

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
EARTH		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a geotechnical standpoint, the site is suitable for the proposed development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for earth-related impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the proposed retail store, parking area and lease lot would require clearing, grading and earth movement, including removal of previously placed undocumented fill material. Approximately 49,500 cubic yards of cut would be required, with approximately 25,000 cubic yards used onsite as fill material, and approximately 24,500 cubic yards (previously placed undocumented fill) exported from the site. An additional, approximately 32,500 cubic yards of fill material would be imported to the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some minor ground settlement could occur as a result of construction of the proposed building and parking areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed utility systems, including stormwater control facilities would be designed and constructed to be above the groundwater elevation onsite. As such, dewatering during construction would not be expected to be necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portions of the site could be susceptible to liquefaction during a seismic event; however, the risk if liquefaction during a seismic event would likely be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onsite topsoil would not be used as fill material, except for landscaping purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and mitigation would not be necessary.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to placing structural fill, the exposed subgrade would be compacted per the recommendations from the geotechnical report to reduce potential for ground settlement (see Appendix C for details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural fill would consist of onsite native soils and/or imported select fill material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where uncontrolled fill is encountered, it would be overexcavated to a minimum depth of 3 feet below the pavement section of the proposed parking lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) measures appropriate for the season in which construction is being performed would be implemented, based on a TESC plan. These would include stabilized construction entrance, filter fabric fences, cover measures (such as vegetative cover), and avoiding vehicle tracking of mud offsite, per the City of Tumwater's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region (1994), as amended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During construction, stormwater would be infiltrated onsite via temporary infiltration ditches and trenches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During earthwork activities, temporary slopes would be protected from the elements by covering with a protective membrane of plastic sheeting or similar impermeable material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent slopes would be planted with a deep-rooted, rapid-growth vegetative cover as soon as possible after completion of slope construction. Grass or groundcover would be planted on all exposed areas with side slopes of 3H:1V or greater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structures constructed on the site, including the proposed retail store and gas station, would meet International Building Code (IBC) design standards for seismic design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With implementation of proposed mitigation measures, no significant earth-related impacts would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for impacts would occur at this time.
WATER RESOURCES		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed construction activities would disturb onsite soils and increase the potential for soil erosion. Without mitigation, surface water runoff could transport eroded soils to nearby roads and the City's drainage system, and ultimately natural receiving waters, affecting water quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No construction or associated potential for water quality impacts would occur at this time. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for water-related impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During construction, unintended release of fuels, oil or hydraulic fluid could contaminate soils and, if unintended or uncontrolled, migrate to groundwater or into surface water resources, affecting water quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following development, approximately 85 percent of the site (or 18.4 acres) would be converted to impervious surfaces, such as building roofs, parking lots, driveways and sidewalks. Post-development stormwater runoff would contain pollutants associated with vehicles and commercial land use, such as: grease and oil, metals and nutrients, and landscape herbicides and pesticides. Without mitigation, these pollutants could contribute to surface (and groundwater) quality degradation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No increase in impervious surface or associated potential for water quality impacts would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A permanent stormwater control system would be designed and constructed according to the City of Tumwater's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for Thurston County (1994), as amended, and the North Thurston County Groundwater Management Plan (1991), as amended. The stormwater system would include onsite water quality treatment vaults and infiltration vaults, and would be sized for the 100-year, 24-hour storm. A separate onsite water quality treatment facility would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, an open surface infiltration pond would also be provided in the northwestern portion of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>be provided in the gas station canopy area, as required by the building code. In the event of a storm greater than the 100-year, 24-hour storm, stormwater would overflow onto the onsite parking lot. No existing flooding or erosion problems are known to exist within ¼ mile downstream of the site that would be exacerbated by the overflow.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development of the site would not affect drinking wells located within a ½ mile radius of the site, because the shallow groundwater flow direction from the site is generally away from these wells. The one private well that is within a ½ mile of the site, and in the general path of groundwater flow from the site, would be protected by the project's adherence to applicable code requirements related to groundwater protection, which include those listed in TMC 16.26 and standards in TMC 16.24 and TMC 18.39. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated potential for impacts to drinking wells would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed retail use would include the onsite storage (for sale), handling, and sale of household and automotive goods, including potentially hazardous materials within the proposed onsite gas station on the future lease lot and within the automotive, paint, household cleaning, and garden departments of the retail store. There would be some potential for accidental spills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, the onsite gas station would be located in the northwestern portion of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No potential for residential spills of potentially hazardous materials would occur at this time.
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) best management practices (BMPs), as specified in the City of Tumwater's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region (1994), as amended, would be implemented (see the Section 3.1, Earth for details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and mitigation would not be necessary.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared and implemented as required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) permit (it should be noted that the NPDES permit would not be required by the project; however, the applicant has indicated that an NPDES permit would be applied for from the Department of Ecology). The SWPPP would include TESC BMPs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permanent stormwater control system would be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Tumwater's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region (1994), as amended, and the North Thurston County Groundwater Plan (1991), as amended. The system would include underground stormwater quality treatment vaults and an underground infiltration vault under the parking area. A separate onsite water quality treatment facility would be provided in the gas station canopy area, as required by the building code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however the system would also include an open surface infiltration pond provided in the northeastern portion of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All applicable regulations related to the storage, handling and sale of potentially hazardous materials would be followed (see Section 3.4, Hazardous Materials and Explosion Risk for details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No household hazardous materials would be stored outdoors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accidental spills of hazardous materials during operation of the project would be addressed by a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan that would be developed as part of the SWPPP in accordance with the NPDES permit. The SPCC would comply with federal regulations under the Clean Water Act Section 311 (40 CFR part 112), and with WAC 173-303-350. SPCC plans include: 1) actions to be taken in the event of a spill; 2) descriptions of arrangements with local agencies, 3) the name of the owner's emergency coordinator, 4) a list of emergency equipment available, and 5) an evaluation of plan for business personnel. The SWPPP would identify plans for control measures and spill response to prevent or control construction equipment leakage of fuel, oil or hydraulic fluid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A separate onsite water quality treatment facility would be provided in the gas station canopy area, as required by the building code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to surface or groundwater resources would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for water-related impacts would occur at this time.
