



COYOTE VALLEY DAM GENERAL INVESTIGATION STUDY

Alternative Delivery Options

August 13, 2026

AGENDA

- Review Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria
- Discuss Evaluation Results
- Recommended Path Forward
- 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 4 – Direct
Advancement Toward
Implementation**

STRATEGY 1 – USACE-LED FEASIBILITY STUDY

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

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

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



STRATEGY 4 – ADVANCE TO IMPLEMENTATION

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

Option 4C: Transfer Lake Mendocino

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



FINAL ALTERNATIVES

Strategy	Option	Alternative Description
Strategy 1: Traditional USACE-Led Feasibility Path	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)
Strategy 4: Advance to Implementation	4A	Congressional Authorization for Construction
	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

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

- Alternatives were evaluated qualitatively using available information, engineering judgment, and policy considerations.
- The evaluation is intended to inform discussion rather than produce a single "correct" answer.
- A Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) approach was used to evaluate the alternatives



MULTI-CRITERIA DECISION ANALYSIS

- MCDA provides a structured framework for comparing alternatives across multiple objectives.
- Each criterion was evaluated independently using a common scoring scale.
- Positive criteria rewarded alternatives that better achieved IWPC objectives.
- Cost and implementation challenge criteria were scored negatively so lower costs and fewer challenges received higher scores.
- Individual criterion scores were combined to provide an overall comparison of alternatives.



ALTERNATIVES

Alternative	Strengths	Challenges
Traditional Feasibility Study	Historical proven federal pathway	Dependent on federal funding, current study constraints limits possibility of success
Advanced Non-Federal Funding	Improved schedule	Greater local funding responsibility, current study constraints limits possibility of success
Section 203 Study	Greater local control	Greater local funding responsibility; limited precedent with a USACE dam
Congressional Authorization for Construction	Potentially accelerates construction	Congressional approval uncertainty; unknown USACE requirements
Transfer Lake Mendocino	Maximum local control	Significant long-term liability and financial commitment



RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION

- Do not select a single preferred alternative today
- Narrow near-term work to three paths:
 - Section 203 Study
 - Traditional USACE Feasibility Study if funding becomes available
 - Congressional Authorization for Construction
- Use the next several months to resolve federal policy questions by securing a federal lobbyist
- Secure a state lobbyist to investigate state funding opportunities
- Preserve flexibility until federal funding and ASA-CW direction are clearer



NEED FOR A FEDERAL LOBBYIST

- Obtain recurring access to ASA-CW, USACE Headquarters, and potentially OMB
- Clarify how federal decision-makers would treat each viable path
- Support any legislative activity to advance water storage at Coyote Valley Dam including:
 - Construction Authorization
 - Study/Design Appropriations
 - Construction Appropriations
 - Addressing USACE policies to support advancement



RECOMMENDED PROCESS FOR SECURING A LOBBYIST

- Ad Hoc Committee evaluates a focused list of known qualified federal lobbyists
- Selection emphasizes USACE expertise, engagement with federal decision-makers, bipartisan relationships, lack of potential conflicts, and approach
- Ad Hoc Committee conducts interviews of top one or two candidates
- Ad Hoc Committee negotiates a proposed scope and fee with the preferred firm
- Commission reviews and approves the recommended firm and contract





SEPTEMBER IWPC MEETING

- Recommend a lobbyist
- Brief commission on next steps following lobbyist selection:
 - Developing lobbyist scope of support
 - Identifying outstanding policy questions and concerns for remaining options

QUESTIONS

