

## CHAPTER 2

### DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This chapter of the Draft EIS describes the Proposed Action and alternatives for the Tumwater retail store. Please see Chapter 1 of this document for a summary of the findings of this Draft Supplemental EIS (SEIS) and Chapter 3 for a detailed presentation of affected environment, significant impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives, mitigation measures and significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

#### 2.1 Background

On December 7, 2004, the applicant, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., filed an application to construct an approximately 207,700 square-foot retail store on an approximately 21-acre site in the Littlerock Road subarea, (as designated by the City of Tumwater Comprehensive Land Use Plan). The City of Tumwater determined that the application was complete on December 15, 2004. The City reviewed the application materials and prior environmental documents related to the proposal. On January 24, 2005, the City issued a combined (1) Notice of Application (NOA), (2) Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents, and (3) Determination of Significance (DS) on the project, requiring preparation of a Supplemental EIS (SEIS) to supplement the Tumwater Town Center Draft and Final EISs (1993). On April 27, 2005, the City issued a Determination of the Scope of this SEIS (see **Appendix A** for the Determination of the Scope of the SEIS).

The Notice of Application (NOA) identified the key City permits and approvals that will be required for the proposed project (see the Fact Sheet of this document for a more complete list of city and state permits and approvals that must be obtained for the project):

#### **Prior Documents**

Several environmental documents have been prepared in the past that are relevant to the proposed Tumwater retail store project. These include the Tumwater Town Center Draft and Final EISs (1993), the Kingswood Center EIS Addendum (2002), both of which directly pertain to the site, and the Littlerock Road Subarea Plan and Final Supplemental EIS (1997). Per WAC 197-11-630, the City adopted the documents that pertain to the project site and determined that a Supplemental EIS was to be prepared, consistent with WAC 197-11-600 (4)(d). This EIS supplements the Tumwater Town Center EIS. Highlights of these documents are presented below.

The Tumwater Town Center EIS (Draft EIS, February, 1993) analyzed the probable significant impacts of a retail shopping center located on an approximately 36-acre site fronting on Littlerock Road, southwest of the Trospen Road/Interstate 5 Interchange. The Tumwater retail store site is part of the Tumwater Town Center site analyzed in that EIS. The Tumwater Town Center Draft EIS evaluated two development alternatives featuring commercial shopping centers ranging in size from 366,000 to 432,000 square feet. The proposed Tumwater retail store project is a component of this overall retail center development. The following elements of the environment were evaluated in the Draft EIS: Earth, Air, Water, Plants and Animals, Hazardous Waste and Asbestos, Environmental Hazards – Noise, Land Use, Aesthetics, Transportation, Public Services and Utilities. The Final EIS was issued in May, 1993.

The Kingswood Center (formerly Tumwater Town Center) EIS Addendum (May, 2002) was prepared to provide additional information and analysis on the proposed retail center. The

Addendum did not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the Tumwater Town Center EIS. This information and analysis primarily related to the Home Depot project. An approximately 116,000 square-foot Home Depot was subsequently approved and built on approximately 11.7 acres of the 36-acre Kingswood Center site (the remaining site area and development capacity is the subject of this SEIS).

The Littlerock Road Subarea Plan and EIS (December, 1997) is intended to serve as a guide for future development of the 292-acre subarea, in keeping with the City of Tumwater Comprehensive Plan. The subarea is bounded by Costco to the north, I-5 to the east, Littlerock Road to the west, and the city limits south of Tumwater Boulevard to the south. The Tumwater retail store site is located within this subarea. The subarea plan provides a description of how the subarea may be developed over the next approximately 20 years, and sets the foundation for implementation of the plan. Most of the subarea north of Bishop Road, where the project site is located, is recommended for general commercial zoning. This area consists of large parcels with convenient vehicular access from the interstate, making it more appropriate for larger commercial developments (see **Section 3.6, Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies** for details on the subarea plan). Environmental analysis was integrated into the subarea plan in order to provide a foundation for the environmental information and analysis necessary for future development projects in the subarea. This approach was intended to potentially reduce the amount of environmental review necessary for subsequent development projects within the Littlerock Road subarea. Additionally, the analysis was intended to allow the City to perform more precise capital facilities planning for infrastructure construction in the subarea. Environmental analysis was performed for land use, transportation, natural environment, and public services and utilities.