TREES AND VEGETATION		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of the proposed retail store, future lease lot, and associated parking and driveway areas would require clearing of approximately 19.2 acres (91 percent) of the approximately 21-acre site (approximately half the site is currently vegetated). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction would require clearing of approximately 18.7 acres (90 percent of the site), somewhat less than under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated clearing would occur. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for tree and vegetation-related impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project would require clearing of a majority of the existing trees on the site, including 65 unhealthy trees and 324 of the healthy trees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, slightly fewer existing, healthy trees would be cleared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearing of vegetation would follow the applicable provisions of the Tumwater Municipal Code and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Forest Practices Rules. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site would occur at this time, and mitigation would not be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 54 healthy, large-diameter trees would be preserved on the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 68 healthy, large-diameter trees would be preserved on the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 612 trees would be planted on and offsite, to meet the requirements of TMC 16.08, or a monetary contribution would be made to the City's Tree Account for offsite plantings. (This number would be in addition to trees required based on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of 549 trees would be planted on and offsite, to meet the requirements of TMC 16.08. (This number would also be in addition to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>landscaping regulations in TMC 18.47). Planting and/or funding of trees to meet TMC 16.08 requirements would include 133 replacement trees planted onsite, and planting or funding (through the City's Tree Fund Program) of an additional 479 trees offsite.</p>	<p>trees required based on landscaping regulations). Planting and/or funding of trees to meet TMC 16.08 requirements would include 249 replacement trees planted onsite, and planting or funding of 300 trees offsite (the required tree preservation/planting would be less than under the Proposed Action, because slightly less area would be developed, and more trees would be retained).</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An additional 260 trees would be planted onsite per TMC 18.47 landscaping regulations (i.e., to provide buffers between the site and adjoining properties and interior buffers within parking areas). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An additional 208 trees would be planted onsite to meet TMC 18.47 landscaping requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groves of trees would be retained in the southwest and northeast portions of the site, similar to the Costco and Fred Meyer projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several large-diameter (25- to 30-foot tall) evergreen trees would be planted along the site frontage to create a landscape buffer along Littlerock Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following development, approximately 1.8 acres of existing vegetation and trees (9 percent of the site) would be preserved, and approximately 1.3 acres (6 percent of the site) would be in landscaped area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, approximately 2.3 acres of existing vegetation and trees (11 percent of the site) would be preserved, and approximately 0.8 acres (4 percent of the site) would be in landscaped area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project would result in clearing of a majority of the vegetation and trees onsite; however, approximately half of the site has already been cleared. Fifty-four healthy, large-diameter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, 68 healthy trees would be preserved, and 549 new trees would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for tree and vegetation-related impacts would occur at this time.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>trees would be preserved, and tree protection provisions of the Tumwater Municipal Code would be met through the planting of 612 new trees both on and offsite at approved locations, to include several large-diameter (25- to 30-foot tall) evergreen trees on the site, or through a monetary contribution to the City's Tree Account. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts would result.</p>	<p>be planted on and offsite, or monetary contribution made to the City's tree account.</p>	
<p>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND EXPLOSION RISK</p>		
<p><u>Significant Impacts</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other than a 500-gallon waste oil tank that was removed from the site during 1992, no hazardous materials are known to exist onsite, and no known hazardous materials would be impacted by construction or operation of the proposed retail store or associated parking area. A potential exists for the discovery of hazardous materials within the uncontrolled fill present on the site, and a limited potential exists for the discovery of hazardous materials (i.e. underground storage tanks) during earthwork activities within other portions of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for discovering buried hazardous materials would occur at this time. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for hazardous materials and explosion risk impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During construction, there would be some potential for accidental spills of construction-related chemicals; however, these would not generally be considered hazardous materials, and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) containing procedures for preventing and responding to accidental spills would be prepared prior to construction (see section 3.2 Water Resources section for details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for accidental spills of construction-related chemicals would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential for the adjacent Albany International facility to have impacted the site, or to impact the site in the future, is low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed retail use would include the onsite storage (for sale), handling, and sale of household and automotive goods including potentially hazardous materials with flammable, combustible and corrosive liquids, within the proposed future lease lot in the southern portion of the site, and within the automotive, paint, household cleaning, and garden departments of the retail store. The proposed gas station on the proposed future lease lot would include underground bulk oil tanks typical of gas station use. While all applicable regulations would be followed, there would be some potential for accidental spills during the storage, handling or sale of these materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, the proposed future lease lot where many of these potentially hazardous materials would be stored and sold would be at the northern end of the site, rather than in the site's southern portion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for accidental spills of hazardous materials would occur at this time.
