



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**  
Portland District



---

# **WILLAMETTE VALLEY SYSTEM OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**

## **APPENDIX M: COSTS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**1. Introduction ..... 1**

**2. Overview ..... 1**

    2.1 No-action Alternative..... 1

    2.2 Capital/Construction Costs ..... 2

    2.3 Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Costs ..... 2

    2.4 Risk and Uncertainty ..... 2

**3. Cost Estimates ..... 4**

    3.1 Capital and Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Cost  
        Estimates by Alternative ..... 4

    3.2 Annual Costs ..... 13

**References ..... 13**

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2-1. Estimated Variance in Capital Cost by Alternative. .... 3

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The cost analysis is an estimate of the total cost for implementing, operating, and maintaining the Willamette Valley System (WVS) under each of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) alternatives. The effective price level for this analysis is FY25.

The cost analysis aims to describe the cost differences among alternatives, particularly between the proposed WVS EIS action alternatives and the No-action Alternative (NAA). Implementation costs include the costs of design and construction of proposed structural measures under the action alternatives.

All alternatives, including the NAA, have costs associated with operating and maintaining the WVS as well as costs that may change relative to the structural and/or operational measures included under an action alternative. These ongoing future costs include capital investments and routine and non-routine operations costs. Costs are focused on 13 Federal multiple purpose dams and reservoirs in the Willamette Valley System in Oregon but also include costs for gravel augmentation and modifications to revetments.

## **2. OVERVIEW**

USACE operations, cost engineering, budget, asset management, project-specific specialists, fish, and hydropower provided input to the cost estimates. The objective was to identify the cost to operate the WVS under the NAA and estimate how these costs would change under the WVS EIS action alternatives. Costs are broken into capital (including construction); design and engineering; and annual Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRRR) costs.

The costs to operate the system are funded through annual Congressionally appropriated Federal tax dollars as well as revenue generated through the marketing and sale of hydropower. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) provides annual funding for fish and wildlife mitigation in the Willamette Basin.

### **2.1 No-action Alternative**

The NAA is a baseline for the costs associated with operating and maintaining the WVS. The NAA provides a starting point for determining how costs vary as structural or operational changes, or both, are made under the action alternatives. The NAA assumed the WVS would continue to operate in a similar manner to current operations, balancing operations for Congressionally authorized purposes across the WVS.

Under the NAA, agencies would continue to maintain system infrastructure while routine operations and maintenance costs for hydropower, cultural resources, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other routine costs would occur. The NAA was developed to provide an accounting of costs to operate and maintain the WVS.

## **2.2 Capital/Construction Costs**

Portland District cost engineers developed estimates for each structural measure included in the action alternatives. Projects that are currently in design use a project-specific estimate in the tables below. For projects that have not started, the design, supervision, administration, and engineering during construction cost estimate is 44 percent of construction and contingency cost. This is based on Walla Walla District Mandatory Center of Expertise for Cost Engineering recommendations based on historical USACE cost engineering estimates.

The structural measures only include measures that are unique additions under an action alternative. For example, under the NAA, the co-lead agencies would continue to invest in power-related capital improvements, additions, replacements, and fund operations and maintenance as needed.

## **2.3 Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Costs**

The OMRRR costs include costs to operate and maintain the dams and reservoirs and adult fish facilities. Operations and maintenance costs have been estimated for each action alternative based on the specific structural and operational measures included. Operations and programs staff and PDT members, based on their knowledge of system operations, developed an estimate of measure-specific OMRRR costs. Completed projects use actual operations and maintenance cost data, projects currently in design use a project-specific estimate, and projects that have not started use a Class 5 estimate.<sup>1</sup>

## **2.4 Risk and Uncertainty**

There are multiple areas of risk and uncertainty in the cost analysis. Risk and uncertainty are inherent with estimates developed and used for water resource planning. Much of the risk and uncertainty associated with cost modeling stems from the assumptions that future costs reflect historical activities and costs. There are uncertainties in the needs and timing of operations and maintenance, engineering and design, construction costs, and capital requirements. Technological advancements and cost efficiencies can also affect future costs, although any future changes in technologies are speculative.

Given the uncertainty associated with the planning-level design for structural measures, the Walla Walla District Mandatory Center of Expertise for Cost Engineering developed an abbreviated risk analysis. During the analysis, the Project Delivery Team discussed project definition, status of the design, and various elements of project risk to establish high and low variance from the estimated project cost (Table 2-1). Note the costs in Table 2-1 are the combined engineering and design and capital (construction) costs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Per ER-1110-2-1302 Engineering and Design CIVIL WORKS COST ENGINEERING, a Class 5 estimate is a rough order of magnitude estimate relying on input such as broad-based assumptions, costs from comparable projects, and cost engineering judgement.

