

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER**

**MINUTE ORDER**

DATE: 08/20/2014

TIME: 02:53:00 PM

DEPT: CX101

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Gail A. Andler

CLERK: Mary White

REPORTER/ERM: None

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT:

CASE NO: **30-2013-00635125-CU-WM-CX** CASE INIT DATE: 02/28/2013

CASE TITLE: **Delaware Tetra Technologies, Inc. vs. County of San Bernardino**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited      CASE TYPE: Writ of Mandate

---

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 72011935

**EVENT TYPE:** Chambers Work

---

**APPEARANCES**

---

Related cases #2013-00635125 Delaware Tetra Technologies Inc vs County of San Bernardino, 2013-00633936 Center for Biological Diversity vs County of San Bernardino, 2012-00594355 Delaware Tetra Technologies Inc vs Santa Margarita Water District, 2012-00612947 Center for Biological Diversity vs County of San Bernardino, 2012-00576715 Delaware Technologies Inc vs Santa Margarita Water District

There are no appearances by any party.

See attached Statement of Decision.

Clerk to give notice to County of San Bernardino and County of San Bernardino to give notice to all other parties.

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING: I certify I am not a party to this cause, over age 18, and a copy of this document was mailed first class postage, prepaid in a sealed envelope addressed as shown, on 20-AUG- 2014, at Santa Ana, California. ALAN CARLSON /EXECUTIVE OFFICER & CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, BY: M.WHITE deputy.

DOWNEY BRAND LLP  
STEVEN P SAXTON  
CHRISTIAN L MARSH  
ARIELLO O HARRIS  
REBECCA A SMITH  
333 BUSH STREET, STE 1400

CASE TITLE: Delaware Tetra Technologies, Inc. vs.  
County of San Bernardino

CASE  
**30-2013-00635125-CU-WM-CXC**

NO:

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-2857

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE – CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER

DELAWARE TETRA  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a  
Delaware Corporation  
Petitioner/Plaintiff,

vs.

COUNTY OF SAN  
BERNARDINO; COUNTY OF  
SAN BERNARDINO BOARD OF  
SUPERVISOR,  
Respondent/Defendants.

---

SANTA MARGARITA WATER  
DISTRICT; CADIZ, INC; FENNER  
VALLEY MUTUAL WATER  
COMPANY

---

Real Parties in Interest

Case No. 30-2013-00635125 (CEQA)

Assigned for all Purposes to the  
Honorable Gail A. Andler

STATEMENT OF DECISION (TETRA  
GMMMP)

1 **STATEMENT OF DECISION**

2  
3 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

4  
5 The instant case is one of six separate cases filed challenging separate administrative decisions of the County  
6 and SMWD related to the Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery and Storage Project (Project).

7 Tetra filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive  
8 Relief (Petition) on October 30, 2012, challenging the County's October 2012 approvals related to  
9 the Cadiz Valley Water Conservation, Recovery and Storage Project (Project), including the  
10 County's approvals as a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),  
11 and as the entity responsible for implementing its own Desert Groundwater Management Ordinance  
12 (Ordinance). Tetra filed an Amended Petition on December 13, 2012.  
13  
14  
15

16 **II. FINDINGS**

17 Upon due consideration of the Administrative Record, the trial briefs of the parties, and the  
18 oral arguments of counsel, the Court finds as follows:

19 **A. Factual Background**

20 The County's Ordinance was designed to "encourage reasonable and beneficial water use,"  
21 and allows groundwater extractions with a County-issued permit or "as otherwise excluded from the  
22 application of [the Ordinance]." (Ord. §33.06554(a)). The Ordinance "shall not apply" to any well  
23 operator where the operator has executed an enforceable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the  
24 County and "developed and instituted a County-approved groundwater management, monitoring and  
25 mitigation plan [GMMMP] associated with its extraction of water that is consistent with guidelines  
26 developed by the County." (Ord. §33.06552(b)). Except for the requirement that the GMMMP be  
27  
28

1 consistent with County-issued guidelines, the Ordinance does not state what procedures or criteria the  
2 County must apply in approving a GMMMP for an exclusion. *Id.*