The Determination of Significance (DS) on the Tumwater retail store project indicated that the City, as lead agency, has determined that the proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and that a supplemental EIS (SEIS) is warranted, consistent with RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). The DS identified the following environmental elements for possible evaluation in the SEIS: roads and traffic, stormwater, groundwater protection, wetland protection, light and glare, noise abatement, tree preservation, land use policies and plans, public services (police, fire and utilities), economic impacts and community policy analysis (see **Appendix A** for the Determination of the Scope of the SEIS). As required by SEPA, (WAC 197-11-408), the City initiated the required 21-day public scoping period with the issuance of the DS and a Request for Comments on the scope of the SEIS for the project. The following section provides details on the public scoping process.

### **Scoping Process and Comments**

The public scoping process for this SEIS began on January 24 and ended February 25, 2005 (a 32-day scoping period). A scoping meeting was convened on Wednesday, February 9, 2005, at 7:00 p.m., at Tumwater City Hall. Twenty-eight people attending the Scoping Meeting offered their concerns via oral comments. Much public comment during scoping centered on non-SEPA issues, such as public perceptions of Wal-Mart's labor practices (see the discussion of SEPA versus non-SEPA issues below). There were also concerns raised about the potential economic impacts of a Wal-Mart operation on existing businesses in the area. With regard to environmental issues, there were comments on increased traffic, traffic safety, crime, noise, and light impacts. Specific natural environment concerns that were raised, included: stormwater and groundwater quality and quantity impacts, and removal of trees. There were also some comments on the design of the project and whether this project meets the intent of the subarea plan vision for the area.

In addition to the oral comments received at the meeting, numerous written comment letters and e-mails were received during the scoping period. Written comments were reflective of those comments voiced at the scoping meeting. A primary focus of the written comments was the potential social and economic impacts of Wal-Mart on the area, with other concerns regarding specific natural and built environmental issues. A summary of all the comments received during scoping is contained in **Appendix B**. The summary includes a synopsis of the concerns raised by each commentor (written and oral), as well as a categorization of comments by topic, keyed to the individuals that raised the comment.

### **SEPA vs. Non-SEPA Issues**

The community concerns expressed through scoping relate to a combination of issues that are reviewable within the context of SEPA and other issues that are outside the purview of SEPA. The list of elements that are to be addressed through SEPA is defined in WAC 197-11-444 and consists of natural and built environmental factors. An EIS is directed by law to consider “environmental” impacts, with attention to impacts that are likely and not merely speculative (WAC 197-11-060(4)(a)). This means that environmental review must focus on impacts that are probable and reasonably likely to occur, given an understanding of the proposed project. State law directs the environmental analysis to explore a reasonable set of probable impacts, and not any and all effects just because they are conceivable, or whether they may occur or not.

Economic factors are not listed as elements of the environment to be addressed through SEPA in WAC 197-11-444. The Tumwater Municipal Code (Chapter 16.04.110) indicates that economy and community policy analysis are elements of the environment for the purpose of EIS content, but do not add to the criteria for threshold determination or perform any other function or purpose for satisfying SEPA requirements. In this SEIS, community policy analysis is addressed in the context of the relationship of the project to relevant City plans and policies (see **Section 3.6, Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies** for details). The City of Tumwater, as lead agency, directed that this SEIS analyze certain economic factors, such as: impacts on local businesses (and the potential for associated impacts to land use), employment generation, and fiscal impacts to the City of Tumwater (see **Section 3.7, Economic Impacts** for details). Issues that are reflective of community preferences based on social factors are not SEPA issues, and are not addressed in this SEIS.

Further, EISs are directed by SEPA regulations to address probable adverse impacts that are significant (WAC 197-11-402(1)). Impacts that are not significant need not be analyzed.

The SEPA environmental review process is designed to work with other decision-making factors to provide a comprehensive review of a proposal (WAC 197-11-055). The purpose of SEPA is to ensure that environmental values are given appropriate deliberation along with other considerations. SEPA contemplates that social welfare, economic and other considerations will be taken into account in weighing and balancing decisions on a project. An EIS is not required to weigh and balance all the possible effects and considerations evaluated by decision-makers in making final decisions about a project (WAC 197-11-448(2)). An EIS is not an agency’s only decision-making document.

