

1 Dean Wallraff (SBN 275908)
2 Kathleen R. Unger (SBN 272279)
3 ADVOCATES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
4 10211 Sunland Blvd.
5 Shadow Hills, CA 91040
6 Phone: (818) 353-4268
7 Facsimile: (818) 864-3224
8 dw@aenv.org; ku@aenv.org

9 Counsel for Petitioners and Plaintiffs

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 FRIENDS OF THE SANTA CLARA RIVER,
13 SCOPE (SANTA CLARITA ORGANIZATION
14 FOR PLANNING AND THE ENVIRONMENT),
15 PETITIONERS,

16 v.

17 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
18 LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF
19 SUPERVISORS, DOES 1 TO 10,
20 RESPONDENTS,

21 AND
22 NEWHALL LAND AND FARMING COMPANY,
23 INC., DOES 11 TO 20,
24 REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

CASE No. BS170568

Assigned for all purposes to
Hon. Richard L. Fruin

PETITIONERS' OPENING BRIEF

Original Petition Filed: August 17, 2017

Trial Date: August 8, 2018
Time: 1:30 PM
Department: 15

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS..... 1

 A. Parties 1

 B. Newhall Ranch and the Specific Plan..... 2

 C. Department of Fish and Wildlife Project and Litigation 2

 D. The Landmark Village Project 3

 1. Project Description 3

 2. Original Environmental Review and Project Approval..... 3

 3. Landmark Project Litigation 3

 4. Subsequent Environmental Review and Project Approval 4

 E. The Mission Village Project 5

 1. Project Description 5

 2. Original Environmental Review and Project Approval..... 5

 3. Mission Project Litigation 5

 4. Subsequent Environmental Review and Project Approval 6

III. THE 2011 LANDMARK AND MISSION EIRS, AS SUPPLEMENTED BY THE
 RECIRCULATED ANALYSIS, VIOLATE CEQA. 7

 A. The Recirculated Analysis’s greenhouse gas analysis violates CEQA in
 several significant respects. 7

 1. The Recirculated Analysis adopted the existing low baselines as the
 significance threshold for GHG impacts. 7

 2. The County has failed to require all feasible mitigation in violation of
 CEQA, since the Projects will have significant GHG impacts. 7

 3. Mitigating only 30 years of operational GHG emissions leaves substantial
 emissions unmitigated, violating CEQA. 8

 4. There is no substantial evidence supporting the County’s conclusion that
 the Projects, with mitigation, will not have significant GHG impacts. 10

 a. Mitigation Measures 4.23-1/2-1 and 4.23-2/2-2, which purport to
 reduce the GHG emissions from the operation of residential and
 commercial buildings to zero, do not ensure that goal will be
 accomplished..... 11

 b. The California Cap-and-Trade Program does not exempt any GHG
 sources from CEQA. 12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

- B. The Recirculated Analysis does not contain the energy analysis required by Guidelines Appendix F..... 13**
- C. The County violated CEQA because the Recirculated Analysis does not analyze significant water supply impacts resulting from changed circumstances and new information..... 14**
 - 1. CEQA requires an agency to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR when significant new information or changed circumstances come to light after the certification of the original EIR.....15
 - 2. Changed circumstances and new information about drought and water supply required analysis in a supplemental EIR.....17
 - a. The Projects will get their potable water mainly by pumping groundwater.17
 - b. There are substantially changed circumstances and new information concerning the Projects’ effects on water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley since the 2011 EIRs were certified.17
 - c. Changed circumstances and new information concerning the Projects’ effects on water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley since the 2011 EIRs were certified are substantial enough that a supplemental EIR was required.....19
 - d. The record does not contain substantial evidence supporting the County’s decision not to undertake supplemental water supply analysis.21
- IV. THE COUNTY VIOLATED WATER CODE § 10910 BY FAILING TO INCLUDE A NEW WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT IN THE RECIRCULATED ANALYSIS. 25**
- V. CONCLUSION 28**

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland</i> (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173.....	13
<i>California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Sons</i> (1964) 224 Cal.App.2d 715	27
<i>Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife</i> (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204	2
<i>Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife</i> (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 1245.....	3
<i>City of Barstow v. Mojave Water Agency</i> (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224	27
<i>Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments</i> (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497	7
<i>Committee for Re-Evaluation of T-Line Loop v. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency</i> (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 1237.....	16, 17
<i>Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.</i> (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937	15, 17, 22
<i>Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112	15
<i>Lotus v. Dept. of Transportation</i> (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 645.....	7
<i>Mira Monte Homeowners Ass’n v. County of Ventura</i> (1985) 165 Cal.App.3d 357	24
<i>Moss v. County of Humboldt</i> (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1041.....	15, 16, 20, 21, 23
<i>Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency</i> (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099.....	14
<i>San Bernardino v. Riverside</i> (1921) 186 Cal. 7	27
<i>San Diego Navy Broadway Complex Coalition v. City of San Diego</i> (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 924.....	15

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Security Environmental Systems, Inc. v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist.
 (1991) 229 Cal.App.3d 11023

Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah
 (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256.....13

Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova
 (2007) 40 Cal.4th 412 7, 26, 28

Statutes

Water Code

§ 10910 25, 26, 28

§ 10911(b)28

§ 10912(a)25

Sen. Bill No. 610 (2001-2002 Reg. Sess.) § 1(b)..... 25, 26, 28

Pub. Resources Code

§ 21002.1(b)8

§ 210672

§ 21080(e) 10, 11

§ 21092.1 14, 15

§ 21100(b)(3)13

§ 21151.925

§ 21166 15, 16, 17, 19

§ 21183(c)9

Regulations

Cal. Code Regs title 14

§ 15088.514

§ 15126.4(a)(1)(C)13

§ 15162 15, 16, 17, 19

§ 15163 16, 17, 24

Appendix F13

1 **I. Introduction**

2 Newhall Ranch, possibly the largest housing project ever approved in California, will
3 have enormous effects on the environment. It will contain over 20,000 housing units on a
4 12,000-acre site in the Santa Clarita Valley, and will incorporate commercial uses,
5 schools, fire stations, a public library, and so on. It will be, in essence, a new city. The
6 development will be composed of several interconnected “villages,” the first two of
7 which—Landmark Village and Mission Village—are the subject of the present lawsuit.
8 Petitioners were among groups of environmental organizations that previously
9 challenged the environmental review and land-use approvals for these two projects.
10 Those successful suits resulted in writs of mandate requiring the County of Los Angeles
11 to address deficiencies in the analysis of greenhouse-gas impacts from the projects.

12 This action challenges what the County calls the “Recirculated Analysis” for the
13 Landmark Village and Mission Village projects, which the County prepared in response
14 to orders of the California Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal, and the Superior Court,
15 to bring the prior environmental analysis into compliance with the California
16 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Recirculated Analysis, however, falls short. It
17 does not comply with CEQA’s mandate to analyze and mitigate greenhouse-gas impacts
18 of the two projects. And, the Recirculated Analysis should have included supplemental
19 review of the projects’ water supply impacts because new information and changed
20 circumstances since the time of the prior environmental impact reports (EIRs) show the
21 projects will have significant effects on water supply that were not previously analyzed.
22 Finally, the County improperly failed to require new Water Supply Assessments for the
23 projects, and in so doing, violated both CEQA and the Water Code.

24 For these reasons, Petitioners request that Court order the County to vacate its
25 certification of the Landmark Village and Mission Village Recirculated Analysis and EIRs,
26 and set aside the land-use approvals for the two projects.

27 **II. Statement of Facts**

28 **A. Parties**

29 Petitioners, public-interest organizations Friends of the Santa Clara River and Santa
30 Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (collectively, **SCOPE**) bring this
31 lawsuit against Respondent County of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles County Board of
32 Supervisors (collectively, **County**) and Real Party in Interest, Newhall Land and Farming
33 Company, Inc. (**Newhall**). Petitioners are nonprofit public-interest organizations whose
34 missions focus on protecting the environment. The County is the lead agency for
35

1 purposes of Public Resources Code § 21067,¹ with principal responsibility for conducting
2 environmental review for and approving the projects at issue in this case. Newhall is the
3 applicant for the entitlements at issue.

4 **B. Newhall Ranch and the Specific Plan**

5 Newhall Ranch is a large, master-planned development to be located in the
6 northwestern portion of Los Angeles County, near the City of Santa Clarita. Approved in
7 2003, the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan covers approximately 12,000 acres (SR 39447), and
8 allows the construction of 21,308 dwelling units, 629 acres of mixed-use development, 67
9 acres of commercial uses, and 249 acres of business park. (LV 120894.)²

10 **C. Department of Fish and Wildlife Project and Litigation**

11 The Newhall Ranch project involves a Resource Management and Development Plan
12 and a Spineflower Conservation Plan, covering certain aspects of biological resource
13 management and development for the project. (SR 1568.) Those two plans constitute a
14 CEQA project (the **RMDP/SCP Project**) for which the California Department of Fish
15 and Wildlife (**CDFW**) serves as the lead agency. (*Ibid.*) CDFW certified an EIR for the
16 RMDP/SCP Project in December 2010, and approved a Master Streambed Alteration
17 Agreement and two Incidental Take Permits. (*Ibid.*)

18 In January 2011, environmental organizations filed a petition for a writ of mandate
19 challenging CDFW’s actions. (SR 28618.) The trial court granted the writ in 2012, but the
20 Court of Appeal reversed that ruling. (*Ibid.*) In November 2015, our Supreme Court again
21 reversed, in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish and Wildlife* (2015) 62
22 Cal.4th 204 (*CBD v. CDFW I*). The Court held that CDFW violated CEQA by failing to
23 support with substantial evidence its conclusion that the Newhall Ranch project’s
24 greenhouse-gas (**GHG**) impacts were insignificant. (*Id.* at pp. 225-31, 240.) The Court
25 also concluded that CDFW violated the Fish and Game Code by adopting two mitigation
26 measures that unlawfully allowed “take” of the unarmored threespine stickleback, a fully
27 protected species, in connection with construction and water diversion activities in the
28 Santa Clara River. (*Id.* at pp. 231-37, 240.)

