadlines for processing Title VI complaints and post-award compliance reviews.<sup>10</sup> Within five days, EPA must acknowledge receipt of the complaint.<sup>11</sup> EPA then has twenty days to accept, reject, or refer a complaint to another agency,<sup>12</sup> and 180 days from the start of an investigation to issue preliminary findings, which must include notifying the recipient in writing of such findings, recommendations for achieving compliance, and the recipient’s right to engage in negotiations.<sup>13</sup>

EPA has taken a brash step by proposing to completely remove these regulatory deadlines and by inserting instead language requiring only that OCR make a “prompt investigation whenever a complaint indicates a possible failure to comply.”<sup>14</sup> EPA claims that this revision will provide “flexibility and discretion” to OCR, a luxury that EPA should not be afforded given its poor record in timely processing Title VI complaints, discussed *infra*. Indeed, according to an independent evaluation prepared by Deloitte Consulting, “Evaluation of the EPA Office of Civil Rights” (“Deloitte Report”), delays at EPA were caused by EPA’s failure to develop meaningful compliance guidance, the challenge of mobilizing agency leadership to make final determinations, the need to build skills and competencies, and the diversion of

---

<sup>10</sup> See 40 C.F.R. § 7.120 (2010).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* § 7.120(c).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* § 7.120(d)(1)(i).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* § 7.115(c) (2010).

<sup>14</sup> Nondiscrimination in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency, 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,289 .

resources from the Title VI program to the Title VII docket, among other things.<sup>15</sup> Eliminating enforcement deadlines addresses none of these issues and fails to ensure that EPA creates the capacity to conduct timely investigations. To the contrary, regulatory deadlines at least offer much needed accountability by giving plaintiffs a solid basis on which to challenge OCR's unreasonable delays in court. By removing the deadlines, EPA is at best weakening the sole legal recourse that impacted communities have to hold the agency responsible for undertaking a timely, meaningful investigation.

**1. EPA's history of delay causes real harm to communities seeking to vindicate their civil rights and work toward cleaner, healthier environments.**

EPA has a demonstrated record of noncompliance with the regulatory deadlines, a record that has caused real harm to communities burdened by the effects of environmental harm and deprived of environmental benefits, including access to parks and recreation. These longstanding delays have gone on for decades. The 2003 U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report "Not in My Backyard" found that "[o]f 124 Title VI complaints filed with EPA by January 1, 2002, only 13 cases, or 10.5 percent, were processed by the agency in compliance with its own regulations."<sup>16</sup> Despite the findings and recommendations of the Commission, the record of delay continued. According to the 2011 Deloitte Report, only six percent of the 247 Title VI complaints since 2001 were timely accepted or dismissed within the 20-day time frame, and 50% took over a year for acceptance.<sup>17</sup> A recent investigation by Center for Public Integrity, which summed up two decades of EPA's delay, revealed the following:

[A review of] 265 complaints filed from 1996 to 2013 shows that the EPA has failed to adhere to its own timelines: On average, the office took 350 days to decide whether to accept a complaint and allowed cases to stretch 624 days from start to finish.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Deloitte Consulting LLP, Evaluation of the EPA Office of Civil Rights: Final Report at 25–27 (2011), available at <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/723416/epa-ocr-audit.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, Not in My Backyard: Executive Order 12,898 and Title VI as Tools for Achieving Environmental Justice 57 (2003), available at <http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/envjust/ej0104.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 19, 25 ("Only 6%, or 15 out of 247 [complaints], were moved to either accepted or rejected within 1-month period, in alignment to the EPA targeted 20-day time frame for acknowledgement. In fact, half of the complaints have taken one year or more to move to accepted or dismissed status.").

<sup>18</sup> Talia Buford, *Thirteen Years and Counting: Anatomy of an EPA Civil Rights Investigation*, Ctr. for Pub. Integrity, Aug. 7, 2015, <http://goo.gl/qGpYBS>.

Indeed, many signatories have experienced the effects of EPA's jurisdictional review process firsthand, frequently waiting more than a year only to have their complaint dismissed on a jurisdictional basis, such as timeliness.<sup>19</sup> This record is simply unacceptable and causes real harm to communities that rely on this enforcement mechanism to vindicate their basic civil rights.

There are several notable instances where EPA's delay has been particularly egregious. In *Padres*, plaintiff groups filed a complaint with EPA's OCR in 1994, alleging that the operation of toxic waste dumps by ten California agencies discriminated on the basis of national origin against Latinos.<sup>20</sup> In total, EPA took *17 years* to resolve this case, despite repeated efforts by plaintiff groups to reach out to EPA.<sup>21</sup> The end result, a dismissal of the complaint, came in 2012, after plaintiffs filed a lawsuit against EPA in 2011.<sup>22</sup> In the words of Senior District Judge Anthony W. Ishii, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, "...17 years to resolve a Title VI complaint is simply deplorable."<sup>23</sup> Judge Ishii noted that between 2006 and 2007, EPA did not process a single Title VI complaint.<sup>24</sup>

In *Angelita C.* – the one and only case in which EPA has made a preliminary finding of discrimination – nearly twelve years passed before EPA made the preliminary finding.<sup>25</sup> While the complaint languished, Latino schoolchildren were exposed on a daily basis to toxic pesticides

---

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., *In re Port Auth. of N.Y. & N.J.*, EPA File No. 01R-14-R2 (EPA OCR 2014) (In 2015, OCR withheld a jurisdictional determination on a Title VI complaint filed by the North Shore Waterfront Conservancy of Staten Island against the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey for more than a year while the construction-adjacent community was exposed to inadequately monitored and likely contaminated dust and debris. After a year, EPA concluded that the complaint was "untimely.").

<sup>20</sup> *Padres Hacia Una Vida Mejor v. Jackson*, 922 F. Supp. 2d 1057, 1060 (E.D. Cal. 2013).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 1060.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* The timing of the dismissal, so soon after the complainants filed litigation, suggests that the lawsuit successfully created pressure on OCR to complete its investigation. It also raises the concern that OCR may have closed the complaint in order to avoid an adverse ruling in court by rendering plaintiffs' claim that OCR unreasonably delayed in resolving the complaint moot. As the Center for Public Integrity's report stated: "[A]s the [EPA's] records reveal, the agency often found allegations 'moot' precisely because of its own inaction...." Kristen Lombardi et al., *Environmental Racism Persists, and the EPA is One Reason Why*, Ctr. for Pub. Integrity, Aug. 3, 2015, updated Sept. 1, 2015, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2015/08/03/17668/environmental-racism-persists-and-epa-one-reason-why>.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 1071 n.9.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> See *Garcia v. McCarthy*, No. 13-cv-03939-WHO, 2014 WL 187386 at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 16, 2014), *appeal docketed* No. 14-15494 (9th Cir. Mar. 17, 2014) (discussing the *Angelita C.* case).

and fumigants.<sup>26</sup> By the time EPA made its preliminary finding, EPA's delay meant that multiple generations of schoolchildren endured exposure to pesticides.<sup>27</sup>

Examples of the agency's inaction continue. In 2015, after waiting more than a decade for EPA action, five complainant groups filed litigation against EPA for unreasonably delaying Title VI investigations of their complaints and by failing to issue preliminary findings.<sup>28</sup> At the time they filed suit, the agency's inaction spanned *ten to twenty years* in each of the cases.<sup>29</sup> These complaints include:

- A 1992 complaint alleging that the permitting process of the Genesee Power Station in Flint, Michigan failed to consider the impacts of the facility on a predominantly African American community. Of particular concern was the fact that the facility incinerated materials that release toxic chemicals into the air of this community.
- A second complaint, filed in 2000, concerned the decision to permit two power plants in the already burdened community of Pittsburg, California, where a majority of the non-white residents suffered higher mortality rates, as well as breast cancer and asthma.
- A third complaint, also filed in 2000, alleged that a permit amendment was issued to ExxonMobil without public participation in a contested case hearing, allowing the company to increase its emissions in the community of Beaumont, Texas, which is 95% African American.
- A fourth complaint, filed in 2002, challenged the permitting process of a hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facility in Chaves County, New Mexico. The complaint alleged that the New Mexico Environmental Department failed to examine the impact of the facility on the predominantly Spanish-speaking residents of this community, in addition to exhibiting hostility toward the community by failing to include them in the permitting process.

---

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at \*1.

<sup>27</sup> Ultimately, complainants sued EPA over the agency's handling of the complaint behind plaintiffs' backs. *Id.* at \*4 ("Plaintiff Maria Garcia is the mother of plaintiffs David Garcia and Angelica Guzman. David Garcia was 14 years old when Angelita C. was filed and a student at Rio Mesa High School in Oxnard, California. David Garcia now has two children, one- and three-years old, that live in Oxnard in the Rio School District and Oxnard Union School District and will attend Rio Lindo Elementary School, Rio del Valle Middle School, and Rio Mesa High School.").

<sup>28</sup> See generally First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, CALifornians for Renewable Energy v. U.S. Env'tl. Prot. Agency, No. 4:15-cv-03292-SBA (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2016).

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*



- Yet another complaint was filed by the Ashurst Bar/Smith Community Organization in 2003, concerning the permitting process for the Stone's Throw Landfill in Tallassee, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, which failed to analyze the discriminatory impact of siting the Landfill in a historic African American community: as a result, the community has endured the impacts of waste received by the Landfill from across Alabama and certain counties in Georgia.

In each of these cases, EPA did not even come close to adhering to the 180-day time frame for making preliminary findings, and let complaints languish. In the meantime, each of these communities has been forced to bear the impacts of the power plants, landfills, or refineries that so affect their lives.

## **2. Regulatory deadlines provide accountability and are a mechanism for complainants to demand relief when EPA fails to act.**

Communities suffering from environmental racism<sup>30</sup> rely on the regulatory deadlines to hold OCR accountable. The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that “when an agency is compelled by law to act within a certain time period...a court can compel the agency to act. . . .”<sup>31</sup> Under the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), complainants can bring actions to “compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed.”<sup>32</sup> However, stripping the

---

<sup>30</sup> In *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*, Robert D. Bullard states:

*Environmental racism* refers to any policy, practice, or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups, or communities based on race or color. Environmental racism combines with public policies and industry practices to provide *benefits* for whites while shifting industry *costs* to people of color. It is reinforced by governmental, legal, economic, political, and military institutions.

Robert D. Bullard, *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality* 98 (1st ed. 1990) (emphasis in original) (citations omitted); *see also* Energy Justice Network, Environmental Justice/Environmental Racism, Definitions, <http://www.ejnet.org/ej/> (last visited Mar. 9, 2016) (“Environmental racism is the disproportionate impact of environmental hazards on people of color.”).

<sup>31</sup> *Norton v. S. Utah Wilderness All.*, 542 U.S. 55, 65 (2004).

<sup>32</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 706(1); *see, e.g., Rosemere Neighborhood Ass’n v. U.S. EPA*, 581 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 2009) (unreasonable delay litigation).

regulations of the deadlines creates an unnecessary hurdle to justice, as the agency will have less accountability and greater discretion.<sup>33</sup>

EPA counters this assertion by contending that the proposed “promptly” standard, which will replace the deadlines, remains “subject to judicial review.”<sup>34</sup> EPA’s assertion is misleading, however, given that the removal of clear deadlines will make it exceptionally difficult for complainants to prevail in court, even where their Title VI complaints remain unresolved for a lengthy period of time. Without the regulatory time frames, courts afford agencies greater discretion in determining what constitutes an unreasonable delay.<sup>35</sup> “[W]hen there is no hard deadline imposed on the agency, courts are often reluctant to compel an agency to act and often allow an agency to set its own priorities.”<sup>36</sup> Unreasonable delay claims in the absence of deadlines are more unpredictable.<sup>37</sup>

Notably, EPA has been subject to few judicial challenges under the current deadlines. Few complainants have exercised the right to take EPA to court for unreasonable delay under the APA, and EPA has only been sued when complaints have languished for years on end, not one day, one week, or even one month beyond the deadlines. There are no instances of plaintiffs filing an action on the 181<sup>st</sup> day. EPA characterizes the deadlines as “self-imposed” and “inflexible.”<sup>38</sup> However, neither EPA’s regulations, nor complainants, nor recipients have bound the agency in a rigid or inflexible way to these deadlines.

### **3. The proposal to remove regulatory deadlines has no rational basis and suggests that EPA is trying to evade its obligations to enforce civil rights.**

---

<sup>33</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,285 (The EPA asserts that the proposed rule will give them “flexibility and discretion.”).

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

<sup>35</sup> *See Forest Guardians v. Babbitt*, 174 F.3d 1178, 1190 (10th Cir. 1999) (“In our opinion, when an agency is required to act—either by organic statute or by the APA—within an expeditious, prompt, or reasonable time, § 706 leaves in the courts *the discretion to decide whether agency delay is unreasonable*. However, when Congress by organic statute sets a specific deadline for agency action, neither the agency nor any court has discretion. The agency must act by the deadline. If it withholds such timely action, a reviewing court must compel the action unlawfully withheld.”) (emphasis added).

<sup>36</sup> Daniel T. Shedd, Cong. Research Serv., R43013, Administrative Agencies and Claims of Unreasonable Delay: Analysis of Court Treatment 1 (2013), available at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R43013.pdf>.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.* at 4 (citing *In re Barr Laboratories, Inc.*, 930 F.2d 72, 76 (D.C. Cir. 1991)) (“There is no per se rule as to how long is too long to wait for agency action.”)