Examples of considerations that are not to be analyzed under SEPA are defined in WAC 197-11-448(3), and include: method of financing proposals, economic competition, profits and personal income and wages, and social policy analysis. Further, monetary costs and benefits are not to be analyzed (WAC 197-11-450).

## **Supplemental EIS**

WAC 197-11-600(4)(d) specifies when a Supplemental EIS (SEIS) should be prepared. It indicates that a SEIS is to be prepared when there are substantial changes so that a proposal is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts and/or new information is available indicating a proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts. Based on the review of prior environmental documents that addressed development of the project site (see the previous Background section), together with the application and supporting information submitted on this proposal in December 2004, the City determined that changes have resulted since the prior EISs and Addendum were completed, warranting an SEIS for this proposal.

WAC 197-11-620 defines procedures for supplemental environmental impacts statements (SEISs). The WAC states that a SEIS shall be prepared in the same way as a draft and final EIS, except that scoping is optional. In the case of this SEIS, scoping was conducted by the City of Tumwater in order to provide an opportunity for the public to provide greater input regarding the types of issues they consider to be important relative to this proposal.

WAC 197-11-620 goes on to state that a SEIS should not include analysis of actions, alternatives, or impacts that are in the previously prepared EIS. This SEIS examines the probable significant environmental impacts of this specific development proposal within the context of the environmental review that was conducted in the original 1993 EIS for the Tumwater Town Center project, and the subsequent environmental documents. The original (1993) Draft and Final EIS were issued for a proposal for development of the Tumwater Town Center within the Littlerock Road subarea (see the discussion in the previous section). As described in WAC 197-11-600(4)(e), the 1993, 1997 and 2002 environmental documents are adopted as part of this environmental review and only additional information that is relevant to the probable significant impacts of this proposed project is included and analyzed within this SEIS. These documents provide the basis for review of the current proposal.

## **SEIS Scope**

Based on all of the input obtained during scoping, review of the materials submitted as part of the December 2004 application by Wal-Mart Stores and review of the prior environmental documents and other information, the scope for this SEIS was determined by the City of Tumwater, the lead agency for this environmental review. On April 27, 2005, the City issued a Determination of Scope (DS) for the Tumwater Retail Store SEIS and identified the following environmental elements to be analyzed in the SEIS:

- 1. Transportation** (roads and traffic)
  - Roadway operations
  - Pedestrian facilities
  - Bicycle facilities
  - Transit facilities
- 2. Natural Environment**
  - Earth
  - Air quality
  - Trees and vegetation
  - Surface water management
  - Groundwater movement and flooding
  - Water quality

### 3. Built Environment

- Hazardous materials and explosion risk
- Noise
- Land Use
- Aesthetics/light and glare

### 4. Public Services and Utilities

- Police and fire services (including crime, public safety, and emergency services)
- Water utility
- Sanitary sewer utility

### 5. Economic Impacts

- Impacts on existing businesses in Tumwater
- Fiscal Impacts
- Job generation- types and characteristics

### 6. Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies

- Comprehensive Plan
- Littlerock Subarea Plan
- Economic Development Plan
- Retail development moratorium

These are the elements that were identified for evaluation through the scoping process for this SEIS; review of other elements covered in the original 1993 EIS and subsequent environmental documents (such as historical/cultural resources) indicated that the current proposal will not result in probable significant impacts on these elements and no further analysis is required under SEPA.

The Determination of the Scope of the SEIS is contained in **Appendix A**.

## 2.2 Location

The approximately 21-acre project site is located to the north of Bishop Road, to the south of Troser Road, to the east of Littlerock Road and to the west of Tyee Drive and Interstate 5 (I-5). The site is situated in Section 3, Township 17 North, Range 2W, W.M (see **Figure 2-1**).

## 2.3 Site Description

The approximately 21-acre site is currently undeveloped and vacant. The southern 1/3 of the site is separated from the northern 2/3s of the site by Kingswood Drive. A Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) easement traverses the southern portion of the site.