29 In December 2016, the trial court issued a writ of mandate, with judgment in favor of
30

31
32 ¹ Undesignated section references are to the Public Resources Code.

33 ² Citations to the original record for the Landmark Village Project are designated by
34 the prefix “LV.” Citations to the original record for the Mission Village Project are
35 designated by “MV.” Citations to the record in the present action, related to the further
environmental review and re-approval of both Landmark and Mission, are designated by
“SR.”

1 the petitioners as to the GHG-emissions and stickleback-take issues. (*Center for Biological*
2 *Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 1245, 1251 [*CBD v.*
3 *CDFW II*].)

4 In response to the court decisions, Newhall modified some aspects of the Newhall
5 Ranch development, related to GHG emissions and design and construction methods for
6 bridges and bank stabilization in the Santa Clara River. (SR 28620.) In November 2016,
7 CDFW prepared and circulated “Additional Environmental Analysis” (AEA) for the
8 RMDP/SCP Project, which addressed GHG emissions and stickleback take. (SR 11, 1569.)
9 CDFW certified the Final AEA on June 14, 2017, and re-approved the project.

10 **D. The Landmark Village Project**

11 **1. Project Description**

12 Landmark Village is the first-approved phase of the Newhall Ranch project. (LV
13 9623; SR 39447.) The site comprises approximately 1.042 acres. (SR 1572.) The Landmark
14 Village Project (**Landmark Project**) will consist of 1,444 residential units (270 single-
15 family and 1,174 multi-family), 1,033,000 square feet of commercial space, and various
16 open-space, recreation, park, trail, and public-facility lots. (LV 312; SR 1572-73.)

17 **2. Original Environmental Review and Project Approval**

18 The County began preparation of the original EIR in 2003. (SR 42.) The original
19 Draft EIR was issued in 2006, and a Final EIR in November 2007. (SR 1573.) Thereafter,
20 the Landmark Project was updated, and a Recirculated Draft EIR was issued in February
21 2010. (SR 1573; LV 18.) After recirculation, the Revised Final EIR was issued in 2011, and
22 the Board of Supervisors (**Board**) certified it on October 4, 2011 (the **2011 Landmark**
23 **EIR**). (SR 1574; LV 27-28.)

24 On February 21, 2012, the Board approved CEQA findings and a statement of
25 overriding considerations. (SR 39445; LV 27-28.) It approved a vesting tentative tract
26 map, two conditional use permits, an oak tree permit, and amendments to the General
27 Plan, Specific Plan, and Local Plan. (SR 1574.)

28 **3. Landmark Project Litigation**

29 In March 2012, a group of environmental organizations, including Petitioners, filed
30 suit challenging the Landmark Project approvals and certification of the 2011 Landmark
31 EIR. (SR 11.) After initial denial of the petition by the trial court and affirmance by the
32 Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court ordered the Court of Appeal to reconsider the case
33 in light of *CBD v. CDFW I*. (SR 11.) The Court of Appeal then reversed the trial court’s
34 original judgment in part, as to its conclusion that there would be no significant
35 environmental impact from the Project’s GHG emissions, noting that the analysis of

1 GHG impacts in the 2011 Landmark EIR paralleled the analysis invalidated in *CBD v.*
2 *CDFW I. (Friends of the Santa Clara River v. County of L.A.,* Case No. B256125, Nov. 3,
3 2016 [2016 Cal.App.Unpub. LEXIS 7971, at p. *10]; see Case Chronology [to be filed with
4 Reply] for further information about this procedural history.)

5 On March 13, 2017, this Court entered judgment and issued a peremptory writ of
6 mandate directing the County to void certification of the portion of the 2011 Landmark
7 EIR that addressed the significance of the Project’s GHG emissions, to suspend project
8 activity that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment
9 until the County took corrective action to address the EIR’s deficiency and comply with
10 CEQA, and to suspend the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations
11 and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. (*Friends of the Santa Clara River v.*
12 *County of L.A.,* L.A. Super. Ct. Case No. BS136549, Mar. 13, 2017.)

13 **4. Subsequent Environmental Review and Project Approval**

14 After this Court issued its judgment and writ, the County conducted further
15 environmental analysis for the Landmark Project. In November 2016, the County issued
16 the Landmark Village Draft Recirculated Portions of the EIR, or 2017 Draft Recirculated
17 Analysis. (SR 9, 12.) The Draft Recirculated Analysis re-analyzed the Project’s GHG
18 emissions, as ordered by the writ. (SR 1566.) The County analyzed 13 new GHG-related
19 mitigation measures, concluding that those measures will reduce, mitigate, and offset 100
20 percent of Landmark’s emissions, resulting in “net zero” GHG emissions. (SR 1566-67.)

21 Additionally, the County determined that two mitigation measures related to stream
22 diversion, which were similar to the mitigation measures the Supreme Court had found
23 constituted “take” of protected stickleback, must be replaced or eliminated, and accepted
24 related project modifications proposed by Newhall. (SR 1567-68.) The County prepared
25 Errata to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (**Landmark 2017 Errata to the**
26 **2011 MMRP**). (SR 1568.)

27 After the 2017 Draft Recirculated Analysis was circulated for public comment, the
28 Board of Supervisors held a public hearing to reconsider the Landmark Project on July 18,
29 2017 (together with the Mission Project). (SR 46-47, 41761-65.) At that hearing, the
30 Board certified the 2017 Recirculated Analysis (the **Landmark Recirculated Analysis**) in
31 combination with the 2011 Landmark EIR as complete and in compliance with CEQA,
32 adopted Supplemental CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and
33 adopted the 2017 Errata to the 2011 MMRP. (SR 15.) The Board rescinded the findings
34 and conditions of approval supporting its prior land-use approvals for the Landmark
35 Project, and re-approved the following land-use entitlements: Vesting Tentative Tract

1 Map No. 53108-(5); SEA Conditional Use Permit No. 2005-00112-(5); Conditional Use
2 Permit No. 00-196-(5); Oak Tree Permit No. 00-196-(5); and Specific Plan Amendment
3 No. 00-196-(5). (SR 9-10, 15, 25, 34, 39447-50).

4 **E. The Mission Village Project**

5 **1. Project Description**

6 Mission Village is the second-approved phase of the Newhall Ranch project. (SR
7 29388.) The Mission Village Project (the **Mission Project**) will include 4,055 residential
8 units (351 single-family and 3,704 multi-family), over 1.5 million square feet of
9 commercial space, public services including an elementary school, a fire station, and a
10 library, and open-space, park, trail, and public facility lots. (MV 7-8; SR 29388.)

11 **2. Original Environmental Review and Project Approval**

12 The County began preparing the original EIR in 2004. (SR 109.) A Draft EIR was
13 issued in 2010, and a Final EIR in May 2011. (SR 30866.) In October 2011, the County
14 issued “Additional Environmental Information” with clarifications and updates to the
15 Final EIR, and a Revised Draft EIR. (MV 298, 303.) On October 25, 2011, the Board
16 certified the Final EIR (the **2011 Mission EIR**).³ (SR 30867; MV 48519.)

17 On May 15, 2012, the Board approved CEQA findings and a statement of overriding
18 considerations. (SR 40248; MV 311-12.) It approved a vesting tentative tract map, two
19 conditional use permits, two oak tree permits, a parking permit, and a substantial
20 conformance review. (SR 30867.)

21 **3. Mission Project Litigation**

22 In June 2012, the present Petitioners and other environmental organizations filed
23 suit challenging the Mission Project approvals and certification of the EIR. The trial court
24 denied the petition, and the Court of Appeal affirmed, but the Supreme Court ordered
25 the Court of Appeal to reconsider the case in light of *CBD v. CDFW I*, as it had for
26 Landmark. Thereafter, the Court of Appeal issued an opinion, very similar to that issued
27 in the Landmark litigation, reversing the trial court judgment in part, as to the EIR’s
28 GHG-emissions analysis. (*California Native Plant Society v. County of L.A.*, Case No.
29 B258090, Dec. 1, 2016 [2016 Cal.App.Unpub. LEXIS 8719]; see Case Chronology [to be
30 filed with Reply] for further information about this procedural history.)

31 On March 13, 2017, this Court entered judgment and issued a peremptory writ of
32 mandate directing the County to void certification of the portion of the final revised EIR
33 that addressed the significance of the Mission Project’s GHG emissions, to suspend
34

35 ³ This brief refers collectively to the 2011 Landmark EIR and the 2011 Mission EIR,
as certified, as the **2011 EIRs**.

1 project activity that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical
2 environment until the County took corrective action to address the EIR's deficiency and
3 comply with CEQA, and to suspend the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding
4 Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. (*California Native*
5 *Plant Society v. County of L.A.*, L.A. Super. Ct. Case No. BS138001, Mar. 13, 2017.)

6 **4. Subsequent Environmental Review and Project Approval**

7 The County conducted further environmental analysis for the Mission Project, in
8 tandem with the further analysis done for Landmark. In November 2016, the County
9 issued the Mission Village Draft Recirculated Portions of the EIR, or 2017 Draft
10 Recirculated Analysis. (SR 84, 88.) The Draft Recirculated Analysis re-analyzed the
11 Project's GHG emissions, and analyzed 13 new mitigation measures, concluding the
12 measures will result in "net zero" GHG emissions from Mission. (SR 30859-60.)