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and/or groundwater wells are encountered onsite during development, they would be decommissioned in accordance with applicable federal, state and local requirements. If UST(s) are found, removal of these USTs would be performed in compliance with Washington State's Underground Storage Tank Regulations (WAC 173-360-385), and with applicable federal and local regulations. A site assessment would be performed, consistent with WAC 173-360-390, to determine whether there has been any leakage of fuels. If leakages are detected, cleanup of the contaminated soils would occur in accordance with Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Cleanup Regulations (WAC 173-340). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and mitigation would not be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any buried hazardous materials, visibly impacted soil areas and/or septic tanks are discovered, they would be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable Federal, State and local requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During construction, any accidental spills of construction-related chemicals would be addressed through the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that would be implemented to prevent adverse construction-related water quality impacts (see Section 3.2, Water Resources). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All applicable regulations related to the storage, handling and sale of potentially hazardous materials would be followed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accidental spills of hazardous materials during operation of the project would be addressed by a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing a SPCC Plan would be prepared and implemented, in accordance with a National Pollution Discharge Elimination (NPDES) permit from the Department of Ecology (it should be noted that the NPDES permit would not be required by the project; however, the applicant has indicated that an NPDES permit would be applied for). The SPCC would comply with federal regulations under the Clean Water Act Section 311 (40 CFR part 112), and with WAC 173-303-350. SPCC plans include: 1) actions to be taken in the event of a spill, 2) descriptions of arrangements with local agencies, 3) the name of the owner's emergency coordinator, 4) a list of emergency equipment available, and 5) an evaluation plan for business personnel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sale of typical household use items that may be considered potentially hazardous (such as propane, aerosols, pesticides and herbicides) would be itemized and addressed as part of the City of Tumwater building permit process to verify that applicable regulations would be followed with respect to the handling and sale of these items. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The storage, handling and sale of potentially explosive materials such as propane, and gasoline on the proposed future lease lot, would be in accordance with all applicable regulations including WAC Chapter 296-24 (General Safety and Health Standards), WAC 173-180A through 180D (Facility Oil-Handling Standards), and WAC 173-360 (Underground Storage Tank Regulations), as applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No household hazardous materials would be stored outdoors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to environmental health conditions would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for hazardous materials and explosion risk impacts would occur at this time.
LAND USE		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in the conversion of approximately 21 acres of undeveloped area to a retail center with associated surface parking and a future lease lot (gas station) use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, approximately 20 acres would be affected. The future lease lot would be located in the northern rather than the southern portion of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development would occur at this time and the site would remain in its existing condition. However, it is likely that some form of site development under the site's General Commercial (GC) zoning would occur at some point in the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At buildout, approximately 85 percent of the site would be in built area, including approximately 20 percent of the site covered by the proposed retail center building, 2 percent of the site covered by the proposed gas station building and canopy, 63 percent of the site in surface parking/roadway area, and approximately 15 percent of the site would be in natural vegetation or landscaped area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the amount of building area on the site would increase from no building area under existing conditions to approximately 207,700 square feet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site development would result in a substantial change from the existing vacant and vegetated site, and would intensify the level of development in the area. However, the general character of the proposed retail center would be consistent with the existing urban retail land use character of the area and with the Tumwater Comprehensive Plan and Littlerock Road Subarea Plan goals and policies calling for commercial development in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Tumwater goals for the establishment of a new commercial center for the City would not be furthered at this time. However, it is likely that some form of site development under the site's GC zoning would occur at some point in the future.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no indication that significant historical or archaeological resources are present on the site. However, it is possible that unidentified resources may exist onsite that could be discovered during site development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated potential for uncovering historical or archaeological resources would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity levels on the site would increase over existing conditions, and would be typical of large-scale retail use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated increase in onsite activity levels would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would be greater in building size and activity level than the cemeteries and automobile salvage yard uses to the west; the middle school to the southwest; the residential uses located to the south, northwest and east; and uses across I-5 from the site. However, given the intervening distance, uses, and transportation corridors between the site and these areas, the potential for significant land use impacts on these uses would be limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, the retail building would be located approximately 100 feet farther to the south, approximately 700 feet from the residential area to the south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated increase in onsite activity levels and potential for land use compatibility impacts would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would not impact the historic status of the Bush/Union/Pioneer Calvary Cemetery to the west. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated potential for impacts to surrounding historical land uses would occur.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no indication that significant historical or archaeological materials are present onsite; however, if archaeological materials are discovered during construction onsite, all work would cease until such materials can be assessed by a professional archaeologist. If confirmed, the proper authorities would be notified and all work would cease until the find has been assessed and a course of action agreed upon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and no mitigation would be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation measures related to increased lighting and building bulk/scale are discussed in Section 3.8, Aesthetics/Light and Glare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in an increase in intensity of development on the site. This is consistent with the site's zoning designation, and City of Tumwater planning goals and policies for the Littlerock Road area, and no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land use would occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for land use-related impacts would occur at this time.
ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACTS		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City would be the primary recipient of economic impacts from the proposed project. While some economic activity would undoubtedly be created for businesses and households located in other cities and within Thurston County, such economic impacts would be dispersed and would not be significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development on the site or associated economic impacts would occur at this time. However, development on the site could occur in the future and would likely generate some increases in economic activity.