The site topography is relatively flat. Several borrow pit areas (areas from which soils have been taken for use as fill on other projects) are present onsite that are typically about 3 to 6 feet deep and up to ¼ acre in size. A Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) easement traverses the southern portion of the site. Based on site investigations, there are no wetlands or streams onsite. The majority of the site is covered in native shrubs. Stands of evergreen and deciduous trees are present in the northeast and southwest portions of the site. (See **Figure 2-2** for a map of existing site conditions and the **Section 3.3, Trees and Vegetation** for more information on existing onsite vegetation).

**Figure 2-1  
Vicinity Map**

**Figure 2-2  
Existing Site Conditions**

The site is designated General Commercial (GC) in the Tumwater Land Use Plan, and is zoned General Commercial (GC) on the official Zoning Map for the City of Tumwater (see **Section 3.5, Land Use** and **Section 3.6, Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies** for details). The proposed project is permitted outright in this land use designation and zoning classification.

## 2.4 Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses in the larger Littlerock Road subarea, in which the project site is located, include a mix of commercial, residential, and public/institutional uses, along with vacant land. The predominant land use immediately surrounding the site is large-scale commercial development. Costco, Fred Meyer, and Albertsons are located to the north of the site. Home Depot is located to the south of the site. The area immediately east of the site is occupied by Albany International, an industrial use, and further east is the I-5 corridor. Two cemeteries (the Olympic Memorial Gardens Cemetery and the Bush/Union/Pioneer Calvary Cemetery) and an auto junkyard operation are located to the west of the site across Littlerock Road. The Tumwater Middle School is located to the southwest of the site across Littlerock Road. Residential uses in the vicinity include multifamily residential to the south of the site, separated by an intervening property, and a mobile home park to the northwest of the site across Littlerock Road (see **Section 3.5, Land Use** for further information).

## 2.5 Applicant's Objectives

The applicant's objectives for the Tumwater retail store are to:

- Construct a retail supercenter that meets Wal-Mart's size and operational objectives;
- Create an economically viable, high quality retail store in close proximity to a major transportation corridor and sizable population center;
- Provide sufficient parking to accommodate the store size and likely community demand; and,
- Create a retail store that meets the design review requirements of the City of Tumwater and seeks to protect significant natural features on site, such as existing stands of significant trees, to the extent feasible.

## 2.6 Proposed Action

The proposal is to construct an approximately 207,700 square-foot (sf) retail store and associated parking on the approximately 21-acre site. A future lease lot would be located onsite to accommodate a gasoline service station.

### **Proposed Retail Use and Design Character**

The Tumwater retail store would feature approximately 207,700 square feet of retail shopping area. The building would provide groceries, pharmacy, sporting goods, electronics, personal furnishings, household merchandise, and other standard retail items. Operations would also include a seasonal garden center and an auto parts/service center (i.e., tire installation and services, oil change, and battery services). Supplier truck loading dock areas would be located along the east side of the building, facing I-5. An approximately 0.4-acre future lease lot would be located in the southern portion of the site to accommodate a gasoline service station (see **Figure 2-3** for a site plan of the Proposed Action).

**Figure 2-3  
Site Plan, Proposed Action**

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). The scale of the proposed building would be similar to the other large retail outlets in the vicinity. The building would be one-story and approximately 30 feet in height. The building height would be modulated across the main building facades. Recessed entryways, awnings, varying rooflines, pilasters, changes in materials and colors, recesses, and an articulated cornice would add interest and reduce the perceived scale of the building. Exterior building materials would include: split-face concrete masonry units, simulated stucco in three earth-tone colors, and brick veneers in dark reds (see **Figure 2-4** for the proposed building elevations).

The proposed project would require clearing of the majority of the existing trees onsite, but each tree cleared in excess of the standard outlined in the Tumwater Municipal Code (TMC Chapter 16.08) would be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. The code requires that the greater of 20 percent of the existing trees onsite (87 trees), or 12 trees per acre (258 trees based on a 21.5-acre site) be retained. The proposed landscape plan calls for retention of 54 of the large diameter trees onsite, and compensation for the clearing of the remainder of the trees via planting of an additional 133 trees onsite, and funding of an additional 479 trees offsite through the City's Tree Fund program, for a total of 612 trees. This would result in a 3:1 replacement ratio for each tree cleared in excess of the standard, and would satisfy the requirements of Chapter 16.08. The proposed landscape plan also calls for an additional 260 trees to be planted onsite based on landscaping regulations in TMC Chapter 18.47. The proposed plantings along Littlerock Road are intended to be consistent with the adjacent plantings along the roadway frontages of Costco, Fred Meyer and Home Depot. The proposed project would also comply with other applicable standards of Chapter 16.08 of the Tumwater Municipal Code and the provisions of the State Department of Natural Resources forest practices permit, that would need to be obtained for the removal of the trees (see **Section 3.3, Trees and Vegetation** and **Section 3.6, Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies** for details on tree retention/replacement).

