Skagit County Mitigation 20/20 Task ™ Estimated Value of Structures at Risk, by

	Neighborhood	Estimated Number Of Structures	Average Value of Each Structure	Percent Structures Considered At Risk	Total Estimated Value (\$) of Structures at Risk				
Skagit County (Unincorporated)									
Hazard Drought									
Neighborhood Name									
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00	25%	\$354,811,380				
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00	15%	\$187,904,588				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00	5%	\$7,219,131				
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	5%	\$6,422,988				
Hazard Earthquake									
Neighborhood Name									
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00	25%	\$354,811,380				
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00		\$939,522,938				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00		\$72,191,310				
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	20%	\$25,691,950				
Hazard Flooding									
Neighborhood Name									
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00		\$1,127,427,525				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00	5%	\$7,219,131				
Hazard High Winds									
Neighborhood Name									
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00		\$1,064,434,140				
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00		\$751,618,350				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00		\$28,876,524				
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	20%	\$25,691,950				
Hazard Landslide, Erosio	on								
Neighborhood Name		400-	***		*				
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00		\$141,924,552				
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00		\$62,634,863				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00		\$21,657,393				
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	15%	\$19,268,963				
Hazard Major Fire -Wildla	and								
Neighborhood Name		400-	***		4 -00 000 -00				
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00		\$709,622,760				
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00		\$125,269,725				
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00		\$72,191,310				
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	50%	\$64,229,876				

Date Printed: 6/20/2003 Page 1 of 2

^{*} Explanation of analysis methodology provided at end of report

	Neighborhood	Estimated Number Of Structures	Average Value of Each Structure	Percent Structures Considered At Risk				
Hazard Severe Winter	Storm							
Neighborhood Name								
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00	50%	\$709,622,760			
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00	50%	\$626,348,625			
Upper Elevation	Mixed Use	2154	\$67,030.00	50%	\$72,191,310			
Wildlands	Mixed Use	1513	\$84,904.00	50%	\$64,229,876			
Hazard Storm surge, Tsunami								
Neighborhood Name								
Fidalgo	Mixed Use	4697	\$302,160.00	5%	\$70,962,276			
Lower Elevation	Mixed Use	8043	\$155,750.00	5%	\$62,634,863			

To make jurisdiction-wide analysis of the dollar value of properties at risk for each hazard type feasible and practical for mitigation planning purposes, a simplified approach has been used. The estimate of the dollar value of properties at risk for specific hazards is accomplished in the following manner: The number of structures in a specific neighborhood and the average dollar value for those structures is estimated by local planners, based on readily available data or their best judgment in the absence of suitable data. The percentage of the specific neighborhood threatened by the identified hazard is then estimated by local planners, again based on readily available data or their best judgment. The percent of the neighborhood at risk is then used as a multiplier to determine the estimated number of structures at risk from that hazard. This number is then multiplied by the estimated average cost of the structures to derive an estimated total value of the property at risk of damage in that neighborhood from the identified hazard. The methodology is simplistic but conservative, in that it assumes structures are uniformly distributed throughout the neighborhood in relation to the area of risk, that the hazard threatens the entire value of each structure, and that structures are equally vulnerable to the impacts of the hazard. The derived estimates for the dollar value of property at risk may therefore be higher than would actually be the case, but the estimates are considered satisfactory to support the local mitigation planning process.

Date Printed: 6/20/2003 Page 2 of 2

^{*} Explanation of analysis methodology provided at end of report