<sup>38</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287.

The proposal to remove regulatory deadlines has no rational basis. Instead of attempting to further loosen its regulatory requirements, EPA should devote its needed resources to reforming its Title VI program to bring practices into line with civil rights law and programs administered by other agencies that conduct investigations in a timely manner. We are concerned that EPA is trying to evade its duty to timely and effectively investigate Title VI complaints. While the *Padres* case was in litigation during 2011, it came to light that EPA was contemplating elimination of the regulatory deadlines.<sup>39</sup> During the pendency of the suit, EPA's then-Region 9 OCR director sent an email to Region 9 employees informing them that Rafael DeLeon, then OCR's director, had received a green light to change the regulations in relation to the 180-day time period.<sup>40</sup> This email was transmitted on July 27, approximately four weeks after the *Padres* plaintiffs filed an unreasonable delay claim under the APA challenging EPA's past and continuing violation of the regulatory deadlines, seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.<sup>41</sup> Such actions suggest that EPA's decision to remove deadlines was not, as it has stated, to "strategically manage its administrative complaint docket,"<sup>42</sup> but rather, to avoid accountability for its delays.

Furthermore, as discussed *infra*, the deadlines are not unique to EPA. The Department of Energy also has regulatory deadlines, for example.<sup>43</sup> In particular, Department of Energy regulations require the Director to complete a jurisdictional determination and, if appropriate, initiate an investigation within 35 days of receipt of a complaint.<sup>44</sup> Department of Energy regulations further direct the agency to advise the recipient in writing of preliminary findings and, where appropriate, recommendations for achieving voluntary compliance within 90 days of

---

<sup>39</sup> See E-mail from Joann Asami, U.S. EPA Region 9, to Patrick Chang, U.S. EPA (July 26, 2011, 09:08am), attached hereto as Ex. 6.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> *Padres*, 922 F. Supp. 2d at 1060.

<sup>42</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,285.

<sup>43</sup> See 10 C.F.R. § 1040.104 (2003) (35-day time frame for the Department of Energy to determine jurisdiction and initiate investigation; 90-day time frame from initiation of investigation to make preliminary finding and recommendations for achieving voluntary compliance); *see also* 24 C.F.R. §§ 8.56(d), 8.56(e)(1)(i), 8.56(g), 8.56(h)(3) (HUD regulation establishing 10-day time frame to notify the complainant and recipient of the agency's receipt of a complaint; 20-day time frame to determine jurisdiction; 180-day time frame from receipt of complaint to notify recipient and complainant (if any) of the results of the investigation; and a subsequent 60-day timeframe for the reviewing civil rights official to sustain or modify the letter of finding).

<sup>44</sup> 10 C.F.R. § 1040.104(c)(1).

initiating the investigation.<sup>45</sup> Similarly, the Tennessee Valley Authority (“TVA”) has a ten-day regulatory time frame from the receipt of the complaint to determine whether the agency has jurisdiction and to initiate an investigation.<sup>46</sup> TVA shares with EPA the 180-day deadline from the initiation of the investigation to make preliminary findings.<sup>47</sup> Other agencies such as the Department of Transportation (“DOT”) and the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) have policies and procedures with similar deadlines with respect to handling complaints filed pursuant to Title VI,<sup>48</sup> further reinforcing the reasonableness of the regulatory time frames. Moreover, the 180-day deadline for investigations is not exclusive to implementing regulations under Title VI, but also guides analogous statutory schemes.<sup>49</sup>

According to EPA, a key reason for removing the deadlines is based on the inherent “complexity” of the complaints filed, however no rigorous analysis is required to provide notice of the receipt of a complaint, which is an administrative task.<sup>50</sup> With the prominence of email communication in the present day, EPA should be able to meet this deadline simply by sending the complainant and recipient an email or form letter by U.S. mail. Moreover, twenty days is ample time to make a determination about jurisdiction, and, as such, should not be removed. Finally, the 180-day deadline from the start of a complaint investigation or compliance review is

---

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* § 1040.104(c)(3).

<sup>46</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 1302.7(c) (2003) (10-day time frame for TVA to determine jurisdiction and initiate investigation; 180-day time frame from initiation of investigation to make preliminary findings).

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> See U.S. Dep’t of Transp., DOT 1000.18, External Civil Rights Complaint Processing Manual 11 (2007), available at <https://www.civilrights.dot.gov/sites/default/files/civil-rights-laws/policies/externalcomplaintmanual-final.pdf> (acknowledgement of complaint within 10 days of receipt; 10-day time frame for jurisdictional review; 180-day time frame for resolving all complaints, not only completing an investigation, unless there are extenuating circumstances); U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Investigation Procedures Manual for the Investigation and Resolution of Complaints Alleging Violations of Title VI and Other Nondiscrimination Statutes (1998), available at <https://www.justice.gov/crt/investigation-procedures-manual-civil-rights-division#ack> (15-day suggested time frame for acknowledgement of the complaint). Although timelines for investigations at DOT and DOJ appear in each agency’s complaint processing manual rather than in regulatory text, neither agency shares EPA’s record of inaction requiring similar mechanisms for accountability. The time frames established by DOT and DOJ operating procedures, however, are comparable or even stricter than EPA’s.

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a) (under the Federal Tort Claims Act, plaintiffs may file suit at any time after the six months; the six months being the time frame by which federal agencies are charged with making a final disposition of a filed claim).

<sup>50</sup> See 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(c).

for *preliminary* findings, not the final disposition of the case.<sup>51</sup> Current time frames are both in line with the regulations, policies and guidance documents at other agencies and feasible.

Time and again, EPA's sister agencies demonstrate that investigations can be completed in a timely way. Most recently, for example, on December 15, 2015, DOT entered into a Voluntary Resolution Agreement with the Texas Department of Transportation, resolving a complaint filed earlier in the same year, on March 13, 2015.<sup>52</sup> EPA's argument that it needs more time to resolve complaints because its cases are somehow more complex than those at other agencies only serves to underscore EPA's failure. Rather than extending time frames for investigation, EPA must clarify its legal standards and revoke the rebuttable presumption that compliance with environmental standards is a defense to a Title VI claim.<sup>53</sup> The presumption has increased EPA's investigatory burden above and beyond the requirements of civil rights law.

Signatories strongly oppose EPA's proposal to remove the regulatory deadlines, which would weaken EPA's Title VI compliance and enforcement program. In the current state of affairs, EPA must take effective action to enforce civil rights, not undermine one of the few mechanisms for accountability.

**B. In the Post-Sandoval Era, Enforcement by EPA is Often the Only Legal Mechanism to Address Violations of Agency Regulations and Should Not be Foreclosed by Greater Agency Discretion in Case Selection.**

EPA proposes to establish that it has discretion to decide which Title VI administrative complaints to accept for investigation by amending 40 C.F.R. § 7.120, which currently requires that EPA promptly investigate "all complaints." EPA proposes to remove this language and substitute text requiring investigation of complaints that "indicate a possible failure to comply."<sup>54</sup> In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, EPA claims that this change "clarifies the agency's discretion to pursue a path to resolution in light of the particular facts of each case," noting

---

<sup>51</sup> *Id.* § 7.115(c).

<sup>52</sup> See Voluntary Resolution Agreement between Fed. Highway Admin. & Tx. Dep't of Transp. (Dec. 17, 2015), available at <https://ccharborbridgeproject.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/voluntary-resolution-agreement-signed.pdf>.

<sup>53</sup> See 78 Fed. Reg. at 24,739 (Draft Policy Paper proposing to revoke the rebuttable presumption that compliance with environmental standards is a defense to a disparate impact claim); Comments on Draft Policy Papers, Ex. 2.

<sup>54</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.120 (currently requiring that OCR "promptly investigate all complaints ...unless the complainant and the party complained against agree to a delay pending settlement negotiations"); 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287.

especially that “[n]ot every complaint...will require the completion of a costly and time-consuming investigation. . . .”<sup>55</sup> As with many of EPA’s proposed provisions, this change in language creates new hurdles for communities of color experiencing discrimination rather than dismantling the historic barriers that have long been the focus of the signatories’ Title VI advocacy with EPA.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, the proposal is unnecessary if it is intended, as EPA purports, to clarify that EPA has flexibility in case handling rather than to afford EPA more discretion to reject complaints.<sup>57</sup> We strongly oppose this proposal for the reasons laid out below.

OCR already has a number of processes “to prioritize and dedicate resources” to those complaints most likely to reveal a Title VI violation – starting with a strictly enforced jurisdictional review that requires complaints to (1) be in writing; (2) describe the alleged discriminatory act that violates EPA’s Title VI regulations; (3) identify the EPA funding recipient that performed the discriminatory act; *and* (4) be filed within 180 days of that discrimination.<sup>58</sup> As highlighted by the Center for Public Integrity’s analysis of EPA’s Title VI enforcement record, of the 264 complaints filed between 1996 and 2013, EPA’s jurisdictional review is anything but *pro forma*: more than 60 percent of complaints were rejected on jurisdictional grounds.<sup>59</sup>

We support EPA’s interest in investigating complaints that indicate a Title VI violation; however, rewriting the regulations to establish discretion over which complaints to investigate does nothing to strengthen OCR’s authority to act pursuant to the mandates of Title VI. In fact, it will weaken the position of environmental justice communities by requiring complainants to try to navigate an additional, unclear standard governing OCR’s acceptance of complaints.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287.

<sup>56</sup> See Exs. 1–5 (comments filed previously by many of the signatories to this letter).

<sup>57</sup> Remarks of Lilian Dorka, Deputy Dir., OCR, Public Meeting (Mar. 1, 2016) (stating that the proposal is not an effort to reject complaints but to provide more flexibility in case handling).

<sup>58</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(b); 65 Fed. Reg. at 39,672.

<sup>59</sup> Yue Qiu & Talia Buford, *Decades of Inaction*, Ctr. for Pub. Integrity, Aug. 3, 2015, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2015/08/03/17726/decades-inaction>.

<sup>60</sup> Notably EPA’s jurisdictional review includes an analysis of whether the complaint asserts an allegation that would constitute a violation of the regulations, *see* 40 C.F.R. §7.120(b)(1), a burden made all the more difficult for complainants and OCR reviewers because of the lack of clarity regarding EPA’s legal standards. Signatories have repeatedly requested that EPA develop a clear and uniform set of legal standards to guide its Title VI practices rather than relying on the decade-old Draft Revised Guidance, which raises a host of procedural and substantive questions about OCR’s legal standards. *See, e.g.*, Ashurst Bar/Smith Cmty. Org. Comments, Ex. 5.

Making this change leaves both environmental justice communities and federal funding recipients with no clarity or criteria to predict which complaints EPA might accept.

Signatories agree that the path to resolution of any given complaint must be tailored to the specific facts of each case and that “such a path may not be identical for every complaint.”<sup>61</sup> Yet, OCR’s investigative authority has always been flexible and complaint-specific. EPA’s current Title VI regulations require OCR to “attempt to resolve complaints informally whenever possible.”<sup>62</sup> EPA’s 2000 Draft Revised Guidance and, more recently, its Interim Case Resolution Manual (“CRM”), discussed *infra*, include complaint resolution processes that create opportunities for EPA and recipients to reach voluntary compliance agreements and, also, for complainants and recipients to resolve complaint allegations informally.<sup>63</sup> EPA expressly describes alternative dispute resolution (“ADR”) as a preferred tool for achieving voluntary compliance, noting that “OCR expects to use ADR techniques to informally resolve” complaints, which “includes a variety of approaches” encompassing third party neutrals and creative problem solving.<sup>64</sup>

Indeed, the rationale underscoring this proposed regulatory amendment – that EPA does not currently benefit from flexibility – is belied by its arguments in *Garcia v. McCarthy*, 3:13-cv-03930-WHO, 2014 WL 187386 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2013), referenced *supra* nn. 25–27. In *Garcia*, EPA asserted that “agencies [such as itself] *have discretion* to determine how best to enforce the law, subject to regulatory, statutory, and constitutional constraints. . . .”<sup>65</sup> More specifically, EPA argued that its “decision to settle an administrative complaint and, thereby, obviate the need for (further) enforcement action is committed to agency discretion,” which it exercised to resolve the Title VI complaint.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287.

<sup>62</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(d)(2)(i).

<sup>63</sup> 65 Fed. Reg. at 39,673; EPA OCR, Interim Case Resolution Manual 17–24 (2015), *available at* [http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/ocr\\_crm\\_final.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/ocr_crm_final.pdf).

<sup>64</sup> 65 Fed. Reg. at 39,673; *see also* CRM at 20–24.

<sup>65</sup> Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint at 1, *Garcia v. McCarthy* (Nov. 20, 2013), ECF No. 20 (emphasis added).

