

## Urban and Regional Planning

Ana Isabel Baptista, Martha Matsuoka, and Chad Raphael

Many of the most significant environmental justice struggles in the United States concern land use conflicts that implicate urban and regional planning efforts. These place-based struggles reflect how our built environments have been shaped over time by histories of racism, inequality, colonization, and ecological exploitation. Thus, environmental injustice and environmental racism are in part products of urban and regional planning systems that have resulted in not only the maldistribution of harm, but also a lack of access to vital resources and decision-making processes that form our cities and towns.

This chapter explores the history and role of urban and regional planning in relation to community-engaged research (CER) and environmental justice (EJ). Highlighted are key examples of how CER has influenced EJ struggles in a variety of planning applications. These examples reflect the contributions of researchers, activists, and community-based, frontline and grassroots groups to urban and regional planning efforts across a diversity of issues, such as air pollution, climate resilience, energy, and water infrastructures. Planners and communities have integrated CER into planning practices through a variety of approaches—from participatory to radical planning—to address a host of challenges and opportunities for advancing dimensions of EJ. Table 11.1 summarizes how planning can address the four dimensions of justice common to CER and EJ discussed in this chapter.

TABLE 11.1. CER, Urban Planning, and EJ

Dimension of Justice	Community Engaged Research in Urban Planning for EJ
<b>Distribution</b> <i>Who ought to get what?</i>	Combining community knowledge with public data sources to document cumulative impacts of environmental harms, such as the siting of polluting industries, and inequitable distribution of environmental burdens and benefits  Prioritizing equity and social justice outcomes of planning processes
<b>Procedure</b> <i>Who ought to decide?</i>	CER to support community-based planning, especially led by non-state EJ organizations using radical planning approaches
<b>Recognition</b> <i>Who ought to be respected and valued?</i>	Centering local grassroots knowledge and intersectional analysis in the planning process, rather than professional and official expertise applied from outside the community
<b>Transformation</b> <i>What ought to change, and how?</i>	Developing new systems and structures of planning and development that practice restorative justice for EJ communities and ecologies (abolitionist ecology, reparation ecologies, just transitions, rights to the city, etc.)

## HISTORY AND TRADITIONS OF PLANNING IN RELATIONSHIP TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The history of planning is as old as human settlements. Populations around the world have continuously evolved methods of settling or organizing land for human survival within their physical and cultural contexts. Contemporary planning in the U.S. has antecedents in western European traditions of planning that arose out of particular conditions of 19th-century industrialization and urbanization. This Eurocentric tradition of planning was spread across the globe through the processes of colonization and imperialism. The justification for planning is contested. Some tout it as a means to check the “free market” and exert state interventions in the public interest, such as public health and the separation of incompatible land uses, while others argue that planning’s primary purpose is to serve as an instrument of capitalism, controlled by experts and elites to make cities conducive to capital flows and profit (Fainstein and DeFilippis 2015). Ambe Njoh describes the spread of European planning models as a rapacious vehicle for the acculturation of racial others (Njoh 2010). Most of the traditional planning models (described in table 11.2) represented a Western, rational approach grounded in utopian visions of cities laid out according to principles of efficiency, order, and beauty, and imbued with the racist, imperial, and colonial assumptions of the day. These utopian city planners entrenched patterns of inequality, erasure, and market logics that were reevaluated and reckoned with later by progressive planning models (see table 11.3).

TABLE 11.2. Traditional Planning Models and Critiques

Planning Model	Characteristics	EJ and CER Critiques
<b>Western, Rational Planning</b>	Utopian and rational goals	Reflects entrenched white supremacy, settler-colonial values
Radiant City (LeCorbusier)	Based on liberal notions of “free market” economics	Drove patterns of racial segregation
Garden City (Howard)	Driven by professional planners, typically situated within the state, or working with elite actors	Equity not a priority Public participation not a focus
City Beautiful (Burnham)	Favors top-down processes	
<b>Euclidean Zoning</b>	Regulates physical form and location of land uses (residential, commercial, industrial)  Sets guidelines for physical layouts (building heights, permitted uses, etc.)	Means for racial segregation  Exclusionary forms of zoning expelling affordable housing and industrial uses from whiter, wealthier areas  Captured by property-owning elites for profit maximization
<b>Rural Planning</b>	Addresses rural economic development and resource management	Failure to acknowledge low-wealth, marginalized, and Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) populations occupying rural areas, and to meet their basic needs (sanitation, clean water, farmworker protections, etc.)
Provincial planning		
Town and country planning (Dandekar)	Linked to key sectors of rural development, including agricultural and natural resource-based economies (fisheries, forestry, etc.)	Based in economic patterns shaped by slavery, settler colonialism, and nativism
<b>Globalized, Neoliberal Planning</b>	Global market interests dominant in development and planning practices  Serves to manage competition for urban land with an emphasis on technology and efficiency  International financial institutions and private real estate sector as key actors in planning processes	Contests the state’s role in planning practices, which are seen as captured by market interests  Disfavors formal planning practices, which serve the interests of private capital, in contrast to more informal bottom-up processes  Tamps down the role of insurgent, rights-based social justice movements in planning

