

1 in Chapters 5–28. Please refer to Chapter 3, *Project Description*, for a detailed discussion of the  
 2 proposed modifications and to Chapter 4, *Approach to the Environmental Analysis*, for an explanation  
 3 of the proposed project construction analyses.

4 As directed by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15163(b), this Supplemental EIR/EIS is focused on  
 5 disclosing the impacts associated with the changes made to the California WaterFix approved  
 6 project (Alternative 4A) as described in the Final EIR/EIS and contains only the information  
 7 necessary to make the Final EIR/EIS adequate for the project as revised. Because no changes to  
 8 conveyance facility operations would be implemented under the proposed project compared with  
 9 the approved project, this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS does not address California WaterFix  
 10 operations or operations-related impacts. **Any clarifications related to modeling assumptions**  
 11 **regarding SWP and CVP water delivered through California WaterFix<sup>1</sup> that have occurred after**  
 12 **certification of the Final EIR did not change the actual modeling performed or associated impact**  
 13 **analysis for California WaterFix in the Final EIR/EIS (or the Biological Assessment prepared to**  
 14 **comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act or presented before the State Water Resources**  
 15 **Control Board during the change petition process) and does not warrant any additional analysis in**  
 16 **this Supplemental EIR/EIS.** In addition, it should be noted Metropolitan Water District’s decision to  
 17 financially support the unfunded capacity of the project, associated with the potential CVP public  
 18 water agencies, does not change the model assumptions for California WaterFix. **Current**  
 19 **information on the record, including Reclamation’s continued participation in the State Water**  
 20 **Resources Control Board change petition process, the Santa Clara Valley Water District board vote to**  
 21 **participate as both a SWP and CVP contractor, and the Metropolitan Water District board’s**  
 22 **authorization on July 10, 2018, indicates that the most likely scenario for use of this capacity would**  
 23 **be consistent with current modeling assumptions.**

24 Similar to the operational issues, no substantive changes are proposed to the content of the  
 25 Environmental Commitments proposed to mitigate habitat effects of the conveyance facility.  
 26 Therefore, because the Environmental Commitments would generally be the same under the  
 27 approved project and proposed project and the resource effects would be similar or would not  
 28 substantially increase under the proposed project, the effects of Environmental Commitments are  
 29 not addressed in this Supplemental EIR/EIS.

30 Another example of information not relevant to the scope of this Supplemental EIR/EIS is the  
 31 potential for transfers of water south of the Delta. The potential for a specific transfer from certain  
 32 SWP agricultural water agencies specifically to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California is  
 33 not related to the proposed design refinements and is not relevant to this Supplemental EIR/EIS. It  
 34 should be noted that a separate EIR is being prepared by DWR on the proposed SWP contract  
 35 amendments related to water management actions and California WaterFix, and it is expected that  
 36 that EIR will address this issue,

<sup>1</sup> For example, there is some confusion on the modeling assumptions used for the impact analysis for California WaterFix operations. Although the deliveries south of the Delta followed the general split of 55% SWP and 45% CVP (totals from operation of the SWP and CVP, including but not limited to California WaterFix facilities), the model always utilized a “float” approach for California WaterFix operations that resulted in approximately 67% SWP water and 33% CVP water solely moving through California WaterFix facilities.