

PUBLIC POLICY AND SUSTAINABLE INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Rahmat Hidayat Djati¹, Liya Yulia²

^{1,2}Politeknik Kepribadian, Bekasi, Indonesia

Email: rahmathidayatdjati.mip@gmail.com

Abstract

Infrastructure development is a key pillar in spurring national economic growth, but large-scale projects often trigger environmental degradation and social conflict if not managed with sustainability principles. Public policy plays a crucial role as a regulatory instrument for aligning economic targets with ecological sustainability. This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of public policy in supporting sustainable infrastructure development and identify key challenges in its implementation on the ground. The research method used was descriptive qualitative, using a document study approach, examining regulations, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reports, and scientific literature. The results indicate that normatively, sustainability principles have been integrated into EIA instruments. However, their effectiveness on the ground remains low due to implementation gaps. The main obstacles include overlapping cross-sectoral regulations, institutional sectoral egos, budget constraints, and minimal local community participation. This study concludes that public policy has not optimally mitigated negative environmental impacts due to weak post-permit oversight. This study recommends strengthening synergy between spatial planning regulations and simplifying green financing schemes for project implementers.

Keywords: *Public Policy, Sustainable Infrastructure, EIA, Green Financing, National Development.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure development is a key driver in accelerating economic growth and increasing a country's global competitiveness. Through the availability of adequate roads, ports, energy, and telecommunications networks, interregional connectivity can be achieved efficiently, thereby reducing high logistics costs (Nugraha & Santoso, 2025). For developing countries, investment in the infrastructure sector serves not only as an instrument for short-term economic stimulation but also as a foundation for long-term structural transformation. Therefore, the physical development agenda always occupies a priority position in every national development strategy plan to catch up on economic backlogs and improve social welfare (Undrizon et al., 2024).

However, the track record of conventional large-scale infrastructure development often leaves behind massive ecological problems and dilemmas. Uncontrolled construction activities exponentially contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions, deforestation, habitat fragmentation, and even the decline of water and air quality around project areas (Sjafruddin, 2013). This phenomenon is exacerbated by past development orientations that tended to prioritize short-term economic gains (an economic-centric approach) while ignoring environmental carrying capacity. As a result, instead of providing equitable prosperity, failure to manage environmental impacts has triggered ecological disasters that burden state finances and threaten the survival of future generations (Amsari et al., 2013).

Beyond the environmental dimension, infrastructure development that ignores the principle of justice often triggers resistance and social conflict at the grassroots level. Repressive land acquisition processes, unfair compensation, and minimal involvement of local

communities in decision-making are key triggers for fraying social cohesion (Iskandar et al., 2024). The infrastructure ultimately fails to deliver inclusive impacts and even risks marginalizing local communities whose living spaces are directly impacted by the project. Therefore, the urgency of shifting the development paradigm from merely physical construction to sustainable infrastructure development that balances economic, social, and environmental aspects is now a non-negotiable demand (Putri et al., 2021).

In overseeing this paradigm shift, public policy plays a crucial role as an instrument of regulation and state intervention. The government has absolute authority to set directions, standards, and limits through legal channels to ensure that any infrastructure investment does not compromise ecological sustainability (Novita, 2025). Responsive public policies can map potential risks early on, allocate resources equitably, and enforce construction industry compliance with established environmental standards. Without strong and decisive public policy intervention, a commitment to sustainable development will remain merely a normative slogan without any legal binding force on the ground (Turyandi et al., 2026).

Regulatorily, the government has issued various policy instruments to mitigate the negative impacts of development, one of which is through tightening Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA). EIA is designed as a controlling document and an absolute requirement for environmental feasibility before an infrastructure project obtains an operating permit (Damanik & Hardi, 2025). Furthermore, the government has begun adopting innovative financial instruments such as green financing schemes and the issuance of green bonds to fund environmentally friendly projects. These regulatory steps demonstrate the political will to align economic development ambitions with global climate change mitigation commitments (Cendekiawan & Firmansyah, 2024).

Despite the availability of regulatory instruments, the reality on the ground shows a wide gap between policy text and operational implementation (implementation gap). In practice, many Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documents are considered merely administrative formalities to expedite the issuance of construction permits, rather than serving as substantive environmental quality control instruments (Widyastuti, 2025). Furthermore, the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies in the domestic construction industry remains very low due to high initial investment costs and limited technical expertise of the local workforce. As a result of this weak policy implementation, environmental damage and social conflict continue to recur in various national strategic projects (Nainggolan et al., 2023).