3 The Project is a public-private partnership designed to manage and use water from the aquifer  
4 system underlying Cadiz's property in California's eastern Mojave Desert. Under current natural hydro-  
5 geologic conditions, surface and groundwater flow from all four of the watersheds near the proposed Project  
6 and drain into the Bristol and Cadiz Dry Lakes, mix with the brine water, and evaporate. The Project  
7 proposes using wells to intercept and capture the groundwater before it reaches the highly saline brine.  
8 Once captured, the groundwater would then be available to southern California users through water  
9 providers like SMWD, among others. SMWD served as the lead agency for CEQA review of the Project,  
10 pursuant to a 2011 Memorandum of Understanding (2011 MOU) between the County and SMWD. See  
11 Cal. Code Regs., title 14, State CEQA Guidelines (Guidelines) §15051(d). The 2011 MOU also provided  
12 that the Project would be subject to the County's discretionary review, under the Ordinance and as a  
13 responsible agency, of the Project's groundwater pumping. (2011 MOU §§2, 7).

14 In December 2011, SMWD released a Draft EIR for the Project. The Draft EIR included a  
15 draft of the GMMMP and noted that, consistent with CEQA, the GMMMP would ultimately be  
16 submitted to the County for its review and approval under the Ordinance. SMWD consulted with the  
17 County regarding its duties as a responsible agency regarding the content of the GMMMP.

18 On May 1, 2012, the County Board of Supervisors approved an MOU (2012 MOU) by and among  
19 SMWD, Cadiz, and the County. The 2012 MOU contained a framework for development of the GMMMP  
20 and for the County's enforcement of the GMMMP if that document were to be adopted. . The 2012 MOU  
21 provided that if and when the GMMMP was approved by the County, it would ensure that the measures in  
22 the GMMMP were enforced. (2012 MOU Recital F and §§4(a), 7).

1 The SMWD Board of Directors certified a Final EIR for the Project in July 2012, which included an  
2 Updated GMMMP. In August 2012, SMWD submitted the GMMMP to the County for its consideration  
3 under the Ordinance. On October 1, 2012, the County Board of Supervisors held a special meeting and  
4 voted to approve the GMMMP and grant an exclusion from the Ordinance.  
5  
6

7 **B. Discussion**

8 **1. First Cause of Action: The County Did Not Abdicate its Role as Lead**  
9 **Agency; SMWD Properly Acted as Lead Agency**

10 Tetra alleged that CEQA required the County to act as the lead agency in reviewing the  
11 Project and approving the EIR. This claim should have been and was raised by Tetra in the earlier  
12 related action challenging the EIR, *Delaware Tetra Technologies, Inc. v. Santa Margarita Water*  
13 *District*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2012-00576715. CEQA claims that should  
14 have been brought in an earlier action are barred by the statute of limitations in future actions. Pub.  
15 Resources Code, §§21167(c), (e); *Committee for Green Foothills v. Santa Clara County Board of*  
16 *Supervisors* (2010) 48 Cal.4th 32, 51-52, 54-57; *Citizens for a Megaplex-Free Alameda*, 149  
17 Cal.App.4th at 109-110.  
18  
19

20 Even if the First Cause of Action were properly before the Court, the Court finds that, while it  
21 has concerns regarding the lead agency designation, it is not persuaded that those concerns constitute  
22 a CEQA violation under existing law. Based on the applicable law, the Court is unable to conclude  
23 that the failure to designate the County as Lead Agency, without more, constitutes a CEQA violation  
24 where the SMWD may be considered to have a substantial claim to be the lead agency. *PCL*, 83  
25 Cal.App.4th at 904-907; Guidelines §15051(a)&(d); Pub. Resources Code, §21067; Gov. Code,  
26  
27  
28

1 §§53091(d)–(e), 53096; see *Central Delta Water Agency v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*  
2 (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 245.

3 Further, Tetra has not shown that the County’s actions as a responsible agency amounted to  
4 prejudicial error under CEQA. *Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Line Construction Authority*  
5 (2013) 57 Cal.4th 439, 463; *Planning and Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources*  
6 (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 892, 907. Accordingly, the Court finds for Respondents and against Tetra on  
7 the First Cause of Action.  
8

9  
10 **2. Second Cause of Action: The County Did Not Fail to Include Feasible Mitigation**