Many traditional planning models stand in stark contrast to EJ approaches to planning and community-engaged practices, both in form and function. For example, CER approaches to planning emphasize (1) direct democratic ideals of participation from the ground up or by people directly impacted; (2) centering equity and social justice concerns in both the process and outcomes of planning;

TABLE 11.3. Alternative Planning Models

Models	Emphases	Examples	Characteristics
<b>Progressive Planning</b> (Fainstein and DeFilippis 2015)	The role of learning, social justice advocacy and equity are central to planning's purpose	<b>Advocacy Planning</b> (Davidoff 1965)	Privileges the interests of the most disadvantaged and places the public planner in the role of advocate
	Emphasis is on a bottom-up approach to planning with greater attention to multiple forms of public participation in the planning process	<b>Equity Planning</b> (Krumholz 1982)	Focuses on the goal of redistribution, with public planners promoting progressive policies from within state-centered planning
	Planning is largely within the purview of the state and professional planners	<b>Communicative Planning</b> (a.k.a. discursive or deliberative planning) (Healey 2012)	Focuses on social learning, and more inclusive and democratic processes of understanding social conflict and planning
<b>Radical Planning</b>	The goal of planning focuses on liberation and realization of a just society	<b>Insurgent Planning</b> (Tactical urbanism, Right to the City, favelados, Slum Dwellers International, etc.) (Gonsalves et al. 2020; Miraftab 2012)	Has citizens acting directly through self-determined oppositional practices that claim urban spaces  Aims to address specific forms of oppression  Focuses on counter-hegemonic, transgressive, and imaginative planning practices
	The model problematizes formal or state-led participation processes and focuses more on direct, participatory democracy or self-determination	<b>Black Radical Tradition</b> (Jacobs 2019; Pulido and De Lara 2018)	Challenges racial capitalism and state-centered planning  Centers Black experience, solidarity across identity  Focuses on community knowledge, intersectional oppressions, and activism in the formation of plans  Emphasizes emancipatory and abolitionist goals, outside the state
	Social movement actors, grassroots groups, and marginalized, dispossessed peoples are central to the planning process	<b>Indigenous Planning</b> (Jojola 2008; Porter et al. 2017)	Centers Indigenous knowledges, identity aspirations, worldviews, and cultural practices  Focuses on decolonized, transformative, and epistemic justice

(3) de-centering professionalized planners and elite actors as the main drivers of planning, and instead putting communities and activists in the role of experts; and (4) encouraging collaboration and interdisciplinarity in planning methods. Most importantly, the goals of planning using a CER approach in an EJ context also differ dramatically by prioritizing transformative forms of justice and well-being over the goals of efficiency, order, or profit seeking. Table 11.2 summarizes some of the traditional planning models and how they contrast with or are critiqued by CER- and EJ-informed planning practices. These models and their respective critiques are represented in simplified terms to highlight the distinctions between them. But there are also overlapping characteristics and diverse expressions of traditional approaches that can be found in a variety of contemporary planning practices, including some that involve CER and attend to EJ concerns.

### *Approaches to CER in Planning*

In the decades after World War II, the era of traditional, top-down planning driven by private sector interests and state planners was forcefully contested. During this period, the rise of the Civil Rights movement coincided with the resurgence of social reform-minded planning practices that included greater consideration of issues of social equity, democratic ideals, and diverse public interests. This pivot introduced various models of planning that served as a foundation for many CER practices in use today in EJ communities. Table 11.3 summarizes the dynamic continuum of alternative planning practices, from progressive planning models that attempted to reform traditional planning to more critical and radical planning practices drawn from the Global South, Indigenous struggles, and Black radical traditions.

