

Jon Harwood

The Local Actions Alternative "could approximate the Applicant's objective to reduce flooding from storms in the Willapa Hills."(p.28) That sounds great.

But also the authors of the EIS suggest that "Elements [of this action] could include components where the Applicant would support (through local regulatory powers, funding, or technical assistance) local efforts for flood damage reduction." Even better!

So the Local Action Alternatives could achieve the objectives. But also these other actions can also be considered, and are probably contained in the Chehalis Basin Strategy.

In addition other elements in the LAND program are still being developed. So there is additional hope there that one or more of those non-dam actions would be suitable.

Finally, Alternatives that were considered but eliminated, should be reexamined. Though not one of them offered much promise, some combination may give additional relief. Especially when combined with LAND actions not fully fleshed out. For example, when some private properties can be identified for voluntary purchase, combined with "Side Channels to Alleviate Flooding" may present a diversion not fully considered. Or the Building of I-5 Walls and Levees sounds like it became too expensive, in 2014. Not that it's going to be cheaper now. But if other measures already "approximate the Applicant's objectives", then perhaps the plan could be scaled down to protect against only the most catastrophic events.

And there's the ultimate solution that always gets tossed out for no good reason: Changes to Forest Practices. It's no coincidence that this flooding is happening in the watershed with the highest incidence of industrial forestry in the state.

It seems much can be done, and is being done, without all the damage and cost from this retention facility – dam.