Institutional factors also complicate the effective enforcement of sustainable infrastructure policies at the practical level. Sectoral egos between ministries and overlapping regulations between the central and regional governments often create legal uncertainty for investors and project implementers (Runtunuwu, 2025). Furthermore, the participation of local communities and civil society organizations in spatial planning processes remains very limited and tends to be top-down. While much previous literature has partially discussed the impacts of infrastructure damage, few studies have comprehensively examined how public policy dynamics fail or succeed in bridging conflicting interests between actors in sustainable development.

Based on this gap, this study aims to deeply analyze the effectiveness of public policy in supporting sustainable infrastructure development and to map the structural barriers that hinder its implementation. The study will focus on evaluating environmental impact analysis (EIA) instruments, institutional readiness, and the challenges of adopting green financing in current infrastructure projects. The results of this study are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of public policy science, while also providing pragmatic recommendations for policymakers to formulate more integrative, adaptive, and accountable regulations to ensure the sustainability of national development.

B. METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach with descriptive-analytical methods to in-depth explore the effectiveness of public policy in sustainable infrastructure development. This approach was chosen to analyze institutional dynamics and map the implementation gap between regulatory texts and the reality on the ground. The research data is sourced from secondary data collected through structured documentation studies of government regulations, environmental impact assessment (EIA) evaluation reports, and reputable scientific journal articles. Data searches were conducted digitally in academic databases with inclusion criteria focused on the interaction of public policy, environmental impact, and national infrastructure.

Data analysis was conducted using an interactive model that includes data reduction, systematic narrative presentation, and conclusion drawing. To ensure the validity of the findings, the researcher applied source triangulation and theory triangulation techniques. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing formal government documents with independent reports from civil society organizations and previous empirical research results. Meanwhile, theory triangulation utilized the perspectives of policy implementation and collaborative governance to minimize bias and produce objective, valid, and accurate conclusions.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Integration of Sustainability Principles and the Effectiveness of Environmental Impact Assessment Instruments in Infrastructure Policy

The integration of sustainability principles into national public policy marks a significant paradigm shift from purely economic growth to environmentally conscious development. Normatively, the government has ratified various global agreements that require the internalization of ecological variables in every large-scale physical development policy. This commitment is manifested through the development of various umbrella regulations that mandate environmental screening from the initial project planning stage. This regulatory step was taken in response to the growing awareness that ecosystem damage resulting from the failure of conventional infrastructure projects has far greater remedial costs than prevention.

Within the context of positive law in Indonesia, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is positioned as the primary preventive instrument with strong legal authority. Every infrastructure project categorized as having a significant impact is required to have a comprehensive EIA document as a prerequisite for issuing an environmental feasibility permit (Putri, 2024). This policy is designed to compel project proponents to identify, predict, and comprehensively evaluate impacts on the initial environmental baseline. Thus, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) theoretically functions as a primary screening gate, preventing damaging projects from the blueprint stage to physical execution.

Strict implementation of EIA during the pre-construction stage has been shown to have a significant positive impact on the design quality of modern infrastructure projects. Comprehensive ecological risk assessments within EIA documents compel engineers to formulate alternative spatial design plans that prioritize the protection of conservation areas and biodiversity corridors (Sesa, 2018). For example, the design of modern mass transportation routes or toll roads is now beginning to adopt the concept of green belts and wildlife crossings to prevent habitat fragmentation. This demonstrates that coercive public policies can encourage changes in corporate behavior in development planning.

Beyond spatial planning aspects, this policy integration has also successfully stimulated the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies within the domestic construction industry. The obligation to meet strict environmental quality standards within EIA regulations encourages project proponents to shift to the use of sustainable materials, such as low-carbon cement and recycled asphalt. Furthermore, the implementation of an integrated construction

waste management system (zero waste construction) is now being systematically implemented to reduce the volume of solid waste at project sites. This dynamic demonstrates how public policy instruments act as catalysts for the modernization of sustainable industrial technology.

The effectiveness of these policy instruments is further strengthened by synergy with green financing schemes, which are beginning to be adopted for National Strategic Projects (PSN). Financial and banking institutions now implement strict environmental feasibility qualifications based on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documents as a primary prerequisite for disbursing construction loans. Infrastructure projects deemed high-risk to the ecosystem automatically face liquidity constraints or are subject to higher risk premiums. This synchronization between environmental policies and financial market instruments creates concrete economic incentives for project implementers to comply with sustainability standards (Yuliawati et al., 2017).

