Table 1-1. Summary of Impacts by Resources and Alternative

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Earth Resources (Section 4.1)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Existing conditions regarding the potential for geologic hazards, including earthquakes, soil liquefaction, and volcanic activity, would remain. The No Action Alternative would have no impact associated with development of the Project in geologically hazardous areas. Permanent conversion of the Project site on soils that lend to agricultural practices would not occur.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	**Soils and Erosion** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* Construction of the Project would result in permanent impacts from alterations to the surface geology, topography, and soils that would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures ER-1 to ER-5. **Volcanic Hazards** *Mitigated significant impact.* The probability of an impact from either ashfall and/or lahar debris flow occurring on site during construction is low. However, the subsequent damage or safety risk should a volcanic eruption occur would be significant; therefore, mitigation measures ER-6 to ER-8 would be required to minimize the potential for significant/catastrophic impacts. **Landslide Hazards** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* Warehouses A and C are mapped within a potential landslide hazard area. There is a potential risk of a landslide impacting the construction of Warehouses A and C. This would require a geotechnical assessment to minimize the potential for significant impacts as outlined in mitigation measure ER-3. **Seismic Hazards** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* The Project site is in an area with the potential for seismic activity and mapped as having moderate to high susceptibility for liquefaction in the event of an earthquake. An emergency response plan (ER-9) and a geotechnical assessment (ER-3) would be required to assess the site conditions and seismic design parameters (ER-10)	**Soils and Erosion** • ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. **Volcanic Hazards** • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. **Landslide Hazards** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. **Seismic Hazards** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design. **Channel Migration Zones** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		implemented to minimize the potential for significant impacts. **Channel Migration Zones** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* The proposed stormwater outfall is located within the mapped severe channel migration zone (CMZ) of the Puyallup River. Portions of the development site building area is located within low to moderate mapped CMZ of the Puyallup River. Anticipated impacts from development in low to moderate CMZs on the site is limited, as BMPs to address channel migration could be reasonably expected to be applied to protect, preserve, or modify the site to prevent losses or damage. The risk of CMZ erosion in the severe CMZ as a result of the proposed Project is considered less than significant with implementation of the design measures required per a geotechnical assessment as outlined in mitigation measure ER-3.	
	Operations	**Soils and Erosion** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* The addition of impervious surfaces to 77 percent of the development site would increase the amount of stormwater generated in the Project site. Left unmanaged, this stormwater would increase soil erosion on and off site. Implementation of SW-1 and SW-2 would reduce the impacts from erosion. **Volcanic Hazards** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* During operations, the same risk of volcanic hazards in the Project site would be present as identified for construction; therefore, mitigation measures ER-6 to ER-8 would be required to minimize the potential for significant impacts. **Landslide Hazards** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* During operations, the same risk of landslide hazards in the Project site would be present as identified for construction; therefore, mitigation measure ER-3 would be required to minimize the potential for significant impacts. The proposed stormwater outfall and infiltration trenches would be located within a mapped	**Soils and Erosion** • SW-1 Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site. • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Volcanic Hazards** • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. **Landslide Hazards** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. **Seismic Hazards** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		shallow-susceptibility landslide hazard area. Implementation of ER-3 would reduce the potential for significant impacts. **Seismic Hazards** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* During operations, the same risk of seismic hazards in the Project site would be present as identified for construction. An emergency response plan (ER-9) and a geotechnical assessment (ER-3) would be required to assess the site conditions and seismic design parameters (ER-10) implemented to minimize the potential for significant impacts. **Channel Migration Zones** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* The proposed stormwater outfall is located within the severe CMZ of the Puyallup River. Portions of the site development building area are located in the low to moderate CMZ areas mapped by Pierce County. However, the risk of severe CMZ erosion as a result of the proposed Project is considered less than significant with implementation of the design measures required per a geotechnical assessment as outlined in mitigation measure ER-3. If channel migration occurs in the low to moderate CMZ, the impacts could include risk of damage to improvements (utility, paving, and other appurtenances) and buildings, although the probability of that scenario is low due to the anticipated timeline for moderate to low CMZ changes to uplands.	• ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design. **Channel Migration Zones** • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer.
Alternative 1 – Rail Alternative	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The construction impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would result in alterations to surface geology, topography, and soils, as described for the proposed Project, but would include a slightly larger disturbance area due to the addition of the area between the Project site and the Meeker Southern railroad where construction of the track extensions from BNSF mainline/Meeker Southern interchange. In addition, Alternative 1 would have the same risk of seismic, landslide, and volcanic hazards and would require construction in the CMZ. Implementation of mitigation measure ER-1 through ER-10 would reduce impacts associated with the construction of Alternative 1.	• ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design.
