

## 4.3 Impacts of Alternative 4A

### 4.3.1 Water Supply

Facilities construction under Alternative 4A would be identical to that described under Alternative 4. Alternative 4A water conveyance operations would be similar to the range of possible operations for the spring Delta outflow requirements that would occur under Alternative 4 H3 and Alternative 4 H4.

Model simulation results for Alternative 4A Early Long-term (ELT), which are represented by the range of Alternative 4 H3 (ELT) and Alternative 4 H4 (ELT), are summarized in Tables B.1-1 through B.1-3 in Appendix B of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Model simulation results for Alternative 4A at Late Long-term (LLT) which are similar to the range of Alternative 4 H3 (LLT) and Alternative 4 H4 (LLT) are summarized in Tables 5-7 through 5-9 in the Draft EIR/EIS.

As indicated in Section 5.3.2, *Determination of Effects*, of the Draft EIR/EIS, NEPA adverse effect and CEQA significant impact conclusions are not provided for the impacts discussed in this water supply sections.

#### 4.3.1.1 Summary of Water Supply Operations under Alternative 4A

##### Change in Delta Outflow

Changes in long-term average Delta outflow under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 4.3.1-1 through 4.3.1-3 in this RDEIR/SDEIS and Tables B.1-1 through B.1-3 in Appendix B of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

Changes in long-term average Delta outflow under Alternative 4A (LLT) (similar to range of Alternative 4 H3 [LLT] and Alternative 4 H4 [LLT]) as compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 5-3 through 5-5 and Tables 5-7 through 5-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Late-fall and winter outflows remain similar or show minor reductions in Alternative 4A compared to No Action Alternative. In the spring months, outflow would increase under Alternative 4A as compared to No Action Alternative. SWP and CVP exports in summer months would increase and result in lower outflow as compared to No Action Alternative. In the fall months, outflow under Alternative 4A as compared to No Action Alternative would be similar because of the Fall X2 requirement in wet and above-normal years, and increased or similar outflow in September and October months of all year types due to OMR flow requirements and export reductions.

Long-term average and wet year peak outflows would increase in winter months with a corresponding decrease in spring months because of the shift in system inflows caused by climate change and increased Delta exports as compared to Existing Conditions. In other year types, Alternative 4A would result in higher or similar outflow because of the spring outflow requirements. In summer and fall months, Alternative 4A would result in similar or higher outflow because of changes in export patterns and OMR flow requirements and export reductions in fall months, and also because of the Fall X2 requirements in wet and above normal years. The incremental changes in Delta outflow between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions would be a function of both the

1 facility and operations assumptions (including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, less  
2 negative OMR flow requirements, enhanced spring outflow and/or Fall X2 requirements) and the  
3 reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise  
4 and climate change.

5 Delta outflow under Alternative 4A would likely decrease in winter and summer months, or remain  
6 similar or increase in other months, compared to the conditions without the project.

7 Results for the range of changes in Delta Outflow under Alternative 4A (LLT), which is similar to  
8 range of Alternative 4 H3 (LLT) and Alternative 4 H4 (LLT), are presented in more detail in  
9 Appendix 5A, *BDCP EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

## 10 **Change in SWP and CVP Reservoir Storage**

11 Changes in May and September reservoir storage under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No  
12 Action Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 4.3.1-4 through 4.3.1-10 and  
13 Tables B.1-1 through B.1-3 in Appendix B of this RDEIR/SDEIS for Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Lake  
14 Oroville, and Folsom Lake. SWP and CVP San Luis Reservoir storages are presented in Figures 4.3.1-  
15 11 through 4.3.1-14 for completeness.

16 Changes in May and September reservoir storage under Alternative 4A (LLT) as compared to the No  
17 Action Alternative (LLT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 5-6 through 5-12 and Tables  
18 5-7 through 5-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS for Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Lake Oroville, and Folsom Lake.  
19 SWP and CVP San Luis Reservoir storages are presented in Figures 5-13 through 5-16 of the Draft  
20 EIR/EIS for completeness.