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* at 4; *see also id.* at 5–6 (EPA arguing that its discretionary action to settle a Title VI complaint is subject to limited judicial review to ascertain whether it is within the bounds of the law); *id.* at 6 (likening EPA’s discretion to settle Title VI complaints with its discretionary authority to decide not to initiate an enforcement action); *id.* at 7 (asserting that EPA has “the discretion to determine the scope of its investigation” and “how to focus its investigations”); *id.* at 8–9 (EPA, in defending the settlement agreement at issue as a good deal, reasoning that “the EPA’s decision regarding what consideration to accept in exchange for promising not to take additional enforcement steps is precisely the kind of



EPA's existing "discretion to pursue a path to resolution" is further evidenced by the fact that EPA has never made a formal finding that a recipient has violated Title VI and its regulations in more than twenty years of processing complaints of discrimination in the environmental context.<sup>67</sup> The Center for Public Integrity report also reaches this conclusion, noting that "[e]ven among the small universe of cases" accepted for investigation -- approximately 25 percent of all complaints filed -- an additional 80 percent are eventually dismissed without any resolution or relief for the complainants.<sup>68</sup> "[T]he civil-rights office rarely closes investigations with formal sanctions or remedies" despite having the authority to correct discriminatory actions by withholding funding or overturning decisions.<sup>69</sup> Rather than pursuing a full investigation and making formal findings, EPA almost exclusively relies on the other tools it has available: voluntary agreements between EPA and the party committing discrimination, occasionally making use of ADR, which brings together recipients and complainants for direct negotiations.<sup>70</sup>

EPA's processing of all complaints for investigation is of heightened importance since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Alexander v. Sandoval* that private parties have no private right of action to enforce disparate impact regulations enacted pursuant to Title VI.<sup>71</sup> Since only acts of intentional discrimination under Title VI can open the door to the federal courthouse for private individuals and organizations, it is of paramount importance that EPA reviews complaints from communities of color that suffer disparate exposures to environmental burdens

---

discretionary agency choice that [case law] protects"); *see also* Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint at 1–6, *Garcia v. McCarthy* (Dec. 20, 2013), ECF No. 25 at 1-6 (EPA refuting plaintiffs' contention that Title VI and EPA's regulations "constrain the exercise of [its] enforcement discretion"). Indeed, the outer confines of this discretion and whether voluntary resolution agreements entered into by EPA must bring the recipient into compliance with Title VI and its regulations are key issues in *Garcia*. *Garcia*, 2014 WL 187386 at \*9–10 (discussing plaintiffs' argument that settlement wrongfully failed to require recipients to remedy disparate adverse impacts). Given that these issues are currently pending in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, *Garcia v. McCarthy*, No. 14-15494, EPA's proposal to grant itself more discretion creates the impression that its proposal is an attempt to avoid future legal challenges by complainants to EPA's case handling.

<sup>67</sup> *See Lombardi et al., supra* note 22 (reviewing the 265 complaints filed between 1996 and 2013).

<sup>68</sup> *Id.*

<sup>69</sup> *Id.*

<sup>70</sup> *Id.* ("Only nine cases have been settled through agreements brokered between agency officials and targets of complaints. Another three cases have been closed through "alternative dispute resolutions," meaning the complainants and the targets hashed out solutions."); *see also*, U.S. EPA, Title VI - Settlements and Decisions <http://www.epa.gov/ocr/title-vi-settlements-and-decisions##settlement> (last updated Oct. 4, 2015)

<sup>71</sup> *Alexander v. Sandoval*, 532 U.S. at 275.



and deprivation of environmental benefit in the places where they live, work, and play. Such communities often have no other recourse for preserving or enforcing their civil rights when EPA declines to investigate a case under a discriminatory impact standard.

The importance of a well-functioning process for addressing disparate impact claims is exemplified by *South Camden Citizens in Action v. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection*. After residents challenged the state's decision to permit a cement processing facility in an environmental justice community already overburdened by Superfund sites, sewage treatment and power plants, and historical contamination, among other things, the District Court twice found that community plaintiffs were entitled to relief for their disparate impact claims.<sup>72</sup> However, in both cases, the realization of relief was denied as a result of the Supreme Court's holding in *Sandoval* that Title VI affords no private right of action to enforce regulatory standards prohibiting actions with an unjustified disparate impact.<sup>73</sup> Despite the court's finding that the recipient violated the law in that case, plaintiffs had no recourse other than an administrative complaint to EPA, a path that may prove even more futile if EPA has even greater discretion to reject complaints.

The proposal to increase EPA's discretion over selecting which complaints to investigate will ultimately make EPA's Title VI enforcement process even less transparent and will require environmental justice advocates and impacted communities experiencing discrimination and recipients to predict which cases EPA will accept, a task made more complex since the process can span multiple different administrations. Even if the goal of this administration is to accept every case that meets jurisdictional standards with transparency and consistency, EPA's proposed amendment would eliminate any accountability that might keep future administrations from summarily rejecting those same complaints. EPA should focus on building a strong Title VI enforcement program no matter who is in office, and these proposed regulations fall short.

**C. The EPA's Record of Delay in Resolving Discrimination Claims Is an Outlier as Compared to Other Agencies: This Necessitates More, Not Less, Accountability in Resolving Discrimination Claims.**

---

<sup>72</sup> See *S. Camden Citizens in Action v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 145 F. Supp. 2d 446 (D.N.J. 2001) (original holding pre-*Sandoval*), modified post-*Sandoval* on other grounds, 145 F. Supp. 2d 505 (D.N.J. 2001), on remand 254 F. Supp. 2d 486 (D.N.J. 2003).

<sup>73</sup> *S. Camden Citizens in Action v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl. Prot.*, 274 F.3d 771, 790–91 (3d Cir. 2001).

As discussed above, the EPA's uniquely poor performance in fulfilling its statutory responsibility to enforce anti-discrimination laws is well known and well-documented.<sup>74</sup> Among the nearly 300 complaints filed with EPA's OCR between 1996 and 2013, 162 were rejected without investigation; 38 received no review; 64 were accepted for investigation; only 12 cases were closed with official action, including negotiated settlements; and at least 17 remain pending.<sup>75</sup> That record is unlike other federal agencies that are also charged with enforcing Title VI. For example, in the 2013-2014 fiscal years, the U.S. Department of Education's ("Education") OCR received 4,600 Title VI-related complaints, affirmatively brought 32 Title VI investigations, and provided technical assistance for 216 events on Title-VI related issues.<sup>76</sup> In those same fiscal years, Education's OCR resolved 67 Title VI complaints involving equal educational opportunities.<sup>77</sup> A report published by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found that between 1994 and 2003, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") received 2,262 Title VI complaints and, in this same period, conducted 530 Title VI compliance reviews.<sup>78</sup>

Moreover, despite EPA's existing regulatory deadlines for investigating Title VI complaints, including 180 days to complete its investigation, OCR rarely has met this goal. Over a 17-year period from 1996 to 2013, EPA took more than 365 days (*i.e.*, a year), on average, to resolve cases and, in fact, took up to two years to resolve 169 cases; two to five years to resolve

---

<sup>74</sup> See, e.g., Qiu & Buford, *supra* note 59 (cataloguing disposition of complaints over 17 year period); Deloitte Report, *supra* note 15 (describing OCR's "record of poor performance"); see also U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *supra* note 16, at 31–32 (reporting that "[b]etween September 1993 and July 1998, EPA did not uphold a single Title VI complaint," and that "[d]uring this period, 58 Title VI complaints were filed with the agency, including 50 challenging state or local permitting decisions," and that "[a]s of July 1998, 31 of these complaints had been rejected, 15 were accepted for investigation, and 12 were still pending acceptance"); see also *id.* at 56 (reporting that as of February 8, 2002, the EPA's backlog had been reduced from 66 to 41 complaints, and that of these, 34 were then identified as being acceptable for investigation); *id.* at 58 (reporting that as of June 20, 2003, the EPA received 136 complaints, 75 of which were rejected).

<sup>75</sup> Qiu & Buford, *supra* note 59.

<sup>76</sup> U.S. Dep't of Educ., OCR, Protecting Civil Rights, Advancing Equity: Report to the President and Secretary of Education 18 (2014), available at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/ocr/report-to-president-and-secretary-of-education-2013-14.pdf>.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* at 19. Education's OCR defines resolved cases as those that resulted in dismissal, administrative closure, a finding of no violation, an early complaint resolution, or a resolution agreement. *Id.* at 45 n.1.

<sup>78</sup> See U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, Funding Federal Civil Rights Enforcement: 2005 42 tbls. 6.4 & 6.5 (2004) available at <http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/crfund05/crfund05.pdf>.

63 cases; and more than five years to resolve 25 cases.<sup>79</sup> In that regard, EPA is unlike other federal agencies, which have a significantly better record of investigating and even resolving complaints within 180 days of their receipt. For example, in fiscal year 2012, Education's OCR resolved 93% of its 7,491 complaints within 180 days.<sup>80</sup> In the three preceding fiscal years, 2009-2011, the percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt ranged from 90-92%.<sup>81</sup> The 2005 report by the Commission on Civil Rights found the average age of open cases at HUD in fiscal year 2003 was 143 days.<sup>82</sup>

Compared to its sister agencies, not only has EPA's complaint processing been significantly less timely, but EPA has shown a remarkable lack of will to enforce the law: "In its 22-year history of processing environmental discrimination complaints, *the office has never once made a formal finding of a Title VI violation.*"<sup>83</sup> By contrast, for example, the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") received an administrative complaint filed on behalf of Leaders for Equality and Action in Dayton on August 10, 2011, and *issued its finding less than two years later* that "African Americans have faced discriminatory impact" as a result of the City of Beavercreek's decision to deny the Regional Transit Authority's application to install bus stops near a mall in the City.<sup>84</sup> FHWA was able to complete its investigation in a timely way despite the fact that complainants raised multiple allegations, including disparate impact claims.<sup>85</sup> Most significantly, FHWA reached its conclusion that the City's action had an "impact" without an

---

<sup>79</sup> Qiu & Buford, *supra* note 59; see U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, *supra* note 16, at 57 ("Of 124 Title VI complaints filed with EPA by January 1, 2002, only 13 cases, or 10.5 percent, were processed by the agency in compliance with its own regulation. None of the 13 complaints processed within the 20-day window were accepted for investigation. All were rejected because EPA assessed that they did not meet the agency's regulatory requirements.")

<sup>80</sup> U.S. Dep't of Educ., OCR, Helping to Ensure Equal Access to Education: Report to the President and Secretary of Education at 21 ex.10 (2012), available at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/ocr/report-to-president-2009-12.pdf>.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.* at 21 ex.10. Over the course of four fiscal years, 2009-2012, OCR received over 7,700 Title-VI related complaints, and affirmatively brought 61 Title VI-related investigations. *Id.* at 26.

<sup>82</sup> U.S. Comm'n on Civil Rights, Ten-Year Check-Up: Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil Rights Recommendations?, in *An Evaluation of the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions* 149 (2004) available at <http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/10yr04/10yr04.pdf>.

<sup>83</sup> Lombardi et al., *supra* note 22 (emphasis added).

<sup>84</sup> Letter from Warren S. Whitlock, Assoc. Adm'r for Civil Rights, FHWA, to Michael Cornell, City Manager, City of Beavercreek, Ohio et al. at 15 (June 26, 2013), available at [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2014/07/07/DOT\\_fhwa\\_decision-lead\\_v\\_city\\_of\\_beavercreek\\_june\\_2013.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2014/07/07/DOT_fhwa_decision-lead_v_city_of_beavercreek_june_2013.pdf). Notably, FHWA *issued a finding* within two years; the investigation was conducted in less time.

<sup>85</sup> *Id.* at 4.

overly burdensome analysis of the impacts – FHWA neither evaluated, for example, how many people might be injured or killed as a result of walking down the highway to reach the mall in the absence of bus stops, nor the precise economic loss individuals might sustain if they were denied the additional access to the mall afforded by bus stops. The letter of findings issued by FHWA reviews the racial composition of the impacted population and then concludes that, based on the statistics, “it is clear that African Americans disproportionately rely on RTA transit service compared with whites. As a result, African Americans are disproportionately affected. . .”<sup>86</sup>

Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor (“DOL”) received an administrative complaint filed on behalf of the Miami Workers Center on or around November 21, 2011, and issued its initial determination *less than 18 months later* finding that the State’s electronic filing system for unemployment insurance benefits had a discriminatory effect on limited English proficient (“LEP”) persons and persons with disabilities.<sup>87</sup> Based on these violations, the DOL concluded that the State must take certain corrective actions *or face sanctions*, including termination of DOL funding.<sup>88</sup>

This record of relative timeliness in making Title VI findings and/or reaching voluntary compliance exists across various other federal agencies. Indeed, certain agencies have made findings of discrimination well within 180 days of the receipt of a complaint (*i.e.*, within a week to six months) or not long after 180 days (*i.e.*, between seven to ten months). Even in those cases where agencies have made findings of discrimination after a longer period of time – for example, up to five years – that time period includes not only the investigation but also administrative activities leading to resolution, and often involve more complex “pattern and practice” claims. The following, thus, illustrate the potential for EPA to complete preliminary investigations, make recommendations, and even resolve cases with far greater expediency.

- **DOJ.** *See, e.g.*, U.S. DOJ, Civil Rights Division, Investigation of the New Orleans Police Department (“NOPD”) at vi, 33–34 (2011), *available at* [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2011/03/17/nopd\\_report.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2011/03/17/nopd_report.pdf) (*within ten months of opening an investigation of the NOPD for alleged discriminatory police practices and unlawful conduct, making a finding that the*

---

<sup>86</sup> *Id.* at 11.