The proposed landscape plan 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 (24 to 30-foot tall) evergreen trees would be planted along the site's Littlerock Road frontage to create a landscape buffer similar to that present along Costco's frontage with this road (see **Figure 2-5A** for the proposed landscape plan and **Figure 2-5B** for a perspective drawing of the proposed landscaping as viewed by a pedestrian along Littlerock Road).

Lighting would be provided throughout the parking area and on the exterior of the building to provide for safety and security. The building and parking lots would be illuminated throughout the night (see **Figure 2-6** for the proposed lighting plan). The proposed lighting system would be designed to minimize impacts to offsite uses. 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. The exterior lighting has also been 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 (see **Section 3.8, Aesthetics/Light and Glare** for details).

Upon completion, a total of 400 employees are anticipated to work at the proposed retail store. Of this total, approximately 70 percent would be full-time employees (PACLAND, 2005).

**Figure 2-4  
Building Elevations**

**Figure 2-5A**  
**Landscape Plan, Proposed Action**

**Figure 2-5B**  
**Landscape Perspective, Proposed Action**

**Figure 2-6  
Lighting Plan, Proposed Action**

## **Vehicular Access and Parking**

Access to the portion of the site north of Kingswood Drive would be provided from four points: one driveway off of Littlerock Road (right-turn in and right-turn out only), two driveways off of Kingswood Drive (which are accessible from both Littlerock Road and Tyee Drive), and one off of the site shared driveway with Costco. Two access points would be provided from Kingswood Drive to the future lease lot and adjacent parking area. (see **Figure 2-3**).

The proposal would provide 5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of proposed building, or a total of 1,138 new parking spaces for customers and employees in two non-contiguous parking areas divided by Kingswood Drive. The Tumwater Municipal Code allows a maximum of four parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of proposed building (TMC 18.50.070A). Therefore, an administrative parking modification would be required for the proposed parking (see **Section 3.9, Transportation** and **Appendix I** for further information).

## **Grading and Stormwater Control System**

Earthwork required for construction of the Proposed Action would include approximately 49,500 cubic yards of cut. Of this, approximately 25,000 cubic yards of the cut material would be used onsite as fill material, and approximately 24,500 cubic yards of the cut material (previously placed undocumented fill) would be exported from the site. Exported fill would be hauled to an approved location. In addition, approximately 32,500 cubic yards of fill material would be imported to the site (see the **Section 3.1, Earth** for details).

During construction, temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) best management practices (BMPs), as specified by the City of Tumwater's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region (1994), as amended, would be implemented. A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would also 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 an NPDES would be applied for) (see the **Section 3.1, Water Resources** and **Appendices C, D, and E** for details).

A permanent stormwater control system would be designed and constructed according to the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region (1994), as amended, and the Northern Thurston County Groundwater Management Plan (1991), as amended, both adopted by the City of Tumwater. Stormwater runoff from new impervious surfaces onsite would be collected in catch basins and conveyed via underground pipes to water quality treatment vaults. From the treatment vaults, stormwater would be directed to infiltration vaults. Stormwater from roof drains would be routed directly to the infiltration vaults, bypassing the water quality treatment vaults, since this stormwater would not interact with areas subject to vehicular traffic (as allowed by code). A separate onsite water quality treatment facility would be provided in the gas station canopy area, as required by the building code. The stormwater treatment and infiltration vaults would be located under the parking area (see **Section 3.1, Water Resources** and **Appendix E** for details).

## **Utilities**

All required utilities are currently available to the site and have adequate capacity to serve the project. Water and sanitary sewer service are provided by the City of Tumwater. Water and sewer lines are located in Kingswood Drive adjacent to the site. No offsite extensions of water

or sewer lines to the site would be required for the project (see the **Utilities** section for further information).

