

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

VINEYARD AREA CITIZENS FOR )  
 RESPONSIBLE GROWTH, INC., et al., )  
 )  
 Plaintiffs and Appellants, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, )  
 )  
 Defendant and Respondent; )  
 )  
 SUNRISE DOUGLAS PROPERTY )  
 OWNERS ASSN. et al., )  
 )  
 Real Parties in Interest and )  
 Respondents. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

S132972  
 Ct.App. 3 C044653  
 Sacramento County  
 Super. Ct. No. 02CS01214

**MODIFICATION OF OPINION**

**THE COURT:**

The opinion herein, appearing at 40 Cal.4th 412, is modified as follows:

1. The first sentence of the second full paragraph that begins on page 432 is modified to read as follows:

Finally, where, despite a full discussion, it is impossible to confidently determine that anticipated future water sources will be available, CEQA requires some discussion of possible replacement sources or alternatives to use of the anticipated water, and of the environmental consequences of those contingencies.

2. The third full paragraph that begins on page 432 is modified to read as follows:

Significantly, none of the Court of Appeal decisions on point holds or suggests that an EIR for a land use plan is inadequate unless it demonstrates that the project is definitely assured water through signed, enforceable agreements with a provider and already built or approved treatment and delivery facilities. Requiring certainty when a long-term, large-scale development project is initially approved would likely be unworkable, as it would require water planning to far outpace land use planning.

3. The first sentence of the first full paragraph that begins on page 437 is modified to read as follows:

With regard to competition from other planned development, the findings state that already entitled development is expected to call, in the following six years, on about 3,000 of the Well Field's 10,000 afa production, leaving about 7,000 afa—more than the FEIR's projected near-term usage of about 5,500 afa—for “development within the SunRidge Specific Plan area.”

4. The third full paragraph that begins on page 449 is modified to read as follows:

The burden of recirculating a draft EIR, we note, may be limited by the scope of the revisions required. “If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the [draft] EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified.” (CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15088.5, subd. (c).)

These modifications do not affect the judgment.