11 Tetra argued that the Project will result in overdraft, and that the County as a responsible  
12 agency should have imposed additional mitigation measures in order to prevent impacts related to  
13 that overdraft. In particular, Tetra argued that in order to avoid impacts addressed in the EIR certified  
14 by SMWD (i.e. particulate emissions, impacts on springs, take of endangered species, saline  
15 intrusion and declines in third party wells, the County should have “strictly regulat[ed] Cadiz’s  
16 pumping until validating Cadiz’s proof of concept” or, alternately, imposed, as a feasible mitigation  
17 measure, that the Project “not defer all of its mitigation responsibilities until someone proves there is  
18 a problem attributable” to pumping.  
19

20 As a responsible agency, the County was entitled to defer to the environmental conclusions reached  
21 by the experts who prepared the EIR, even where other experts disagreed with the underlying data, analysis,  
22 or conclusions. *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 408-09  
23 (*Laurel Heights I*). This Court finds that the County met its legal obligations under CEQA when it agreed  
24 with the expert conclusions and determined that the Project would not result in overdraft and that the  
25 potential impacts of the Project could be mitigated to a less than significant impact, and declined to  
26 undertake subsequent environmental review or otherwise impose additional mitigation measures.  
27 Administrative Record 7:9-14; see also 13:3648-3653 (springs) 15:4868-69; 4884-4890; 4943 (air quality);  
28



1 15:4869-70; 4890-4903; 4943-4945 (biological resources); 15:4918-33; 4949 (saline intrusion and well  
2 drawdowns); 15:4910-4914 (subsidence).

3 Moreover, the County's decision not to challenge SMWD's approval of the Project and certification  
4 of the EIR (which Tetra did when it filed *Delaware Tetra Technologies Inc. v. SMWD, et al*, Orange County  
5 Superior Court Case No. 30-2012-00594355) confirms that it found the EIR to be adequate. See Pub.  
6 Resources Code, §§21166, 21167.1(b), 21167.3(b); Guidelines §15162; *City of Redding v. Shasta County*  
7 *Local Agency Formation Com.* (1989) 209 Cal.App.3d 1169, 1178. Accordingly, the only additional  
8 environmental review that the County could have conducted prior to approving the GMMMP would have  
9 been to prepare a supplemental or subsequent EIR under Public Resources Code, §21166. The Court finds  
10 that the circumstances under Section 21166 were not present. See 7:11-12. Tetra did not bring any claim  
11 under Section 21166, nor did it present any evidence to support such a claim. The record does not support a  
12 claim that future environmental review was required.

13  
14  
15 For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds for Respondents and against Tetra on the Second Cause  
16 of Action. To the extent that this Cause of Action may be read as an argument that the Project was required  
17 to comply with the Ordinance's definition of the term "overdraft," the Court incorporates its finding as to  
18 the Fourth Cause of Action below.

19  
20 **3. Third Cause of Action: The County Complied with the County Ordinance**

21 Regarding Tetra's Third Cause of Action, the Court finds that the Ordinance does not require  
22 that the County approve the GMMMP and 2012 MOU in any particular order, as the plain language  
23 of the Ordinance includes no such requirement. (Ord., §33.06552(b)). The Ordinance requires only  
24 that for a well to be excluded from the Ordinance, the well operator must enter into an enforceable  
25 MOU "and" develop and institute a County-approved GMMMP. (Ord. §33.06552(b)(2)); *MacIsaac*  
26 *v. Waste Management Collection & Recycling, Inc.* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 1076, 1083. The plain  
27  
28



1 language of the Ordinance does not contain a sequencing requirement, and the Court cannot impose  
2 this requirement based on policy justifications not appearing in the language itself. *In re Cabrera*  
3 (2013) 55 Cal.4th at 692-93; see also *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization* (1998)  
4 19 Cal.4th 1, 22.

5         The Court further finds that the timing of the 2012 MOU and GMMMP approvals does not  
6 impair the enforceability of those documents, as the County conditioned the 2012 MOU's  
7 effectiveness on the possibility that it would later approve a GMMMP, and specifically provided for  
8 the enforceability of both documents if approved. (2012 MOU §§3, 4, 7 & 25). The 2012 MOU  
9 therefore satisfied the Ordinance's only requirement. (Ord. §33.06552(b) (2)); see Civ. Code §1438;  
10 *L.A. Athletic Club v. Bd. of Harbor Comrs. of L.A.* (1933) 130 Cal.App. 376, 387; *Frankel v. Bd. of*  
11 *Dental Examiners* (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 534, 550. For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds for  
12 Respondents and against Tetra on the Third Cause of Action.