## **Construction Schedule**

Construction of the proposed project is scheduled to begin in late 2006. Construction is expected to be completed and opening of the retail store is expected to occur in 2007.

## 2.7 Alternatives

Two alternatives to the Proposed Action are analyzed in this SEIS: (1) Alternative 1 – retail store with realignment of Kingswood Drive; and (2) the No Action Alternative. Per WAC 197-11-786, a reasonable alternative is an action that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation. The Proposed Action and Alternative 1 meet the applicant's objectives for development of the site (see the previous Applicant's Objectives section), and Alternative 1 could feasibly attain these objectives at a lower environmental cost. As examples, the relocation of Kingswood Drive and the resulting contiguous parking area under Alternative 1 would require less clearing and allow for more tree retention, thereby reducing impacts to existing onsite vegetation; this Alternative would also improve vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation relative to the Proposed Action. The No Action alternative is included in this SEIS to comply with the requirements of SEPA.

### **Alternative 1**

Alternative 1 would feature construction of a retail store similar in size and character to the Proposed Action (see **Figure 2-7**). A 207,700 square-foot store would be developed on a 20.9-acre site (the site would be smaller than under the Proposed Action because of the vacation of a portion of existing Kingswood Drive).

Under Alternative 1, Kingswood Drive would be relocated along the southern boundary of the site. A street vacation would be required for this realignment. The realignment would allow for a contiguous parking area and a more efficient access and circulation pattern within the site. Access would be provided from: three access points off of realigned Kingswood Drive, one access point off of Littlerock Road (right-turn in and right-turn out only), and two access points off of the driveway shared with Costco. A total of 972 parking spaces would be provided. As under the Proposed Action, an administrative parking modification would be required.

Under this alternative, the future lease lot that would accommodate a gasoline service station would be located in the northwestern portion of the site and would be approximately 0.8 acre in size. Under Alternative 1, reconfiguration of the parking area would allow retention of 68 of the existing large diameter trees onsite, and planting of 549 additional trees both on and off site or contribution to the City's Tree Fund Program to compensate for cleared trees, consistent with TMC 16.08 (see **Figure 2-8A** for the Alternative 1 landscape plan and **Figure 2-8B** for a perspective sketch of the Alternative 1 landscaping as viewed by a pedestrian along Littlerock Road). The site landscaping design would maximize the number of replacement trees planted on the project site. In addition to 249 trees replacement trees planted onsite per TMC 16.08, compliance with the landscape buffer and parking lot landscape code (TMC 18.47) would require planting of an additional 208 new trees onsite. New onsite trees would provide a dense

**Figure 2-7**  
**Site Plan, Alternative 1**

**Figure 2-8A**  
**Landscape Plan, Alternative 1**

**Figure 2-8B**  
**Landscape Perspective, Alternative 1**

**Figure 2-9  
Lighting Plan, Alternative 1**

buffer, augmenting the 68 large diameter trees being retained. Lighting would be provided throughout the parking area and on the exterior of the building, similar to under the Proposed Action (see **Figure 2-9** for the Alternative 1 lighting plan). The design character of the proposed building would be the same as under the Proposed Action.

### Key Differences between the Proposed Action and Alternative 1

The Proposed Action and Alternative 1 evaluated in this Draft EIS represent the two possible options for configuring the proposed retail store and associated parking on the site. Under the Proposed Action and Alternative 1, the size, orientation and design of the retail store would be the same.

The differences between the Proposed Action and Alternative 1 would primarily relate to the location of Kingswood Drive. Under the Proposed Action, Kingswood Drive would be retained in its existing location, bisecting the site. In this configuration, Kingswood Drive would divide the parking area for the proposed retail store into two non-contiguous areas. A lease lot for a future gas station would be located in the southern portion of the site, along with some of the parking spaces for the retail store. Under Alternative 1, Kingswood Drive would be relocated along the southern boundary of the site to allow for more efficient use of the site; parking for the proposed retail store would be located in one contiguous parking lot. The lease lot for a future gas station would be located in the northern portion of the site.