Despite a robust regulatory framework, the actual effectiveness of EIA instruments declines drastically when entering the operational phase. The reality at the site level demonstrates a wide gap due to the weak post-permit oversight function of authorized government agencies. After the environmental feasibility permit is issued and construction activities begin, regular monitoring of compliance with the Environmental Management Plan (RPL) and Environmental Monitoring Plan (RPL) is often passive. This weak oversight opens up wide opportunities for project implementers to ignore mitigation commitments in order to reduce operational costs.

This situation is exacerbated by the phenomenon of diminishing the substantial value of the Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) document itself among industry players. In many cases, the preparation of an EIA document tends to be viewed as merely an administrative formality or a bureaucratic commodity intended to expedite the permitting process. The quality of the impact analysis presented in the document is often generic, inaccurate, and does not specifically represent the actual conditions of the initial environmental conditions. As a result of this substantial devaluation, the EIA's function as a long-term ecological quality control instrument becomes ineffective and loses its scientific edge.

Another factor degrading the effectiveness of environmental policy is the low transparency of information throughout the EIA document preparation process. Public access to draft impact analysis documents and environmental management plans is often limited and difficult for civil society groups to access. This lack of information prevents environmental observers, academics, and independent practitioners from providing objective, critical input on the validity of these documents. As a result, published EIAs are susceptible to analytical flaws due to hasty methodology and lack of validation by non-state stakeholders.

The direct impact of this lack of information leads to marginalization and minimal active participation of local communities living near project sites. Community involvement is often unilaterally reduced to one-way socialization or signature gathering, rather than a deliberative public consultation process. Local voices and wisdom regarding the ecological vulnerability of their areas are rarely substantively accommodated in the formulation of impact management documents. This neglect of participatory rights not only violates the principles of environmental justice but also sets a time bomb for social conflict.

This lack of public oversight and participation ultimately triggers massive environmental damage during the construction phase. The decline in surface water quality due to project mud sedimentation, high levels of air pollution from heavy equipment, and the fragmentation of productive land are real consequences that communities must bear. Project implementers often neglect the installation of adequate ecological impact control facilities, believing they will not face strict sanctions from supervisory authorities. This empirical reality highlights the acute operational dysfunction within the environmental policy oversight chain. The weak effectiveness of environmental impact assessments (EIA) in the field is also rooted

in the lenient legal sanctions imposed on violators of environmental compliance commitments. Environmental law enforcement mechanisms in the infrastructure sector tend to be compromised and dominated by administrative sanctions in the form of written warnings that have little deterrent effect. More progressive sanctions, such as the suspension of operating permits or large-scale financial fines, are rarely implemented, under the pretext of ensuring smooth investment and meeting national project deadlines. The government's fear of an economic slowdown ultimately compromises the firmness of environmental law enforcement.

Theoretically, the failure to implement EIA policies reflects the phenomenon of regulatory capture, where regulatory institutions are controlled by the interests of the industries they are supposed to oversee (Arafah et al., 2025). Strong political pressure to expedite the completion of strategic infrastructure projects places environmental authorities in a difficult and weak bargaining position. Supervisory officials in the field often experience structural intimidation or are trapped in transactional practices to whitewash ecological violations committed by contractors. As a result, the essential independence of public policy as a protector of the public interest is systemically compromised. This operational gap is further exacerbated by the limited technical and personnel capacity of regional environmental oversight agencies. The ratio of civil servant environmental investigators (PPNS) to the number of ongoing infrastructure projects is highly imbalanced. Limited field laboratory instruments and a limited operational budget mean that unannounced inspections (*sidak*) are rarely conducted on a regular basis. This logistical and human resource inadequacy leaves the state powerless to detect and respond to environmental violations quickly and accurately.

Despite facing complex operational challenges, it is undeniable that the integration of sustainability principles has succeeded in instilling new normative standards in modern governance. Awareness of the importance of balancing economic growth with environmental sustainability has now become part of the mainstream discourse among top policymakers. The existence of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) instrument, despite its weaknesses at the implementation level, has at least provided a formal legal basis for civil society to demand environmental accountability from the state and corporations. This legal foundation is crucial as a starting point for future policy reform (Budiono et al., 2025).