Along this continuum of alternative planning models, there are diverse perspectives on planning's goals, approaches to public participation, and the situatedness of planners. In the progressive planning model, "progressive social change results only from the exercise of power by those who previously had been excluded from power" (Fainstein 2000, 466). In this view, planning is not just a process mediated by public and private interests and controlled by the state, but a process of active engagement with and by social movements to produce a more just city. The more radical strains of planning put these social movement actors in the driver's seat to envision alternative futures that take back cities and land from the exclusive control of propertied elites (Harvey 2008, 24). The visions that these different forms of planning produce can often overlap, such as promoting equitable access to resources or community well-being. But they can also diverge, as many radical planning traditions seek to go beyond distributive or procedural forms of justice and state-centered planning to enact abolitionist or transformative forms of justice in the form of liberation or reparations. For example, a radical approach to planning in a community facing food insecurity like Detroit would plan around the development of autonomous, community-owned food

production and distribution based on cooperatively owned land and markets. This is precisely what D-Town Farm and the Detroit Black Community Food Security Network (n.d.) set out to do to meet the community's food needs—rather than pursuing state-subsidized or privately controlled food markets. This is just one example of how the EJ movement shares many of the same goals that radical planning proposes (Griffin, Cohen, and Maddox 2015).

Participation is important in both the progressive and radical traditions. The norms of participation are embedded in the professional planning code of ethics (American Institute of Certified Planners 2021), which calls for the “meaningful involvement” of communities. However, some challenges and critiques emerge around the role of participation in progressive planning models. Participation without power is meaningless and frustrating (Arnstein 1969). Communicative forms of planning attempt to grapple with the uneven power dynamics often at play in state-led planning models. For example, John Forester (1989) offers pragmatic ways in which professional planners can influence the conditions that shape a community's ability to participate in formal planning processes, such as (1) notifying less organized groups early in planning processes, (2) supplying critical technical and political information to communities, (3) anticipating the political and economic pressures that will shape plans, and (4) sharing those issues with groups early and through open as well as informal processes, etc.

While participation in communicative planning is still driven by professional planners, in radical planning traditions participation often falls well outside of state forums, such as public hearings, planning charrettes, or public meetings. Instead, participation in traditions such as insurgent planning can be unorganized and spontaneous, and sometimes includes illicit acts by residents attempting to reclaim, control, or shape spaces at the center of planning contestation. One example that embodies the transgressive and imaginative forms of action that insurgent planning can produce is the case of community communicators working in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, known as the Frente de Mobilização da Maré (Friendly 2022). During the COVID-19 pandemic, and in the face of repressive federal government actions, these communicators planned creative uses of local media and outreach to promote prevention actions, distribute mutual aid for the provision of basic services, and disrupt the presence of the police state inside favelas (Friendly 2022). This exemplifies how radical planning transgresses the norms of formal participation, as communities resist oppressive state actions and reclaim control to shape the conditions of their lives.

Progressive and radical planning models can also involve differing views of the roles of the state and professional planners. Radical planning de-emphasizes the roles of professional planners and the state in favor of activist-led forms of planning that engage deeply with social movement actors, situating planners as within and aligned with movements (Huq 2020). These approaches increasingly call for planners' training to include active engagement with resistance movements,

and learning more critical and liberatory practices that de-center whiteness and employ decolonial, antiracist, and revolutionary practices and tools (Urban Planners for Liberation 2021). Deshonay Dozier (2018) suggests introducing students to BIPOC planning voices, histories, and readings that draw on diverse disciplines and tools, such as adrienne maree brown's (2017) *Emergent Strategy* and the *Abolitionist Planning for Resistance* guide (UCLA Abolitionist Planning Group 2018). Planning education can also learn from activist and practitioner sources, including the Center for Urban Pedagogy (n.d.), BlackSpace (n.d.), and the *Urban Green Policy Toolkit* (Oscilowicz et al. 2021).

In many examples of CER-based approaches to planning in EJ communities, EJ groups partner with professional planners and bring multiple actors, including state actors, into the planning process. In this sense, CER-based planning can be more collaborative, intersectional, and open to multiple forms of expertise and knowledge than traditional or even progressive forms of planning. One example can be seen in the case of the Ironbound Community Corporation (ICC) in Newark, New Jersey (see table 11.4). As part of local efforts to reclaim the waterfront from industrial and real estate speculation for the development of public parks, the community spearheaded the Ironbound Open Space and Recreation Plan. ICC initiated this plan with a committee of residents who identified their vision for a public waterfront and mapped out assets, park needs, and potential threats. The group also partnered with public planners to draw up renderings, and together they implemented a campaign to stop the privatization of the waterfront. Ultimately, this plan was the foundation of the city's Riverfront Park design that was implemented in 2013.