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The operations impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project. The amount of impervious surface is not expected to increase when compared to the proposed Project, as the rail line is considered pervious surface. In addition, Alternative 1 would have the same risk of seismic, landslide, and volcanic hazards and would require construction in the CMZ. Implementation of mitigation measure SW-1, SW-2, ER-3, ER-6, ER-7, ER-8, ER-9, and ER-10 would minimize impacts associated with the operation of Alternative 1.	• SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site. • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design.
Alternative 2 – Reduced Intensity Alternative	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The construction impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be less than those described for the proposed Project. Similar to the proposed Project, construction of Alternative 2 would result in alterations to surface geology, topography, and soils, but the smaller site footprint would result in less disturbance and less potential for impacts. The potential for exposure to geologic hazards would be the same as the proposed Project under Alternative 2, except for landslide hazards. Under Alternative 2, landslide hazard areas would be outside of the Alternative 2 Project footprint and would no longer be of concern. Even with a smaller footprint, mitigation for soil and erosion impacts would still be required as outlined under the proposed Project. ER-1 through ER-10 would reduce impacts associated with the construction of Alternative 2 to the extent feasible.	• ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact*. Operational impacts related to Alternative 2 would be less than the impacts listed for the proposed Project. This includes decreasing the potential for increased stormwater runoff generated in the Project site from impervious surfaces, the long term or permanent loss of soil productivity for local agricultural production, and potential for exposure to geologic hazards. The potential for exposure to geologic hazards would be the same under Alternative 2, except for landslide hazards and CMZs. Under Alternative 2, landslide hazard areas would be outside of the Alternative 2 Project footprint and would no longer be of concern; additionally, although not entirely, the majority of the portions of the Project within the moderate and low CMZs would be removed from those mapped hazard areas, limiting the need for long-term monitoring of impacts from changes to the Puyallup River channel area relative to site improvements and buildings. Even with a smaller footprint, mitigation would still be required as outlined under the proposed Project. Implementation of mitigation measures ER-3, ER-6, ER-7, ER-8, ER-9, and ER-10 would minimize impacts associated with the operation of Alternative 1 to the extent feasible.	• ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design.
Surface Water (Section 4.2)			
No Action Alternative		Under the No Action Alternative, the construction and operation of the Project would not occur. No Project-related impacts to surface water resources would result. The Project site floodplain and uplands would continue to be farmed, left fallow or potentially developed differently in the future, as limited or allowed in regulations. If current management does not change, existing water quality impacts on the Puyallup River would not change, meaning that the same agricultural impacts would persist.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	**<u>Puyallup River</u>** During construction on the high terrace, direct impacts to surface water quality could occur from grading, which contributes to erosion and sediment movement; water flows that cause turbidity through erosion; sediment transport downstream of soil disturbance activities; or	**<u>Puyallup River</u>** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		release of pollutants from construction equipment. Oil, fuel, and other chemicals could inadvertently spill or leak from construction equipment or materials, leading to contamination of surface water through runoff. The 42-inch diameter outfall pipe intended to receive future runoff from the Project site is already installed at the existing stormwater outfall structure in the floodplain at the northern end of the Project site. The outfall structure is currently impacted by collection of sandy river sediment during seasonal river flooding and by channelized erosion of these sediments from stormwater runoff flowing from the Viking facility outfall pipe. Current conditions indicate that increasing future flows to the outfall structure by adding new runoff volumes from the Project warehouse complex and from the greater surrounding stormwater basins would significantly increase erosion and instability at the riverbank. **Wetlands** On-site wetlands would shrink or be entirely lost unless current hydrology sources are identified and maintained. In order to preserve on-site wetland hydroperiods on the floodplain (Wetlands A, B and C) and at Wetland D, targeted, properly located and designed wet season infiltration facilities that would capture and infiltrate appropriate volumes of surface runoff are needed to seasonally recharge groundwater in locations that would ensure maintenance of wetland hydroperiods during construction and in the future. **Floodplains and Shorelines** Impacts to floodplain wetlands in relation to ongoing erosion within the outfall and at the riverbank are discussed above. Therefore, the discussion below addresses other aspects of potential floodplain impacts. During construction, no new grading or mobilization activities related to the Project warehouse development would occur in the floodplain, and no new impacts to the floodplain are expected until such time as future Project site stormwater runoff is directed to the existing outfall on the floodplain.	wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all onsite wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance. • SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan. **Floodplain and Shorelines** • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
	Operation	**Puyallup River** Water Quality Without proper management, this pollutant carried in new runoff volumes from the Project site could cause significant new impacts to surface water quality at the outfall and related significant increase in mortal impacts to listed salmonid species in the river. Riverbank Flood and Erosion Under the proposed Project, future increased runoff volumes from the Project site would greatly increase current flow volumes through the outfall structure, inevitably increasing current erosion at the riverbank below the outfall structure. Sending significantly greater runoff volumes to the outfall in the future when the riverbank is already failing under current conditions would further degrade the outfall system and erode the riverbank. Without significant repair or revision of the outfall structure and properly designed bank stabilization installations, the ongoing erosion would eventually undermine the outfall structure, and result in additional loss of boulders, concrete, and other construction materials into the river—a significant impact to water quality and fish habitat. **Wetlands** Under the proposed Project, the Project would be required to comply with code provisions for the protection of water resources from grading activities and Operational Stormwater Permit conditions. Therefore, minimal impacts to water quality in wetlands are expected during Project operation, as long as mitigation plans designed to address potential water quality issues at Wetland D are prepared and followed. Under the current proposal, the groundwater source for Wetlands A, B, and C would decrease over time during both Construction and Operational phases as most of the currently permeable Project surface area would be paved over a period of several years during Construction phases, while the warehouses are being built and subsequently occupied. This would result in a decrease over	**Puyallup River** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all on-site wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance. • SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan. **Floodplain and Shorelines** • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		time of on-site infiltration and no replenishment of groundwater on the high terrace, where the new warehouses, roads, and parking areas are sited. **Floodplains** During proposed Project operations, the primary long-term impact on the floodplain related to the Project would be from the stormwater outfall structure and backwater flooding through the outfall, which is discussed in detail above and would continue throughout the operational lifetime of the Project facilities. **Shorelines** Under the proposed Project operations, impacts to the shoreline zone are effectively the same as those to the floodplain, and are discussed above.	