<sup>87</sup> Initial Determination at 35, *Miami Workers Ctr. v. Fla. Dep’t of Econ. Opportunity, Div. of Workforce Servs., Office of Unemployment Comp.*, CRC Complaint No. 12-FL-048 (Apr. 5, 2013), *available at* [http://nelp.3cdn.net/2c0ce3c2929a0ee4e1\\_wim6i5ynx.pdf](http://nelp.3cdn.net/2c0ce3c2929a0ee4e1_wim6i5ynx.pdf).

<sup>88</sup> *Id.* at 53.

NOPD engages in a pattern or practice of discriminatory policing based on race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, in violation Title VI and other laws).

*See also* Letter from Thomas Perez, Asst. Att’y Gen., U.S. DOJ, Civil Rights Division, to John W. Smith, Dir., N.C. Admin. Office of the Courts at 1, 4 (Mar. 8, 2012), *available at* [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2012/03/08/030812\\_DOJ\\_Letter\\_to\\_NC\\_AOC.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2012/03/08/030812_DOJ_Letter_to_NC_AOC.pdf) (*within five years* of the complaint making a finding, among others, “*after a comprehensive investigation* that [North Carolina state court’s] policies and practice discriminate on the basis of national origin, in violation of [Title VI and other] federal law, by failing to provide limited English proficient (LEP) individuals with meaningful access to state courts proceedings and operations” and providing that “appropriate enforcement action as authorized by Title VI” and other laws will be initiated if there is non-compliance) (emphasis added).

*See also* U.S. DOJ, Civil Rights Division, Investigation of Shelby County Juvenile Court (2012), *available at* <http://njdc.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/USDOJ-Report-Investigation-of-the-Shelby-County-Juvenile-Court.pdf> (*within five years* of the complaint, making various findings that the Shelby County Juvenile Court violated Title VI, including by failing to provide constitutionally required due process to children of all races, and administering justice that discriminates against Black children).

- **DOT, Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”).** *See, e.g.,* Voluntary Resolution Agreement entered into by FHWA and the Texas Department of Transportation (Dec. 17, 2015), *available at* <https://ccharborbridgeproject.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/voluntary-resolution-agreement-signed.pdf> (*within eight months* of an administrative complaint filed by complainants alleging that highway project violated Title VI). In recent testimony to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law described FHWA’s handling of this complaint:

The processing of the Corpus Christi Title VI complaint by the FHWA is in stark contrast to [the] pattern of enforcement [at EPA] and instructive for any federal agency’s Title VI program. The complaint was received by FHWA on March 13, 2015. FHWA began its investigation soon after that and issued a letter accepting the complaint and beginning the investigation on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. FHWA Office of Civil Rights staff were responsible for the investigation and immediately initiated a proactive investigation, making visits to Corpus Christi several times which included meetings with residents in the impacted neighborhoods to explain the status of the investigation and possible outcomes. FHWA also put the Harbor Bridge Project on hold during

the investigation which created time and leverage for the investigation and negotiations to occur in a timely manner.<sup>89</sup>

- **DOT, Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”).**<sup>90</sup> *See, e.g.,* Letter from Peter M. Rogoff, FTA, to Steve Heminger, Exec. Dir., Metro. Transp. Comm’n & Dorothy Dugger, Gen. Manager, S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist. (Jan. 15 2010), *available at* [https://www.bart.gov/sites/default/files/docs/BART\\_MTC\\_Letter\\_On\\_OAC.pdf](https://www.bart.gov/sites/default/files/docs/BART_MTC_Letter_On_OAC.pdf) (*within four months* of receiving a complaint and investigating the failure of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (“BART”) to complete a service equity analysis for a planned federally assisted Oakland Airport Connector Project, making a preliminary finding that “BART failed to conduct an equity analysis for service and fare changes for the Project” and, thus, was “in danger of losing federal funding for the project”).
- **HUD.** *See, e.g.,* Letter from Charles E. Hauptman, Dir., Office of Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity, HUD, to Mr. Roy Bateman, Cmty. Dev. Coordinator, Marin Cnty. Cmty. Dev. Agency-Fed. Grants Division (Dec. 21, 2010) and attachments thereto *available at* <http://www.hud.gov/offices/fheo/library/10-Marin-VCA-final-12-21-2010.PDF> (*within a year* of HUD affirmatively investigating Marin County’s Community Development Block Grant Program, making a preliminary finding of noncompliance because in a county that is majority white, African American and Latino populations were concentrated in two areas).

*See also* Voluntary Compliance Agreement Between HUD and State of Neb. Dep’t of Econ. Dev., Title VI Review No. 07-11-R002-6, Sec. 504 Review No. 07-11-R002-4, at 2 (2014), *available at* [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2014/07/02/Voluntary\\_Compliance\\_Agreement\\_HUD\\_%26\\_Nebraska\\_3-2014.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2014/07/02/Voluntary_Compliance_Agreement_HUD_%26_Nebraska_3-2014.pdf) (providing that HUD *affirmatively* investigated Title VI compliance and, *within two years*, issued a finding that Nebraska “has not taken reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to federally funded programs for LEP persons”); *see also* Letter from Betty J. Bottiger, Dir., Region VII Office of Fair Hous. & Equal Opportunity, HUD, to Catherine D. Lang, Dep’t Dir., Neb. Dep’t of Econ. Dev. (May 31, 2013), *available at* <http://www.fremontne.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2509>.

*See* Letter from HUD to Rocky Delgadillo, Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, City of Los Angeles (Sept. 25, 2000), *available at* <http://www.cityprojectca.org/ourwork/documents/hud-letter.pdf> (*within a week* of receiving community administrative complaint, HUD required the City of Los Angeles to prepare a full environmental impact statement considering the impact on

---

<sup>89</sup> *See* Lawyers’ Comm. for Civil Rights Under Law, Comments to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at 5 (Mar. 2, 2016), attached hereto as Ex. 7.

<sup>90</sup> Notably, while the DOT receives relatively few Title VI complaints, it has been able to resolve the claims expeditiously. U.S. Comm’n on Civil Rights, *supra* note 16, at 63, 64 tbl.3 (reporting that from 1995 to 2001, the DOT’s U.S. Coast Guard had no complaints and the Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) Office of Civil Rights had four complaints, two of which were resolved in approximately two years).



people of color before HUD would issue any federal funding for a proposed warehouse project, citing Title VI and the President's Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice and health).

- **Interior:** See Letter from Dep't of Interior, to California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger (Jan. 27, 2010)<sup>91</sup> (*within seven months* of receiving community administrative complaint under Title VI, Interior wrote to the Governor that proposed actions to close state parks and reduce park services could not be weighted on the basis of race or national origin).
- **Education.** Based on an analysis of 109 Title VI complaints filed with Education's seven regional offices between 2007-2012, of the 100 that were resolved, 58 were the result of early case resolution or voluntary compliance or settlement agreements.<sup>92</sup>

Given EPA's record of inaction over many decades, as compared to other federal agencies charged with Title VI enforcement, accountability and recourse to the courts are even more critical for strengthening EPA's compliance and enforcement program than at other agencies.

**D. EPA'S Argument that its Proposals are Animated by an Interest in Aligning its Regulations is Unpersuasive.**

EPA's argument that its proposals are animated by an interest in aligning regulations with other agencies is unpersuasive. The proposed changes will not, in fact, bring EPA's regulations into alignment with regulations other agencies; instead, EPA has cherry-picked particular provisions while retaining others that diverge from the norm.

EPA attempts to justify its proposal to remove regulatory deadlines in the name of conforming "to the regulatory text of its sister agencies."<sup>93</sup> Yet EPA is not alone in having deadlines and timeframes in its regulations for processing Title VI complaints and conducting compliance reviews. The Department of Energy also has regulatory deadlines, for example.<sup>94</sup> In

---

<sup>91</sup> On file with The City Project.

<sup>92</sup> On file with the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc.

<sup>93</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287; *see also* U.S. EPA, OCR, PowerPoint Presentation, The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to Amend its Nondiscrimination Regulations at slide 6 (Dec. 1, 2015), *available at* [http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/nprm\\_presentation\\_final\\_draft.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/documents/nprm_presentation_final_draft.pdf). ("In order to enable it to create a model civil rights program which can nimbly and effectively enforce civil rights statutes in the environmental context, EPA's regulations will be aligned with those of over 20 other federal agencies.")

<sup>94</sup> *See* 10 C.F.R. §1040.104(c) (35-day time frame to determine jurisdiction, notify recipient, and initiate investigation; 90-day time frame from initiation of investigation to advise recipient of preliminary

particular, Department of Energy regulations require the Director to complete a jurisdictional determination and, if appropriate, initiate an investigation with 35 days of receipt of a complaint.<sup>95</sup> Department of Energy regulations further direct the agency to advise the recipient in writing of preliminary findings and, where appropriate, recommendations for achieving voluntary compliance, within 90 days of initiating an investigation.<sup>96</sup> Similarly, the Tennessee Valley Authority (“TVA”) has a 10-day time frame from the receipt of the complaint to determine whether the agency has jurisdiction and to initiate the investigation.<sup>97</sup> TVA shares with EPA the 180-day deadline from the initiation of the investigation to make preliminary findings.<sup>98</sup>

Moreover, the language that EPA proposes is different from the regulations adopted by other agencies. EPA proposes the following regulatory language: “The OCR will make a prompt investigation whenever a complaint indicates a possible failure to comply.”<sup>99</sup> While a number of other agencies also require a “prompt investigation,” EPA’s proposal diverges in a significant way. Regulations promulgated by the Department of Education and many other agencies require the “responsible Department official or his designee” to make a “prompt investigation whenever a *compliance review, report, complaint, or any other information* indicates a possible failure to comply....”<sup>100</sup> Whereas under these rules, a prompt investigation is triggered when “a compliance review, report, complaint, *or any other information*” shows a potential failure to comply, under EPA’s proposal an investigation is triggered when a complaint, and only a complaint, shows a potential failure to comply – and, significantly, the proposed regulatory

---

findings, recommendations for voluntary compliance, and give recipient opportunity to request voluntary compliance negotiations).

<sup>95</sup> *Id.* § 1040.104(c)(1).

<sup>96</sup> *Id.* § 1040.104(c)(3).

<sup>97</sup> *See* 18 C.F.R. § 1302.7(c).

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

<sup>99</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,289.

<sup>100</sup> *See, e.g.,* 34 C.F.R. § 100.7(c) (Dep’t of Educ.) (emphasis added) (“The responsible Department official or his designee will make a prompt investigation whenever a compliance review, report, complaint, or any other information indicates a possible failure to comply with this part); *see also* 49 C.F.R. § 21.11 (Dep’t of Transp.); 45 C.F.R. § 80.7(c) (Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.); 24 C.F.R. § 1.7(c) (HUD); 28 C.F.R. 42.107(c) (Dep’t of Justice); 32 C.F.R. § 195.8(c) (Dep’t of Defense); 15 C.F.R. § 8.10(a) (Dep’t of Commerce); 6 C.F.R. § 21.11(c) (Dep’t of Homeland Security); 43 C.F.R. § 17.6(c) (Dep’t of Interior); 29 C.F.R. § 31.7(c) (Dep’t of Labor); 22 C.F.R. § 141.6(c) (Dep’t of State); 38 C.F.R. § 18.7(c) (Dep’t of Veterans Affairs).



language omits the possibility that “any other information” might trigger the investigation.<sup>101</sup> EPA’s proposal is significantly weaker and isn’t “aligned” with the regulations of other agencies.

There are also other significant differences between EPA’s regulations and the regulations of other agencies that will remain untouched by EPA’s rulemaking, which undermine EPA’s claim that the proposed rulemaking is motivated by an interest in alignment. Notably, EPA does not categorically separate regulatory provisions related to Title VI from provisions applicable when processing complaints of discrimination under other federal laws. For example, HUD’s Title VI regulations, located at 24 C.F.R. Part 1, specifically apply to Title VI, and as such they are titled “Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.” Other agencies that have this identical regulatory format include the Department of Education,<sup>102</sup> the Department of Transportation,<sup>103</sup> the Department of Health and Human Services,<sup>104</sup> the Department of Defense,<sup>105</sup> the Department of Commerce,<sup>106</sup> the Department of Labor,<sup>107</sup> the Department of State,<sup>108</sup> as well as the Department of Veteran Affairs.<sup>109</sup> EPA’s regulations are certainly not in alignment here; unlike these other agencies, EPA’s Title VI regulations implement not only Title VI but also section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and section 13 of the Federal Water Pollution Act,<sup>110</sup> and prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national or sex, where applicable, by programs or activities receiving EPA assistance.<sup>111</sup>

The chart below, comparing EPA’s Title VI regulations with those promulgated by three other agencies, highlights additional differences that are critical to Title VI enforcement—such as the required assurance and eligibility for restoration of Title VI funding following the termination or suspension of funding. For example, while EPA’s regulations require that applicants submit an assurance that “they will comply with the requirements” and “must also submit any other information that the OCR determines is necessary for preaward review,”<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,289 (emphasis added).

<sup>102</sup> 34 C.F.R. pt. 100.

<sup>103</sup> 49 C.F.R. pt. 21.

<sup>104</sup> 45 C.F.R. pt. 80.

<sup>105</sup> 32 C.F.R. pt. 195.

<sup>106</sup> 15 C.F.R. pt. 8.

<sup>107</sup> 29 C.F.R. pt. 31.

<sup>108</sup> 22 C.F.R. pt. 141.

<sup>109</sup> 38 C.F.R. pt. 18.

<sup>110</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.10.