13 Additionally, the County determined two mitigation measures related to stream
14 diversion must be replaced or eliminated, and accepted Newhall's related project
15 modifications. (SR 30860-61.) The County prepared Errata to the Mitigation Monitoring
16 and Reporting Plan (**Mission 2017 Errata to the 2011 MMRP**). (SR 30861.)

17 The Board of Supervisors reconsidered the Mission Project, together with the
18 Landmark Project, at its public hearing on July 18, 2017. (SR 113-14, 41761-65.) At that
19 hearing, the Board certified the Mission Project's 2017 Recirculated Analysis (the **Mission**
20 **Recirculated Analysis**)⁴ in combination with the 2011 Mission EIR as complete and in
21 compliance with CEQA, adopted Supplemental CEQA Findings and Statement of
22 Overriding Considerations, and adopted the 2017 Errata to the 2011 MMRP. (SR 90.) The
23 Board rescinded the findings and conditions of approval supporting its prior land-use
24 approvals for the Mission Project, and re-approved the following land-use entitlements:
25 Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61106-(5); SEA Conditional Use Permit No. 2005-
26 00080-(5); Conditional Use Permit No. 2005-00081-(5); Oak Tree Permit Nos. 2005-
27 00032-(5) and 2005-00043-(5); Parking Permit No. 2005-00011-(5); and Substantial
28 Conformance Review No. 2010-00001-(5). (SR 84, 90-91, 100, 40250-52.)
29
30
31
32
33

34 ⁴ This brief refers collectively to the Landmark Recirculated Analysis and the Mission
35 Recirculated Analysis as the **Recirculated Analysis**. The two documents are nearly
identical with the exception of information specific to each Project.

1 **III. The 2011 Landmark and Mission EIRs, as supplemented by the**
2 **Recirculated Analysis, violate CEQA.**

3 **A. The Recirculated Analysis’s greenhouse gas analysis violates CEQA in**
4 **several significant respects.**

5 **1. The Recirculated Analysis adopted the existing low baselines as the**
6 **significance threshold for GHG impacts.**

7 The County has adopted 698 metric tonnes of carbon-dioxide equivalent per year
8 (MTCO₂e/year) as the threshold of significance for greenhouse-gas emissions on the
9 Landmark Site, and 369 MTCO₂e/year as the threshold of significance for GHG emissions
10 on the Mission Site. Those are the amounts of greenhouse gases that are currently
11 generated on the Project Sites, according to the Recirculated Analysis. (SR 1642; 30935.)⁵
12 One of the significance thresholds adopted for both Projects, Threshold 2.1-1, is “Would
13 the Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a
14 significant impact on the environment?” (SR 1643; 30937.) The Recirculated Analysis
15 claims the Projects will not have significant GHG effects because they will cause no net
16 increase in GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting, effectively
17 adopting the existing baseline as the threshold of significance. (SR 1646; 30940.) “Because
18 the Project, as mitigated, would result in no net increase in the GHG emissions level, the
19 Project would not have a significant impact on global climate change.” (SR 1670; 30963.)
20 Based on this adopted threshold, any increase above the existing baseline GHG emissions
21 would be significant, requiring further mitigation, if feasible, and, if infeasible, a
22 statement of overriding considerations.

23 **2. The County has failed to require all feasible mitigation in violation of**
24 **CEQA, since the Projects will have significant GHG impacts.**

25 CEQA requires an EIR’s determination of whether a particular environmental
26 impact is significant to be made before mitigation measures are considered. (*Lotus v.*
27 *Dept. of Transportation* (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 645, 658 [cited with approval in *Cleveland*
28 *National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Governments* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497, 529];
29 see *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova* (2007)
30 40 Cal.4th 412, 444 [*Vineyard*] [water supply availability must be analyzed in EIR, even if
31 mitigation will stop further development if water supply turns out to be inadequate].)

32 As discussed above, the Recirculated Analysis effectively adopts zero as the first of
33 two thresholds of significance. The Recirculated Analysis admits that the Projects,

34
35 ⁵ Hereafter, when citations to the record are separated by a semicolon, the first refers
to the Landmark portion of the record, the second to the Mission portion of the record.

1 without mitigation, would have significant greenhouse-gas impacts. (SR 1646; 30940.)
2 Since the Projects' impacts will be significant, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation
3 be adopted. (§ 21002.1(b).) There is no substantial evidence in the record—because the
4 Recirculated Analysis does not contend—that the approved GHG mitigation measures
5 constitute all feasible mitigation. There is no showing, for example, that it would be
6 infeasible for Newhall to provide additional renewable energy generation and storage on
7 the Project Sites so as to become a net generator of energy—to go below “net zero,” or at
8 least to offset some of the Project’s remaining mobile-source GHG emissions on-site
9 instead of purchasing offsets. Since the Projects’ GHG impacts will be significant without
10 mitigation, CEQA requires all feasible mitigation.

11 The failure by the County to require all feasible mitigation is a procedural violation
12 of CEQA, a failure to proceed in the manner required by law, which is evaluated de novo
13 by this Court. This Court should order the Recirculated Analysis set aside, and should
14 order the County to require Newhall to adopt all feasible measures to mitigate the
15 significant GHG effects of the Landmark and Mission Projects.

16 **3. Mitigating only 30 years of operational GHG emissions leaves substantial**
17 **emissions unmitigated, violating CEQA.**

18 The County’s strategy is to require Newhall to mitigate only the first 30 years of
19 operational emissions. (SR 1776; 31069.) This is improper, as there is no substantial
20 evidence that the Projects’ operational GHG emissions will cease after 30 years. In fact,
21 the Projects’ GHG emissions will continue well beyond that time limit. To give just two
22 examples, residents will continue to cook with natural gas, a direct source of GHG
23 emissions, and they will continue to drive to and from the Projects—and there is no
24 reason to think all such driving will be in zero-emission vehicles, or the electricity used to
25 supply power for those vehicles will all come from zero-emission sources.

26 The Recirculated Analysis contains topical responses attempting to justify the
27 County’s 30-year GHG horizon. (SR 1776-89; 31059-68.) The topical responses make a
28 variety of arguments, some supported by evidence, some supported only by argument
29 with citations to legal authority.

30 In most cases, the arguments put forth by the County may justify the use of 30 years
31 as an analysis window for estimating a project’s total GHG emissions—something the
32 County has apparently not done for these Projects—but these arguments do not support a
33 30-year limit on mitigation. The GHG mitigation will be done as the Projects are built out
34 and occupied, a process expected to be complete by 2024. (SR 1618, fn. 2; 30911, fn. 2.)
35 When such a substantial part of the proposed mitigation consists of the purchase of

1 offsets, a readily available commodity, a monitoring program could continue to evaluate
2 the effectiveness of the other mitigation measures and require purchase of offsets to
3 compensate for all unmitigated Project GHG emissions in the future.

4 To justify the 30-year mitigation limit, the County points to a letter from the
5 California Air Resources Board (**CARB**) dated November 3, 2016, which states that
6 CARB “finds the documentation [submitted in support of the net-zero greenhouse-gas
7 determination in the CDFW RMDP/SCP Additional Environmental Analysis] provides
8 an adequate technical basis to determine that the project would not result in any net
9 additional GHG emissions after the mitigation measures are fully implemented.” (SR
10 28917; 38945 [the **CARB Letter**].) This letter does not directly support the similar
11 analysis in the Recirculated Analysis for the Landmark and Mission Projects, but the
12 GHG mitigation measures for the CDFW RMDP/SCP Project are similar. The CARB
13 Letter also does not mention the 30-year analysis window or mitigation limit and
14 provides no information about how CARB reached its conclusion that the measures in
15 the CDFW Additional Environmental Analysis fully mitigate the GHG effects of the
16 RMDP/SCP Project. Because it’s impossible, from the CARB Letter, to determine whether
17 CARB actually considered the 30-year mitigation limit, the Court should heavily discount
18 this letter as substantial evidence supporting the 30-year limit on mitigation of the
19 Project’s GHG impacts.

20 The County also points to the 30-year analysis horizon used by CARB when
21 determining whether projects comply with § 21183(c)’s requirement that “leadership
22 projects” not result in net additional GHG emissions. (SR 1781; 31074.) And SCAQMD
23 guidance allows a 30-year analysis window when determining a project’s total GHG
24 emissions for the purpose of purchasing offsets at one time at the beginning of a project.
25 (SR 1783; 31075-76.) But, again, these 30-year windows are for the purpose of analyzing
26 GHG emissions, and it does not indicate that CARB would support limiting GHG
27 *mitigation* to the first 30 years of a project’s operation.

28 The 30-year period over which the County has amortized construction-related GHG
29 emissions (SR 1784; 31076-77) is still further removed from the question at hand.
30 Amortization is merely an accounting function used to spread one-time construction
31 emissions over the years of a project, to convert them into annual emissions, when a
32 significance threshold of a certain number of MTCO₂e per year is being used.

33 The alignment of the 30-year analysis window with Executive Order S-3-05 (SR
34 1785-86; 31078-79) is also irrelevant to the mitigation issue. To the extent the County is
35 arguing that the GHG problem will have been solved or greatly reduced in 30 years, this is

1 very optimistic speculation, given how slowly the process of reducing GHG emissions is
2 proceeding now.

3 The County also argues that the Recirculated Analysis likely overestimates project
4 emissions. (SR 1786-87; 31079-80.) This argument is contradicted by the County's own
5 analysis. If the County thought the emissions estimate was high, it should have corrected
6 it.

7 The substantial evidence and legal argument cited by the County do not support its
8 claim that it may not require any mitigation for the Projects' emissions after 30 years.