CER approaches are particularly relevant for planning related to emergent, intersecting, and multiplying threats in EJ communities. These threats pose both acute and chronic impacts in the form of legacy pollution, health disparities, climate risks, disasters, and displacement that formal planning processes ignore or are ill equipped to address. Thus, many locally based, grassroots EJ organizations have found themselves applying radical planning tools to ensure their survival and resurgence.

#### CASES OF CER AND EJ IN PLANNING

There is a rich array of examples in which EJ communities have used CER in the context of planning. These examples include community efforts to draw attention to and collect data on harmful conditions; prepare for or respond to disasters; advocate for greenspace; push back against displacement; ensure healthy, safe, affordable places to live; reimagine economic prosperity; respond to climate impacts; and most importantly to lay out visions of an environmentally just future. The examples discussed below also reflect a variety of progressive and radical planning traditions that have involved community groups, EJ activists, residents, and professional planners both within and outside the state. So many of the EJ struggles that plague communities in the U.S. have their origins in the legacy

of racist planning and zoning imposed on BIPOC communities from above. In contrast, the cases described here exemplify planning practices that emerge from the lived experiences and leadership of EJ communities. The plans also depict the richness of community-led visions for alternative, reimagined future possibilities of a more just and free world.

Some of the most prominent examples of CER in planning practices happen at the local level, where residents and grassroots EJ organizations have led efforts to carry out community-led planning and land use zoning reforms. While substantive regulatory reform at the state or federal level is often slow, EJ groups have been more capable of exerting their organizing power to impact regional, municipal, and county planning. Recent research on local land use policies and zoning regulations in the U.S. identified a total of 40 policies from across the country that had an explicit focus on EJ (Baptista 2021). The measures were adopted by more than 20 municipalities, two counties, and two local utilities, from Los Angeles to New York, largely as a result of local EJ advocacy. These policies spanned a diverse range of approaches, including (1) outright bans on unwanted, noxious land uses; (2) EJ policies embedded in general plans or explicit EJ policies or programs adopted by municipalities; (3) environmental justice reviews, often tied to the development process; (4) proactive planning measures or comprehensive approaches; (5) phase-outs, fees, or enforcement activities aimed at mitigating existing noxious land uses; and (6) use of local public health codes to prevent noxious or nuisance activities in EJ areas. Box 11.1 details how several California EJ communities employed CER to

#### **BOX 11.1. CALIFORNIA GREEN ZONES**

Green Zones emerged from EJ activists who sought relief from repeated struggles over siting of facilities that concentrated pollution in communities of color and low wealth. Despite decades of attention to EJ concerns in California, little progress was made to mitigate existing toxic hot spots. Many EJ activists reacted to the opposition and the complexity of regulating cumulative impacts of multiple pollutants at the state level by turning to local planning venues, which might address the concerns of EJ communities more proactively.

Green Zones are specific areas within a locality designated by the local government and identified by residents for improvements in economic development and public health through the reduction and prevention of existing burdens, and direction of investments to greener development projects (California Environmental Justice Alliance 2011). Typically, this process includes (1) greater regulation of polluting land uses through the creation of special use or overlay zones by local planning offices, (2) community decision making to identify the zones and targeted interventions, and (3) collaboration with the public and private sector to direct investments to local green businesses with local employment opportunities.

*(Continued)*



**BOX 11.1. (CONTINUED)**

By 2015, 13 organizations in 11 EJ communities were using the Green Zones approach (California Environmental Justice Alliance 2011). Municipalities including San Francisco, Los Angeles, Richmond, and Commerce, as well as the County of Los Angeles, have also adapted this approach to their local zoning and development processes.

CER has made significant contributions to the development of Green Zones. The community organizations involved in creating Green Zones conducted extensive ground-truthing exercises with local residents, using their knowledge of the area to identify previously undocumented hazards, confirm or highlight particular hot spots for pollution, identify vulnerable or sensitive areas of the neighborhoods, and then fact-check the existing state and local databases. This form of local data collection not only helped to identify the areas for Green Zones, but also shaped the types of planning controls and incentives residents in each area needed to address local concerns. In addition, EJ organizations and residents collaborated with volunteer or professional planners to help develop proposed planning ordinances and overlay zones. These collaboratives also worked with local city planners to engage them early in the process of developing the scope of zoning changes and target neighborhoods for Green Zones. Communities not only engaged in research, but also led the visioning and implementation of Green Zones campaigns that persuaded municipal and county governments to adopt model ordinances.

implement a proactive planning approach called Green Zones—a model that has since been adopted by EJ communities in other parts of the country.

