

From: Walt Jorgensen <waltjorgensen@comcast.net>
To: Roger Gellenbeck <rgellenbeck@ci.tumwater.wa.us>
Date: 6/30/2006 3:44:28 pm
Subject: Wal-Mart Supplemental EIS Comments

CC: Michael Matlock <mmatlock@ci.tumwater.wa.us>, S...
Friday, June 30, 2006

Roger Gellenbeck, Director
Development Services Department
City of Tumwater
555 Israel Rd. S.W.
Tumwater, WA 98501

Wal-Mart Supplemental EIS Comments

Dear Mr. Gellenbeck,

I submit the following comments and recommendations for the Wal-Mart SEIS.
Economic and Fiscal Impact section-

On page 3.7-9, the EIS denies Wal-Mart's entire history of predatory marketing by asserting that, "Impacts of the proposed grocery component of the project on existing, small grocers would not be considered significant. Current Tumwater residents already have an established choice in grocery stores between small, local establishments and Albertsons, Costco and Fred Meyer. The introduction of a Wal-Mart grocery store would add to the established choice between small, local businesses, and the larger chain outlets that have, to date, not had adverse impacts on the local economy, based on gross business income, establishment counts and taxable retail sales data reported by the Washington Department of Revenue."

1

The EIS further speculates that, "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. Indirect employment would be relatively low because most suppliers to the proposed store are assumed to be outside the region."

2

The above employment would result in net, positive impacts to the local economy. Due to Tumwater's household growth rate, any short-term displacement of jobs would be minor to nonexistent."

On page 3.7-8, the EIS concludes that, "Therefore, a new Wal-Mart store in Tumwater does not pose unprecedented competition to existing businesses in Tumwater. Third, the precedent of the Lacey Wal-Mart store indicates that a highly visible Wal-Mart location along Interstate 5 has not had an adverse impact on the Lacey Fred Meyer store, or any other direct competitors, along Sleater Kinney Road."

What's missing here is Tumwater's business plan or pro forma depicting how the City and other public entities will fare economically, including such information as yield on investment and the identification of specific anticipated beneficiaries, e.g. businesses, individuals, non-profit organizations.

3

I want the stockholders in the municipal corporation of Tumwater, i.e., the property and business owners and the people who live here and pay sales taxes, to get as much consideration for their financial well-being as has been expended on Wal-Mart. Show me actual empirical data that indicates that individual, real people, who depend on Tumwater as a place that provides their homes, their jobs, their businesses, their opportunities for recreation and education, etc., will benefit directly economically and/or experience an increase in the quality of their lives (as they define it) as a result of Wal-Mart claiming a footprint of real estate from which to do business in their community.

4

This Supplemental EIS is inadequate for assessing the impact of the Wal-Mart retail facility being imposed on the economy of Tumwater and environs. The Economic and Fiscal Impact section of the SEIS must be completely redone.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Jorgensen

--

Walt Jorgensen
waltjorgensen@comcast.net

"The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed -- and thus clamorous to be led to safety -- by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary."
-- H.L. Mencken