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 2-1. Estimated Variance in Project Cost by Alternative.**

Alternative	Low-Cost Range (millions of dollars)	Current Total Cost (millions of dollars)	High-Cost Range (millions of dollars)
1	2,020	3,288	5,274
2A	1,292	1,967	2,760
2B/5	1,242	1,913	2,869
3A	386	637	933
3B	473	755	1,266
4	2,183	3,492	5,541
6	1,745	2,543	3,687

Due to a complex Federal study approval and project appropriation process, the actual implementation timeframe for each alternative is uncertain. The cost analysis presents total “project first costs” in FY25 dollars. Project first costs include construction costs as well as contingency; supervision and administration; planning, engineering, and design; and engineering during construction.

### 3. COST ESTIMATES

#### 3.1 Capital and Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation Cost Estimates by Alternative

This section provides cost estimates of the engineering and design during construction, capital construction, and annual operations and maintenance for each Alternatives, including the No Action Alternative. Costs in the tables below are in millions of dollars. Cost estimate for nature-based improvements to revetments is listed separately since the revetments are not associated with specific dams.

**Table 3-1. No-action Alternative Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>		
Detroit/Big Cliff	0.0	8.1
<b>South Santiam</b>		
Foster	0.0	2.7
Green Peter	0.0	6.3
<b>Long Tom</b>		
Fern Ridge	0.0	2.5
<b>McKenzie</b>		
Cougar	0.0	6.5
Blue River	0.0	2.1
<b>Middle Fork</b>		
Hills Creek	0.0	4.4
Lookout/Dexter	0.0	10.7
Fall Creek	0.0	2.1
<b>Revetments</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-2. Alternative 1 Costs by Sub-Basin**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design/ EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>Low Design/EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>High Design/EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>Low Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>High Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>OMRRR (\$M)</b>	<b>Low OMRRR (\$M)</b>	<b>High OMRRR (\$M)</b>
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	251.7	143.8	367.6	986.6	592.8	1418.0	13.2	10.5	17.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	27.5	13.6	47.4	58.7	28.0	102.9	2.9	2.3	3.9
Green Peter	303.7	193.2	512.9	690.3	439.2	1165.8	11.5	9.2	15.0
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	3.1	1.6	6.2	7.1	3.5	14.2	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	2.9	2.3	5.7	6.8	5.4	13.2	6.7	2.2	3.6
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	5.7
Lookout/Dexter	285.7	178.8	489.5	649.3	406.4	1112.5	15.7	12.5	20.4
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	879	537	1,435	2,409	1,483	3,840	61	46	75

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-3 Alternative 2A Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	248.9	141.5	362.0	980.3	587.7	1405.4	13.2	10.5	17.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	24.7	11.4	41.9	52.4	22.9	90.2	2.9	2.3	3.8
Green Peter	18.3	14.6	24.0	41.6	33.1	54.6	6.6	5.3	8.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	40.1	32.1	52.2	163.9	131.1	213.0	11.6	6.1	10.0
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	5.7
Lookout/Dexter	117.0	93.6	152.2	266.0	212.8	345.8	15.6	12.5	20.3
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	453	297	638	1,514	996	2,122	61	46	74

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-4 Alternative 2B Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	248.9	141.5	362.0	980.3	587.7	1405.4	13.2	10.5	17.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	24.7	11.4	41.9	52.4	22.9	90.2	2.9	2.3	3.8
Green Peter	18.3	14.6	24.0	41.6	33.1	54.6	6.6	5.3	8.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	45.7	34.3	114.3	104.2	78.2	260.0	6.9	2.4	4.3
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	5.7
Lookout/Dexter	117.0	93.6	152.2	266.0	212.8	345.8	15.6	12.5	20.3
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	459	299	700	1,454	943	2,169	54	40	65

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-5 Alternative 3A Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.7	1.4	2.2	8.3	6.6	10.7
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.8	2.2	3.6
Green Peter	18.3	14.6	24.0	41.6	33.1	54.6	6.6	5.3	8.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	9.6	7.7	12.5	22.1	17.7	28.8	6.7	2.3	3.7
Blue River	73.8	42.3	107.1	168.0	96.4	243.7	2.6	2.0	3.3
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	87.6	49.2	134.8	199.2	111.9	306.4	4.7	3.8	6.1
Lookout/Dexter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	8.6	14.0
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	194	118	285	443	269	649	47	34	56

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-6 Alternative 3B Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	0.65	0.52	0.84	1.71	1.37	2.22	8.3	6.6	10.7
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.8	2.2	3.6
Green Peter	18.3	14.6	24.0	41.6	33.1	54.6	6.6	5.3	8.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	45.7	34.3	114.3	104.2	78.2	260.0	6.9	2.4	4.3
Blue River	73.8	42.3	107.1	168.0	96.4	243.7	2.6	2.0	3.3
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	87.6	49.2	134.8	199.2	111.9	306.4	4.7	3.8	6.1
Lookout/Dexter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	8.6	14.0
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	230	144	386	525	329	880	47	35	56