Cases such as those summarized in table 11.4 show how community-based, grassroots organizations take planning into their own hands to guide the future development of their communities. In many cases, social movement activists operating outside state processes initiate planning, articulate transformative visions for the future of their communities, and counter neoliberal values of efficiency and profit seeking by emphasizing community well-being, health, and equity. Some plans are developed collaboratively with multiple stakeholders—including planners, residents, and state and private actors—yet these stakeholders often use data from CER grounded in local knowledge and experiences of residents to map out existing conditions and identify opportunities.

CER also features prominently in planning to address air pollution through local monitoring or ground-truthing efforts. Some of the earliest and ongoing EJ struggles centered on addressing the cumulative impacts of multiple sources of air pollution in overburdened fenceline and frontline communities. These communities searched for ways to raise the alarm about local conditions to skeptical government officials, who put the burden of proof of harm on residents. Without empirical evidence of emissions and exposure data, and lacking regulations that required polluters or regulators to gather these data, residents were left to

TABLE 11.4. Community Planning Initiatives by EJ Organizations

Organization	Characteristics of CER	Plans and Resources
<b>WE ACT for Environmental Justice</b> New York, NY	<p>Planning processes led by WE ACT organizers include multiple community meetings, charrettes, and development of public education materials for advocacy campaigns to implement community visions and goals</p> <p>WE ACT also has planners on staff to lead community planning efforts</p>	<p>WE ACT for Environmental Justice (n.d.) plans:</p> <p>Northern Manhattan Climate Action Plan</p> <p>Harlem on the River: Making a Community Vision Real</p> <p>Green Renaissance: A Guide to Healthy, Sustainable, Urban Development in Harlem</p>
<b>Ironbound Community Corporation</b> Newark, NJ	<p>ICC staff lead and initiate community planning processes</p> <p>They hire professional planners to assist in plan development and lead community charrettes and meetings to identify future visions and goals for plans</p>	<p>Ironbound Community Corporation (n.d.) plans:</p> <p>ICC Community Master Plan</p> <p>Ironbound Open Space and Recreation Plan</p> <p>East Ironbound Revitalization</p> <p>Ironbound Riverfront Park Plan, 2004–2011</p> <p>East Ironbound Neighborhood Revitalization Plan, 2018</p>
<b>Environmental Health Coalition</b> San Diego, CA	<p>EHC's community planning tools:</p> <p>Community action teams with residents trained to serve as spokespersons for campaigns and plans</p> <p>Leadership training programs, which provide residents with skills in planning and land use rules</p> <p>Community surveys to collect and document local needs</p> <p>Community visioning with residents to develop neighborhood plans</p> <p>Support from land use planning firms to work with residents in the development of plans</p>	<p>Community land use planning initiative, EHC planning (Environmental Health Coalition, n.d.)</p>

fend for themselves to protect against exposures. In some cases, data about the source of hazards were incomplete, lacking granular information about conditions on the ground, such as smaller polluting facilities or unregulated, illegal activities present in EJ areas. EJ communities took responsibility for monitoring, data collection, hazard identification, and enforcement—functions commonly left to

TABLE 11.5. Community Science on Air Pollution for Planning

Organization	Characteristics of CER	Plans and Resources
<b>Los Angeles Collaborative for Environmental Health and Justice</b> Los Angeles, CA	A coalition of EJ organizations worked with residents to identify local air quality hazards  The coalition developed a list of land uses and facilities considered sensitive or hazardous  Residents were trained to locate and map facilities by walking in the community, using maps and air photos, to verify accuracy of regulatory databases	<i>Hidden Hazards</i> report (Los Angeles Collaborative for Environmental Health and Justice 2010)  Clean Up, Green Up ordinance (City of Los Angeles 2016)
<b>El Puente for Peace and Justice</b> Brooklyn, NY	Residents conducted a door-to-door asthma prevalence survey in Williamsburg, Brooklyn (Ledogar, Acosta, and Penchaszadeh 1999)  Local residents sampled and interviewed people fishing in the East River to estimate the number of fish caught and consumed; the data improved the U.S. EPA's risk estimates related to consumption of contaminated fish (Corburn 2002)  Local youth and residents used mobile phone apps to record levels of air pollutants, conduct field observations of park usage and vehicle counts, and develop GIS maps of data sources (Ramírez et al. 2019)	Our Air! / ¡Nuestro aire! plan (El Puente, n.d.)
<b>Community Air Mapping Project for Environmental Justice (CAMP-EJ)</b>  <b>NYC Environmental Justice Alliance</b> New York, NY	Residents from two EJ communities in the South Bronx and Brooklyn used low-cost, portable air quality monitors to measure local air quality and characterize air pollution exposures locally (Gilmore et al. 2021)  Community groups and residents developed recommendations in response to the data	<i>CAMP-EJ: Findings and Recommendations Report</i> (Gilmore et al. 2021)  HabitatMap, Aircasting (HabitatMap 2021)