<u>Construction</u>		
<i>Economic Impacts</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is estimated that over \$727,000 in indirect and induced sales within Tumwater would result from construction activity for the Proposed Action, including nearly \$174,000 in indirect sales at Tumwater businesses, and \$554,000 in induced sales due to spending by construction and vendor employees locally. No direct business revenues in Tumwater are assumed to result from construction, based on the assumption that a general contractor from outside of Tumwater would likely be responsible for the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although an estimated 93 persons would be directly employed in project development and construction, these employees are not expected to be from Tumwater, based on the assumption that the general contractor would be from outside of Tumwater. However, some local indirect and induced jobs would be created. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a result of indirect and induced employment from project construction, employment income in Tumwater is estimated to increase by over \$300,000 during the course of construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<i>Fiscal Impacts</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the proposed retail store would result in one-time increases in tax revenues to the City of Tumwater during construction activity, estimated at over \$51,000 (primarily in sales tax and B&O taxes) which would result from sales by local supply vendors and spending by construction employees and others employed locally (indirect and induced economic impacts). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development on the site or associated fiscal impacts would occur at this time. However, development on the site could occur in the future and would likely generate some fiscal impacts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the proposed retail store could result in the need for limited increases in public service provision, primarily including police protection, fire protection and emergency medical service, and the associated fiscal costs to the City of providing those services. Construction would occur within a single year, and their associated costs for public services would be temporary and would not be considered significant. Additional analysis of fiscal impacts to public services is discussed below under <u>Operation</u>. Also see Section 3.12, Public Services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<i>Operation</i>		
<i>Economic Impacts</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over \$92.4 million in direct annual retail sales are estimated to occur upon stabilization of the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development on the site or associated economic impacts would occur at this time. However, development on the site could occur in the future and would likely generate some increases in economic activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct sales are estimated to drive an additional \$9.6 million in economic ripple effects in Tumwater via indirect and induced economic activity. Sales by local vendors of goods and services to the proposed project are expected to be minor at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>approximately \$1 million annually in current dollars (total indirect economic impact), as the proposed Wal-Mart store is expected to rely on a more nationally-based supply chain. Private spending by Tumwater residents employed directly or indirectly by operation of the proposed retail store is estimated to create nearly \$8.6 million in additional sales for Tumwater businesses (total induced economic impact).</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tumwater does not presently have an established downtown retail area, although Tumwater does feature historic homes and older neighborhoods in different parts of the community. Therefore, competition from the proposed Wal-Mart store with an established downtown retail area would not occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tumwater does not match the profile of rural, declining or depressed communities susceptible to negative, adverse economic impacts from the opening of the proposed type of store. However, local businesses and residents would be affected in varying degrees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The economic effects of the proposed store would be expected to include recovery of some retail sales leakage (sales to Tumwater residents currently occurring outside of Tumwater). The current retail sales leakage from Tumwater, due to residents shopping outside of Tumwater, is estimated at over \$20.5 million annually, or 10 percent of total retail sales activity in Tumwater. Further, a store in Tumwater would likely draw spending by residents of surrounding communities that shop at "less convenient" Wal-Mart stores in Lacey, Shelton and Chehalis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competing, non-grocery retailers dealing in similar goods may experience an initial loss of sales activity after the proposed store is constructed, due to shoppers sampling the new store. However, impacts on existing retailers would not be expected to be significant because: the number of Tumwater businesses and their sales are growing despite the existing retail sales leakage; to a certain extent, Tumwater businesses already compete against the Wal-Mart in Lacey and a new store in Tumwater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>does not pose unprecedented competition to existing Tumwater businesses; and, the precedent of the Lacey Wal-Mart store indicates that a highly visible Wal-Mart location along I-5 has not had an adverse impact upon the Lacey Fred Meyer store or its other direct competitors.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grocery store component of the proposed retail store would likely pose considerable competition for large, national grocery retailers including Albertson's, Fred Meyer (Kroger), and Costco. Existing grocery chains in Tumwater that compete purely on a price basis would be vulnerable to stagnant or lost business, depending upon their strategy in reaction to Wal-Mart's entry into the market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of the proposed grocery component of the project on existing, small grocers would not be considered significant, because current Tumwater residents already have an established choice in grocery stores between small, local establishments and large, national stores, and the larger chain outlets have, to date, not had adverse impacts upon the local economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operation of the proposed retail store can be expected to put downward pressure on local prices of grocery and non-grocery items, estimated at an average of 12 percent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment at the proposed retail store would be expected to reach 328 full-time equivalents (FTEs) by stabilization. This in turn would be expected to generate additional, new employment elsewhere in the Tumwater economy via indirect and induced effects, at approximately 44 FTEs. This employment would result in net, positive impacts to the local economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation of the proposed retail store is estimated to result in nearly \$9.9 million in direct annual employment income within Tumwater. Indirect and induced economic ripple effects are estimated to create an additional \$873,000 in labor income for Tumwater residents annually. On average, direct jobs at the proposed store are estimated to pay \$24,700, including benefits and other indirect compensation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hourly wage for employees of the proposed retail store is expected to average \$10.10, or seven percent lower than the County average retail wage of \$10.84. Although a lower average wage would be expected of a discount retailer, the average wage would be competitive with the County average. Accordingly, the proposed project would not be expected to result in negative impacts on wage scales in Tumwater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<i>Fiscal Impacts</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Tumwater would be expected to receive over \$718,000 in tax revenues (in 2005 dollars) annually, including sales, B&O, property and utility taxes, as a result of direct, indirect and induced commercial growth associated with operation of the proposed project, after stabilization. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development on the site or associated economic impacts would occur at this time. However, development on the site could occur in the future and would likely generate some fiscal impacts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation of the proposed retail store would result in increases in City public service provision and the associated fiscal costs to the City of providing those services. The most notable increase in needed services and associated costs would be for police protection, fire protection and emergency medical service, and road maintenance; other City departments could also be affected, but the effect would not be substantial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operation of the proposed retail store is estimated to result in the additional need for 0.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) police personnel within the Tumwater Police Department (see Section 3.12, Public Services). The annual cost of this additional staffing is estimated at \$30,000 in current, 2005 dollars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current estimate of additional fire fighter personnel necessary to meet target levels in the 1988 Fire Services Plan is four full time equivalent (FTE) personnel, each at a current annual cost of \$65,040 and a start-up cost (training, equipment) of \$8,000. However, according to the Tumwater Fire Chief, it cannot be concluded that the proposed retail store would warrant the additional hiring of fire department personnel. Therefore, additional costs for fire and emergency service were not assumed in the fiscal analysis (see Section 3.12, Public Services). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the proposed retail store would be expected to generate a 10 to 15 percent increase in traffic volumes on affected City streets (see Section 3.9, Transportation) and a similar increase in associated road maintenance costs. Therefore, annual road maintenance costs to the City would be expected to increase by roughly \$27,500 to \$41,250 in current 2005 dollars due to the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated annual City tax revenues of roughly \$680,000 that would directly result from operation of the proposed project would be expected to more than adequately reimburse the City for the estimated \$71,250 in additional public service costs directly attributable to the proposed project (the \$71,250 assumes an increase in road maintenance costs of 15 percent on affected roads). Further, expected City revenues of \$671,000, accounting for total revenues less bond levy revenue, would be expected to be adequate to meet estimated ongoing City costs resulting from the project (see Section 3.7, Economic Impacts and Appendix H for further information). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant fiscal or economic impacts would be expected, and no mitigation measures would be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and no mitigation would be necessary.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for economic or fiscal impacts would occur at this time.