21 Results for changes in SWP and CVP reservoir storages under Alternative 4A (LLT), which is similar  
22 to range of Alternative 4 H3 (LLT) and Alternative 4 H4 (LLT), are presented in more detail in  
23 Appendix 5A, *BDCP EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

### 24 **Trinity Lake**

25 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Trinity Lake storage as compared to No  
26 Action Alternative would increase or remain similar in most years.

27 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Trinity Lake storage as compared to  
28 Existing Conditions would decrease or remain similar. This decrease would occur due to sea level  
29 rise, climate change, and increased north of Delta demands.

30 A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential  
31 change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that average annual end of September Trinity  
32 Lake storage could increase or remain similar under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions  
33 without the project.

### 34 **Shasta Lake**

35 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Shasta Lake storage as compared to No  
36 Action Alternative would remain similar at ELT and decrease (up to 3%) at LLT.

37 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Shasta Lake storage as compared to Existing  
38 Conditions would decrease. This decrease would occur due to sea level rise, climate change, and  
39 increased north of Delta demands.

1 A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential  
2 change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that average annual end of September Shasta  
3 Lake storage could remain similar or decrease under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions  
4 without the project.

#### 5 **Lake Oroville**

6 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Lake Oroville storage as compared to No  
7 Action Alternative would increase.

8 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Lake Oroville storage as compared to  
9 Existing Conditions would decrease in all years. This decrease would occur due to sea level rise,  
10 climate change, and increased north of Delta demands.

11 A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential  
12 change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that average annual end of September Lake  
13 Oroville storage would increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the  
14 project.

#### 15 **Folsom Lake**

16 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Folsom Lake storage as compared to No  
17 Action Alternative would remain similar at ELT and decrease (2%) at LLT.

18 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September Folsom Lake storage as compared to  
19 Existing Conditions decrease. This decrease primarily would occur due to sea level rise, climate  
20 change, and increased north of Delta demands.

21 A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential  
22 change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that average annual end of September Folsom  
23 Lake storage could decrease or remain similar under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions  
24 without the project.

#### 25 **San Luis Reservoir**

26 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September San Luis Reservoir storage as compared to  
27 the No Action Alternative would mostly decrease, due to changes in export patterns.

28 Under Alternative 4A, average annual end of September San Luis Reservoir storage as compared to  
29 Existing Conditions would decrease. This decrease primarily would occur due to sea level rise,  
30 climate change, and increased north of Delta demands.

31 A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential  
32 change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that average annual end of September San Luis  
33 Reservoir storage would generally decrease under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions  
34 without the project.

#### 35 **Change in Delta Exports**

36 Changes in average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action  
37 Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Tables B.1-1 through B.1-3 in Appendix B  
38 and Figures 4.3.1-15 through 4.3.1-18 of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

1 Changes in average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A (LLT) (similar to range of Alternative  
2 4 H3 [LLT] and Alternative 4 H4 [LLT]) as compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT) and Existing  
3 Conditions are shown in Figures 5-17 through 5-20 and Tables 5-7 through 5-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

4 The addition of the north Delta intakes and changes to Delta regulatory requirements under  
5 Alternative 4A change SWP and CVP Delta exports as compared to Delta exports under Existing  
6 Conditions and the No Action Alternative.

7 Delta exports would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years  
8 under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative depending on the  
9 capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months.

10 Total long-term average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A would decrease as compared to  
11 exports under Existing Conditions reflecting changes in operations due to less negative OMR flows,  
12 implementation of Fall X2 and/or spring outflow under Alternative 4A, and sea level rise and climate  
13 change.