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-7 Alternative 4 Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	251.7	143.8	367.6	986.6	592.8	1418.0	13.2	10.5	17.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	27.5	13.6	47.4	58.7	28.0	102.9	2.9	2.3	3.8
Green Peter	3.1	2.4	6.1	7.0	5.4	13.9	6.3	5.0	8.2
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	3.1	1.6	6.2	7.1	3.5	14.2	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	42.9	34.3	57.7	170.2	136.2	225.7	11.6	6.1	10.0
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	301.0	191.0	507.4	684.0	434.1	1153.1	9.7	7.7	12.6
Lookout/Dexter	285.7	178.8	489.5	649.3	406.4	1112.5	15.7	12.5	20.4
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	919	569	1,487	2,573	1,614	4,053	66	50	81

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-8 Alternative 5 Costs by Sub-Basin**

Location	Design/ EDC (\$M)	Low Design/EDC (\$M)	High Design/EDC (\$M)	Capital (\$M)	Low Capital (\$M)	High Capital (\$M)	OMRRR (\$M)	Low OMRRR (\$M)	High OMRRR (\$M)
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	248.9	141.5	362.0	980.3	587.7	1405.4	13.2	10.5	17.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	24.7	11.4	41.9	52.4	22.9	90.2	2.9	2.3	3.8
Green Peter	18.3	14.6	24.0	41.6	33.1	54.6	6.6	5.3	8.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	45.7	34.3	114.3	104.2	78.2	260.0	6.9	2.4	4.3
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	5.7
Lookout/Dexter	117.0	93.6	152.2	266.0	212.8	345.8	15.6	12.5	20.3
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	459	299	700	1,454	943	2,169	54	40	65

*Willamette Valley System Operations and Maintenance  
Environmental Impact Statement*

**Table 3-9 Alternative 6 Costs by Sub-Basin**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Design/ EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>Low Design/EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>High Design/EDC (\$M)</b>	<b>Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>Low Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>High Capital (\$M)</b>	<b>OMRRR (\$M)</b>	<b>Low OMRRR (\$M)</b>	<b>High OMRRR (\$M)</b>
<b>North Santiam</b>									
Detroit/Big Cliff	290.7	175.0	416.4	1075.3	663.7	1528.9	10.8	8.6	14.1
<b>South Santiam</b>									
Foster	49.4	31.2	74.0	108.6	67.9	163.3	2.9	2.3	3.8
Green Peter	42.6	34.0	55.5	96.7	77.2	126.2	4.3	3.5	5.6
<b>Long Tom</b>									
Fern Ridge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	3.2
<b>McKenzie</b>									
Cougar	70.5	54.1	146.4	160.4	123.1	333.1	6.1	4.9	8.3
Blue River	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6	2.2	1.8	2.9
<b>Middle Fork</b>									
Hills Creek	25.1	20.1	32.7	57.1	45.7	74.2	3.8	3.0	4.9
Lookout/Dexter	168.8	135.0	219.4	383.6	306.9	498.7	13.1	10.5	17.1
Fall Creek	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.6	2.7
<b>Revetments</b>	4.1	3.3	5.3	9.6	7.6	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$651</b>	<b>\$453</b>	<b>\$950</b>	<b>\$1,892</b>	<b>\$1,292</b>	<b>\$2,737</b>	<b>\$48</b>	<b>\$38</b>	<b>\$63</b>

### 3.2 Annual Costs

An implementation schedule was not developed for each alternative; therefore year-by-year costs are not available for each alternative. For calculation of the Average Annual Equivalent Cost (AAEQ) in Table 3-10, the Design and EDC and Capital costs were spread evenly over the first 20 years of the 30-year implementation timeframe.

**Table 3-10 Design and Engineering During Construction (EDC), Capital, and Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs and Total Annual Costs for Each Alternative (Millions \$, FY25 Price Level, 3.25% Discount Rate)**

Alternative	Design and EDC	AAEQ Design and EDC	Capital	AAEQ Capital	O&M	Total AAEQ Cost
NAA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45	\$45
1	\$879	\$95	\$2,409	\$35	\$61	\$194
2A	\$453	\$60	\$1,514	\$18	\$61	\$142
2B	\$459	\$57	\$1,454	\$18	\$54	\$132
3A	\$194	\$18	\$443	\$8	\$47	\$75
3B	\$230	\$21	\$525	\$9	\$47	\$79
4	\$919	\$102	\$2,573	\$36	\$66	\$208
5	\$459	\$57	\$1,454	\$18	\$54	\$132
6	\$651	\$75	\$1,892	\$26	\$48	\$151

\* The total in this column may not be the sum of the three annual columns due to rounding.

### REFERENCES

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2026. Economic Guidance Memorandum 26-01, Federal Interest Rates for Corps of Engineers Projects for Fiscal Year 2026. October 30, 2026. Available in the [Planning Toolbox](#)