To restore the EIA's reputation as an effective ecological control instrument, a radical reconstruction of the environmental policy governance system is absolutely necessary. The process of preparing, assessing, and monitoring EIA documents must be transformed from a bureaucratic-centralized system to a digital system that is transparent and based on open scientific data. The involvement of independent academic institutions and non-governmental organizations in EIA assessment teams needs to be expanded to ensure the objectivity of impact assessment results. Digitizing environmental documents will also facilitate the public's independent monitoring of project implementation compliance (crowdsourced monitoring).

Ultimately, the successful integration of sustainability principles into public policy depends heavily on the government's political will to equate ecological aspects with economic ones. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) should no longer be viewed as an obstacle to investment or merely an administrative formality that hinders construction permits. Consistent legal enforcement and moral courage from policymakers are needed to halt infrastructure projects proven to violate environmental commitments. Only through fair and impartial enforcement of regulations can long-term sustainability and inclusive prosperity for all communities be achieved.

2. Structural Barriers: Overlapping Regulations, Budgetary Constraints, and Sectoral Ego

The implementation gap in sustainable infrastructure policies is inextricably linked to structural issues at the governance level. The most fundamental structural barrier is the

overlapping regulations between sectoral laws and regulations concerning regional autonomy. On the one hand, land and spatial planning laws demand rapid land use for public interests in the form of National Strategic Projects (PSN). On the other hand, environmental protection laws and regional regulations stipulate strict conservation zoning. This regulatory conflict creates chronic legal uncertainty for investors, project implementers, and bureaucratic officials in the field.

This lack of alignment between cross-sectoral regulations automatically triggers acute sectoral egos among government agencies. Each technical ministry, such as the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs, tends to interpret the meaning of "sustainable development" partially according to its respective key performance indicators. This sectoral ego makes horizontal coordination extremely expensive, bureaucratic, and slow to execute. Inter-agency meetings often turn into territorial disputes rather than forums for integrative policy synchronization for the broader public interest.

This situation is exacerbated by horizontal and vertical friction between the central and regional governments in the division of government affairs. The central government often establishes large-scale infrastructure projects in the regions without first synchronizing them with the relevant district/provincial Spatial Plans (RTRW). Regional governments often feel their authority has been overstepped but are forced to bear the long-term environmental and social impacts of these projects. As a result of this lack of synchronization in cross-regional spatial planning, the physical implementation of infrastructure on the ground is often mired in legal disputes and administrative resistance from local bureaucracies.

The direct impact of these overlapping regulations and sectoral egos is fueling widespread agrarian conflicts and land disputes at the grassroots level. Land acquisition processes for sustainable infrastructure often infringe on customary territories, productive agricultural land, or protected forest areas due to inaccurate inter-ministerial land concession data. When land conflicts erupt, their resolution takes a very long time and drains significant social energy. The failure to mitigate agrarian disputes fairly from the outset of planning demonstrates that national spatial planning policies have not been able to integrate social justice aspects into physical development.

In addition to regulatory and institutional barriers, budget constraints are a crucial financial factor slowing the adoption of environmentally friendly infrastructure. The State Budget (APBN) has very limited fiscal space to finance all the needs of national infrastructure megaprojects. When the state budget is squeezed, funding allocations for environmental impact mitigation components and the implementation of green technology are the first sectors to be cut by project managers. The government tends to prioritize short-term construction cost efficiency (cost-cutting) over investing in the long-term sustainability of projects.

These financial constraints are exacerbated by the high upfront costs of using sustainable materials and low-emission construction technologies. Domestic contractors must invest additional capital to acquire environmentally friendly technology, green certification, and specialized expertise. Without significant government subsidies or tax incentives, the private construction industry will continue to choose conventional methods, which are much cheaper but high in emissions. The market's inability to absorb the premium costs of green technology has slowed the transition to sustainable infrastructure.

On the other hand, the potential for alternative financing through green financing schemes and green bonds has yet to be fully utilized in Indonesia. The national banking sector and financial institutions still impose very rigid and bureaucratic ecological risk screening requirements on local developers. Many small and medium-sized construction service providers struggle to meet the complex green taxonomy criteria due to limited administrative capacity. As a result, the abundant liquidity of global green funds fails to be properly absorbed by infrastructure projects at the regional level.

These financial obstacles are further complicated by the immaturity of the green investment ecosystem and the lack of long-term regulatory certainty for the private sector. International investors tend to adopt a cautious, wait-and-see approach due to frequent, abrupt regulatory changes in the infrastructure and renewable energy sectors. Political risks and legal uncertainty are considered far higher than the projected environmental benefits offered. Without guaranteed investment protection and fair tariff certainty from government policies, global private sector participation in financing domestic sustainable infrastructure will remain minimal.