9 **4. There is no substantial evidence supporting the County's conclusion that**
10 **the Projects, with mitigation, will not have significant GHG impacts.**

11 The County has set the threshold of significance very low for GHG impacts, as
12 discussed above. The significance threshold is 698 MTCO₂e/year for Landmark Village, a
13 little over one percent of the 58,393 MTCO₂e the Landmark Project would emit without
14 mitigation. (SR 1642, 1648.) For Mission Village, the significance threshold is 369
15 MTCO₂e/year, about one-half percent of the 79,202 MTCO₂e/year that Project would
16 emit without mitigation. (SR 30935, 30941.)

17 The County claims this mitigation to near-zero emissions will be achieved in each
18 case by 13 mitigation measures: LV 4.23-1/2-1 to LV 4.23-13/2-13 for Landmark Village
19 (SR 1659-69), and MV 4.23-1/2-1 to MV 4.23-13/2-13 for Mission Village. (SR 30952-62).
20 These two sets of mitigation measures are essentially identical to each other, and identical
21 to the mitigation measures approved by CDFW for the RMDP/SCP Project for Newhall
22 Ranch as a whole. (SR 1658-59; 30951-52.)

23 For this Court to find that the Landmark and Mission GHG mitigation scheme is
24 supported by substantial evidence, there must be substantial evidence that each of the 13
25 mitigation measures is guaranteed to function properly and will contribute its claimed
26 share of GHG reduction. Conclusory assertions of effectiveness are not substantial
27 evidence. (§ 21080(e) [opinions must be supported by fact to be substantial evidence].)

28 One such global assertion of effectiveness is the CARB Letter dated November 3,
29 2016, stating that CARB "finds the documentation [submitted in support of the net-zero
30 greenhouse-gas determination in the CDFW RMDP/SCP Additional Environmental
31 Analysis] provides an adequate technical basis to determine that the project would not
32 result in any net additional GHG emissions after the mitigation measures are fully
33 implemented." (SR 28917; 38945.) This letter sets out a conclusion reached by CARB, but
34 provides no information on how CARB reached that conclusion. It contains no
35 information on whether CARB considered the many objections to the GHG mitigation

1 program raised in the Center for Biological Diversity’s comment letter. (SR 3677-97;
2 32976-96.) Because CARB’s raw conclusion is not supported by any analysis or evidence
3 in the record, it is not substantial evidence. (§ 21080(e) [expert opinion is substantial
4 evidence only when supported by fact].)

5 Each of the 13 GHG mitigation measures is flawed to the point that it doesn’t comply
6 with CEQA. Some of those flaws are discussed in the following sections, and as a result, it
7 is evident that the measures will not reduce the Projects’ GHG emissions to near-zero.
8 Even if there were a 95 percent chance that each of the 13 mitigation measures would
9 accomplish its part in the mitigation scheme, the overall scheme would have just a 51
10 percent chance of reaching the goal of near-100 percent mitigation.⁶

11 The County’s conclusion that each measure will contribute its part to the GHG
12 mitigation scheme is not supported by substantial evidence. The failure of the County to
13 provide substantial evidence in support of any one of the 13 mitigation measures is
14 enough to require the Court to invalidate the GHG analysis in the Recirculated Analyses.

15 **a. Mitigation Measures 4.23-1/2-1 and 4.23-2/2-2, which purport to reduce the**
16 **GHG emissions from the operation of residential and commercial buildings**
17 **to zero, do not ensure that goal will be accomplished.**

18 Mitigation Measures 4.23-1/2-1 (SR 1659-60; 30952-53) and 4.23-2/2-2 (SR 1660-62;
19 30953-55) purport to require the Projects’ residential buildings to reduce their net energy
20 consumption to zero by complying with the ZNE (zero-net energy) standard established
21 by the California Energy Commission (CEC) in its 2015 Integrated Energy Policy Report.
22 (SR 51410-728, **2015 IEPR**.) The ZNE standard, as defined in the 2015 IEPR, is slightly
23 misquoted in the mitigation measures.⁷ Under the standard, “A ZNE Code Building is
24 one where the value of the energy produced by on-site renewable energy resources is
25 equal to the value of the energy consumed annually by the building . . . measured using
26 the California Energy Commission’s Time Dependent Valuation metric.” (SR 51464.)

27 Notice that the standard does not require the energy consumed in the building, or
28 the building’s direct GHG emissions—e.g., from burning natural gas in stoves, hot-water
29 heaters, and fireplaces—to net to zero. It requires the *value*, i.e., the cost of such energy, to
30 net to zero. The CEC Time Dependent Valuation defined by the California Energy
31 Commission in the 2011 document titled “Time Dependent Valuation of Energy for
32 Developing Building Efficiency Standards” (SR 51729-805, the **CEC TDV Document**)
33 uses a complicated methodology. The basis, which is applicable primarily to electricity, is
34

35 ⁶ $0.95^{13} = 0.5133$.

⁷ E.g. MM 4.23-1/2-1. (SR 1659; 30952 [changing “energy” to “net energy”].)

1 that energy is worth more at peak times, so that a building should be credited more for its
2 energy contribution from, for example, photovoltaic panels at peak times when the price
3 of energy is high than it is credited for its contribution at times when the price is low.

4 The CEC ZNE requirements are used as a performance standard for Mitigation
5 Measures 4.23-1/2-1 and 4.23-2/2-2, but there are many uncertainties in the ZNE
6 standard, acknowledged in the 2015 IEPR, that prevent the ZNE definition from
7 functioning as a CEQA mitigation performance standard. One such uncertainty is how to
8 address natural gas within the definition. The 2015 IEPR's discussion of potential ways to
9 deal with natural-gas use includes replacing natural gas with waste heat, replacing it with
10 renewables, and replacing natural-gas appliances with electrical ones. (SR 51466-67.) The
11 ZNE standard, as set forth in the 2015 IEPR, comprises a lot more than just the high-level
12 requirement that the value of the energy produced by the Projects equal the value of the
13 energy consumed by the Projects. But it's unclear from the text of Mitigation Measures
14 4.23-1/2-1 and 4.23-2/2-2 which parts of the standard the ZNE Report must comply with,
15 given the uncertainties and state of flux.

16 There is no showing, let alone substantial evidence, in the Recirculated Analysis's
17 GHG analysis (SR 1618-71; 30911-64), the Ramboll Environ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
18 Technical Report (SR 395-540; 29617-763), the ConSol Residential and Commercial
19 Building Analysis Report (SR 660-71; 29943-54), the responses to comments (SR 1794-
20 3567; 31087-2860), the 2015 IEPR, or the CEC TDV Document that compliance with the
21 ZNE Standard in the 2015 IEPR will reduce the Projects' net energy use, or the GHG
22 emissions that indirectly result from that energy use, to zero, as required for these
23 mitigation measures to do their part in achieving the overall mitigation scheme's
24 requirement to reduce the Landmark and Mission Projects' GHG emissions to near zero.

25 ***b. The California Cap-and-Trade Program does not exempt any GHG sources***
26 ***from CEQA.***

27 In the discussion of the California Cap-and-Trade Program, the Recirculated
28 Analysis states, "the Cap-and-Trade Program has been designed to provide a firm cap,
29 ensuring that the 2020 statewide emissions limit identified by CARB in the 2008 Scoping
30 Plan will *not* be exceeded. Thus, for the emission sources covered by the Program, which
31 are nearly all of the sources associated with land use development projects . . . compliance
32 with AB 32's 2020 mandate is assured by the Cap-and-Trade Program." (SR 1640; 30933.)

33 The Recirculated Analysis cites a guidance document issued by the San Joaquin
34 Valley Air Pollution Control District (**SJVAPC Guidance**)—a document pertaining to
35 another jurisdiction, and not binding as a regulation anywhere—as concluding that the

1 GHG sources subject to the Cap-and-Trade Program “are determined to have a less than
2 significant impact on global climate change under CEQA.” (SR 1640, fn. 29; 30933, fn.
3 29.) The Ramboll Environ Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report (**GHG Tech**
4 **Report**) for each Project goes further: it concludes, based on the SJVAPC Guidance, that
5 “GHG emissions increases that are otherwise covered under CARB’s Cap-and-Trade
6 Program . . . cannot constitute significant increases in emissions under CEQA . . .” (SR
7 434; 29656.) As a result, GHG emissions from landscaping and construction equipment,
8 stoves and water heaters, electricity production, and cars and trucks, and methane
9 generated by wastewater treatment and waste disposal are not mitigated for the
10 Landmark and Mission Projects. (SR 1640-41; 30933-34.)

11 It may be proper to assume that the Cap-and-Trade Program mitigates these types of
12 GHG emissions under Threshold 2.1-2, where the focus is on compliance with state and
13 local regulatory programs. But the SJVAPC Guidance does not justify ignoring these
14 emissions under Threshold 2.1-1, where the standard is to reduce the Projects’ GHG
15 emissions to near zero. The SJVAPC Guidance may be contrasted with § 21159.8(a),
16 which, under certain circumstances, exempts from CEQA GHG emissions from cars and
17 light-duty truck trips. There is no authority showing that GHG impacts subject to Cap-
18 and-Trade should not be taken into account in determining whether the suite of
19 mitigation measures reduce the Project’s GHG emissions to the point where they fall
20 under Threshold 2.1-1.

21 The exclusion of the Cap-and-Trade-related GHG sources from the Project’s GHG
22 analysis is a failure to proceed in the manner required by law, analyzed de novo by this
23 Court, which should order the Recirculated Analysis for each Project voided and should
24 order the County to comply with CEQA.