government entities. This led to a diverse set of efforts, from community science and do-it-yourself sampling techniques to community mapping and ground-truthing activities, some examples of which are summarized in table 11.5.

Climate and disaster planning are also critical areas of concern for EJ communities, which often face disproportionate disaster-related burdens and have underlying conditions that can make them more susceptible to disaster impacts. This has become especially evident over the last two decades, as natural and man-made disasters have laid bare environmental racism and injustice. Cases of climate

resilience planning have increasingly been taken up by EJ communities to respond not only to the climate crisis but to the threat of gentrification and displacement that can result from climate adaptation investments. The addition of greenspaces or investments in green infrastructure can lead to speculative real estate developments that have been referred to as “disaster gentrification” or “climate gentrification.” For example, Greenberg (2014) examined the examples of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, Lower Manhattan after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the New York region after Hurricane Sandy to demonstrate how disaster recovery can initiate cycles of displacement and disinvestment for EJ communities.

Planning scholars have increasingly turned their attention to this wicked problem: residents of EJ communities who struggle to improve conditions in their communities then find themselves priced out of their own communities as they become more attractive (Anguelovski et al. 2019). Efforts to respond to green gentrification have produced some interesting proposals, such as the “just green enough” approach, which favors smaller-scale greening projects tied to local social and ecological needs (Wolch, Byrne, and Newell 2014). Pearsall and Anguelovski (2016) give examples from Brooklyn, Boston, and Seoul to demonstrate how EJ and anti-displacement activism can use complementary tactics, such as initiating collaborative projects to integrate affordable housing measures with small-scale greening projects in line with local community needs and desires. There are also powerful community-led planning efforts to characterize and respond to neighborhood-level impacts of gentrification (Matsuoka 2017; Matsuoka and Urquiza 2021). Table 11.6 presents a variety of examples of EJ communities using CER in the process of responding to climate risks and disasters through their preparedness planning and recovery efforts, often in direct opposition to more traditional, top-down or state-led climate initiatives.

The EJ movement has long taken up the contestation over both wanted and unwanted land uses that invoke a collective voice to shape communities as more inclusive and healthy places for all people to thrive. Similarly, the Right to the City is both a demand and a movement that calls for low-income, marginalized people to have a say in all aspects of shaping the city, turning away from capitalism’s rapacious cycles of investment and profit that benefit the real estate developers and speculators (Harvey 2008, 24). The EJ movement’s efforts to shape community control of land redevelopment and housing apply radical and insurgent forms of planning to reimagine our relationship to economic prosperity, housing, and community development.

For example, the use of community land trusts to achieve permanent affordability and protect land for collective uses (such as farming) is increasing in many EJ communities, to regain local control over development processes overtaking community spaces (Blumgart 2015). One of the most exciting and revolutionary examples of this type of CER planning is the Jackson-Kush Plan developed in Jackson, Mississippi. The plan is the grounding document for the organization