13  
14  
15  
16                 **4. Fourth Cause of Action: The GMMMP Complied with State  
Groundwater Law and the County Ordinance**

17         Tetra alleged that the Project violates the County Ordinance and the common law because it  
18 permits overdraft of the Project aquifers by improperly expanding the definitions of "overdraft" and  
19 "temporary surplus" under the County Ordinance and common law. The Court finds that the  
20 County's approval of the GMMMP under the Ordinance has not unlawfully expanded the concept of  
21 temporary surplus, and the record shows the GMMMP's use of the terms "overdraft," "safe yield"  
22 and "undesirable result" comport with California water law and the Ordinance.

23  
24         The County's Ordinance protects "the groundwater resources of San Bernardino County in order to  
25 ensure the health of that resource," and is intended to be consistent with the directive in California  
26 Constitution Article X, section 2 to maximize the beneficial use of water resources while preventing waste.  
27  
28

1 (Ord. §33.06551(c)). The Ordinance allows groundwater extractions to proceed under a County-issued  
2 permit or “as otherwise excluded from the application of [the Ordinance].” (Ord. §33.06554(a)). The  
3 Ordinance unambiguously states that it “shall not apply” to extractions when the well operator (1) enters  
4 into an enforceable MOU with the County; and (2) institute a County-approved GMMMP that is consistent  
5 with County Guidelines. (Ord. §33.06552(b)). Because the challenged Project proceeded under an  
6 exclusion from the Ordinance, the definitions of the Ordinance are not controlling. *Id.*; see 7:10, 12;  
7 15:4633-46; 772:9522-23. The County’s authority to grant an exclusion is within its discretion to  
8 tailor groundwater regulation to the unique needs of its jurisdiction and to particular aquifers. See  
9 *Baldwin v. County of Tehama* (1994) 31 Cal.App.4th 166, 182. Further, the Court is not persuaded by  
10 Tetra’s evidence that the GMMMP was inconsistent with the County’s Guidelines, and compliance with  
11 those Guidelines was the only requirement necessary for the GMMMP to be approved under the Ordinance.  
12 (Ord. §33.06552(b) (1)).

13  
14  
15 The Court finds that Tetra has failed to meet its burden to show either that the County failed to  
16 follow the law, or that its decision to approve the GMMMP was entirely lacking in evidentiary support.  
17 Tetra’s argument is based on the notion that the California Supreme Court’s decision in *City of Los Angeles*  
18 *v. City of San Fernando* established a rigid template for application of the terms “temporary surplus,”  
19 “overdraft” and “safe yield.” See *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando* (1975) 14 Cal.3d 199, 280  
20 (*San Fernando*). State law mandates that managing groundwater, unlike surface waters, is a matter for local  
21 control based on local conditions. *Baldwin v. County of Tehama, supra*, 31 Cal.App.4th at 182. The  
22 law does not insist on maintaining a particular groundwater level, nor does it require a specific method of  
23 basin management. See, e.g., *City of Lodi v. East Bay Mun. Utility Dist.* (1936) 7 Cal.2d 316, 340-41 (*City*  
24 *of Lodi*); *City of Santa Maria v. Adam* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 266, 288-89. Overdraft and the amount of  
25 surplus groundwater available for appropriation in a particular basin are determinations that must be  
26  
27  
28

1 considered “in light of the facts of [each] case.” *San Fernando*, 14 Cal.3d at 280. Case- and fact-specific  
2 water management is further evident in the numerous cases acknowledging that a trial court shoulders the  
3 equitable obligation to pursue a management plan (or “physical solution”) to facilitate the maximum  
4 beneficial use and prevention of waste or unreasonable use of the state’s water resources as required by  
5 Article X, section 2 of the California Constitution. *City of Lodi*, 7 Cal.2d at 341; *Tulare Irr. Dist. v.*  
6 *Lindsay-Strathmore Irr. Dist.* (1935) 3 Cal.2d 489, 573-74; *Erickson v. Queen Valley Ranch Co.* (1971) 22  
7 Cal.App.3d 578, 584-85; see also *Joslin v. Marin Municipal Water Dist.* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 132, 140-41  
8 (reasonable use determined on a case-by-case basis).