25 ***B. The Recirculated Analysis does not contain the energy analysis required***
26 ***by Guidelines Appendix F.***

27 CEQA requires an analysis of energy impacts and potential energy conservation
28 measures. (§ 21100(b)(3); Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(C), App. F.) An EIR must expressly
29 address energy consumption, and must calculate the amount of energy used by mobile
30 sources and in construction and operation of a project; merely citing compliance with
31 energy-efficiency standards or relying on GHG reduction measures, as the Recirculated
32 Analysis has done, is insufficient to satisfy CEQA’s energy-impacts analysis requirements.
33 (See *Ukiah Citizens for Safety First v. City of Ukiah* (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 256, 261-65;
34 *California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland* (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173.)

35 The Recirculated Analysis does not contain the required analysis (nor, in fact, did the

1 2011 EIRs). It analyzes Projects with substantially different energy impacts than the
2 Projects as addressed in the 2011 EIRs: GHG emission estimates, building efficiency
3 standards, mobile source assumptions, and a host of other factors affecting energy use
4 and conservation have changed in the revised analysis. Accordingly, certifying that the
5 Recirculated Analysis in combination with the 2011 EIRs is complete under CEQA, when
6 the energy analysis was not included, is a violation of CEQA, a failure to proceed in the
7 manner required by law.

8 **C. The County violated CEQA because the Recirculated Analysis does not**
9 **analyze significant water supply impacts resulting from changed**
10 **circumstances and new information.**

11 The County limited the scope of its additional environmental review for the
12 Landmark and Mission Projects to a re-analysis of GHG emissions, analysis of how
13 project changes would avoid take of unarmored threespine stickleback, and related
14 revisions to the MMRP. (SR 1578; 30868.) The County refused to conduct further review
15 of other environmental impacts of the Landmark and Mission Projects despite
16 commenters raising further issues during the comment period. (SR 1766; 31059.)

17 Responding to comments on the Draft Recirculated Analysis, the County justified its
18 decision to limit the scope of its additional environmental review by saying it was “not
19 ‘required to start the EIR process anew,’” and asserted that the “scope of the corrective
20 action is determined ‘in light of the legal standards governing recirculation of the EIR
21 prior to certification.’” (SR 1772; 31065 [citing *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v.*
22 *Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1112; § 21092.1; Guidelines⁸
23 § 15088.5].) Thus, the County relied on § 21092.1 and Guidelines § 15088.5 as the
24 standards governing its additional review.

25 The County focused its attention on changes that were made to the Projects with
26 respect to GHG emissions and avoiding stickleback take (SR 1773; 31065), but the
27 Projects are not the only things that changed in the years between the 2011 EIRs’
28 certification and the County’s re-approval of the Projects. During that time, new
29 information of substantial importance became available regarding climate change’s effects
30 on water resources in the Santa Clarita Valley. As a result, it has become apparent that the
31 circumstances under which the Projects are being undertaken have changed substantially.
32 For this reason, the County was obligated to go beyond analyzing the changes made to
33 the Projects to correct the previously identified CEQA violations, and should have
34

35 ⁸ “Guidelines” refers to the CEQA Guidelines in 14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000-15387.

1 prepared supplemental analysis of water supply impacts pursuant to § 21166.⁹

2 **1. CEQA requires an agency to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR**
3 **when significant new information or changed circumstances come to**
4 **light after the certification of the original EIR.**

5 Under § 21166, a subsequent or supplemental EIR should be prepared if any of the
6 following occurs:

- 7 (a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major
8 revisions of the environmental impact report.
9 (b) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the
10 project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the
11 environmental impact report.
12 (c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at
13 the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete,
14 becomes available.

15 Section 21166 applies when environmental review of a project has already occurred
16 in a prior EIR, and the time to challenge the prior EIR has expired. (*Moss v. County of*
17 *Humboldt* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1041, 1050.) Thus, where an agency undertakes further
18 discretionary approval of a project, such as when changes are made to the project, the
19 agency must determine whether a subsequent or supplemental EIR is required because
20 any of the above conditions is present. (Guidelines § 15162(a), (c); *San Diego Navy*
21 *Broadway Complex Coalition v. City of San Diego* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 924, 935.)

22 The limitations in § 21166 “are designed to balance CEQA’s central purpose of
23 promoting consideration of the environmental consequences of public decisions with
24 interests in finality and efficiency.” (*Friends of College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo*
25 *County Community College Dist.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, 949 [*San Mateo Gardens*].) The
26 purpose of a subsequent or supplemental EIR is to consider potential environmental
27 impacts that were not considered in the original EIR. (*Id.* at p. 950.)

28 Guidelines § 15162 provides guidance concerning when conditions triggering further
29 environmental review exist:

30 ⁹ Even if the County was correct in concluding that the Recirculated Analysis was
31 governed by § 21092.1 and not § 21166, that is a distinction without material difference,
32 because the standards for recirculation are similar to those for determining if new
33 information or changed circumstances necessitate a subsequent or supplemental EIR. In
34 *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1993) 6 Cal.4th
35 1112, our Supreme Court interpreted § 21092.1 by reference to § 21166 and its
implementing regulations because the two statutes govern “analogous situation[s].” (*Id.* at
p. 1129.) The Court held that recirculation is required under circumstances described in
Guidelines § 15162. (*Id.* at p. 1130.)

1 **Project changes:** A subsequent EIR is required if proposed project changes are
2 substantial and involve new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in
3 the severity of significant effects already identified, requiring major revisions of the
4 previous EIR. (Guidelines § 15162(a)(1).

5 **Changed circumstances:** A subsequent EIR must be prepared if a substantial change
6 has occurred in the circumstances under which a project is undertaken, and that change
7 involves new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects, requiring
8 major revisions to the previous EIR. (Guidelines § 15162(a)(2); see *Committee for Re-*
9 *Evaluation of T-Line Loop v. San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency* (2016) 6
10 Cal.App.5th 1237, 1255 [*T-Line Loop*].)

11 **New information:** A subsequent EIR must be prepared if “[n]ew information of
12 substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the
13 exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified,” shows (1) the
14 project will have significant effects not analyzed in the previous EIR, (2) significant effects
15 of the project will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR, or (3)
16 mitigation measures or alternatives, either that were found infeasible but that are in fact
17 feasible, or that are considerably different from those previously analyzed, would
18 substantially reduce significant impacts of the project, but the project’s proponent
19 declines to adopt the measures or alternatives. (Guidelines § 15162(a)(3); see *Moss v.*
20 *County of Humboldt, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1057-58.)

21 Guidelines § 15163 provides that a supplemental EIR may be prepared instead of a
22 subsequent EIR if one of the above conditions requiring a subsequent EIR exists, but
23 “[o]nly minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR
24 adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.” (Guidelines § 15163(a).) A
25 supplemental EIR may be limited to the information needed to respond to the project
26 changes, changes in circumstances, or new information that necessitated further
27 environmental review. The supplement must contain only information needed to make
28 the previous EIR adequate under the new conditions. (Guidelines § 15163(b).)¹⁰

29 There are no cases directly governing circumstances like those present here, in which
30 an agency was required by a court order to conduct additional environmental review to
31 address deficiencies in a prior EIR, and during the intervening time, new information
32 came to light or the circumstances under which the project was undertaken changed,
33

34 ¹⁰ This brief assumes that analysis of water supply impacts in a supplemental EIR—
35 rather than a subsequent EIR revising the entire 2011 EIR for each Project—would meet
the County’s obligations under § 21166 and Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15163.

1 requiring further environmental review of other project impacts under § 21166. But
2 nothing in CEQA or the Guidelines makes § 21166 inapplicable simply because the
3 agency is already preparing further environmental review to respond to a court order,
4 when triggering conditions arise. Even when the agency is already re-analyzing some
5 project impacts, when “further discretionary approval of [a] project is required,” and “any
6 of the conditions described in subdivision (a) occurs,” the agency granting the further
7 approval must analyze the new (or substantially more severe) significant effects revealed
8 by new information or resulting from changed circumstances. (Guidelines § 15162(c).)

9 An agency’s decision regarding what it must do to comply with its obligations under
10 § 21166 and Guidelines §§ 15162 and 15163—including whether a subsequent or
11 supplemental EIR is required, and the scope of that document—must be supported by
12 substantial evidence. (*San Mateo Gardens, supra*, 1 Cal.5th at p. 953; *T-Line Loop, supra*, 6
13 Cal.App.5th at p. 1251.)

14 **2. Changed circumstances and new information about drought and water**
15 **supply required analysis in a supplemental EIR.**

16 The Recirculated Analysis is improperly limited to analysis of only the Project
17 modifications related to GHG emissions and avoiding take of stickleback. Instead, the
18 County should have prepared a supplemental EIR that addressed changed circumstances
19 and new information, which rendered the prior analysis of water supply inadequate.

20 **a. The Projects will get their potable water mainly by pumping groundwater.**

21 The Landmark and Mission Project Sites lie within the Santa Clara River Valley
22 Groundwater Basin, East Subbasin, which includes two aquifers: the Alluvial aquifer and
23 the Saugus Formation. (LV 10813; MV 6043.) The two Projects will obtain potable water
24 from the Alluvial aquifer via Valencia Water Company, a local retail water purveyor.
25 Specifically, the Projects, as part of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, are slated to use
26 water that Newhall has historically used for agricultural irrigation. (LV 10938; MV 6171.)
27 The 2011 EIRs explain that Newhall has rights to 7,038 acre feet per year (afy) of Alluvial
28 groundwater, which will be used for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area. (LV 10819,
29 10938; MV 6049, 6171.) Landmark Village would use approximately 608 afy of that
30 amount, and Mission Village would use approximately 1,676 afy. (LV 10938; MV 6172.)