AESTHETICS		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<i>Aesthetic Character</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The undeveloped, vacant site would be converted to a large-scale (approximately 207,700 square-foot) retail store and associated surface parking. A future lease lot would be located in the southern portion of the site to accommodate a gasoline service station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under this alternative, the realignment of Kingswood Drive would consolidate the two portions of the site into one contiguous surface parking area. The future lease lot that would accommodate a gasoline service station would be located in the northern portion of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development would occur at this time, and the site would continue in its current condition. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for aesthetic-related impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of the proposed building would be similar to the other large retail stores in the vicinity, which include a Home Depot, Costco and Fred Meyer, and design features of the building would be similar to, but with somewhat greater articulation than, the adjacent Fred Meyer and Costco stores. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project would require clearing of the majority of the existing trees onsite; each tree cleared in excess of the Tumwater Municipal Code (Chapter 16.08) would be replaced at a 3:1 ratio including both onsite and offsite plantings or by contribution to the City's Tree Fund Program (see Section 3.3, Trees and Vegetation for further detail). In addition to trees planted per TMC 16.08, 260 new trees would be planted onsite per applicable landscaping regulations of TMC 18.47. The placement of new trees throughout the parking lot, and the location of retained trees, would break up the mass of the parking lot and would be intended to provide a softer, more human scale to the development. The trees would also provide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, somewhat fewer trees would be cleared, and a larger number of replacement trees would be planted onsite. In addition to replacement trees, 208 new trees would be planted per applicable landscaping regulations, and the landscape plan for this alternative includes landscaped islands within the parking areas in addition to perimeter landscaping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>shade and would help minimize the glare from vehicles within the parking lot.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views of the proposed project would be possible from the uses and roadways that adjoin the site, including from Littlerock Road, I-5, and the multifamily development to the south of the site; however, proposed perimeter landscaping (or an 8-foot high site-obscuring screenwall along a portion of the eastern site boundary) would partially screen views of the building, and design features of the building would avoid the display of blank walls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated changes in views to the site would occur at this time.
<p><i>Light and Glare</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project would add light and glare sources to the site, including light from parking lot lighting, exterior building illumination, and vehicular traffic (see Figure 2-6 for the proposed lighting plan). The building and parking lots would be illuminated throughout the night for safety and security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; lighting, vehicle access and onsite circulation would be somewhat different, as would the location of associated light and glare (see Figure 2-9 for the Alternative 1 lighting plan). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated changes in light and glare conditions would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Light from the project would be visible from the uses adjoining the site, and could be visible from more distant uses, such as the multifamily residential area to the south, depending upon the type of lighting fixture that is used. Lighting on the site would appear as a continuation of the existing lighting pattern along the east side of Littlerock Road, and the proposed landscaping would provide screening for headlights at night. However, the proposed lighting system would be designed to minimize impacts to offsite uses, based on a photometric analysis, and the project's exterior lighting has been designed to ensure that lighting at all property lines, that are not abutted by a roadway, would not exceed 0.5 foot-candles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New sources of glare could include building and parking lot lighting, building surfaces (particularly windows and other reflective surfaces) and paving. Vehicular traffic would also be sources of glare. Given the type of lighting, building materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; lighting, vehicle access and onsite circulation would be somewhat different, as would the location of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>that have been specified for the project and the amount of glazing proposed, minimal new glare would be generated by the proposed building. The proposed landscaping would help to minimize glare from vehicles in the parking lot and along the perimeter of the site.</p>	<p>potential glare from lighting and traffic.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed building design is intended to be consistent with the Tumwater Municipal Code Design Review Guidelines (Chapter 18.43) to ensure that the proposal is visually compatible with surrounding uses and general community characteristics (see Section 3.6, Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies for details). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and no mitigation would be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed landscape plan has been designed in compliance with TMC 18.47, and features plantings along the site perimeter, as well as in islands within the parking areas. A landscape berm ranging in height from one to three feet is proposed along the site's entire Littlerock Road frontage, and several large diameter evergreen trees would be planted along the site's Littlerock Road frontage, to create a landscape buffer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, the landscape berm along Littlerock Road would be up to four feet in height in some places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior lighting fixtures would be shielded to reduce light spillage and glare, and lighting would be directed away from adjacent less intense land uses, consistent with TMC 18.50. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-reflectivity building glazing and building materials would be used on the building surfaces to reduce the potential for glare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed landscaping in and adjacent to the parking areas would help to minimize glare from onsite vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed exterior lighting system would be designed to ensure that lighting at all property lines that are not abutted by a roadway would not exceed 0.5 foot-candles, as requested by the City of Tumwater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An 8-foot high site-obscuring screenwall would be constructed along the portion of the eastern site boundary adjacent to the Albany International property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for aesthetic-related impacts would occur at this time.