14 The incremental change in Delta exports under Alternative 4A as compared to No Action Alternative  
15 would be caused by the facility and operations assumptions of Alternative 4A. Delta exports would  
16 either remain similar or increase in wetter years and remain similar or decrease in the drier years  
17 under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

## 18 **Change in SWP and CVP Deliveries**

### 19 **Impact WS-1: Changes in SWP CVP Water Deliveries during Construction**

20 **NEPA Effects:** During construction of water conveyance facilities associated with Alternative 4A,  
21 operation of existing SWP and CVP water conveyance would continue. Construction would not affect  
22 the timing or amount of water exported from the Delta through SWP and CVP facilities.

23 **CEQA Conclusion:** Constructing Alternative 4A water conveyance facilities would not impact  
24 operation of existing SWP or CVP facilities.

### 25 **Impact WS-2: Change in SWP and CVP Deliveries**

26 The addition of the north Delta intakes under Alternative 4A provides operational flexibility  
27 compared to deliveries under Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative.

28 Changes in SWP and CVP Deliveries under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action  
29 Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Tables B.1-1 through B.1-3 in Appendix B  
30 and Figures 4.3.1-22 through 4.3.1-28 of this RDEIR/SDEIS.

31 Changes in SWP and CVP Deliveries under Alternative 4A (LLT) (similar to range of Alternative 4 H3  
32 [LLT] and Alternative 4 H4 [LLT]) as compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT) and Existing  
33 Conditions are shown in Figures 5-6 through 5-12 and Tables 5-7 through 5-9 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

34 Results for SWP and CVP deliveries at LLT are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, *BDCP EIR/S*  
35 *Modeling Technical Appendix*, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

1 **Total CVP Deliveries**

2 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total CVP deliveries as compared to No Action Alternative,  
3 would increase by up to 3% at ELT and by up to 2% at LLT. Under Alternative 4A, average annual  
4 total south of Delta CVP deliveries as compared to No Action Alternative, would increase by about  
5 5%.

6 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total CVP deliveries as compared to Existing Conditions,  
7 would increase by up to 3% at ELT and decrease by up to 2% at LLT. Under Alternative 4A, average  
8 annual total south of Delta CVP deliveries as compared to Existing Conditions, would decrease by up  
9 to 4% at ELT and by up to 9% at LLT. However, the decrease would occur due to sea level rise and  
10 climate change, and increased north of Delta demands.

11 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
12 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
13 and climate change, and the results show that average annual total CVP deliveries and average  
14 annual total CVP south of Delta deliveries would increase or remain similar under Alternative 4A as  
15 compared to the conditions without the project.

16 **CVP North of Delta Agricultural Deliveries**

17 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP north of Delta agricultural deliveries would increase by  
18 up to 4% at ELT and by up to 2% at LLT as compared to No Action Alternative.

19 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP north of Delta agricultural deliveries as compared to  
20 Existing Conditions, would decrease by up to 18% at ELT and by up to 31% at LLT. However, this  
21 decrease primarily would occur due to sea level rise and climate change, and increased north of  
22 Delta demands.

23 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
24 Alternative 4A in, the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
25 and climate change, and the results show that average annual CVP north of Delta agricultural  
26 deliveries as compared to No Action Alternative would generally increase. Therefore, average  
27 annual CVP north of Delta agricultural deliveries would generally increase or remain similar under  
28 Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

29 **CVP South of Delta Agricultural Deliveries**

30 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP south of Delta agricultural deliveries as compared to No  
31 Action Alternative would increase by up to 12% at ELT and by up to 13% at LLT.

32 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP south of Delta agricultural deliveries as compared to  
33 Existing Conditions would decrease by up to 6% at ELT and 18% at LLT. However, this decrease  
34 primarily would occur due to sea level rise and climate change, and increased north of Delta  
35 demands.

