



COYOTE VALLEY DAM GENERAL INVESTIGATION STUDY

Alternative Delivery Options

July 9, 2026

AGENDA

- Review Decision-Making Framework
- Strategies and Alternatives
- Screening of Alternatives
- Evaluation Criteria
- Next Steps



SCHEDULE

- June 11
 - Discussed Why Alternative Pathways Need to be Evaluated
 - Recommended Decision-Making Framework
- ➔ • July 9
 - Review Alternatives
 - Discuss Screened Alternatives
 - Review Evaluation Criteria
- August 13
 - Review Evaluation Results
- September 10
 - Discuss Implementation Plan





Potential Strategies



Strategy 1 – Traditional USACE-Led Feasibility Path



Strategy 2 – Non-Federal-Led Feasibility Path



Strategy 3 – Alternative Planning and Operational Studies



Strategy 4 – Direct Advancement Toward Implementation

SCREENING CRITERIA

Screened out highly unlikely alternatives based on:

- Infeasibility
- Impracticality
- Inconsistent with IWPC Goals



INITIAL ALTERNATIVES

Strategy	Option	Retained	Alternative Description
Strategy 1: USACE-led Feasibility Study	1A		100% Federally Funded Study
	1B	✓	Traditional Feasibility Study (50% Fed / 50% NF)
	1C	✓	Advanced Non-Federal Funding (<50% Fed / >50% NF)
Strategy 2: Non-Fed-led Feasibility Study	2A	✓	Section 203 Study (100% NF funding)
	2B		Reconnaissance Study (100% NF funding)
Strategy 3: Other Planning Options	3A		Reclamation Basin Study
	3B		USACE Water Supply Storage Reallocation Study
Strategy 4: Advance to Implementation	4A	✓	Congressional Authorization for Construction
	4B		Construct Raise under Section 408
	4C	✓	Transfer Lake Mendocino

STRATEGY 1 – USACE-LED FEASIBILITY STUDY

Screened
Out

Option 1A: 100% Federally funded Study (100% Fed / 0% NF)

- Advocate to waive non-federal share of the study
- Advocate for appropriation of entire study cost in one action

Retained

Option 1B: Traditional Feasibility Study (50% Fed / 50% NF)

- Advocate for appropriation of entire federal share of study in one action
- Pursue state / local money to fund the non-federal share

Retained

Option 1C: Advanced Non-Federal Funding (<50% Fed / >50% NF)

- Amend cost-sharing agreement
- Pursue state / local money to fund non-federal share of study



STRATEGY 2 – NON-FED-LED FEASIBILITY STUDY

Retained

Option 2A: Section 203 Study (100% NF funding)

- Non-Federal team develops study for ASA-CW review and approval
- Non-Federal team funds study and federal and technical assistance
- Can pursue federal funding for federal and technical assistance

Screened Out

Option 2B: Reconnaissance Study (100% NF funding)

- Non-Federal team develops study to support future USACE study
- Non-Federal team funds study
- No federal participation



STRATEGY 3 – OTHER PLANNING OPTIONS

Screened Out

Option 3A: Reclamation Basin Study

- Evaluates existing / future water supply and demand imbalances
- Identifies adaptation strategies (reservoir operational / structural changes)
- Likely cost-shared 50% federal / 50% Non-federal

Screened Out

Option 3B: USACE Water Supply Storage Reallocation Study

- Evaluates how existing reservoir storage is used
- Sometimes identifies the need for additional storage capacity
- Likely non-federally funded



STRATEGY 4 – ADVANCE TO IMPLEMENTATION

Retained

Option 4A: Congressional Authorization for Construction

Rely on 1950 Chief's Report for authorization to construct raise
Seek authorization of "ultimate" flood control plan in next WRDA

Screened Out

Option 4B: Construct Raise under Section 408

- Submit application to USACE for non-federal interest to "modify" CVD
- All activities 100% non-federally funded
- Could include pump station and diversion

Retained

Option 4C: Transfer Lake Mendocino

Transfer long-term operations and liabilities to non-federal interests
Non-Federally led and funded modernization of dam



RETAINED ALTERNATIVES

Strategy	Option	Retained	Alternative Description
Strategy 1: USACE-led Feasibility Study	1A		100% Federally Funded Study
	1B	✓	Traditional Feasibility Study (50% Fed / 50% NF)
	1C	✓	Advanced Non-Federal Funding (<50% Fed / >50% NF)
Strategy 2: Non-Fed-led Feasibility Study	2A	✓	Section 203 Study (100% NF funding)
	2B		Reconnaissance Study (100% NF funding)
Strategy 3: Other Planning Options	3A		Reclamation Basin Study
	3B		USACE Water Supply Storage Reallocation Study
Strategy 4: Advance to Implementation	4A	✓	Congressional Authorization for Construction
	4B		Construct Raise under Section 408
	4C	✓	Transfer Lake Mendocino



EVALUATION CRITERIA

Objective	Criteria
Secure Sustainable Water Supply	Maximizing Storage
	Operational Flexibility
Synchronize Water Storage Availability w/ NERF Delivery	Schedule Coordination
	Schedule Certainty
Deliver a Successful and Durable Project	Challenges to Implementation
	Acceptability
Maximize Federal and State Cost-Sharing	Cost of Study (Local)
	Cost of Implementation (Local)
	Funding Probability

SCHEDULE

- June 11
 - Discussed Why Alternative Pathways Need to be Evaluated
 - Recommended Decision-Making Framework
- ➔ • July 9
 - Review Alternatives
 - Discuss Screened Alternatives
 - Review Evaluation Criteria
- August 13
 - Review Evaluation Results
- September 10
 - Discuss Implementation Plan



QUESTIONS

