

From: [John Matterand](#)
To: [NWS-Skagit-River-GI](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (draft FR/EIS) for the Skagit River Flood Risk Management General Investigation Study Comment
Date: Monday, August 04, 2014 9:51:11 AM

As I reviewed the proposed solution for Skagit River flooding it appears that the proposal selected places the greatest weight on the economic savings gained by protecting Burlington and Mount Vernon flood plain areas. That is understandable, but that savings is based upon a clear transference of risk. I work in a dental office very close to United General Hospital and live just south of Clear Lake on Hwy 9. Both my livelihood and my water supply for my home are under a significant increased risk of damage from flooding by the increase in flood height brought about by the increased levee heights in Burlington. A mention was made in the study that the 1 foot increase in flood depths would only last for a day. I am not sure how that was determined but it does not matter to a dental office whether the flood damage is 1 day or 3 days, the damage will be extensive. With that increased flood depth the flood protection built into my dental office is negated. The increase in flood levels will obviously bring about an increase in flood insurance premiums that have already experienced a significant increase just last year. Are there plans to subsidize those increased costs for those of us in the storage area for Burlington and Mount Vernon? I believe that allowing Burlington, Dike District 12, and Mount Vernon to increase levee heights and reducing their flood insurance premiums should be offset by a subsidy of flood insurance premium increases for affected areas.

I do not believe that enough emphasis has been given to the risk to infrastructure upstream from Burlington. If United General Hospital has a flood protection structure built around it, it protects the building but if the hospital is completely cut off to ground transportation by flood waters it rapidly will lose it's effectiveness and will need to be evacuated by air. The importance of Hwy. 9 as an alternative to I-5 was demonstrated just last year but this Hwy. would be cut off with a significant flood event (increased likelihood under this proposal). Hwy. 20 east of Burlington would be cut off. I am a Commissioner for FPD #4 (Clear Lake). The Clear Lake Fire Building would need to be evacuated and fire events and medical aid calls might not be able to have a timely response.

In summary, I do not believe that this proposal addresses either the transfer of risk or the significantly increased costs for areas upstream from Burlington and would encourage some mechanism for this to be accounted for and paid for before this proposal is approved and implemented.

John Matterand DDS
[REDACTED]
Clear Lake, WA 98235