31 **b. There are substantially changed circumstances and new information**
32 **concerning the Projects’ effects on water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley**
33 **since the 2011 EIRs were certified.**

34 Commenters presented evidence that after the 2011 Landmark and Mission EIRs
35 were certified, the region in which the Projects are to be built has suffered severe drought

1 conditions, and climate change has led to hotter and drier conditions exacerbating the
2 effects of drought. This evidence strongly suggests that future conditions will be markedly
3 different from historical patterns of wet and dry years, and will affect water supply in
4 ways not previously accounted for.

5 California entered a prolonged period of drought in 2011. (SR 7056.)¹¹ This has been
6 called a “drought of extreme proportions.” (SR 7022.) The cumulative precipitation
7 between 2011 and 2014 was at a record low. (*Ibid.*) And as of June 2016 (before the
8 temperature of that year had been measured), 2014 and 2015 were the two hottest years
9 on record. (*Ibid.*) These high temperatures exacerbate drought conditions. (*Ibid.*) This
10 period of extreme drought affected the Santa Clarita Valley specifically. (SR 3972; 33272.)

11 One indicator of the severity of this drought is the snowpack deficit it caused. A
12 study published in 2016 concluded this drought is the worst in California’s recorded
13 history in terms of the deficit in snowpack, a crucial source of freshwater for the state. (SR
14 7047.) Comparing 65 years of records, the study found 2015 unique: it was the driest year
15 on record, to an extent that would not be expected to occur more than once in 600 years.
16 (SR 7048.) That dry snow year compounded the effects of several prior years of drought.
17 (SR 7048-49.) The study found that in the historical record, past deficits were erased
18 within one year for all years except one. (*Ibid.*) By contrast, this deficit was so severe that
19 the recovery was expected to take more than four years, or even longer if any of those
20 future years were drier than normal. (SR 7049-50.)

21 Evidence shows a link between climate change effects, including both warming and
22 drying of the climate, and intensifying drought conditions—and resulting imbalances
23 between water supply and demand. (SR 7056.)

24 The consequences of the multi-year drought have been felt in the local area of
25 Landmark and Mission. Monitoring of wells near the Whittaker Bermite facility, about
26 five miles from the Project Sites (LV 4672; MV 6047) has shown a decline in water levels
27 of more than 70 feet from 2006 to the beginning of 2016. (SR 43426.) Wells relied on by
28 the Santa Clarita Valley’s retail water purveyors have also shown declines, and an inability
29 to meet target production volumes. According to a 2014 study by GSI Water Solutions,
30 Inc., several retail water wells in the Alluvial aquifer experienced difficulty in achieving
31 target volumes in 2014, and some were unable to produce at all. (SR 3973; 33273.)

32
33
34
35
¹¹ Some evidence cited herein was submitted as attachments to letters commenting
on both Landmark and Mission Projects. (See, e.g., SR 3672, 3704; 32971, 33003.) Some
attachments were included in the administrative record only once, for the Landmark
Project. Therefore, only a Landmark Project citation is available for these documents.

1 **c. *Changed circumstances and new information concerning the Projects’***
2 ***effects on water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley since the 2011 EIRs were***
3 ***certified are substantial enough that a supplemental EIR was required.***

4 The evidence discussed above constitutes new information that did not exist when
5 the prior 2011 EIRs for Landmark and Mission were certified, and demonstrates that
6 substantial changes have occurred in the circumstances under which the Projects are
7 being undertaken. (§ 21166(b), (c); Guidelines § 15162(a)(2), (3).) This new information
8 is substantially important because it shows the Projects will potentially have significant
9 effects on water supply, which the prior 2011 EIRs did not address. (Guidelines
10 § 15162(a)(3)(A).) It also demonstrates that circumstances have changed substantially,
11 requiring major revisions of the 2011 EIRs (in the form of a supplemental EIR) to discuss
12 previously unaddressed significant environmental effects. (Guidelines § 15162(a)(2).)

13 Among the significance thresholds selected for water supply impacts in the 2011
14 EIRs is that each Project would have a significant impact on water resources if it would
15 “[s]ubstantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater
16 recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local
17 groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop
18 to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits
19 have been granted).” (SR 4734; 6156-57.) Although the County previously concluded that
20 water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley are sufficient to serve the Landmark and
21 Mission Projects and existing and planned uses in the Santa Clarita Valley (LV 10819;
22 MV 6049), the evidence presented above strongly indicates that local water supplies are
23 not sufficient for other existing uses in the area, and the Projects will draw on already
24 scarce water resources. According to the 2011 EIRs, the potable water demands of the
25 Landmark and Mission Projects would be met through the use of local groundwater. (LV
26 4708; MV 6107.) But new information calls into question the supplies of groundwater for
27 the area as previously analyzed, indicating that the Projects may substantially deplete
28 groundwater supplies that otherwise would support existing uses, thereby causing a
29 significant impact the 2011 EIRs did not previously discuss.

30 One primary climate change effect is increased temperatures. Projected temperatures
31 for the Upper Santa Clara River region follow the global trend of increasing temperatures
32 between the present day and the end of this century. (SR 51925.) As explained above,
33 temperature increases exacerbate drought. (SR 7022.) Accordingly, conditions of drought
34 and recovery from past history cannot be expected to continue in the future.

35 New climate conditions, including exacerbated drought, have significant effects on

1 water supply, including sources that supply water to the Santa Clarita Valley. As
2 explained in the 2015 Santa Clarita Valley Urban Water Management Plan (**2015**
3 **UWMP**), drier conditions resulting from climate change can affect the process of
4 recharge to the region’s groundwater basins. (SR 50087.)

5 Additionally, the information presented above about Sierra Nevada snowpack
6 deficits is relevant new information because the water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley
7 relies on more than local sources of water. First, part of the Valley’s water supply comes
8 from imported water from the State Water Project (**SWP**), which depends on snowpack.
9 (SR 50205, 51301, 51327.) One potential impact of climate change is reduction in those
10 imports, with forecasts showing overall lower SWP deliveries under all types of water
11 year, and as much as a 20 percent decrease in deliveries in dry years. (SR 51305.) Such a
12 reduction would lead to greater reliance on local groundwater to meet the area’s water
13 needs, and therefore increased groundwater production. (SR 51301-02.) Second, when
14 snowpack is in deficit, water must come from other sources, including groundwater,
15 leading to deficits in that water source as well. (SR 7051, 7056.)

16 Future deficits in the water supply from drought will be coupled with higher
17 demands on water. Water use is projected to increase over the life of the Projects. (SR
18 7062, 7063). That will further tax the water supply, as California “[w]ater use in 2012 was
19 already proven unsustainable given the ongoing multi-year drought.” (SR 7063.)

20 The new information set forth above demonstrates that water supply for the Santa
21 Clarita Valley will be more precarious in the future than in the past. The 2011 EIRs
22 concluded that the Landmark and Mission Projects would cause no significant impacts to
23 water supply, but did so by assuming that the water supply was sufficient for existing and
24 planned uses. (LV 10819; MV 6049.) That analysis is called into question by the new
25 information and evidence that the climatic circumstances under which the Projects are
26 being undertaken have changed substantially. Because hotter and drier climate will
27 reduce the water available for area land uses, Landmark and Mission will “[s]ubstantially
28 deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge” by
29 using water that otherwise would be available for existing uses. (SR 4734; 6156-57.)

30 A useful comparison can be made with *Moss v County of Humboldt, supra*, 162
31 Cal.App.4th 1041. In that case, during a subdivision project’s initial environmental
32 review, a water assessment evaluation concluded that the creek from which water was
33 supplied to a city downstream from the project could accommodate an increase of
34 approximately 74 percent over the city’s current number of water users, and the project
35 would not substantially reduce the water available for the city, although it would slightly

1 reduce the water in the creek. (*Id.* at p. 1059.) The County approved the project and
2 adopted an MND. (*Id.* at p. 1046.) While litigation was pending, the applicant’s tentative
3 tract map expired, and he applied for a new tract map several years later. (*Id.* at pp. 1046-
4 47.) County staff determined an EIR would be required, and the applicant appealed that
5 decision. (*Id.* at p. 1047.) The downstream city’s water commissioner submitted data
6 demonstrating that the city’s use of creek water had increased by 74 percent, and now was
7 at the creek’s maximum capacity. (*Id.* at pp. 1059-60.) The court concluded this was new
8 evidence not available when the project was previously reviewed, and was substantial
9 evidence showing the project—even though it would only slightly increase water demand
10 —could cause significant effects on water supply to the downstream city, justifying the
11 County’s finding that supplemental environmental review was required. (*Id.* at p. 1060.)

12 Similarly here, the original analytical assumption was that sufficient water supplies
13 exist to reliably serve current and planned land uses in the Santa Clarita Valley. The 2011
14 EIRs found that the local groundwater basin is sustainable and that adequate water supply
15 is available for the Landmark and Mission Projects from the Alluvial aquifer. (LV 4681,
16 4734; MV 6062, 6157.) New information now shows that in the face of climate change,
17 droughts have already become, and are projected to become, more severe. As a result, an
18 unprecedented snowpack deficit has already occurred (SR 7048), and with a trend toward
19 higher temperatures, deficits can be expected in the future, in turn causing deficits in
20 groundwater supplies. Groundwater supplies in the Valley are declining (SR 43315), and
21 pumping fell below target levels in 2013-2014. (SR 3973; 33273.) Groundwater is likely to
22 be less available in the future as climate-change effects intensify. This information shows
23 that the area’s groundwater resources are significantly closer to their sustainable capacity
24 than previously concluded, and will be more stressed in the coming decades, so that the
25 Landmark and Mission Projects’ draw of groundwater supplies potentially will cause
26 significant effects on water supply for other uses in the Valley. The County therefore
27 should have undertaken supplemental environmental review of water supply impacts to
28 make the prior EIRs adequate in light of new information and changed circumstances.