From a governance perspective, this policy stalling is also caused by the low adoption of collaborative governance principles in the decision-making process. Strategic infrastructure project planning is still dominated by a top-down approach that positions the state and large corporations as the sole, all-knowing actors. Space for dialogue for civil society organizations, academics, and marginalized groups to provide critical input from the feasibility study stage is severely limited. This asymmetrical relationship between actors closes the door to healthy social control over accountability for project implementation on the ground.

This lack of a collaborative approach has triggered massive social resistance from local communities whose living spaces are directly impacted by physical development. Community resistance is often simplistically interpreted by the government as anti-development or political sabotage, rather than as an expression of distributive injustice. When citizens' voices are ignored, they resort to demonstrations, road blockades, or legal action to defend their ecological rights. These protracted social conflicts ultimately result in far greater economic losses and delay project completion.

Human resource capacity at the regional bureaucracy also exacerbates the structural barriers to policy implementation. Government officials at the district/city level often lack the technical expertise to translate abstract sustainability principles into operational indicators on the ground. This limited understanding makes monitoring compliance with green standards, carried out by regional technical agencies, ineffective. This weak human resource capacity within the local bureaucracy, creates disparities in the quality of policy implementation between large cities and remote areas.

This structural challenge is compounded by the poor integration of national spatial planning and land ownership data systems. Data asymmetry between government agencies has led to overlapping policies because each agency uses different reference maps (multi-map policy). This situation is exploited by unscrupulous land speculators and corporate mafias to exploit legal loopholes for personal gain around infrastructure project corridors. The absence of a single, transparent and accurate database makes it difficult for the government to carry out precise environmental impact mitigation planning.

While this landscape of structural obstacles appears highly complex, the direction of future public policy is beginning to show signs of positive institutional reform. The government's efforts to implement the One Map Policy represent a strategic structural step to end overlapping national land claims. This spatial data synchronization is expected to break the chain of sectoral egos and provide absolute legal certainty for sustainable spatial planning. The success of this single data initiative will be a crucial foundation for the effectiveness of future infrastructure planning.

Therefore, overcoming these structural barriers requires radical institutional restructuring by strengthening the function of independent, cross-sectoral coordinating bodies. These bodies must have strong legal authority to break the deadlock of sectoral egos and rapidly harmonize conflicting regulations. Furthermore, the government needs to expand green fiscal incentives, such as providing tax breaks for contractors using environmentally friendly materials and simplifying access to green credit. This financing reform is crucial so that

sustainability is no longer viewed as a cost burden but rather as a profitable investment opportunity.

Ultimately, breaking down these structural barriers requires a consistent political commitment to shift the development paradigm toward inclusive and accountable governance. Sustainable infrastructure development will never be achieved if bureaucratic structures remain rigidly sectoral and neglect public participation. Synergy between legal certainty, flexible green financing, and deliberative public engagement is an absolute prerequisite. Only with comprehensive structural transformation can public policy truly become a driving force for equitable, sustainable, and sustainable national development.

D. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the integration of sustainability principles into public policy in Indonesia has a strong regulatory foundation through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) instrument, but its effectiveness in the field is still suboptimal. The implementation gap occurs because the EIA document is often reduced to merely fulfilling administrative formalities to expedite construction permits, which is exacerbated by weak post-permit oversight. This operational failure is rooted in structural institutional barriers such as overlapping cross-sectoral regulations, inter-ministerial egos, limited operational budgets, and the suboptimal absorption of green financing schemes. As a result, the designed public policies have not been able to fully stem the negative externalities of development on the environment and society. As a practical recommendation, the government needs to strengthen the institutional coordination function through the integration of the One Map Policy to end overlapping land regulations. In addition, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Public Works and Housing must increase public transparency in the preparation of EIAs and implement strict administrative and financial sanctions for violators of environmental quality standards. Financial authorities also need to simplify access to green financing to facilitate mass adoption by local contractors. This study has limitations because it focuses on the analysis of secondary data and macro policy documents. Therefore, future research agendas need to be directed toward empirical case studies at the site level using quantitative or mixed-methods methods. This is crucial for precisely measuring the economic-ecological impacts of implementing sustainable infrastructure policies in ongoing national strategic projects.