36 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
37 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
38 and climate change and the results show that average annual CVP south of Delta agricultural  
39 deliveries as compared to No Action Alternative would generally increase. Therefore, average  
40 annual CVP south of Delta agricultural deliveries would increase or remain similar under Alternative  
41 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

1 **CVP Settlement and Exchange Contract Deliveries**

2 There would be negligible change to CVP Settlement Contract deliveries during dry and critical years  
3 under Alternative 4A as compared to deliveries under the No Action Alternative.

4 There would be negligible change to CVP Settlement Contract deliveries during dry and critical years  
5 under Alternative 4A at ELT as compared to deliveries under the Existing Conditions. Under  
6 Alternative 4A at LLT, CVP Settlement Contract deliveries during dry and critical years as compared to  
7 Existing Conditions would decrease. This is due to Shasta Lake storage declining to dead pool  
8 more frequently, as described previously, under increased north-of Delta demands and climate  
9 change and sea level rise conditions. As described in the methods section of Chapter 5, *Water Supply*,  
10 in the Draft EIR/EIS, model results and potential changes under these extreme reservoir storage  
11 conditions may not be representative of actual future conditions because changes in assumed  
12 operations may be implemented to avoid these conditions.

13 There would be no changes in deliveries to CVP Exchange Contractors under Alternative 4A.

14 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
15 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
16 and climate change and the results show that CVP Settlement Contract and CVP Exchange  
17 Contractors deliveries during dry and critical years would remain similar. Therefore, CVP Settlement  
18 Contract and CVP Exchange Contractors deliveries during dry and critical years under Alternative  
19 4A would be similar to the deliveries under the conditions without the project.

20 **CVP North of Delta Municipal and Industrial Deliveries**

21 Under Alternative 4A, average CVP north of Delta M&I deliveries as compared to No Action  
22 Alternative would remain similar of result in minor increase.

23 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP north of Delta M&I deliveries as compared to Existing  
24 Conditions would increase by up to 88% at ELT and 82% at LLT. However, this increase primarily  
25 would occur because there would be an increase in north of Delta M&I water rights demands under  
26 Alternative 4A and No Action Alternative as compared to demands under Existing Conditions.

27 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
28 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
29 and climate change and the results show that average annual CVP north of Delta M&I deliveries  
30 would remain similar or show minor increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the deliveries  
31 under the No Action Alternative. Therefore, average annual CVP north of Delta M&I deliveries would  
32 remain similar or increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

33 **CVP South of Delta Municipal and Industrial Deliveries**

34 Under Alternative 4A, average CVP south of Delta M&I deliveries as compared to No Action  
35 Alternative, would increase by about 4%.

36 Under Alternative 4A, average annual CVP south of Delta M&I deliveries as compared to Existing  
37 Conditions would decrease by up to 2% at ELT and by up to 7% at LLT. However, this decrease  
38 primarily would occur due to sea level rise and climate change, and increased north of Delta  
39 demands.

1 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
2 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
3 and climate change and the results show that average annual CVP south of Delta M&I deliveries  
4 would remain similar or increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the deliveries under the No  
5 Action Alternative. Therefore, average annual CVP south of Delta M&I deliveries would increase or  
6 remain similar under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

### 7 **Total SWP Deliveries**

8 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP deliveries as compared to No Action Alternative,  
9 would decrease (by about 3%) or increase (by about 12%) depending upon range of spring outflow  
10 requirements. Under Alternative 4A, average annual total south of Delta SWP deliveries as  
11 compared to No Action Alternative, would decrease (by about 4%) or increase (by about 16%)  
12 depending upon range of spring outflow requirements.

13 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP deliveries as compared to Existing Conditions,  
14 would decrease (9%) or increase (5%) at ELT and remain similar or decrease (13%) at LLT  
15 depending upon range of spring outflow requirements. Under Alternative 4A, average annual total  
16 south of Delta SWP deliveries as compared to Existing Conditions, would decrease (12%) or  
17 increase (7%) at ELT and would decrease (17%) or remain similar at LLT depending upon range of  
18 spring outflow requirements. However, the decrease in deliveries primarily would occur due to sea  
19 level rise and climate change.