29 ***d. The record does not contain substantial evidence supporting the County’s***
30 ***decision not to undertake supplemental water supply analysis.***

31 Despite the evidence of changed circumstances and new information regarding
32 climate-change effects on water sources, the County declined to undertake supplemental
33 analysis of water supply. It asserted that no substantial changes have occurred in the
34 circumstances under which the Projects are undertaken, and that neither the property on
35 which the Projects are to be built nor the governing regulatory structure has changed

1 since the 2011 EIRs were approved. (SR 1773; 21066.) It further asserted that no new
2 information has become available that meets the standards of Guidelines §15126(a)(3).
3 (SR 1773-74; 31066.) That determination should be upheld if it is supported by
4 substantial evidence. (*San Mateo Gardens, supra*, 1 Cal.5th at p. 953.) But it is not.

5 First, the prior analysis of water supply did not sufficiently address the potential
6 water supply impacts of the Projects as a result of climate change, with resulting higher
7 temperatures and worsening drought conditions.

8 As mentioned above, the Landmark and Mission Projects contemplate obtaining all
9 potable water supplies from the Alluvial aquifer. (LV 4370; MV 6043.) The 2011 EIRs'
10 analysis recognized the need to maintain the sustainability of groundwater to meet
11 demand on a renewable basis. (LV 4690; MV 6074.) The water supply analysis relied on a
12 "groundwater operating plan" developed by Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) and the
13 local retail purveyors. (LV 10842, 4686-87; MV 6070, 6072-73.) The groundwater
14 operating plan's purpose is to meet water requirements for municipal, agricultural, and
15 other uses while maintaining the groundwater basin in a sustainable condition, based on
16 the assumption that there can be greater pumping in dry years and lower pumping in wet
17 years to allow for groundwater recharge. (*Ibid.*) The plan is quantified as ranges of water
18 volumes that can be pumped without causing detrimental effects to groundwater and
19 surface water resources, as set forth in a table in each EIR. (LV 4687; MV 6072-73.) The
20 EIRs' analysis assumes the groundwater operating plan will maintain the aquifers in a
21 sustainable condition, but commenters' evidence calls that that assumption into question.

22 With respect to the Alluvial aquifer, the water supply analysis concluded pumping
23 from the aquifer continued to be sustainable, with no symptoms of water-level-related
24 overdraft. (LV 4695; MV 6078.) The analysis noted that past dry-period declines had been
25 followed by wet-period recoveries, with recharge of aquifer storage space. (*Ibid.*) But the
26 2014 study by GSI Water Solutions showed that assumptions about amounts that could
27 be pumped from the Alluvial aquifer were not borne out in practice during a multi-year
28 drought. (SR 3972-76; 33722-76.) The study concluded target pumping volumes from the
29 aquifer would not be achievable in continued drought conditions, with an estimated total
30 shortfall for 33 wells owned by retail water purveyors of 5,600 to 10,300 afy compared to
31 the pumping targets in the groundwater operating plan. (SR 3974, 3976; 33274, 33276.)

32 With respect to the Saugus Formation, the groundwater operating plan relies on the
33 assumption that significantly higher pumping would be allowed from that aquifer during
34 dry years (when SWP imports decline and Alluvial pumping is curtailed), but that after
35 three consecutive dry years, pumping would return to the lowest, normal-year amounts,

1 allowing natural recharge processes to enable groundwater levels and storage volumes to
2 recover. (LV 4688; MV 6073-74.) But it is no longer reasonable to assume droughts will
3 end quickly enough to allow for reduced pumping from the Saugus Formation after three
4 years. The most recent drought lasted at least five years, and was extreme by historical
5 standards. (SR 7022.) Because temperatures are increasing, and higher temperatures
6 exacerbate the effect of drought (*ibid.*), the use of historical patterns of wet and dry years
7 to project future water supplies is questionable, and requires further analysis.

8 Because new information raises questions about assumptions on which the original
9 water supply analysis relied, the County should have done supplemental analysis. (See
10 *Security Environmental Systems, Inc. v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist.* (1991)
11 229 Cal.App.3d 110, 124 [new information led air quality district to be concerned about
12 potentially higher health risks from hazardous waste incinerator emissions than original
13 analysis assumed]; *Moss v. County of Humboldt, supra*, 162 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1060-61.)

14 Another problem with the water supply analysis in the 2011 EIRs is that studies used
15 there included modeling of groundwater pumping and recharge based on historical
16 rainfall records. (LV 2390.) Basing models on historical rainfall is questionable given new
17 evidence of the accelerating effects of climate change on rainfall. (See, e.g., SR 7048.) The
18 County acknowledged in 2011 that water supply studies up to then did not fully account
19 for climate change, but said it was relying on the best information available at the time. It
20 recognized future studies might provide new information about predicted changes in the
21 strengths of future droughts, which could be incorporated to test the influence of climate
22 change on the groundwater system. (LV 2391.) Nevertheless, the County declined to
23 conduct further analysis of potential climate-change effects on water supplies at that time,
24 saying it would be speculative to quantify the effects of climate changes on the SWP
25 system and local groundwater basin. (LV 2394.) In preparing the Recirculated Analysis,
26 the County should have re-analyzed water supply impacts without relying on historical
27 water trends, and accounting for climatic changes and their effects on water resources.

28 The 2011 EIRs' analysis of water supply also relies on the fact that the Landmark and
29 Mission Projects' potable water will come from existing groundwater being converted
30 from agricultural use. The EIRs assert that because the water is already used to support
31 agricultural uses, no net increase in groundwater use will occur, and there will be no
32 resulting significant adverse effects resulting from use of the water. (LV 4737; MV 6169.)
33 This reasoning ignores the fact that the effect of increased droughts on groundwater in
34 the Santa Clarita Valley is an aquifer-wide issue. If drought reduces the amount of
35 available groundwater to the extent that there is not enough water for other uses in the

1 area, then the Projects’ use of groundwater will impact water supply for those other uses.
2 The fact that Newhall has used some groundwater for agricultural uses in the past and
3 present does not mean the Projects will have no impact on overall water supply in the
4 future. If Newhall were to continue to use the water for agricultural purposes after
5 increased drought driven by climate change led to reduced groundwater supplies, that use
6 would also affect water supply for other uses, and Newhall’s right to that agricultural
7 water might very well be curtailed. (See SR 7056 [noting that in June 2015, in response to
8 the severe drought since 2011, the State Water Board mandated cuts to senior agricultural
9 water rights holders].) Thus, although the water slated for the Projects currently is being
10 used for another purpose, there is an obligation to analyze impacts on water supply from
11 the Projects resulting from more extreme droughts driven by climate change.

12 Furthermore, in rejecting commenters’ calls for supplemental water supply analysis,
13 the County declared that the Santa Clarita Valley was no longer in an extreme drought.
14 (SR 2309; 31609.) Although it is true that the drought status of the Valley was
15 downgraded after heavy rainfall in the winter of 2016-2017, the effects of drought on
16 water supply outlast the drought period itself. For example, it is estimated that it will take
17 several years to recover from the deficit in snowpack from 2015. (SR 7049.)

18 Moreover, as discussed above, the strong potential for more frequent, more extreme,
19 and longer-lasting drought periods as a result of climate change means the County can no
20 longer rely on historical patterns of drought and wetter periods to conclude water supply
21 will be reliable. (SR 50087 [noting drought events could increase in intensity, impacting
22 regional groundwater recharge].) New information shows the water supply is not as
23 reliable as assumed in the 2011 EIRs because of climate change, raising concerns about
24 Santa Clarita Valley’s water supply. Because the Landmark and Mission Projects are new
25 developments that will draw on water that otherwise could be available for existing uses,
26 they will potentially exacerbate water shortages, and thus have potentially significant
27 impacts. The County should have conducted supplemental analysis to “make the previous
28 EIR[s] adequate for the project[s]” given the new information and changed circumstances
29 that has come to light. (Guidelines § 15163(a)(2).)

30 Failing to conduct supplemental environmental review despite the changed
31 circumstances and presence of new information violates CEQA and impedes the EIR’s
32 function as an informational document. (*Mira Monte Homeowners Ass’n v. County of*
33 *Ventura* (1985) 165 Cal.App.3d 357, 364-65.) Thus, the County’s failure to include a
34 revised water supply analysis in a supplemental EIR “deprived the public . . . of
35 meaningful participation regarding the issue of” water supply. (*Id.* at p. 365.)

1 **IV. The County violated Water Code § 10910 by failing to include a**
2 **new Water Supply Assessment in the Recirculated Analysis.**

3 SB 610, one of the “show me the water” laws passed in 2001, was enacted to
4 “strengthen the process pursuant to which local agencies determine the adequacy of
5 existing and planned future water supplies to meet existing and planned future demands
6 on those water supplies.” (Sen. Bill No. 610 (2001-2002 Reg. Sess.) § 1(b).)

7 SB 610 generally requires a Water Supply Assessment (**WSA**) to be prepared for a
8 development that will contain more than 500 dwelling units, more than 500,000 square
9 feet of retail space, or commercial space employing more than 1,000 people. (Water Code,
10 §§ 10910, 10912(a).) A city or county, at the time it undertakes CEQA review of such a
11 development, must request a WSA from the “public water system” that will provide water
12 to the project. (Water Code, § 10910(c).) The purpose of the WSA is to ensure sufficient
13 water will be available for the project, and also to determine whether the public water
14 system’s supplies will be adequate to meet its overall projected water demand. (Water
15 Code, § 10910(c)(3).) CEQA expressly requires that a city or county comply with SB 610
16 when it has determined a project is subject to CEQA. (§ 21151.9.) The public water
17 system that will supply water for the Landmark and Mission Projects was, at the time the
18 Recirculated Analysis was approved, Valencia Water Company (**VWC**).¹² In 2010 VWC
19 prepared WSAs for Landmark and Mission (LV 8004-36; MV 25073-103.) The 2011 EIRs’
20 water supply analysis for the two Projects relied on those WSAs.