REFERENCES

- Amsari, S., Harahap, I., & Nawawi, Z. M. (2024). Transformasi paradigma pembangunan ekonomi: Membangun masa depan berkelanjutan melalui perspektif ekonomi syariah. *Ekonomis: Journal of Economics and Business*, 8(1), 729-738.
- Arafah, W., Ismelina, M., Tawakal, A., & Yasin, A. M. (2025). *Dilema Batu Bara: (Regulasi, Dampak Lingkungan Dan Transisi Energi Di Indonesia)*. Penerbit Berseri.
- Budiono, I., Amrulla, F., Amelia, M. S., Farabi, K. A., & Senastri, N. M. J. (2025). Kajian Implementasi AMDAL sebagai Instrumen Pengelolaan Lingkungan dalam Rangka Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Ibu Kota Nusantara. *Bhirawa Law Journal*, 6(1), 35-45.
- Cendekiawan, M., & Firmansyah, A. (2024). Pengembangan Green Bonds di Indonesia: Upaya Pemerintah Untuk Mewujudkan Keuangan Berkelanjutan. *Journal of Law, Administration, and Social Science*, 4(1), 87-100.
- Damanik, Z. G., & Hardi, S. C. (2025). Peran Dan Implementasi Analisis Mengenai Dampak Lingkungan (Amdal) Dalam Menilai Kelayakan Bisnis dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup: Studi Kasus Pada Proyek Pembangunan Pabrik Semen Indonesia Aceh (SIA). *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, 3(2), 173-187.

- Iskandar, I., Abduh, M. N., Sariman, S., Rasyidi, E. S., Hijriah, H., Syahrir, S., & Mallawangeng, T. (2024). Pembangunan Jalan Lingkar Berbasis Keadilan Sosial: Studi Sosiologis Di Kawasan Pesisir Kota Bontang. *Jurnal Sosiologi Kontemporer*, 4(2), 71-82.
- Nainggolan, H., Nuraini, R., Sepriano, S., Aryasa, I. W. T., Meilin, A., Adhicandra, I., ... & Prayitno, H. (2023). *Green technology innovation: Transformasi teknologi ramah lingkungan berbagai sektor*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Novita, A. A. A. (2025). *Governance for sustainable development*. Selaras Media Kreasindo.
- Nugraha, B., & Santoso, A. D. (2025). Peran transportasi multimoda dalam meningkatkan konektivitas dan efisiensi logistik di Pulau Jawa. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 5(2), 1935-1948.
- Putri, A. Y. (2024). *Tinjauan Hukum Terhadap Analisis Dampak Lingkungan (Amdal) Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup di Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau).
- Putri, N. E., Helmi, H., Noer, M., & Yossyafra, Y. (2021). Systematic Literature Review (SLR) Dinamika Perencanaan Pembangunan Infrastruktur Berkelanjutan. *Journal Public Policy*, 7(2), 103-111.
- Runtunuwu, Y. B. (2025). Analisis Kebijakan dan Penegakan Hukum Lingkungan Hidup di Negara-negara Asean: Implikasi terhadap Akses Keadilan dan Keberlanjutan Lingkungan. *Collaborative: Journal of Community Service*, 1(2), 62-76.
- Sesa, B. (2018). Implementasi AMDAL dalam Mendukung Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (Sustainable Development). *Jurnal Sosio Sains*, 4(1), 1-13.
- Sjafruddin, A. (2013). Pembangunan Infrastruktur Transportasi untuk Menunjang Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Berbasis Ilmu Pengetahuan. *Makalah. Bandung: Institut Teknologi Bandung, Fakultas Teknik Sipil dan Lingkungan*.
- Turyandi, I., Santoso, O. R., Latianingsih, N., Nurchotimah, E., Riwayanti, J., Fourina, Y., ... & Halimah, L. (2026). *KEBIJAKAN PUBLIK (Proses, Tantangan, dan Dinamika Global)*. Penerbit Widina.
- Undrizon, U., Yuhelson, Y., & Prasetyo, D. A. (2024). Efektivitas Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Pembangunan Infrastruktur dalam Mendukung Industri Strategis untuk Kesejahteraan Nasional. *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi*, 4(6), 305-316.
- Widyastuti, T. V. (2025). *Rekonstruksi regulasi izin lingkungan hidup untuk mewujudkan harmonisasi hukum berbasis nilai keadilan ekologi* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang).
- Yuliawati, T., Rani, A. M., & Assyofa, A. R. (2017). Efektivitas Implementasi Green Financing Sebagai Alternatif Pembiayaan Berkelanjutan Bagi UMKM Sektor Industri Pengolahan Alas Kaki Di Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Performa*, 14(2), 152-162.