TRANSPORTATION		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed retail development is expected to generate a total of 9,716 new daily, and 793 net new weekday PM peak hour vehicular trips. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new vehicular trips would be generated at this time. However, any future development of the site would likely result in trip generation similar to under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of service (LOS) impacts were calculated at 13 study intersections for the weekday PM peak hour. An assessment of queuing conditions along the Trosper Road corridor was also conducted. In addition, an origin-destination study was performed to link vehicle trips to/from the north along I-5 and trips to/from Capitol Boulevard south of the Trosper Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two arterial intersections are forecast to operate at LOS F in the future without the proposed project: the northbound and southbound I-5 ramps at Tumwater Boulevard. In addition to these two intersections, at the intersection of Littlerock Road and the Costco south driveway, LOS F conditions are anticipated to continue with the addition of traffic from previously approved projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the baseline condition in 2007 (without the proposed project), future queue lengths at several intersections locations along the Trosper Road corridor are anticipated to extend beyond the storage provided, and the maximum queue lengths are generally forecast to be longer than under existing conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2007 with the Proposed Action, three of the study area arterial intersections (not including site driveways) are forecast to operate below the City of Tumwater's LOS standard without mitigation: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the 2007 baseline without the proposed project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The I-5 SB Ramps/Trosper Road intersection is anticipated to operate at LOS F compared to LOS E without the proposed project. In addition, due to the proximity of this intersection to the Trosper Road/Littlerock Road SW intersection, eastbound queuing at the I-5 SB ramps would impact the operations of the Littlerock Road intersection. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The intersection of I-5 SB Ramps/Tumwater Boulevard is forecast to operate at LOS F with or without the proposed project. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The I-5 NB Ramps/Tumwater Boulevard is forecast to operate at LOS F with or without the proposed project. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queue lengths are forecast to increase along the Trosper Road corridor as a result of the proposed project. The greatest increase is anticipated at the I-5 SB Ramps/Trosper Road intersection.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the 2007 baseline without the proposed project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the proposed site plan, the parking lot would be bisected by Kingswood Drive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingswood Drive would be realigned along the south site boundary and the parking lot would not be bisected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingswood Drive would not be realigned and no parking lot would be constructed at this time.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shared access with Costco and Albany International (Littlerock Road/south Costco driveway) is forecast to operate at LOS F with (or without) the proposed project. A traffic signal is proposed by the applicant at the Littlerock Road/south Costco driveway. With installation of a signal, the intersection would improve to LOS A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. No signal would be installed at the Littlerock Road/South Costco Driveway, and the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally, as traffic volumes increase throughout the area, the potential for traffic accidents would also increase. However, the City's planned Littlerock Road improvement project will significantly improve operations and traffic safety as it relates to turning conflicts. Mitigation to improve safety and operations for the minor street movements is proposed at the south Costco shared access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action, except that no improvements to the south Costco access would occur.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the proposed site plan, there would be frequent pedestrian crossings of Kingswood Drive, increasing pedestrian/vehicle conflicts and affecting the operations of Kingswood Road. No significant safety impacts are anticipated, however. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingswood Drive would be realigned along the south site boundary and pedestrian/vehicle conflicts would be reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new pedestrian crossings of Kingswood Drive would occur.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the turn restrictions and the access management planned as part of the City's Littlerock Road corridor project, the proposed retail project would have minimal impact on the safety and operations of the Tumwater Middle School access. As a result of the proximity of the school access points to the future roundabout at Kingswood Drive and the traffic calming effect caused by the roundabout, travel speeds are anticipated to be within the design speeds of the roadway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action; however, Kingswood Drive would be located further to the south than under the Proposed Action. A design option that shifts the school's primary access to the north could improve Tumwater Middle School access. Another design option would be to maintain the three right – in–right–out access points currently planned by the City; with either case Alternative 1 would have minimal impact on the school's access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional impacts to the Tumwater Middle School access would occur.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the frontage improvements required of this project, the continuous section of sidewalk on Littlerock Road would extend to Kingswood Drive. No significant impacts to non-motorized transportation are anticipated with the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No frontage improvements on Littlerock Road would be constructed at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An administrative modification of the Tumwater Municipal Code has been requested by the applicant to allow an increased amount of parking for the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new parking is proposed at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A parking demand analysis was performed for the project. The proposed parking supply rate in the current proposal for the stalls north of Kingswood Drive would fall within the peak parking demand range (considering an 85 to 90 percent practical capacity) calculated for the non-December Saturday scenario. The parking supply would not be designated to meet the practical capacity of peak annual conditions onsite (in December). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, all parking would be located north of Kingswood Drive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<p>The applicant has proposed to implement the following transportation improvements, as identified in the Transportation Impact Analysis in Appendix I, as necessary mitigation for project impacts:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trosper Road/I-5 SB Ramp Intersection (Tyee Drive): The addition of exclusive through-lanes for the north and southbound approaches, the implementation of a northbound right-turn overlap phase, and signal timing optimization and phase modifications. These mitigations are more fully described in Appendix I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site would occur at this time and no mitigation is necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trosper Road/Littlerock Road: Reconfigure the northbound approach to include a right-turn lane, a right-through lane, and a left-turn lane. Reconfigure the westbound approach to include two exclusive left-turn lanes and a single through-right. Modify the signal phasing accordingly. These mitigations are more fully described in Appendix I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Littlerock Road/Costco Shared Access: Installation of a traffic signal including channelization. Traffic control would be provided at the internal intersection with Costco. Stop signs would be installed on both the north and south leg of this intersection. In addition, an eastbound right-turn lane from the shared access drive into the Wal-Mart parking lot would be constructed to improve internal circulation. These mitigations are more fully described in Appendix I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<p>In addition, the applicant has volunteered to take the following actions to improve non-project related transportation deficiencies:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Troster Road/Capitol Boulevard: Eliminate the signal phasing for the east leg of the intersection and construct a northbound U-turn, north of M Street. These mitigations are more fully described in Appendix I. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under proposed action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under no action.