<sup>111</sup> 40 C.F.R. pt. 7 (Subpart B).

<sup>112</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.80(a)(1).

these requirements depart substantively from DOT’s provision. DOT’s regulations require assurance that the program will be “conducted” or the facility will be “operated” in compliance with “all” requirements “imposed by or pursuant to” the relevant regulations.<sup>113</sup> Without evaluating the nuances of each word, the comparison demonstrates that the language is distinct and that interpretations of these differences may vary significantly. Moreover, DOT requires that states and state agencies applying for continued federal financial assistance also provide or submit an application accompanied by “provision for such methods of administration for the program as are found by the Secretary to give reasonable guarantee” that the recipients will comply with such requirements.<sup>114</sup> The chart lists a selection of EPA regulations with language that varies from Education, DOT, and HUD.

Select Regulatory Differences: EPA Compared to HUD, DOT & Dep’t of Ed.

	<b>EPA</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>HUD</b>	<b>DOT</b>
Application	<p><i>“Applicability”</i>  40 CFR 7.15</p> <p><i>-Does not list instances where the part does NOT apply</i></p>	<p>“Application of this Regulation”  34 C.F.R. 100.2</p> <p>- Lists instances where the part does NOT apply</p>	<p>“Application of Part 1”  24 C.F.R. 1.3</p> <p>- Lists instances where the part does NOT apply</p>	<p>“Application of this Part”  49 C.F.R. 21.3</p> <p>- Lists instances where the part does NOT apply</p>
Compliance information	<p><i>“Requirements for Applicants and Recipients” (Subpart D) → “Recipients”</i>  Compare 40 C.F.R. 7.85(a)</p>	<p>“Compliance Information”  34 C.F.R. 100.6</p>	<p>“Compliance Information”  24 C.F.R. 1.6</p>	<p>“Compliance Information”  49 C.F.R. 21.9</p>
Assurances	<p><i>“Requirements for Applicants and Recipients” (Subpart D) → “Applicants”</i></p>	<p>“Assurances required”  34 C.F.R. 100.4</p> <p>- Entire provision</p>	<p>“Assurances required”  24 C.F.R. 1.5</p> <p>- Entire provision</p>	<p>“Assurances required”  49 C.F.R. 21.7</p> <p>- Entire provision</p>

<sup>113</sup> 49 C.F.R. § 21.7(a).

<sup>114</sup> *Id.* § 21.7(b).

	<p>40 C.F.R. 7.80(a)</p> <p><i>“Applicants for EPA assistance shall submit an assurance with their applications stating that, with respect to their programs or activities that receive EPA assistance, they will comply with the requirements of this part. Applicants must also submit any other information that the OCR determines is necessary for preaward review. The applicant's acceptance of EPA assistance is an acceptance of the obligation of this assurance and this part.”</i></p>	outlining detailed information on assurances	outlining detailed information on assurances	outlining detailed information on assurances
Hearings	<p>Lacks specific provision related to hearings</p> <p>Compare 40 C.F.R. 7.130</p>	Contains specific provisions related to hearings, such as right to counsel, procedures, evidence and	Contains specific provisions related to hearings 24 C.F.R. 1.9; 24 C.F.R. Part 180	Contains specific provisions related to hearings, such as right to counsel, procedures, evidence and

		record 34 C.F.R. 100.9		record 49 C.F.R. 21.15
Eligibility for funds/post-termination	<p><i>“Procedure for regaining eligibility”</i></p> <p><i>An applicant or recipient whose assistance has been denied, annulled, terminated, or suspended under this part regains eligibility as soon as it:</i></p> <p><i>(1) Provides reasonable assurance that it is complying and will comply with this part in the future, and</i></p> <p><i>(2) Satisfies the terms and conditions for regaining eligibility that are specified in the denial, annulment, termination or suspension order.</i></p> <p>40 C.F.R. 7.135</p>	<p>(g) Post-termination proceedings.</p> <p>(1) An applicant or recipient adversely affected by an order issued under paragraph (f) of this section shall be restored to full eligibility to receive Federal financial assistance if it satisfies the terms and conditions of that order for such eligibility or if it brings itself into compliance with this part and provides reasonable assurance that it will fully comply with this part.</p> <p>34 C.F.R. 100.10</p>	<p>Does not contain a procedure in Part 1 (Title VI)</p>	<p>(g) Post termination proceedings.</p> <p>(1) An applicant or recipient adversely affected by an order issued under paragraph (f) of this section shall be restored to full eligibility to receive Federal financial assistance if it satisfies the terms and conditions of that order for such eligibility or if it brings itself into compliance with this part and provides reasonable assurance that it will fully comply with this part.</p> <p>49 C.F.R. 21.17</p>

As this chart demonstrates, with respect to its proposed rulemaking, EPA has selectively chosen certain language to modify, particularly provisions that prescribe time frames for agency action, purportedly to bring EPA into alignment with other agencies also charged with implementing Title VI. However, if EPA's goal were to align its regulations with other agencies, then the proposed rulemaking would be both under and over-inclusive. If EPA's purpose were truly to bring its regulations into alignment, many other modifications to its regulations would have to be made with regard to the regulatory language and the organization of numerous provisions. Instead, EPA cherry-picked, attempting to make only carefully selected changes.

**E. EPA's Proposal to Amend its Regulations to Clarify its Affirmative Authority is Unnecessary.**

EPA is proposing to amend § 7.85(b) by removing the language, “where there is reason to believe that discrimination may exist in a program or activity receiving EPA assistance” in order to clarify that it has affirmative authority to collect compliance data.<sup>115</sup> Through this rule, EPA intends to require recipients to submit compliance reports unrelated to complaint investigations or compliance reviews, but seeks comments on its proposed phased approach to conducting compliance reviews and whether to postpone implementation of provisions governing compliance reports until there are final guidance documents in place related to this process.<sup>116</sup> While we support EPA's endeavor to strengthen its authority to collect information and ensure compliance, the agency already has the affirmative authority under existing regulations to collect data and conduct pre- and post-award compliance reviews. 40 C.F.R. §§ 7.85, 7.110, and 7.115. As such, EPA should immediately start utilizing this authority, rather than phase in compliance reviews or delay any further in anticipation of any clarification or new guidance.

---

<sup>115</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,287.

<sup>116</sup> *Id.* at 77,286–87; *see also* EPA Staff Draft, EPA-HQ-OA-2013-0031 at 11(Dec. 1, 2015) (“EPA does not intend to request compliance reports, unrelated to compliance reviews and complaint investigations, from recipients any sooner than 90 days after it has ... finalized the guidance.”).

Signatories support the removal of the “reason to believe” language in 40 C.F.R. §§ 7.85(b), 7.110(a), and 7.115(a) even though “reason to believe” should not be viewed as a significant barrier to requiring recipients to submit additional compliance data or conduct on-site pre or post-award compliance reviews. The “reason to believe” standard does not require definitive evidence of discrimination; instead the inquiry is focused on whether a reasonable person would conclude, based on available information, that discrimination is occurring.<sup>117</sup>

If EPA goes forward with these clarifications, it should also delete language suggesting that OCR must determine whether information is “necessary” for its review.<sup>118</sup> This language plants the seeds for yet more challenges to the collection of compliance information. Removing the requirement that information be “necessary” goes hand in hand with EPA’s proposal to remove the term “reason to believe.” Section 7.85(b) as amended would read:

The OCR may require recipients to submit data and information specific to certain programs or activities to determine compliance or to investigate a complaint alleging discrimination in a program or activity receiving EPA assistance.

If EPA is committed to using its affirmative authority to ensure compliance and move its civil rights program forward, it should also remove the term “necessary.”

We strongly oppose EPA’s proposal to wait for the issuance of guidance documents before requesting compliance reports, given that EPA already has the authority to request compliance reports and given OCR’s poor record of timely producing and finalizing guidance

---

<sup>117</sup> See, e.g., Policy Statement on Discrimination in Lending, 59 Fed. Reg. 18,266, 18,271 (Apr. 15, 1994) (describing what constitutes “reason to believe” on lender discrimination in violation of Equal Credit Opportunity Act); see also Black’s Law Dictionary (10<sup>th</sup> ed. 2014) (defining “reasonably believe” as “[t]o believe (a given fact or combination of facts) under circumstances in which a reasonable person would believe.”).

<sup>118</sup> See, e.g., 40 C.F.R. § 7.80(a) (“Applicants must also submit any other information that the OCR determines *is necessary* for preaward review.”) (emphasis added); 40 C.F.R. § 7.85(b) (“*If necessary*, the OCR may require recipients to submit data and information specific to certain programs or activities to determine compliance when there is reason to believe that discrimination may exist. . . .”) (emphasis added).

documents.<sup>119</sup> For example, in 1998 EPA issued its “Interim Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits” (“Interim Guidance”) to guide OCR’s implementation and enforcement of Title VI regulations.<sup>120</sup> The Interim Guidance was never finalized. In June 2000, EPA then released the Draft Revised Guidance for public comment.<sup>121</sup> Despite significant input from the public, the effort to finalize legal standards languished. In 2005, EPA published the “Draft Final Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs.”<sup>122</sup> These guidance documents took years to draft and revise, with only the public involvement guidance finalized, in 2006.<sup>123</sup> With regard to the legal standards EPA uses to evaluate whether a Title VI violation has occurred, to date EPA has still failed to finalize guidance. At this point, rather than finalizing guidance, EPA has announced its intention to address legal issues in a Civil Rights Compliance Toolkit.<sup>124</sup>

Communities cannot afford yet another delay if EPA waits for guidance documents to be finalized on compliance reports. EPA presently has the authority under 40 C.F.R. § 7.85 to ensure that recipients comply with Title VI, and recipients are already on notice that they may be

---

<sup>119</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,286–77 (“[T]he EPA does not intend to request compliance reports, unrelated to compliance reviews and complaint investigations, from recipients any sooner than 90 days after it has drafted guidance about such reports, sought stakeholder input on the guidance, put the guidance out for notice and comment, and finalized the guidance.”).

<sup>120</sup> U.S. Comm’n on Civil Rights, *supra* note 16, at 32–34.

<sup>121</sup> U.S. EPA, EPA’s Title VI – Policies, Guidance, Settlements, Laws and Regulations, <http://www.epa.gov/ocr/epas-title-vi-policies-guidance-settlements-laws-and-regulations##polandguid> (last updated Feb. 19, 2016).

<sup>122</sup> *Id.*

<sup>123</sup> Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs, 71 Fed. Reg. 14,207 (Mar. 21, 2006).

<sup>124</sup> U.S. EPA, Office of Civil Rights, External Compliance and Complaints Program Strategic Plan: Fiscal Year 2015-2020 at 5 (2015), available at [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/strategic\\_plan.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/strategic_plan.pdf). EPA has also failed to finalize the Draft Policy Paper on Adversity. See *supra* at 2.

required to submit additional information “specific to certain programs or activities.”<sup>125</sup> In fact, EPA even acknowledges its affirmative authority in the preamble to the instant proposed rulemaking.<sup>126</sup> For EPA to have an effective “Model Civil Rights Program” it must immediately effectuate its compliance procedures, rather than phasing them in.<sup>127</sup>

**F. EPA Should Establish Clear Data Collection and Reporting Requirements, Which are a Necessary Component of a Robust Title VI Compliance Program.**

EPA’s regulations currently require applicants for federal funds to provide both an “assurance” that they will comply with requirements pursuant to EPA’s Title VI regulations and “any other information that the OCR determines is necessary for preaward review.”<sup>128</sup> These mandates are too vague to provide guidance to recipients as to what constitutes compliance and what type of information should be collected and maintained. EPA should amend 40 C.F.R. §§ 7.110(a) and 7.80 to require that an applicant for EPA financial assistance demonstrate that it has, and is implementing, an effective Title VI compliance program.

EPA has specifically requested comments on what type of information a recipient will be required to collect and report and, particularly, what type of information recipients will be required to include in compliance reports. As a starting point, EPA should compare the level of specificity set forth in FTA’s Circular on Title VI Requirements and Guidelines, Circular, FTA, FTA C 4702.1B, Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients (Oct. 1, 2012), *available at* [http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA\\_Title\\_VI\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Title_VI_FINAL.pdf) (“FTA Circular”). The Circular contains the following provisions:

---

<sup>125</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.85(b).

<sup>126</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77,286 (“These changes reaffirm the agency’s existing authority to use compliance reviews to identify and resolve compliance concerns with recipients of EPA financial assistance to prevent costly investigations and litigation.”).

<sup>127</sup> Although we urge EPA to finalize a guidance on legal standards and finally reject the rebuttable presumption, lack of clarity about the legal standards cannot and should not be used an excuse to postpone the exercise of EPA’s affirmative authority and the initiation of compliance reviews. All stakeholders seek greater clarity on EPA’s legal standards, but compliance reviews are no different in this regard than investigations. EPA must finalize guidance on its legal standards to provide recipients with meaningful notice of expectations and, also, to provide clarity for complainants and investigators.

<sup>128</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.80(a)(1).