20 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
21 Alternative 4A without the effects of sea level rise and climate change and the results show that  
22 under Alternative 4A average annual total SWP deliveries would decrease and increase. Therefore,  
23 average annual total SWP deliveries and average annual total SWP south of Delta deliveries under  
24 Alternative 4A would show a decrease or an increase as compared to the conditions without the  
25 project depending upon the range of spring Delta outflow requirements.

### 26 **SWP Table A Deliveries**

27 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Table A deliveries with Article 56 (without Article  
28 21) as compared to No Action Alternative, would decrease (by about 7%) or increase (by about  
29 13%) depending upon range of spring outflow requirements. Under Alternative 4A scenarios,  
30 average annual total south of Delta SWP Table A deliveries with Article 56 (without Article 21) as  
31 compared to No Action Alternative, would decrease (by about 7%) or increase (by about 13%)  
32 depending upon range of spring outflow requirements.

33 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Table A deliveries with Article 56 (without Article  
34 21) as compared to Existing Conditions, would decrease (11%) and increase (8%) at ELT and would  
35 decrease (17%) and increase (3%) at LLT depending upon range of spring outflow requirements.  
36 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total south of Delta SWP Table A deliveries with Article 56  
37 (without Article 21) as compared to Existing Conditions, would decrease (12%) and increase (8%)  
38 at ELT and would decrease (17%) and increase (2%) at LLT depending upon range of spring outflow  
39 requirements. However, the decrease in deliveries primarily would occur due to sea level rise and  
40 climate change.

41 Deliveries under the No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
42 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise

1 and climate change and the results show that under Alternative 4A average annual total SWP Table  
2 A deliveries with Article 56 (without Article 21) would decrease or increase depending upon range  
3 of spring outflow requirements.

#### 4 **SWP Article 21 Deliveries**

5 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Article 21 deliveries as compared to No Action  
6 Alternative, would increase by about 164%.

7 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Article 21 deliveries as compared to Existing  
8 Conditions, would decrease by up to 20% at ELT and by up to 32% at LLT. However, this decrease  
9 primarily would occur due to sea level rise and climate change.

10 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
11 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
12 and climate change and the results show that average annual Article 21 deliveries would increase  
13 under Alternative 4A as compared to the deliveries under the No Action Alternative. Therefore,  
14 average annual Article 21 deliveries would increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the  
15 conditions without the project.

#### 16 **SWP Feather River Service Area**

17 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Feather River Service Area deliveries during dry  
18 and critical years as compared to No Action Alternative would increase or remain similar.

19 Under Alternative 4A, average annual total SWP Feather River Service Area deliveries during dry  
20 and critical years as compared to Existing Conditions, would decrease by up to 4% at ELT and by up  
21 to 6% at LLT. The primary cause of this reduction would be change in SWP operations due to sea  
22 level rise and climate change.

23 Deliveries compared to No Action Alternative are an indication of the potential change due to  
24 Alternative 4A in the absence of the effects of increased north of delta demands and sea level rise  
25 and climate change and the results show that average annual SWP Feather River Service Area  
26 deliveries would increase or remain similar under Alternative 4A as compared to the deliveries  
27 under No Action Alternative. Therefore, average annual SWP Feather River Service Area deliveries  
28 would remain similar under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project.

29 **NEPA Effects:** SWP and CVP deliveries under Alternative 4A as compared to deliveries under No  
30 Action Alternative would increase or remain similar. Indirect effects of changes in water deliveries  
31 in addition to potential effects on urban areas caused by changes in SWP and CVP water supply  
32 deliveries under Alternative 4A, are addressed in Section 4.3.26, *Growth Inducement and Other*  
33 *Indirect Effects*, and other sections of this RDEIR/SDEIS addressing specific resources.