<p>The Applicant would endeavor to construct the Troster Road/Capitol Boulevard improvements described above, but if necessary right-of-way is not available or construction is prevented by circumstances outside the applicant's control, the City would accept a letter of credit for the cost of these improvements. Completion of these improvements would not be a precondition to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the project.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant would voluntarily pay a mitigation fee under RCW 82.02.020 for impacts to the Tumwater Boulevard/I-5 Interchange as described below:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tumwater Boulevard/I-5 Interchange: The City's planned transportation improvements at the Tumwater Boulevard/I-5 interchange include widening of the existing overpass, adding a second lane to the northbound on-ramp, signalization of the northbound ramp terminal, addition of new interchange on-ramps for both eastbound to northbound and westbound to southbound traffic. These mitigations are more fully described in Appendix I. <p>The proportionate share of constructing the improvements is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the proposed action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under no action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>derived by dividing the total costs of improvements by the total amount of capacity (in trips) provided by those improvements. In this case, that proportionate share amounts to a mitigation fee of \$3,103 for each of the 118 trips that would be generated by the project that are distributed to the Tumwater Boulevard/I-5 interchange; for a total of \$366,154.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-5/Tumwater Boulevard Interchange. Improvements have been identified for the I-5 interchange at Tumwater Boulevard. The proposed project would be required to pay a mitigation fee towards these improvements at approximately \$3,100 per weekday PM peak hour trip that would impact the interchange. Based on the number of trips attributed to the proposed project and projected to travel through this interchange, the total cost of mitigation would be approximately \$366,000. The City of Tumwater's current CFP includes the Tumwater Boulevard project as a funded improvement through the collection of the SEPA mitigation fees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capitol Boulevard/Trosper Road The improvements at the intersection of Trosper Road/Capitol Boulevard would include the elimination of the westbound signal phase at this intersection. The existing east leg of this intersection would be converted to a left-in/right-in/right-out movement. A u-turn location would be developed north of the Burger King access at a location yet to be determined by the City. Although the project's impacts would not trigger the need for this improvement, the existing and future baseline conditions warrant this improvement and have been previously identified in the City's sub-area plan prepared for this area. With this improvement, the northbound through/left-turn queue is anticipated to decrease from 715 feet (with-project) to 310 feet. • Measures would be instituted during the peak retail season if parking onsite reaches full capacity. These measures could include requiring employees to park offsite in designated areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action. • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With proposed mitigation, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to transportation would be expected. The I-5 SB Ramps/Tumwater Boulevard intersection will not meet City of Tumwater LOS standards with or without the proposed project; however, the project would contribute to future improvements at this intersection in the form of SEPA mitigation fees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for transportation-related impacts would occur at this time.
AIR		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities, if not properly mitigated, could temporarily generate PM₁₀ (coarse particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter) and small amounts of other pollutants at the site and from vehicles leaving the site; the potential would be greatest during excavation activities. Any air quality construction impacts would be temporary or short-term and with mitigation would not be significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site, or associated potential for construction or operational air quality impacts would occur at this time. However, any future development on the site would likely result in a similar potential for impacts as under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy trucks and construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would generate CO and NO_x in exhaust emissions. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the site, and with mitigation would not be significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some phases of construction would result in short-term odors, particularly during paving operations using asphalt. Odors might be detectable to some people near the project site and would be diluted as distance from the proposed site vicinity increases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, NO_x, or O₃ emissions or any other criteria pollutant concentration would not increase above the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and would not contribute to any significant air quality impacts during daily operation of the proposed retail store or based on traffic associated with the proposed retail store. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable and/or appropriate precautions would be taken to prevent fugitive particulate material from becoming airborne, consistent with ORCAA regulations, Sections 9.05(c) and Ecology regulations in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Sections 173-400-040, 050, 060, and 070 and TMC 18.40. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and no mitigation would be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction impacts would be mitigated by incorporating best management practices (BMPs) into the project's construction plans and specifications using both Ecology and ORCAA regulations. See Section 3.10, Air Quality, for a list of BMP mitigation measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project would conform to all applicable air quality regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A traffic signal would be installed at the Littlerock Road/S Costco Driveway intersection to bring the intersection into compliance with the City of Tumwater intersection level of service standard (see Section 3.9, Transportation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated potential for air quality-related impacts would occur at this time.
NOISE		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic noise modeling was conducted to predict baseline noise levels in 2007 without the proposal. Baseline noise levels in 2007 would increase by a maximum of 1 dBA over existing conditions at the 7 representative receivers analyzed. The highest noise levels would be expected in the residential area to the south of the site represented by Receiver 5, which is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>predicted to have a noise level of 64 dBA, due to the close proximity of Littlerock Road. A 1 dBA increase is expected to go unnoticed by the homeowners in this area (noise changes of less than 3 dBA are generally imperceptible).</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The primary source of construction noise under the Proposed Action would be heavy equipment, such as heavy trucks. Secondary noise sources would include stationary equipment, such as generators and compressors. Depending on the activity, peak noise levels from equipment would most likely range from 69 to 106 dBA at 50 feet from the source; however, noise would decrease with distance from the source at a rate of approximately 6-7.5 dBA per doubled distance. The closest receivers in the site vicinity are a commercial property and a cemetery located approximately 500 to 600 feet from the proposed retail store; the nearest residences are located approximately 800 feet from the proposed construction area. Construction activities generally are short-term and occur during daylight hours when occasional loud noises are more tolerable. During daylight hours, such noises are exempt from local, state, and federal regulations. Construction would comply with the City's noise regulations prohibiting construction activities that produce noise clearly audible at any dwelling units during nighttime hours (TMC 8.08). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No construction would occur at this time. Future development of the site could result in construction noise impacts similar to under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The operation of the proposed retail store would contribute to increased noise levels in the site vicinity. The primary source of noise associated with operation of the proposed retail store would be noise from traffic associated with the project, including truck traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No retail store would be operated on site at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic noise modeling for the 2007 horizon year with the project was conducted. Compared to baseline conditions in 2007, noise levels at representative receiver locations under the Proposed Action would be expected to increase by an average of approximately 2 dBA. The predicted noise increases under the Proposed Action, as compared to existing conditions, would generally be 1dBA higher than the noise increase over the 2007 baseline condition. None of the predicted noise levels would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic noise would be the same as under the 2007 baseline condition.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>approach or exceed the WSDOT noise abatement criteria of 67 dBA for residential areas and 72 dBA for commercial areas, and no significant noise impacts would be expected.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibration may be associated with delivery trucks traveling to and from the site. The vibration emitted from the delivery trucks would be typical of other commercial trucks in the area and would not be expected to significantly impact residences or businesses within the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No delivery truck vibration would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant store operational noise impacts would not result from the use of compressors or HVAC units, loading or unloading of trucks, or the use of garbage compactors at the site. Given the close proximity of I-5 to the east and the distance of the nearest residential sensitive receiver (over 600 feet in any direction), significant impacts to residential receivers would not result, even during nighttime hours. The brief frequency of these noise levels would be within Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) noise limitations for Class A and Class B Environmental Designations for Noise Abatement for daytime noise, would be below background noise levels, and would occur for periods that would be less than Ecology provisions during the nighttime hours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No retail store would be operated at this time.