- Requirement to provide assurances annually, which are posted on FTA’s website.<sup>129</sup>
- Requirement to submit “a Title VI Program,” which must be approved by a responsible governing entity, to the FTA regional civil rights officer once every three years. Recipients must submit documentation that the entity has approved the Program.<sup>130</sup>
- Each “Program” must include particular information, such as the recipient’s Title VI notice to the public notifying the public of the protections afforded against discrimination; a copy of the instructions to the public regarding how to file a Title VI complaint; a list of investigations, complaints or lawsuits related to Title VI filed with the recipient since the last submission; a public participation plan that includes “an outreach plan to engage minority and limited English proficient populations”; and a copy of a plan for providing language assistance, among other things.<sup>131</sup>

Significantly, this level of specificity ensures that recipients indeed have a Title VI program and that assurances are not just pro forma.

- Requirements to collect and evaluate demographic information include the race and ethnicity of populations served by the program or activity.<sup>132</sup>

EPA’s data collection requirements should include these components: robust assurances, with detailed information about Title VI programs – including specific, required information such as complaint procedures; demographic data relevant to the program or activity; and procedures for conducting analysis of whether operations comply with Title VI. All of this information should be updated regularly and be made publicly available.

Tools such as EJSCREEN<sup>133</sup> are now readily accessible to recipients to conduct analyses of compliance with Title VI. As EPA’s website states, EJSCREEN “offers a variety of powerful data and mapping capabilities that enable users to access environmental and demographic information, at high geographic resolution, across the entire country; displayed in color-coded maps and standard data reports. These maps and reports show how a selected location compares

---

<sup>129</sup> FTA Circular § III.2.

<sup>130</sup> *Id.* § III.4.

<sup>131</sup> *Id.* § III.4(a).

<sup>132</sup> *See, e.g., id.* § IV.5 (requirement to collect and report demographic data applicable to transit providers); *id.* § V.2 (requirement to prepare and submit a Title VI program including a demographic profile and demographic maps applicable to states).

<sup>133</sup> *See* EPA, EJSCREEN, Frequent Questions About EJSCREEN, <http://www.epa.gov/ejscreen/frequent-questions-about-ejscreen#q1> (last updated Sept. 8, 2015).

to the rest of the nation, EPA region or state.”<sup>134</sup> Although EJ Screen is a work in progress – for example, EJSCREEN should incorporate data on the distribution of environmental benefits such as park access<sup>135</sup> – the availability of such online tools allows recipients to more readily access demographic data relevant to their Title VI program.

Moreover, any rulemaking amending provisions regarding data collection, EPA’s compliance program and, the Case Resolution Manual (discussed below) should clarify that a violation of Title VI and its regulations is established when a recipient fails to consider the disparate impact of a program or policy, including but not limited to whether the operation of a permitted facility will have a disparate impact on the basis of race, color or national origin.<sup>136</sup> Rulemaking and the CRM, Chapter 5 (Compliance Reviews) should explicitly make clear that recipients have an obligation to evaluate whether their actions, policies or practices have an unjustified disparate impact on the basis of race, color or national origin.

## II. INTERIM CASE RESOLUTION MANUAL

Signatories to this letter support the release of the CRM because it responds to the need for a more professional, uniform, and standardized approach to handling environmental justice cases. To be clear, we applaud the intent of the CRM to “provide procedural guidance to OCR case managers to ensure EPA’s prompt, effective, and efficient resolution of civil rights cases consistent with science and the civil rights laws.”<sup>137</sup> Moreover, we are pleased to know that this CRM and subsequent versions will be posted on EPA’s website and also distributed to the public

---

<sup>134</sup> *Id.*

<sup>135</sup> See, e.g., *US EPA Include Park Access in EJSCREEN and Support Equal Access to Parks and Recreation*, The City Project Blog (Jan. 6, 2016), <http://www.cityprojectca.org/blog/archives/41531>; Letter from Claire Robinson, Amigos de los Rios et al., to Gina McCarthy, Adm’r, U.S. EPA & Mustafa Santiago Ali, Sr. Advisor on Env’tl. Justice, (July 14, 2015), available at <http://www.cityprojectca.org/blog/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/USEPA-Public-Comments-20150714-updated-allies.pdf>.

<sup>136</sup> *S. Camden Citizens in Action*, 145 F. Supp. 2d at 481 (granting plaintiffs’ request for declaratory judgment on this basis); see also Letter from Peter M. Rogoff, Adm’r, Fed. Transit Admin., to Steve Heminger, Exec. Dir., Metro. Transp. Comm’n, & Dorothy Dugger, Gen Manager, S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist. (Jan. 15, 2010), available at <https://oaklandliving.files.wordpress.com/2010/01/fta-letter-to-mtc-and-bart-on-oakland-airport-connector.pdf> (preliminary results of compliance review revealed failure to conduct equity analysis, putting agency in danger of losing federal funds).

<sup>137</sup> CRM, *supra* note 63, at ii. Throughout the CRM, there are repeated referrals to the OCR’s intent to have “prompt, effective, and efficient case resolution.” *Id.* at 6, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27.

through its network of Deputy Civil Rights Officials.<sup>138</sup> This allows stakeholders of environmental justice complaints, including the impacted communities and recipients of federal funds, to review and comment on this CRM and future versions, and to be informed of the procedural guidance for Title VI complaints.

Consistent with this improved transparency, we urge EPA to timely post on its website other documents referenced in the CRM including: (1) templates of its strategic case management plans, investigation plans, requests for information, and investigation reports; (2) letters of insufficient evidence and non-compliance letters of findings; (3) informal resolution agreements and voluntary compliance agreements and any modifications thereto; (4) post- and pre-award compliance reviews; (5) monitoring reports; (6) documents initiating enforcement proceedings; (7) all regulations and other applicable laws referenced in the CRM; and (8) all acknowledgments of receipt of correspondence which could constitute a complaint and the accompanying complaints and supporting documents. Environmental justice communities seeking information about prior complaints or previous Title VI enforcement efforts should not each be required to request such basic information through public records requests. Such a piecemeal approach is both burdensome for communities and inefficient for EPA.<sup>139</sup>

More generally, we support EPA's articulated goal in this CRM to "promote appropriate involvement by complainants and recipients in the External Compliance complaint process," and other processes.<sup>140</sup> In all case resolution proceedings, we urge OCR to engage with impacted community members to the fullest extent. This engagement should include regularly updating complainants and recipients of the status of case investigations. Indeed, in this and other ways specifically identified below, the CRM does not go far enough to bring Title VI process into alignment with principles of environmental justice and to ensure that those who are most affected by discriminatory practices will have timely information and meaningful opportunities to inform decision-making. Thus, we request that EPA modify the CRM, in all ways possible, including those specifically suggested *infra*, to expand the role of complainants in the Title VI case

---

<sup>138</sup> *Id.* at ii–iii.

<sup>139</sup> The Center for Public Integrity has been able to post such materials, which they obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests, within a relatively short time frame compared to how long it is taking EPA to make such materials available online. *See Lombardi et al., supra* note 22. Stakeholders should not have to rely, however, on the Center rather than EPA for up-to-date information.

<sup>140</sup> CRM at 14. Moreover, voluntary compliance agreements contemplate that the OCR may visit community members, among others, to determine whether a recipient has complied with the terms of such an agreement. *See id.* at 29.

resolution process, consistent with the EPA's espoused policies, such as the 2003 Public Involvement Policy, 2006 Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs, and 2015 Guidance on Considering Environmental Justice During the Development of Regulatory Actions.<sup>141</sup>

Below please find comments on specific provisions of the CRM that merit OCR's further consideration.

#### **A. Jurisdiction**

The CRM provides that when OCR evaluates whether correspondence is a complaint, it must consider four factors including: "[w]hether [the correspondence] identifies an applicant for, or a recipient of, EPA financial assistance as the entity that committed the alleged discriminatory act."<sup>142</sup> The failure to meet all four factors is a basis for rejecting or referring the correspondence.<sup>143</sup> The CRM provides that "[d]etermining whether an entity classifies as a recipient of EPA financial assistance may require more complex analysis, including, for example, examining the flow-through of federal funds."<sup>144</sup> To the extent that the determination of whether an entity is a federal funding recipient is complex, the CRM should be revised to reflect that EPA is the appropriate entity to conduct that analysis and should not rely solely on the complainant's jurisdictional analysis. The CRM should make clear that if a complainant fails to identify the recipient(s) that are committing the alleged discrimination or that information is incomplete, EPA must conduct its own analysis to determine whether the actor is a recipient of federal funds. This modification is critical since the identification of an EPA recipient is a basis for rejecting or referring correspondence, even if the other factors are met, including that a complainant has alleged acts that may violate EPA's non-discrimination regulations. The burden

---

<sup>141</sup> U.S. EPA, EPA-233-F-03-004, Introducing EPA's Public Involvement Policy (2003), *available at* <http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/100045RR.PDF?Dockey=100045RR.PDF>; Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs, 71 Fed. Reg. 14,207; U.S. EPA, Guidance on Considering Environmental Justice During the Development of Regulatory Actions (2015), *available at* <http://www3.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/resources/policy/considering-ej-in-rulemaking-guide-final.pdf>. All of these policies espouse that both EPA and Title VI recipients provide opportunities for early and meaningful involvement by complainant communities in agency decision-making, as well as transparency in agency decision-making.

<sup>142</sup> CRM at 6–7.

<sup>143</sup> *Id.* at 7.

<sup>144</sup> *Id.* at 9.

at this initial stage of the complaint process certainly should not be on the complainant, who is enduring the discrimination individually or systemically, to make what can be a complex and difficult jurisdictional showing. That burden should be placed on EPA, which has the capacity to conduct that analysis.

Moreover, if a complaint creates a reason to believe that there is discrimination, the CRM should be revised to require that the OCR initiate a compliance review, whether or not the complaint meets all of the other jurisdictional factors or not.<sup>145</sup>

The CRM sets forth a non-exhaustive list of prudential factors that can form the basis for a decision to “administratively close” a complaint.<sup>146</sup> These bases for rejecting a complaint include that the claim is not ripe, is moot, is pending or resolved by another agency, or has been filed against the same recipient.<sup>147</sup> Thus it appears that the CRM contemplates that the jurisdictional review or subsequent consideration will include a screening for standing and ripeness, grafting doctrines developed in the judicial context onto administrative enforcement proceedings, a proposal which many of the signatories to this letter previously criticized.<sup>148</sup> Perhaps most centrally, many Title VI complaints in the environmental context are submitted by community groups without the assistance of lawyers, and EPA should not close complaints on the basis of insufficient information to support such procedural requirements or for inartful drafting, particularly if information outside of the four corners of the complaint indicates that there is reason to believe that the recipient is not complying with Title VI. Moreover, there is no standing requirement to file an administrative complaint and the CRM should not impose one, particularly if it would add impediments to filing a viable complaint for an already overburdened, under-resourced potential complainant. Similarly, the CRM’s imposition of a screening for ripeness is vague and has the potential to frustrate meaningful civil rights enforcement. Indeed, timely complaints will often assert allegations that anticipate future actions; ideally, complainants will have the opportunity to challenge actions, policies and practices that are discriminatory before shovels hit the ground and decisions become more costly to reverse. In *Angelita C.*, referenced *infra*, EPA unambiguously stated that the showing of *potential* health effects (depending on their nature and severity) is an adequate basis not just for

---

<sup>145</sup> *Id.* at 6–7.

<sup>146</sup> *Id.* at 16.

<sup>147</sup> *Id.*

<sup>148</sup> See Comments on Draft Policy Papers, Ex. 2, at 14-18.

filing a complaint, but also for a finding of adverse impact.<sup>149</sup> The agency noted that a reasonable cause for concern and, correspondingly, a reasonable basis for filing a complaint based on concern for public health or welfare, can be evidenced by establishing *imminent*, substantial harm or endangerment in a complaint. Consistent with that determination, EPA's CRM should not impose heightened requirements for filing a complaint, particularly a standard that requires that actual harm occurred."<sup>150</sup> EPA's proposal to establish additional bases on which to reject or "close" complaints – and particularly, the imposition of a ripeness standard -- would be a radical departure from the last two decades of Title VI enforcement.<sup>151</sup>

Even when these prudential factors may be relevant in particular cases, EPA's record raises serious concerns about whether EPA will broadly apply them to the detriment of complainants, defeating the purpose of Title VI and its regulations. In 2012, for example, EPA rejected a complaint filed by residents of Uniontown, Alabama, on the prudential ground that a related case had been filed in court<sup>152</sup> because at the time of the complaint there was also a pending case against the permitted facility, Arrowhead Landfill, under state tort law.<sup>153</sup> The litigation filed in state court named the Landfill and contractors as defendants, not the state permitting agency, the Alabama Department of Environmental Management (ADEM), and raised

---

<sup>149</sup> *In re Cal. Dep't of Pesticide Regs.*

<sup>150</sup> To be clear, EPA should apply the imminence standard as it did in *Angelita C.* and not apply the ripeness standard that it used to dismiss with prejudice and deny reconsideration of that dismissal in *In re California Air Resources Board*, EPA File No. 09R-12-R9 (EPA OCR 2012) (involving California community groups with members living in close proximity to facilities governed by California's greenhouse gas cap-and-trade program who alleged that the California Air Resources Board violated Title VI by allowing carbon trading, which denied overburdened populations the benefit of co-pollutant reductions in their communities); *see also* Letter from Rafael DeLeon, Dir., OCR, to Brent Newell & Sofia Parino, Ctr. on Race, Poverty & the Env't. (July 12, 2012); Letter from Rafael DeLeon, Dir., OCR, to Brent Newell & Sofia Parino, Ctr. on Race, Poverty & the Env't. (Jan. 25, 2013); Letter from Brent Newell, Ctr. On Race, Poverty & the Env't. to Rafael DeLeon, Dir., OCR (Aug. 6, 2012); Letter from Rafael DeLeon, Dir., OCR, to Brent Newell & Sofia Parino, Ctr. on Race, Poverty & the Env't. at 2 (Jan. 25, 2013).