21 Three provisions in SB 610 required the County to require new, updated WSAs
22 before certifying that the Recirculated Analysis in combination with the 2011 EIRs
23 constituted adequate and complete EIRs for both Projects.

24 The first requires the County, at the time it determines what form of CEQA
25 document to prepare, to request the appropriate public water system to prepare a WSA.
26 (Water Code § 10910(c)(1).) After the courts ordered the County to set aside portions of
27 the EIRs for the two Projects, the County decided to proceed by preparing the
28 Recirculated Analysis, amending the 2011 EIRs. This decision triggered the requirement
29 in Water Code § 10910(c)(1) that the County request new WSAs for the two Projects.

30 Second, “[t]he city or county shall include the water supply assessment provided
31 pursuant to Section 10910 . . . in *any* environmental document prepared for the project
32 pursuant to [CEQA].” (Water Code § 10911(b) [emphasis added].) *Vineyard, supra*, 40
33

34 ¹² In early 2018 Valencia Water Company merged into a valley-wide entity called
35 SCV Water, composed of the water retailers in the Santa Clarita Valley plus the former
 CLWA, the primary mission of which was to provide SWP water to local water retailers.

1 Cal.4th 412, refers to the “plans and estimates that Water Code section 10910 mandates
2 for future water supplies at the time of *any* approval subject to CEQA.” (*Id.* at p. 434.)
3 Neither the Water Code nor our Supreme Court’s interpretation of it limits the WSA
4 requirement to the initial EIR; a WSA is required for a supplemental EIR or when
5 substantial portions of an EIR are recirculated.

6 Third, SB 610 requires a new WSA to be prepared when changes in circumstances
7 substantially affect the water agency’s ability to provide sufficient water supply, or
8 significant new information becomes available that was not known and could not have
9 been know at the time the assessment was prepared. (Water Code § 10910(h)(2), (3).)

10 The Recirculated Analysis for the Landmark and Mission Projects should have
11 included a new Water Supply Analysis, as required by Water Code § 10910, because of
12 the new information and changed circumstances relating to the Projects’ effects on water
13 supply in the Santa Clarita Valley, as described above in section III.C.2. That section lays
14 out evidence showing the water table in aquifers underlying the Santa Clarita Valley
15 declined substantially during the multi-year drought, and some wells were unable to meet
16 their target production volumes. The evidence also shows that more-extreme drought
17 conditions can be expected in the future because of the effects of climate change: the
18 Santa Clarita Valley will get increasingly hotter and drier.

19 The SB 610 WSAs included with the 2011 Landmark EIR and the 2011 Mission EIR
20 were prepared in January 2010 (LV 8005; MV 25073) by VWC, wholly owned at that time
21 by Newhall. The 2010 WSAs were based in part on the 2005 Urban Water Management
22 Plan (UWMP) for the Santa Clarita Valley. That UWMP has been superseded by
23 UWMPs in 2010 and 2015. The 2015 UWMP lists several events that affect the Valley’s
24 water supply, and thus affect the Projects’ effects on that water supply:

- 25 • SB X7-7, the Water Conservation Act of 2009, signed into law in November 2009,
26 which sets a target of 20 percent reduction in per capita water use statewide by
27 2020, and requires retail water suppliers like VWC to comply with water-
28 conservation requirements to be eligible for state water grants (SR 50074);
- 29 • several changes to the Water Code, which require modifications in water planning
30 generally (SR 50074-75); and
- 31 • the increased presence of perchlorate in well water in the Santa Clarita Valley,
32 initially found via testing in August 2010, and requiring a significant well to be
33 taken out of production (SR 50160).

34 The 2005 UWMP barely mentions climate change. The 2015 UWMP contains, in
35 Appendix I (SR 51284-335), drawn from the 2014 Upper Santa Clara River Integrated

1 Regional Water Management Plan, a 53-page discussion of the effects of climate change
2 on water supply. It contains substantial information on how climate change is likely to
3 affect water supply, including temperature increases of up to 8 degrees (SR 51294), and
4 precipitation declining by up to 22 percent. (SR 51296.) In a table listing climate-change
5 vulnerabilities, the report states climate change may well affect the availability of
6 groundwater in the Santa Clarita Valley:

7 Changes in local hydrology could affect natural recharge to the local
8 groundwater aquifers and the quantity of groundwater that could be pumped
9 sustainably over the long-term. Decreased inflow from runoff, increased
10 evaporative losses, warmer and shorter winter seasons can alter natural recharge
11 of groundwater. In addition, additional reductions in the SWP imported water
12 imposed by climate change would lead to more reliance on groundwater. (SR
13 51297.)

14 The issue here is not so much whether sufficient water will be available for Landmark
15 Village, Mission Village, and Newhall's other projects. Newhall has rigged the system to
16 ensure its projects will be given priority in water allocation by signing an agreement with
17 VWC, then its wholly owned subsidiary, before selling the water company to CLWA,
18 under which agreement VWC agreed to lock in Newhall's water, and give priority to
19 Newhall, regardless of competing uses:

20 The Company agrees that it: (i) shall never use Newhall's 7,038 ac of
21 groundwater as a basis for issuing water supply assessments, water supply
22 verifications, or will serve letters for water service, permanent or temporary,
23 other than for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, without the written consent of
24 Newhall; (ii) shall never contend, or authorize or encourage any other person or
25 entity to contend, that the groundwater is not available to serve elements of the
26 Newhall Ranch Specific Plan due to the need to use such supplies to support the
27 water needs of other existing or future water users (SR 42669-70.)

28 The above-cited agreement may be contrary to law. Newhall's rights to pump
29 groundwater for agriculture are overlying rights, akin to riparian rights, and appurtenant
30 to the land. (*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Sons* (1964) 224
31 Cal.App.2d 715, 725.) By contrast, the public use of groundwater is classified as an
32 appropriative use. (*San Bernardino v. Riverside* (1921) 186 Cal. 7, 25.) The rights of
33 overlying users in the groundwater basin are superior to appropriators; and the rights of
34 prior appropriators in the basin are superior to VWC's. (*City of Barstow v. Mojave Water
35 Agency* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 1224, 1241.) VWC therefore has no legal right to guarantee that
Newhall may use for municipal purposes the groundwater it is currently pumping for its
own agricultural use.

The reason a new WSA is required is to allow the County to determine the effect of

1 approving the Projects on availability of water for other Santa Clarita Valley uses. “The
2 ultimate question under CEQA . . . is not whether an EIR establishes a likely source of
3 water, but whether it adequately addresses the reasonably foreseeable *impacts* of
4 supplying water to the project.” (*Vineyard, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 434.)

5 The County’s failure to require new WSAs when it prepared and circulated the
6 Recirculated Analysis and then certified that the Recirculated Analysis in combination
7 with the 2011 EIRs constituted adequate and complete EIRs for both Projects, violated
8 both CEQA (§ 21168.5) and the Water Code (§§ 10910(c), 10911(b)). This failure was a
9 failure to proceed in the manner required by law, reviewed de novo by this court.
10 (*Vineyard, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 435 [correct procedures are evaluated de novo].)


11 Though the courts upheld the water supply analysis in the 2011 EIRs, SB 610 and
12 CEQA required the County to prepare new Water Supply Assessments as part of the
13 process of recirculating portions of the EIRs. The County failed to comply with this
14 procedural requirement of CEQA, and as a result, the Court should order the
15 Recirculated Analysis for each Project set aside until corrected to comply with CEQA.
16

17 **V. Conclusion**

18 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the petition for a writ of mandate,
19 setting aside the County’s certification of the Recirculated Analysis in combination with
20 the 2011 EIRs, as well as the land-use approvals, for both the Landmark Project and the
21 Mission Project, and ordering the County to prepare EIRs that comply with CEQA.
22

23 Dated: May 24, 2018

24 Respectfully Submitted,
25 ADVOCATES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
26 Counsel for Petitioners

27 By 
28 _____
29 Dean Wallraff
30
31
32
33
34
35

Proof of Service

I, Benita Wallraff, declare:

I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is 10211 Sunland Blvd., Shadow Hills, CA 91040, which is located in the county where the service described below occurred.

On May 24, 2018, I served the following document:


Petitioners' Opening Brief

by **Electronic Mail** transmission from my electronic service address, which is bw@aenv.org, to the following counsel at the electronic service addresses listed below. The transmission occurred without error.

<p>Elaine M. Lemke Assistant County Counsel 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012-2713 elemke@counsel.lacounty.gov</p> <p>Attorney for Respondent, County of Los Angeles</p>	<p>Mark J. Dillon David P. Hubbard Gatzke Dillon & Balance LLP 2762 Gateway Road Carlsbad, California 92009 mdillon@gdandb.com dhubbard@gdandb.com</p> <p>Arthur G. Scotland Nielsen Merksamer Parinello Gross & Leone, LLP 1415 L Street, Suite 1200 Sacramento, CA 95418 ascotland@nmgovlaw.com</p> <p>James L. Arnone Benjamin Hanelin Latham & Watkins LLP 355 S. Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560 james.arnone@lwcom benjamin.hanelin@lw.com</p> <p>Attorneys for Real Party in Interest, Newhall Land and Farming Company, Inc.</p>
---	--

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: May 24, 2018

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B Wallraff", written over a light gray rectangular background.

Benita Wallraff