TABLE 11.6. Climate and Disaster Planning

Organization	Characteristics of CER	Plans and Resources
<b>The Green Resilient Industrial District Plan (The GRID), UPROSE</b> Brooklyn, NY	Community-proposed alternative to private, real estate–driven development of “Industry City” for luxury retail use	Collective for Community, Culture, and Environment (2019)
	Reflected community vision to transform the neighborhood and industrial waterfront to integrate climate adaptation, mitigation, and resilience	<i>Sunset Park Green Resilient Industrial District</i> report (Collective for Community, Culture, and Environment 2019)
	Focus on alternatives based on Just Transition values, including analyses of existing conditions, plans, and policies related to neighborhood opportunities for climate adaptation, and green industry and clean energy sectors	<i>The Grid</i> (UPROSE n.d.)
<b>Sandy Regional Assembly and Recovery Agenda, NYC EJ Alliance</b> New York/New Jersey Metropolitan Region	Initiated regional convenings with labor, environmental, EJ, social justice, and service organizations to identify short- and long-term recovery and disaster response needs (Sandy Regional Assembly 2013)	Climate Justice and Community Resiliency plan (New York City Environmental Justice Alliance, n.d.)
	Focused on grassroots-led recovery prioritizing low-income people, communities of color, immigrants, and workers	
	Centered bottom-up approaches to resilience planning and investments	
<b>Community-Driven Climate Resilience Planning: A Framework, National Association of Climate Resilience Planners</b> U.S.	Bottom-up processes driven by residents of vulnerable and impacted communities to define challenges and solutions (Gonzalez 2017)	National Association of Climate Resilience Planners (n.d.)
	Climate solutions that consider relevant, unique assets and threats in communities (Kresge Foundation 2019)	<i>Climate Resilience and Urban Opportunity Initiative</i> (Kresge Foundation 2019)
	3 key capacities for climate resilience: (1) assert a community vision and priorities (2) assess community assets and vulnerabilities (3) build community voice and power	

Cooperation Jackson, which was formulated by the New Afrikan People’s Organization and the Malcolm X Grassroots Movement. The plan drew on government data to map conditions facing the Black Belt South and reflects the rich legacy of

the Black Liberation Movement in its goals to “advance the development of the New Afrikan Independence Movement and hasten the socialist transformation of the territories currently claimed by the United States settler-colonial state” (Akuno 2017, 3). This plan was based on three fundamental pillars: (1) building people’s assemblies, (2) building an independent Black political party, and (3) building a broad-based solidarity economy. This type of people-led plan demonstrates the possibilities for radical forms of CER planning to articulate emancipatory ideals of a free and just future.

Urban and regional planning also plays a key role in the development and access to a variety of public and private infrastructures. Typically, these infrastructures serve populations across a wide geographic area and are sometimes considered locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) due to the related pollution, risk, and nuisances (odor, traffic, noise, etc.). LULUs are concentrated in areas where industrial development corridors were developed along racially and class-segregated residential patterns. In this way, regional infrastructures, including highways, wastewater treatment plants, energy production facilities, goods movement centers (i.e., seaports, warehouse hubs, airports, railyards, etc.), and waste facilities, are often sited in EJ communities. Additionally, many EJ communities throughout the U.S. lack basic infrastructure, including sanitation, clean drinking water, public transportation, broadband, and energy services. CER plays an important role in EJ struggles to mitigate effects of these infrastructures and transform them over time. Table 11.7 highlights examples in EJ communities in Baltimore, Puerto Rico, and Los Angeles.

## CONCLUSION

While urban planning’s origins in the United States gave rise to problematic planning models, contemporary practices have evolved with the advancement of more progressive and radical approaches led by planners, community activists, and social movements. Throughout the country, EJ communities have redefined planning’s purpose and created new tools to meet their needs and reimagine their collective futures. Community plans that are informed by CER share noticeable similarities, such as privileging local knowledge, prioritizing more equitable benefits and well-being, and a collaborative and democratic approach to planning. The cases highlighted in this chapter demonstrate the depth of expertise and experience in community-led CER for planning oriented to EJ goals. Many EJ organizations today have planners on their staff and build their planning around resident-led efforts. These groups often integrate popular education and organizing into work with residents in ground truthing, visioning, and implementing community-based planning efforts.

There are also exciting new opportunities for pushing CER planning practices to new areas of focus. One of these emergent areas can be found in abolitionist

TABLE 11.7. Infrastructure and Greenspace Planning

Organization	Characteristics of CER	Plans and Resources
<b>Community Solar Energy Initiative, Resilient Power Puerto Rico</b> Puerto Rico	Engages community groups most impacted by Hurricane Maria to deliver direct donations for the installation of solar energy systems (Funk 2021; Resilient Power Puerto Rico, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)  Matches funding with community centers that agree to become community energy hubs and provides technical installation support  Once installed, communities identify post-disaster needs and priorities, develop a collective operations and maintenance plan, and define community energy resilience agenda	Resilient Power Puerto Rico Lookbook (Resilient Power Puerto Rico, n.d.-b)  <i>Energy Independence in Puerto Rico</i> , Community Solar Projects, StoryMaps (Funk 2021)
<b>Baltimore’s Fair Development Plan for Zero Waste, Fair Development Roundtable</b> Baltimore, MD	Participatory approach with the leadership of grassroots organizations, youth-led groups including Free Your Voice, the United Workers, Institute for Local Self-Reliance, and other partners in Baltimore  Focus on replacing waste incineration with local economic opportunities in zero-waste industries, such as food waste composting, repair work, and recycling	Institute for Local Self-Reliance, <i>Baltimore’s Fair Development Plan for Zero Waste</i> (Liss et al. 2020)
<b>Community Alternative 7, Coalition for Environmental Health and Justice</b> Los Angeles, CA	Presents alternatives for goods movement projects, including the I-710 freeway expansion (Karner et al. 2018)  Project alternatives developed by coalition of local residents along the freeway, legal organizations, EJ and community groups  Alternatives included a list of key elements, such as public transit, community benefits, pedestrian and bike investments	I-710 campaign (East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, n.d.)  <i>I-710 Corridor Project HIA</i> (Human Impact Partners 2011)