10 The record demonstrates that the County’s use and application of the terms “temporary surplus,”  
11 “overdraft,” “safe yield” and “undesirable result” are consistent with California groundwater law and the  
12 Ordinance and satisfy the constitutional mandate to put the waters of the State to maximum beneficial use to  
13 the extent capable. Administrative Record 7:9-14, 8:34-35; 15:4642-45, 4716, 4737-63, 4799-830, 4836-41,  
14 4863-4940, 4809-21, 4826-28. The record also supports the County’s conclusions regarding the Project,  
15 with the protections included in the GMMMP. Specifically, the GMMMP includes terms and conditions  
16 that will enable the County to take additional action in the future if necessary to prevent overdraft or other  
17 undesirable results. 15:4737-63, 4799-830, 4836-41. Under the terms of the GMMMP, such actions may  
18 include reduction or cessation of Project-related groundwater pumping.

21 For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds for Respondents and against Tetra on the Fourth  
22 Cause of Action.

24 **5. Fifth Cause of Action: The County Complied with State Law and Did Not**  
25 **Contract Away its Police Powers**

26 Tetra argued that the County failed in its duty to exercise its police powers to protect the  
27 Basin under the Ordinance. Specifically, Tetra claimed that as a result of the County’s approvals of  
28

1 the 2012 MOU and GMMMP, the County had little continuing authority to exercise oversight over  
2 the project, resulting in the impermissible “contracting away” of the County’s police powers. Tetra  
3 additionally argued that the County should have imposed as conditions of approvals on the Project the  
4 requirement that Cadiz and SMWD obtain permits for well construction and conveyance systems  
5 from the County’s Department of Environmental Health.  
6

7 This Court finds that the County has not unlawfully delegated its police power. See *County*  
8 *Mobilehome Positive Action Com.v. County of San Diego* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 727, 738; *108 Holdings,*  
9 *Ltd. v. City of Rohnert Park* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 186, 196. The record reflects that when it entered into  
10 the MOU and GMMMP, the County reserved its discretionary authority to reject the GMMMP, to impose  
11 additional corrective measures, or to halt all groundwater pumping if the extractions do not adhere to the  
12 terms of the GMMMP, MOU, and conditions of approval. The dispute resolution process in the MOU and  
13 GMMMP does not impair this authority, as the County reserved both its ability to go to court in the event of  
14 a GMMMP violation and the authority to administratively enforce the MOU, GMMMP, and conditions of  
15 approval before ever having to go to court or otherwise invoke the mediation provisions.  
16  
17

18 This Court further finds that whether the extractions may be subject to further permitting  
19 requirements before pumping may begin has no bearing on whether the County’s approval of the  
20 GMMMP comported with CEQA or with the Ordinance. The GMMMP provides that “[a]ll new Project  
21 production wells shall be designed, installed, and completed in manner consistent with all applicable state  
22 and local regulations, and industry standards, and shall be equipped with flow meters.” 15:4801. Even if the  
23 Project were required to obtain additional ministerial permits from the County related to well construction,  
24 these permits would only be required before drilling a well. San Bernardino County Code, §33.0631 (“No  
25 person or entity...shall dig, drill, bore...a well...without first filing a written application...and retaining a  
26 valid permit.”). A future requirement to obtain a well permit before “breaking ground” does not in any way  
27  
28

1 diminish the legality under CEQA of the approvals issued to date. *Health First v. March Joint Powers*  
2 *Authority* (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1143-44. For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds for  
3 Respondents and against Tetra on the Fifth Cause of Action.

4  
5 **6. Sixth Cause of Action: The GMMMP Complies with State Law, CEQA,  
and the County Ordinance**

6 Tetra's Sixth Cause of Action alleges that the GMMMP unlawfully authorizes pollution of  
7 Project area aquifers and fails to require mitigation of significant effects. Tetra argued that the  
8 GMMMP allows the intentional degradation of water quality in the Bristol and Cadiz groundwater  
9 basins in violation of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Sources of Drinking Water  
10 Policy (anti-degradation Policy), and that the groundwater extractions as governed by the GMMMP  
11 result in an impermissible discharge of waste under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act  
12 (Porter-Cologne).  
13  
14