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Construction</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce construction noise at nearby receivers, construction-industry best management practices would be incorporated into construction plans and contractor specifications, including: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site would occur at this time and no mitigation would be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limiting noisier construction activities to 7 AM to 8 PM during weekdays and 9 AM to 8 PM on Saturday to comply with the Tumwater Municipal Code noise regulations (TMC 8.08) and reduce construction noise impacts during sensitive nighttime hours. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equipping engines of construction equipment with adequate 		

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
mufflers, intake silencers, or engine enclosures that would reduce their noise by 5 to 10 dBA.		
- Turning off construction equipment when not in use for long periods of time to eliminate noise from construction equipment during those time periods.		
- Requiring contractors to maintain all equipment and training their equipment operators to reduce noise levels and increase efficiency of operation.		
- Locating stationary equipment away from receiving properties to decrease noise, as feasible.		
Operation		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mitigation measures related to operation of the proposed retail store or associated traffic would be required. However, best available mitigation alternatives could be implemented to limit operational noise. (See Appendix K, Section 9 for further information on mitigation measures.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None would be expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No noise-related development of the site or associated potential for impacts would occur.
PUBLIC SERVICES		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<i>Fire and Emergency Medical</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project would result in an incremental increase in overall demand on fire and emergency medical services provided by the Tumwater Fire Department. This would contribute to the overall needs advanced in the Tumwater Fire Department's 1988 Fire Services Plan (the 1988 Plan assumed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated increase in demand on fire and emergency medical services would occur at this time. Existing service deficiencies in fire services would continue. Future development of the site could result in additional

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<p>retail development would occur on the site, and accounted for this in its forecasted need for Department staffing and equipment).</p>		<p>demand for fire and emergency medical services.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An existing Wal-Mart super store located in the City of Chehalis generated an estimated 40 to 45 calls for service annually to the Chehalis Fire Department in 2003 and 2004. The majority of these calls were for emergency medical service. It is assumed that the proposed retail store would generate a similar number of calls for fire and emergency medical service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action; however, somewhat fewer calls for emergency services than under the Proposed Action could result, since the realignment of Kingswood Drive would eliminate the need for shoppers to cross Kingswood Drive and would reduce the potential for pedestrian/vehicle accidents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the Tumwater Fire Chief, the Department is presently understaffed citywide based on targeted service levels, as identified in the Tumwater 1988 Fire Services Plan; it cannot be concluded that the proposed retail store would warrant the additional hiring of fire department personnel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With future development at the site and continued growth occurring in the City, if needs identified in the Tumwater 1988 Fire Services Plan are not addressed (such as personnel to staff the north station), fire and emergency medical response times to the northern part of Tumwater may be difficult to maintain (see Section 3.12, Public Services). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional demand on fire and emergency medical services would also include annual fire code inspections. Currently, the Tumwater Fire Department is deficient in staff to adequately address this area of operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing fire flow on the site would exceed the flow requirement for fire protection sprinklers for the proposed building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development or associated need for fire flow would occur at this time.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<i>Police</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed retail store would result in an incremental increase in overall demand on police services provided by the City of Tumwater Police Department; approximately 359 calls for police service would be generated by the project annually, based on an average of the annual calls in 2003 and 2004 received by the City of Chehalis Police Department from the existing Wal-Mart super store located in that city. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site or associated increase in demand on police services would occur at this time. However, future development of the site could result in additional demand for police services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additional approximately 359 annual calls for police service to the project would represent an approximately 1.6 percent increase in calls for service in the City of Tumwater. If the increase in calls is used as the basis for a similar increase in the need for commissioned personnel within the Tumwater Police Department, the 1.6 percent increase would represent an additional 0.4 full time equivalent (FTE) staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed building would be equipped with fire protection sprinklers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development of the site would occur at this time, and no mitigation would be necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant would pay the City of Tumwater fire protection impact fee for commercial development, which is currently set at of \$0.1013 per gross square foot of floor area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Security at the proposed retail store would include a closed-circuit camera (surveillance) system inside the store operating 24 hours per day. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A trained risk control team would be responsible for identifying and correcting safety issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional security measures would include closed-circuit camera systems outside the store. Enhanced lighting outside the store could be provided, if deemed necessary by a risk analysis (crime survey) of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as above under No Action.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax revenues generated by the project (i.e., sales tax and business and operation tax) would offset the project's impacts on police and fire protection services. It is estimated that the project would result in an annual net surplus to the City of Tumwater (tax revenues would exceed public service costs; see Section 3.7, Economic Impacts and Appendix H for further information). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above under No Action.
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None expected with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for public services-related impacts would occur at this time.
UTILITIES		
<u>Significant Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would connect to existing utilities in Kingswood Drive with the onsite extension and looping of an 8-inch water line and an 8-inch sewer line on the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the Alternative 1 site plan, water and sewer lines in Kingswood Drive would need to be relocated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development or associated need for sewer and water connections would occur at this time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water demand from the proposed development would be approximately 6,800 gallons per day, within the capacity of the City of Tumwater water supply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development or associated increase in demand for water service would occur at this time. However, future development of the site could result in demand for water service.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewer demand would be approximately 6,120 gallons per day, within the capacity of the City of Tumwater sewer system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development or associated increase in demand on sewer service would occur at this time. However, future development of the site could result in demand for sewer service.
<u>Mitigation Measures</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant impacts to utilities would be expected, and no mitigation measures would be required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site would occur at this time and no mitigation would be necessary.

Proposed Action	Alternative 1	No Action Alternative
<u>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant adverse impacts to utility services are expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under the Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development of the site or associated potential for impacts would occur.