or reparative forms of radical planning, which are gaining more attention among EJ communities and allies (Sze 2020, 29). This approach centers on the struggles for freedom from violence and the abolition of prisons, border walls, the police state, and other expressions of the carceral state that perpetuate violence against BIPOC and low-wealth people (Dozier 2018). EJ communities seeking freedom from both the extractive economy and the prison-industrial complex can use abolitionist and reparative practices in their approach to planning the future of their communities. However, in this movement-allied form of planning, the role

of professional planners again comes into question. While planning students, such as the UCLA Abolitionist Planning Group (2018), seek to forge new practices, questions remain about how radical or reform-oriented planners can be. For example, in Dozier's view,

[a]bolition is not, nor ever will be, about "planners." It never has been. Instead, it is about practitioners of freedom dreams that occur outside of planning education and profession. Contributing to these movements and redistributing resources to them is a step in what "planners" can do. (Dozier 2018, para. 9)

There are many freedom dreamers in the EJ movement working alongside many other allies, including professional researchers, to experiment with this form of radical planning. An example can be seen in the Renewable Rikers Plan (Bratspies 2020). The Rikers Island prison complex occupies hundreds of acres in New York City and is one of the country's most notorious penal colonies. The Renewable Rikers Plan connects the current crises of mass incarceration, toxic prisons, and environmental racism to a vision grounded in restorative justice and reparations for the people and land harmed by the legacy of colonialism, incarceration, environmental injustice, and racism. This campaign is led by a coalition of organizations including the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance, New York Lawyers for the Public Interest, Urban Justice Center, NRDC, and A More Just NYC. Together these groups convened legislators, legal advocates, and activists across a range of social movements to conceive of a campaign not only to shut down the notorious prison, but to replace it with reparative projects that give opportunities to formerly incarcerated people, as well as residents of EJ communities, to produce renewable energy, grow food, and treat wastewater. In February 2021, the New York City Council (2021) passed three bills transferring Rikers Island from the Department of Corrections to other agencies for sustainability and resiliency purposes. The laws also require a feasibility study for renewable energy production and storage as well as wastewater treatment. An advisory committee will guide the process with survivors of Rikers and residents of EJ communities.

Another emergent CER practice in the EJ movement is planning focused on just transitions. Just transitions is both a concept and a process by which society shifts from an extractive, exploitative economy to a regenerative economic system by making connections between workers and community issues, organizing, and movement building (Córdova, Bravo, and Acosta-Córdova 2022). One example of this type of planning was developed by the Climate Justice Alliance (CJA) with Movement Generation in their guide to just transition planning (Gonzalez 2021), which details how communities can craft and lead their own vision for achieving a just transition. This guide provides insights into the role of planning, as well as curriculum and other tools to lead planning processes grounded in frontline community experiences. Some of the key roles of planning that the guide highlights are (1) activating cultural wealth and community assets, and



practicing accountability to community vision and values; (2) alignment among key players in moving a just transition strategy; (3) advocacy and organizing that is responsive to community priorities; and (4) activating community capacity to take over public planning processes. EJ organizations—such as PUSH Buffalo (2017), Kentuckians for the Commonwealth (2013), and the Indigenous Environmental Network (2021)—along with public agencies and even some in the private sector, are increasingly developing similar plans that articulate their visions and strategies for shifting to a pollution-free and more just set of economic and social systems around which to build their communities. As the climate crisis deepens in the decades ahead, the ability for EJ communities to plan for and implement transformative change will be critical to their survival and resurgence. These emergent approaches to planning can break open a radical reimagining of future possibilities, allowing EJ communities to research, reclaim, restore, and remake their communities and the world through acts of reparations, freedom, and placemaking (Gilmore 2017).