For the two scenarios, the location of the access driveways and the total number of parking stalls would differ. The number of existing large trees that would be retained onsite, and trees that would be planted and/or funded on or offsite would also vary. **Table 2-1** highlights the key differences between the Proposed Action and Alternative 1. Chapter 3 describes in detail (and the Summary Matrix in Chapter 1 summarizes) the probable significant impacts, mitigation measures and unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, and the No Action Alternative.

**Table 2-1  
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION & ALTERNATIVE 1**

	<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>
<b>Site Area</b>	21.5 acres	20.9 acres*
<b>Parking Area</b>	1,138 stalls in two non-contiguous parking areas divided by Kingswood Drive	972 stalls in one contiguous parking area
<b>Relocation of Kingswood Drive</b>	None	The portion of Kingswood Drive that currently bisects the site would be relocated along the southern boundary of the site.
<b>Lease Lot</b>	A 0.4-acre lease lot would be located in the southern portion of site. A gas station on the lease lot would be approximately 150 feet from the closest BPA transmission tower.	A 0.8 acre-lease lot would be located in the northwestern portion of the site. A gas station on the lease lot would be approximately 900 feet from the closest BPA transmission tower.

**Table 2-1  
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION & ALTERNATIVE 1  
(cont'd)**

<b>Vehicle Access to Retail Store</b>	Vehicle access would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One driveway off of Littlerock Road (right-turn in and right-turn out only);</li> <li>- Two driveways off of Kingswood Drive (which are accessible from both Littlerock Road and Tye Drive); and,</li> <li>- One driveway off of the driveway shared with Costco.</li> </ul>	Vehicle access would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One access point off of Littlerock Road (right-turn in and right-turn out only);</li> <li>- Three access points off of the realigned Kingswood Drive; and,</li> <li>- Two access points off of the driveway shared with Costco.</li> </ul>
<b>Vehicle Access to Lease Lot</b>	Two access points would be provided off of Kingswood Drive to the future lease lot and adjacent parking area.	No additional access would be required.
<b>Pedestrian Access</b>	Pedestrians would be required to cross Kingswood Drive to access the retail store from the southern portion of the site.	Pedestrians would not be required to cross Kingwood Drive to access the retail store from the southern portion of the site.
<b>Tumwater Middle School Access</b>	Turn restrictions to the middle school access driveways are planned as part of the City's Littlerock Road corridor project.	The middle school general purpose access driveway could be realigned with the Kingswood Drive/Littlerock Road roundabout. Alternatively, turn restrictions to the middle school access driveways could be employed.
<b>Onsite Tree Removal, Retention and Planting</b>	A total of 389 trees would be removed from the site (including 65 unhealthy trees). A total of 447 trees would be retained/planted onsite, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 54 large diameter trees retained onsite</li> <li>- 393 trees planted onsite</li> </ul>	A total of 375 trees would be removed from the site (including 65 unhealthy trees). A total of 525 trees would be retained/planted onsite, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 68 large diameter trees retained onsite</li> <li>- 457 trees planted onsite</li> </ul>
<b>Offsite Tree Planting and/or Funding</b>	A total of 479 trees would be planted and/or funded offsite (through the City's Tree Fund program).	A total of 300 trees would be planted and/or funded offsite (through the City's Tree Fund program).

Source: Blumen Consulting Group, 2006.

\*The site area would be smaller under Alternative 1 than under the Proposed Action, because of the vacation of a portion of existing Kingswood Drive under Alternative 1.

## **No Action**

Under the No Action Alternative, development of the proposed retail store onsite would not occur and existing site conditions would continue. Based on the existing GC zoning of the site, it is likely that development of the site would occur at some point in the future, consistent with zoning and other regulations in place at that time.

### 2.8 Benefits and Disadvantages of Deferring Project Implementation

The benefits of deferring project implementation include deferral of:

- Potential impacts of the project on the elements of the natural environment evaluated in this SEIS; and,
- Potential impacts of the project on the manmade environment, including public services (such as police and fire protection) and traffic operations.

The disadvantages of deferring project implementation include deferral of:

- The opportunity to provide additional retail shopping opportunities in the Littlerock Road subarea; and,
- Tax revenues and other fees (i.e. permit, inspection and utility connection fees) to the City generated by the project.