15 This Court finds that neither groundwater extraction nor naturally occurring salinity are  
16 regulated discharges of waste under Porter-Cologne. See Wat. Code, §§13260 et seq., 13300 et seq.  
17 The saline water in the aquifer is naturally occurring and while the pumping will allow some saline  
18 migration (spreading) it does not meet the Porter-Cologne definition of "waste" which is defined as  
19 substances "associated with human habitation, or of human or animal origin, or from any production,  
20 manufacturing, or processing operation," and groundwater, including saline water, as "waters of the  
21 state." Wat. Code §13050(d-e). Similarly, the Project pumping as regulated under the GMMMP is  
22 also consistent with the SWRCB's anti-degradation Policy which seeks to "achieve the highest water  
23 quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State." *Asociacion de Gente Unida por*  
24 *el Agua v. Central Valley RWQCB* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1260. Specifically, the GMMMP  
25 monitors and controls the groundwater extractions which are designed to beneficially use this water  
26  
27  
28

1 without harming existing beneficial uses. See 14:4276, 4299-4301, 4308-18. For the foregoing  
2 reasons, the Court finds for Respondents and against Tetra on the Sixth Cause of Action.

3  
4 **7. Seventh Cause of Action: The GMMMP Complied with CEQA;  
No Additional Mitigation Was Required**

5 Tetra's Seventh Cause of Action alleged that: "the GMMMP ignores unmitigated effects on  
6 military lands and aquifers for which feasible mitigation should have been required." Tetra asserted  
7 that the groundwater extractions approved by the GMMMP will harm the military operations 40  
8 miles west of the Project and will impact aquifers underlying the military operations by Marine Air  
9 Ground Task Force Command Center. In support of this claim, Tetra cited a report prepared by  
10 outside experts. Tetra further claimed the County was required, as a responsible agency and under  
11 its own Ordinance, to impose "feasible mitigation" regarding those aquifers in the GMMMP and as a  
12 condition of its approval of the EIR. *Id.* The record reflects that while the Marine Corps commented  
13 on the Project, it did not raise this issue.

14  
15  
16 As discussed above, the Court finds that the County was entitled to defer to the environmental  
17 conclusions reached by the experts who prepared the EIR, even where other outside experts disagreed with  
18 the underlying data, analysis, or conclusions. *Laurel Heights I*, 47 Cal.3d at 408-09. The record reflects  
19 that those experts concluded that the Marine Corps extracts water from an aquifer that is hydrologically  
20 separate from the Project aquifer and located in a topographically distinct watershed, thus the Project would  
21 not impact the Marine Corps' aquifer. Further, the County was required to presume that the EIR complied  
22 with CEQA, or else file suit if it concluded that the EIR did not. See Pub. Resources Code, §§21166,  
23 21167.1(b), 21167.3(b); Guidelines §15162; *City of Redding*, 209 Cal.App.3d at 1178. As with the Second  
24 Cause of Action, Tetra did not identify any evidence in the record that would support a claim that  
25 "substantial changes" in the Project or its circumstances necessitated "major revisions" to the EIR,  
26  
27  
28



1 including the imposition of additional mitigation measures. For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds  
2 for Respondents and against Tetra on the Seventh Cause of Action.

3  
4 **8. Eighth Cause of Action: No Violation of Tetra's Procedural Due Process Rights**

5 As shown on the record, Tetra confirmed at the February 5, 2014, hearing on this matter that  
6 it had abandoned its claims under this cause of action, and therefore the Court finds for Respondents  
7 and against Tetra on the Eighth Cause of Action.  
8

9  
10 **9. Ninth Cause of Action: No Failure to Comply with Public Participation Requirements of the County Groundwater Ordinance, Brown Act, and San Bernardino County Sunshine Ordinance**

11 Tetra did not brief or argue this cause of action. Failure to brief an issue constitutes waiver of  
12 those issues. *Paulus v. Bob Lynch Ford, Inc.* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 659, 685; *Tisher v. California*  
13 *Horse Racing Bd.* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 349, 361. Further, as shown on the record, Tetra confirmed  
14 at the February 5, 2014, hearing on this matter that it had abandoned its claims under this cause of  
15 action, and therefore the Court finds for Respondents and against Tetra on the Ninth Cause of Action.  
16

17 **C. Relief**

18 Having found against Tetra on all of its causes of action, the Court denies the Petition and all  
19 forms of Tetra's requested relief.  
20

21 Dated: **AUG 20 2014**

22  
23 By: Gail A. Andler

24 GAIL A. ANDLER

25 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
26  
27  
28