<sup>151</sup> *See* 65 Fed. Reg. at 39,672 (June 27, 2000) ("[T]he complainants do not have the burden of proving their allegations are true, although their complaint should present a clearly articulated statement of the alleged violation. It is OCR's job to investigate allegations and determine compliance.").

<sup>152</sup> *See* CRM at 16 (factors for closing the complaint include "[t]he same civil rights allegations have been filed by the complainant against the same recipient with state or federal court individually or through a class action.").

<sup>153</sup> Complaint and Pet. for Relief or Sanction, *In re Ala. Dep't of Env'tl. Mgmt.* EPA File No. 01R-12-R4 (EPA OCR May 30, 2013); Letter from Vicki Simons, Acting Dir., EPA OCR, to David Ludder (June 27, 2013), available at [http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/12r-13-r4\\_accpt\\_emplt-redacted-0.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/12r-13-r4_accpt_emplt-redacted-0.pdf).

no civil rights claims in that action. Nonetheless, EPA rejected the complaint filed against ADEM under Title VI on the ground that it was related to the tort action and complainants were forced to refile after the tort case was settled, leading to a more than two-year delay in EPA's investigation and any potential remedy.<sup>154</sup> Accordingly, the CRM should be revised to clarify that a complaint should not be dismissed on the prudential grounds of standing or ripeness, or on the tenuous relationship between a civil rights claim against a recipient and other non-civil rights claims filed in another forum against another party. These references to standing and ripeness as other factors to consider after opening an investigation should be removed from the CRM. Simply stated, OCR fails to serve justice when it dismisses a complaint on jurisdictional or such prudential grounds and ignores discrimination.

## **B. Accepted Cases: Preliminary Investigation and Resolution**

The CRM recognizes that “[p]art of effective case planning includes the identification of all legal theories that would be applicable to the issues identified for investigation,” and provides three typical categories of legal claims: disparate/different treatment; disparate impact/effects; and retaliation.<sup>155</sup> Throughout the CRM, there also are references to the pertinent legal standards with respect to a case.<sup>156</sup> Notwithstanding, the CRM does not address the need for the clarification of legal standards used by the EPA.<sup>157</sup> Clear legal standards are critical for recipients and complainants alike to understand what actions may give rise to Title VI investigations and enforcement actions.

The CRM further provides for ADR, which “involves the formal mediation of a complaint or complaint allegations between the complainant and recipient, through the use of a

---

<sup>154</sup> *Id.* at 10–11 (discussing procedural history).

<sup>155</sup> CRM, *supra*, note 63, at 15.

<sup>156</sup> *See, e.g., id.* at 22 (setting forth that a statement of the case where a case has been investigated, but where no finding has been issued, must contain “[a]n explanation of the pertinent legal standard(s)”; *id.* at 24 (referring to OCR’s obligation to “ensure that investigations are legally sufficient”); *id.* (providing that the “scope of OCR’s investigation and resolution activities will depend upon the particular issue(s) accepted for investigation and applicable legal standards”); *id.* at 25 (providing that an investigation plan should identify “applicable legal theories”); *id.* at 26 (providing that an investigation report should set forth “applicable legal theories”); *id.* at 27 (providing that a non-compliance determination includes an “explanation of the pertinent legal standard(s)”).

<sup>157</sup> *Id.* at ii (“The CRM is not intended to *address substantive civil rights policy or legal standards* or processes outside of OCR’s jurisdiction and responsibility to enforce the federal civil rights laws ...”) (emphasis added)

professionally trained mediator.”<sup>158</sup> Notwithstanding our appreciation of the potential for ADR to resolve complaints, the process raises several concerns. First, the CRM should be revised to ensure that complainants have similar access to legal and technical resources, including experts, during ADR as are typically available to recipients of federal funding. As EPA has recognized, many complainants are not represented by counsel and have little or no financial capacity to retain counsel and substantive experts to aid them in the ADR process, where they must negotiate with sophisticated and relatively amply funded state or local government or private entities.<sup>159</sup> For example, even when ADR yields results, as in *Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice v. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District*,<sup>160</sup> complainants are at a competitive disadvantage in the process. Greenaction, the complainant, lacked counsel while the Air District, the recipient of federal funds, enjoyed in-house attorneys and staff resources.

Moreover, the need for a level playing field becomes all the more important given that once the participants have come to agreement, the CRM calls for OCR to determine that the terms are reasonable, though it fails to establish criteria for this determination.<sup>161</sup> Complainants must be provided with the resources to ensure that the terms are reasonable and to monitor compliance. Indeed, the CRM provides that OCR “will not monitor the implementation of the ADR Resolution Agreement, but will respond to complaints by the parties of Resolution Agreement breaches. . . .”<sup>162</sup> In the case of a breach, “if a new complaint is filed, OCR will not address the alleged breach of the agreement” but will “determine whether to investigate the original allegation,” which will be considered timely if it is filed “within 180 calendar days of the date of the last alleged act of discrimination or within 60 calendar days of the date the complainant obtains information that a breach occurred, whichever is later.”<sup>163</sup> With a procedure

---

<sup>158</sup> *Id.* at 20.

<sup>159</sup> EPA has recognized the unequal playing field between complainants and recipients in its Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs. *See supra* note 123, referencing this guidance, which urged that EPA “design a process that will allow all parties to provide necessary information in good faith and in some cases secure independent technical expertise to assist some of the parties prior to any negotiations.”; 71 Fed. Reg. at 14,214.

<sup>160</sup> *In re San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Dist. & Cal. Energy Comm’n*, EPA File No. 11R-09-R9 (EPA OCR 2009).

<sup>161</sup> CRM at 20.

<sup>162</sup> *Id.*; *see also id.* at 19 (similar standard for ECR).

<sup>163</sup> *Id.*



reliant on timely complaints, the complainants must have the capacity to conduct monitoring activities.

The CRM further provides that OCR *may* engage in an informal resolution process with the recipient of Title VI finding and, in so doing, based on its enforcement discretion, also *may* “engage complainants who want to provide input on potential [informal] resolution issues” and “potential terms of a resolution agreement between OCR and the recipient.”<sup>164</sup> We urge OCR to revise the CRM to *require* that OCR engage complainants during any informal resolution process with respect to potential resolution issues and terms, consistent with environmental justice principles.<sup>165</sup> In the only instance where EPA negotiated a voluntary compliance agreement as a result of making preliminary findings of non-compliance in its history, it did so without notifying the complainants until after EPA negotiated the resolution with the recipient. Specifically, in *Angelita C. v. California Department of Pesticide Regulation*, discussed *infra*, EPA issued a Preliminary Finding of Noncompliance without notifying the complainants. EPA thereafter negotiated a settlement agreement in secret with the recipient and ultimately settled on terms that required additional monitoring by the recipient rather than prohibiting the discriminatory conduct.<sup>166</sup> The complainants learned of the Preliminary Finding months later,

---

<sup>164</sup> *Id.* at 21.

<sup>165</sup> EPA defines environmental justice as “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” U.S. EPA, What is Environmental Justice?, <http://www3.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/> (last updated Feb. 22, 2016).

Involving complainants in the information resolution process also is consistent with a protocol developed by the Department of Justice’s Environmental and Natural Resources Division, which prioritizes reaching out to stakeholders even in non-civil rights cases, as part of its effort to integrate environmental justice principles into its work. See U.S. DOJ, Department of Justice Guidance Concerning Environmental Justice 4–12 (2014), available at [https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ej/pages/attachments/2014/12/19/doj\\_guidance\\_concerning\\_ej.pdf](https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ej/pages/attachments/2014/12/19/doj_guidance_concerning_ej.pdf) (outlining how DOJ identifies EJ issues, including “[w]hether individuals, certain neighborhoods, or tribal or indigenous populations have had an equal opportunity for meaningful involvement, as provided by law, in governmental decision-making relation to the distribution of environmental benefits or burden”); see also U.S. DOJ, 2014 Implementation Progress Report on Environmental Justice, available at <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/ej/pages/attachments/2015/02/11/2014-implementation-progress-report.pdf> (“Community outreach is one of the key principles upon which the environmental justice movement is founded. Outreach gives communities a meaningful opportunity to have input into environmental decision-making that could affect them and help us to better understand their concerns.”)

<sup>166</sup> *In re Cal. Dep’t of Pesticide Regs.*

when EPA informed the public of its preliminary findings and settlement agreement. Complainants ultimately sued EPA for violations of their due process rights.<sup>167</sup>

Because complainants are the individuals and communities impacted by the challenged actions of the recipient, their input is necessary when any form of resolution is contemplated to ensure that any harm to them is remedied appropriately and their best interests are served. This is particularly critical since an agreement between OCR and the recipient through the informal resolution process, which has been implemented per the terms, *will* result in OCR closing the case file.<sup>168</sup> And following the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in *Sandoval*, OCR’s administrative proceeding essentially is often the only recourse for overburdened complainant communities disparately impacted by environmental harms.<sup>169</sup>

### **C. Investigation and Voluntary Compliance**

The CRM provides, “When during the course of the investigation of a complaint, OCR identifies new compliance concerns involving unrelated issues that were not raised in the complaint or issues under investigation. . .OCR *may* follow up on those issues and address them within the resolution of the original complaint ....”<sup>170</sup> The signatories urge that the CRM be revised to *require* OCR to follow up on any issues that it becomes aware of during investigation of the original complaint. This is consistent with OCR’s affirmative obligation to collect data and initiate compliance reviews to address environmental justice issues referenced *infra*.<sup>171</sup>

The CRM also provides that “if an [investigative plan (IP)] has been developed, OCR will *not* release the IP to the complainant or the recipient during the pendency of the investigation,” and, similarly, that “if an [investigative report (IR)] has been developed, OCR will *not* release the IR to the complainant or the recipient during the pendency of the

---

<sup>167</sup> See *Garcia v. McCarthy*, 2014 WL 187386 , at \*1,

<sup>168</sup> CRM at 22–23.

<sup>169</sup> 532 U.S. at 275 (holding that “[t]here is no private right of action to enforce disparate-impact regulations promulgated under Title VI).

<sup>170</sup> CRM at 24–25 (emphasis added).

<sup>171</sup> EPA’s Title VI regulations make clear that the agency has affirmative authority to enforce Title VI, authority that is not limited to responding to complaints: “The OCR may periodically conduct compliance reviews of any recipient’s programs or activities receiving EPA assistance, including the request of data and information, and may conduct on-site reviews when it has reason to believe that discrimination may be occurring in such programs or activities.” 40 C.F.R. § 7.115(a).

investigation.”<sup>172</sup> In light of our other recommendations for greater, not less, transparency in the case resolution process, as discussed *infra*, we recommend that the CRM be revised to provide that OCR make available the IP and IR to complainants and recipients during the investigation. Doing so will allow complainants and the recipient to provide relevant and timely information to investigators and may also facilitate compliance, since the IP and IR should each include information indicating the discrimination at issue, the evidentiary basis for the identified discrimination, and potential legal liability.<sup>173</sup>

Moreover, as with the informal resolution process, the CRM provides that OCR *may* engage in voluntary compliance negotiations with the recipient and that the “OCR will notify the complainant that it intends to negotiate a voluntary compliance agreement.”<sup>174</sup> We urge OCR to revise the CRM to *require* that the OCR not merely notify the complainants during the voluntary compliance agreement process, but also engage complainants during that process, both with respect to potential resolution issues *and* terms, to be consistent with environmental justice principles. As discussed above, in the only instance where EPA issued a preliminary finding of non-compliance in its history, it did so without notifying the complainants until after the EPA negotiated a resolution of the complaint with the recipient.<sup>175</sup> Because complainants are the individuals and communities impacted by the challenged actions of the recipient, their input when any form of resolution is contemplated is necessary to ensure that any harm to them individually and systemically is remedied appropriately and their best interests are served. As mentioned *supra*, OCR’s Title VI complaint process is often the only means for complainant communities to achieve redress for environmental injustice following the *Sandoval* decision.<sup>176</sup>

#### **D. Compliance Reviews**

The CRM provides that OCR *may* initiate post-award compliance reviews and identifies several factors that it will consider in making this determination.<sup>177</sup> We urge OCR to consider during post-award compliance review whether the recipient was alleged to have violated Title VI in any complaint that raised such a claim, even if EPA closed the case based on a jurisdictional

---

<sup>172</sup> CRM at 25, 26 (emphasis added).

<sup>173</sup> *Id.* at 25–26.

<sup>174</sup> CRM at 28.

<sup>175</sup> See *supra* note 167 and accompanying text.

<sup>176</sup> 532 U.S. at 275.

<sup>177</sup> CRM at 30–31.

defect. In addition, the rejection on jurisdictional grounds of a complaint that otherwise raises cognizable claims under Title VI should, by itself, prompt OCR to conduct a post-award review of recipient.<sup>178</sup>

#### **E. Monitoring of Informal Resolution Agreements and Voluntary Compliance Agreements**

The CRM identifies various means by which it will ensure implementation of remedial agreements, including by interviewing recipients and/or knowledgeable persons.<sup>179</sup> Consistent with principles of environmental justice, we urge EPA to revise the CRM to require OCR to engage the complainants, as well as community members impacted by the recipient's activities.