34 **CEQA Conclusion:** SWP and CVP deliveries under Alternative 4A would decline as compared to  
35 deliveries under Existing Conditions. The primary cause of the reduction is increased north of Delta  
36 water demands that would occur under No Action Alternative and Alternative 4A and changes in  
37 SWP and CVP operations due to sea level rise and climate change. As shown above in the NEPA  
38 analysis, SWP and CVP deliveries would generally increase or remain similar under Alternative 4A  
39 as compared to deliveries under conditions in 2025 and 2060 without Alternative 4A if sea level rise  
40 and climate change conditions are considered the same under both scenarios (Alternative 4A and No  
41 Action Alternative). SWP and CVP deliveries under Alternative 4A would generally increase or

1 remain similar as compared to deliveries under Existing Conditions without the effects of increased  
2 north of Delta water demands, sea level rise, and climate change. Some reductions in the SWP south  
3 of Delta deliveries could occur under Alternative 4A with higher spring outflow requirements.  
4 Indirect effects of changes in water deliveries including potential effects on urban areas caused by  
5 changes in SWP and CVP water supply deliveries are addressed in Section 4.3.26, *Growth*  
6 *Inducement and Other Indirect Effects*, and other sections of this RDEIR/SDEIS addressing specific  
7 resources.

### 8 **Impact WS-3: Effects of Water Transfers on Water Supply**

9 Alternative 4A increases project water supply allocations as compared to the No Action Alternative,  
10 and consequently will decrease cross-Delta water transfer demand compared to the No Action  
11 Alternative. Alternative 4A would change the combined SWP Table A and CVP south-of-Delta  
12 agricultural water supply allocations as compared to Existing Conditions, and the frequency of years  
13 in which cross-Delta transfers are assumed to be triggered would change as well, assuming an  
14 estimated cross-Delta transfer supply of 600,000 acre-feet in any one year.

15 Under Alternative 4A as compared to Existing Conditions, the frequency of years in which cross-  
16 Delta transfers would increase, and the average annual volume of those transfers would increase.  
17 Under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative, the frequency of years in which  
18 cross-Delta transfers would occur would decrease.

19 Alternative 4A provides a separate cross-Delta facility with additional capacity to move transfer  
20 water from areas upstream of the Delta to export service areas and provides a longer transfer  
21 window than allowed under current regulatory constraints. In addition, the facility provides  
22 conveyance that would not be restricted by Delta reverse flow concerns or south Delta water level  
23 concerns. As a result of avoiding those restrictions, transfer water could be moved at any time of the  
24 year that capacity exists in the combined cross-Delta channels, the new cross-Delta facility, and the  
25 export pumps, depending on operational and regulatory constraints, including criteria guiding the  
26 operation of water conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A.

27 **NEPA Effects:** Alternative 4A would decrease water transfer demand compared to existing  
28 conditions. Alternative 4A would decrease conveyance capacity, enabling additional cross-Delta  
29 water transfers that could lead to increases in Delta exports when compared to No Action  
30 Alternative. Prior to approval, each transfer must go through NEPA review and be evaluated by the  
31 export facility agency, and may also be subject to CEQA review and/or SWRCB process. Indirect  
32 effects of changes in Delta exports or water deliveries are addressed in Section 4.2.29, *Growth*  
33 *Inducement and Other Indirect Effects*, and other sections addressing specific resources.

34 **CEQA Conclusion:** Alternative 4A would increase water transfer demand compared to existing  
35 conditions. Alternative 4A would increase conveyance capacity, enabling additional cross-Delta  
36 water transfers that could lead to increases in Delta exports when compared to existing conditions.  
37 Prior to approval, each transfer must go through the CEQA and/or SWRCB process and be evaluated  
38 by the export facility agency, and may also be subject to NEPA review. Indirect effects of changes in  
39 Delta exports or water deliveries are addressed in Section 4.2.29, *Growth Inducement and Other*  
40 *Indirect Effects*, and other sections addressing specific resources.