The CRM provides that "OCR *may* address a new compliance issue(s) identified for the first time during monitoring by providing technical assistance or considering the issue(s) as factors to initiate compliance review."<sup>180</sup> We urge OCR to revise the CRM to *require* OCR to investigate any new compliance issues that arise during the monitoring phase based on EPA's affirmative obligation to remedy individual and systemic violations of Title VI and its regulations.

Moreover, the CRM provides that complainants must be notified in writing of any modification to the substance of any informal or voluntary agreement.<sup>181</sup> We urge EPA to modify the CRM to (1) *require* that OCR provide complainants with the opportunity to comment within a reasonable time-period (e.g., 30-60 days) on any proposed substantive modifications to any agreements *prior* to OCR approving them and that, (2) OCR be *required* to consider and provide documentation of how OCR considered a complainant's response to a proposed modification(s) in its decision to approve or disapprove of the modification.

---

<sup>178</sup> Signatories urge EPA to clarify legal standards in order to communicate clearly to all stakeholders – to communities regarding the standards that EPA will apply regarding what constitutes compliance with Title VI, and, also, for EPA to provide meaningful notice to recipients when it pursues enforcement for non-compliance. The failure to clarify and finalize legal standards should not, however, be used as an excuse not to move forward with data collection and compliance reviews. There is no logical distinction between EPA's ability to conduct investigations versus compliance reviews: both require a clear understanding of legal standards. Signatories call on EPA to finalize guidance on legal standards, *see supra* notes 7–9, and, also, immediately to fulfill its compliance and enforcement function, including the use of its affirmative authority to collect data and conduct compliance reviews.

<sup>179</sup> *Id.* at 32.

<sup>180</sup> *Id.* at 33 (emphasis added).

<sup>181</sup> *Id.*

## **F. Initiation of Enforcement Action**

The CRM demonstrates that fund termination is a remedy often preceded by other less drastic forms of corrective action.<sup>182</sup> The signatories urge OCR to revise the CRM to make clear that EPA intends to initiate fund termination or referral to DOJ if a recipient fails to come into compliance. This is critical given that in the *first and only time* that the EPA has formally made a *preliminary finding* of discrimination—in a case that took OCR more than ten years to find that a Title VI recipient allowed toxic chemicals to be applied near schools attended by primarily by Latino school children—the recipient *still* was not in jeopardy of losing Title VI funds.<sup>183</sup> EPA should strengthen the language of the Chapter 7 in the CRM to make clear that OCR will, in fact, enforce the law.

## **G. Appendices**

The CRM provides for “aspirational” target timeframes for resolving Title VI complaints. The CRM provides that these targets are based in part on those included in the notice of proposed rulemaking. As signatories, we have provided comments on those proposed rules and, to the extent that they critique goals or targets, they are incorporated herein.

## **III. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

In sum, the undersigned recommend the following:

### *Regarding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking:*

- EPA should withdraw its proposal to eliminate deadlines for investigations and to substitute less definitive language requiring only that OCR “promptly review” complaints. The regulatory deadlines established by 40 C.F.R. § 120 provide clear measures of timeliness and create a modicum of accountability, and they should not be removed.
- EPA should withdraw its proposal to remove the requirement that EPA investigate “all complaints.” See 40 C.F.R. § 120. Greater discretion to reject complaints has the potential to leave communities with no legal recourse to address violations of Title VI

---

<sup>182</sup> *Id.* at 34–35.

<sup>183</sup> Complaint Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000d AND 40 C.F.R. Part 7, *In re Cal. Dep’t of Pesticide Regs.*, EPA File No. 16R-99-R9 (EPA OCR Apr. 22, 2011), available at <http://www.ejnet.org/ej/angelitac-complaint.pdf>.

and its regulations, and it will both erode confidence in OCR and undermine compliance with Title VI in the environmental context.

- In order to “create a model civil rights program which can nimbly and effectively enforce civil rights statutes in the environmental context,”<sup>184</sup> EPA must finalize guidance on legal standards and clarify that the rebuttable presumption that compliance with standards established under environmental laws is not a defense to a disparate impact claim. We urge EPA to address the need for clear legal standards that are consistent with civil rights law and to address other concerns about EPA’s civil rights compliance and enforcement program that communities have consistently raised over the past two decades.<sup>185</sup>
- OCR already has the affirmative authority to initiate compliance review “when it has reason to believe that discrimination may be occurring”<sup>186</sup> and to require compliance information, and it should immediately begin utilizing this authority.
- EPA should remove the language at 40 C.F.R. § 7.85(b) limiting additional information sought by EPA to instances “where there is reason to believe that discrimination may exist in a program or activity receiving EPA assistance” and the requirement that EPA accompany requests from recipients for additional information with a written statement setting forth the basis of the belief if these provisions are barriers to requesting information. EPA should similarly remove the language at 40 C.F.R. § 7.110(a) limiting EPA’s authority to conduct an on-site review in the pre-award compliance context to instances “when it has reason to believe that discrimination may be occurring in a program or activity” that is the subject of an application for assistance, and at 40 C.F.R. § 7.115(a) limiting EPA’s authority to conduct on-site reviews in the post-award context to instances “when it has reason to believe that discrimination may be occurring in such programs or activities.” The “reason to believe” requirement should not have been a significant barrier to requiring recipients to submit additional compliance data or to conduct site visits. If, however, this language has posed a high burden for EPA and it is necessary to reaffirm and clarify the agency’s existing authority, EPA should finalize this amendment.
- EPA should remove the qualifier “If necessary” from 40 C.F.R. § 7.85(b) to clarify OCR’s authority to require recipients to submit data and information relevant to determining compliance.

---

<sup>184</sup> 80 Fed. Reg. at 77284.

<sup>185</sup> See Exs. 1–5 (comments previously submitted to EPA by many of the signatories and other stakeholders).

<sup>186</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 7.115(a).

- EPA should amend 40 C.F.R. §§ 7.110(a) and 7.80 to require that an applicant for EPA financial assistance demonstrate that it has, and is implementing, an effective Title VI compliance program.
- EPA should devote sufficient resources to conduct, at a minimum, triennial post- award compliance reviews of every financial assistance recipient.
- EPA should use the FTA's Circular as a starting point when considering what type of information EPA should require recipients to collect and report, and what information should be included in compliance reports.

Regarding the Case Resolution Manual:

- EPA should remove standing and ripeness as factors for OCR to consider in determining whether to reject a complaint and should clarify that allegations will not be rejected on the basis of a relationship with claims asserted under laws other than Title VI in other forums. (Section 2.2).
- EPA should revise the CRM to provide that if a complainant fails to identify the Title VI recipient(s) that are committing the alleged discrimination or that information is incomplete, EPA must conduct its own analysis to determine whether or not the actor is a recipient of Title VI funds. (Section 2.4).
- EPA should revise the CRM to bring Title VI process into alignment with principles of environmental justice and to ensure that those who are most affected by discriminatory practices will have timely information and meaningful opportunities to provide EPA with information and to inform decision-making. (Sections 3.1, 3.13). This should include providing complainants and recipients with regular updates on the status of case investigations. In the same vein, EPA should revise the CRM to *require* that OCR engage complainants during any informal resolution process or negotiations to develop a voluntary compliance agreement, with respect to both potential resolution issues and terms. (Sections 3.13, 4.8).
- EPA should revise the CRM to clarify that if a complaint creates a reason to believe that there is discrimination, OCR will initiate a compliance review, whether the complaint meets all jurisdictional and other factors or not. (Sections 2.4, 3.4).
- EPA should revise the CRM to ensure that complainants have access to legal and technical resources, including experts, during ADR as are typically available to recipients of federal funding, as well as access to resources for monitoring compliance. (Section 3.11).

- EPA should revise the CRM to require OCR to follow up on any issues of which it becomes aware of during investigation of the original complaint and address them within the resolution of the original complaint. (Section 4.1).
- EPA should revise the CRM to require OCR to engage complainants whose allegations prompted resolutions (whether informal or voluntary), as well community members impacted by the complained harm, during the monitoring phase of a case. (Sections 6.1-6.4). EPA should also modify the CRM to require that OCR provide complainants with the opportunity to comment within a reasonable time period on any proposed substantive modifications to any agreements *prior* to OCR approving such modifications and to consider and provide documentation of how OCR considered a complainant's response to a proposed modification(s) in its decision to approve or reject the modification. (Section 6.3).
- EPA should revise the CRM to require OCR to investigate any new compliance issues that arise during the monitoring phase of the implementation of an agreement, based on EPA's affirmative obligation to remedy individual and systemic harms. (Section 6.3(2)).

\*\*\*

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on these important issues.

Sincerely,



Marianne Engelman Lado  
Senior Staff Attorney  
Earthjustice  
48 Wall Street, 19th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 845-7393

Sherrilyn Ifill  
Director-Counsel  
Janai Nelson  
Christina Swarns



Coty Montag  
Leah C. Aden  
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.  
40 Rector Street, 5th Floor  
New York, NY 10006  
(212) 965-2200

Sara Imperiale  
Legal Fellow, Environmental Justice  
NRDC  
40 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10011  
(212) 727-2700

On Behalf Of:

Rubin D. Arvizu  
Ocean Futures Society

Larry Baldwin  
Crystal Coast Waterkeeper  
Coastal Carolina Riverwatch

Michael Boyd  
Californians for Renewable Energy

Marc Brenman  
IDARE, LLC\*

Robert D. Bullard  
Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland  
School of Public Affairs  
Texas Southern University\*

Kemp Burdette  
Cape Fear River Watch

Amy Laura Cahn  
Public Interest Law Center  
of Philadelphia

Marianne Engelman Lado  
Earthjustice

Esther Calhoun  
Ellis Long  
Mary Leila Schaeffer  
Black Belt Citizens Fighting  
for Health and Justice

Cecil D. Corbin-Mark  
WE ACT for Environmental Justice

Veronica Eady  
Conservation Law Foundation

Leslie Fields  
Environmental Justice  
& Community Partnerships Program  
Sierra Club

Patricia Fron  
Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance

Robert Garcia  
The City Project

Mike Giles  
North Carolina Coastal Federation\*

Omar Gomez  
San Gabriel Mountains Forever

Marce Graudiņš

Azul

Megan Haberle  
Poverty & Race Research Action Council

Devon Hall  
Rural Empowerment Association for  
Community Help (REACH)

Michael Hansen  
Gasp

Macy Hinson  
Concerned Citizens of West Baden  
Community

Savonala "Savi" Horne  
The Land Loss Project

Sara Imperiale  
Natural Resources Defense Council

Gray Jernigan  
Waterkeeper Alliance

Susan Jordan  
California Coastal Protection Network

Helen H. Kang  
Nina C. Robertson  
Golden Gate University School of Law  
Environmental Law and Justice Clinic

Gregg Macey  
Brooklyn Law School\*

Mark Magaña  
GreenLatinos

Aaron Mair  
Arbor Hill Environmental Justice, Inc.

Vincent Martin  
Original United Citizens of SW Detroit  
Human Synergy Works

Mark Masaoka  
Asian Pacific Policy & Planning Council

Douglas Meiklejohn  
New Mexico Environmental Law Center

Pamela Miller  
Alaska Community Action on Toxics

Vernice Miller-Travis  
Maryland Commission  
on Environmental Justice\*

Naeema Muhammad  
North Carolina Environmental Justice  
Network

Peggy Newman  
Center for Community Action  
and Environmental Justice/Centro de Acción  
Comunitaria y Justicia Ambiental

Brent Newell  
Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment

Jennifer Peters  
Clean Water Action

Martha Pardo  
LatinoJustice PRLDF

Byron E. Price  
School of Public Affairs  
Baruch College\*

Bill Przulucki  
People Organized for Westside  
Renewal (POWER)

Wesley Reutimann  
Bike San Gabriel Valley

Bruce Reznik  
Los Angeles Waterkeeper

Joe D. Rich

Lawyers' Committee for  
Civil Rights Under Law

Karyn L. Rotker  
Poverty, Race & Civil Liberties Project  
ACLU of Wisconsin Foundation

Virginia Ruiz  
Farmworker Justice

Jennifer Savage  
Surfrider

Ellen R. Shaffer  
San Francisco, CA

Allie Sheffield  
PenderWatch & Conservancy

Amelia Shenstone  
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

Jacqueline Smith  
Environmental and Climate Justice  
Committee  
NAACP, Houston Branch

Ronald Smith  
Ashurst Bar/Smith Community  
Organization

Beatriz Sosa-Prado  
Doctoral Student  
Public Health, UC Merced\*

Kieran Suckling  
Center for Biological Diversity

Chandra Taylor  
Southern Environmental Law Center

Beryl Thurman  
North Shore Waterfront Conservancy  
of Staten Island

Luis Torres  
League of United Latin American  
Citizens (LULAC)

Irene Vilar  
Americas For Conservation

Guy Williams  
Detroitters Working for Environmental Justice

Omega and Brenda Wilson  
West End Revitalization Association

Rev. Leo Woodbury  
Loretta Slater  
Kingdom Living Temple  
Woodberry & Associates  
The Whitney M. Slater Foundation  
New Alpha Community Development Corp.

\* For identification purposes only