Alternative 1	**Construction**	The Alternative 1 proposal is likely to result in similar significant impacts on the river, on-site wetlands, the floodplain, and the shoreline area. Most of those impacts would be initiated during construction phases, but would continue during long-term operations.	**Puyallup River** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all on-site wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance. • SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			Floodplain and Shorelines • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.
	Operation	The Alternative 1 proposal is likely to result in similar significant impacts on the river, on-site wetlands, the floodplain, and the shoreline area. Most of those impacts would be initiated during construction phases, but would continue during long-term operations, as described above.	**Puyallup River** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site. • SW-2. Re-Evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all on-site wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance. • SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan. **Floodplain and Shorelines** • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.
Alternative 2	**Construction**	Construction of Alternative 2 would result in similar but slightly reduced impacts during construction as compared to the proposed Project. Due to Alternative 2's reduced footprint, temporary and permanent impacts analogous to the proposed Project would occur, but at a smaller scale and farther from some of the environmentally sensitive areas on site—specifically, fill impacts at Wetland D and its on-site buffer would not occur, and the potential landslide hazard	**Puyallup River** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		areas near the top of steep slopes at the eastern edge of the high terrace would not be developed. However, Alternative 2 does not change the current proposal to redirect most site runoff to the Puyallup River, and therefore, does not address ongoing erosion at the riverbank, does not address water quality and listed species impacts from 6PPD pollutants, nor the need to protect and maintain current groundwater-fed hydrology sources for the on-site wetlands. Neither does it propose revegetation of the undeveloped surfaces between the terrace edge and the warehouse zone, which would be expected to become weed-dominated unless properly managed. These impacts to surface water would occur during Construction because the timing of paving and construction of stormwater systems during Construction would overlap with impacts from new warehouse traffic runoff during Operations.	• SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all on-site wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance. • SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan. **Floodplain and Shorelines** • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.
	Operation	The Operations Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar but slightly less than those described for the proposed Project, due to the smaller Project site footprint. As a result of the Alternative 2 reduced impacts approach, there would be a reduction in total impervious surface and a decrease in the number of daily traffic trips. But the general approach to stormwater management would remain the same. Impacts to surface water wetlands from lack of hydrology, ongoing riverbank erosion and water quality impacts from 6PPD still remain. Thus, under Alternative 2, wetlands are still expected to become smaller or disappear entirely due to a decrease in infiltration and associated groundwater hydrology volumes. Ongoing erosion at the riverbank is expected to increase as a result of increased runoff from Project pavement through the outfall. New impacts to listed salmonids from new inputs of 6PPD laden water from pavement still remain, although would be slightly reduced by having less pavement.	**Puyallup River** • SW-1. Evaluate the outfall erosion issues prior to Hearing Examiner hearing and prior to County and Hearing Examiner approval and final Project permitting and take corrective action as needed to redesign, repair, or relocate the stormwater outfall structure or components of the Project-wide stormwater management plan in relation to future flow increases from the Project site. • SW-2. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. **Wetlands** • SW-3. Hydrogeologist/Geotechnical engineer assessment of steep slopes and location of proposed infiltration facilities. • SW-4. Surface and Groundwater Hydrology monitoring prior to final site design and construction in all on-site wetlands to define hydroperiods, as needed to develop effective plans to preserve current wetland hydrology, as required in Code. • SW-5. Long-term groundwater monitoring during operations to document success of proposed hydrology support. • SW-6. Wetland D impact avoidance.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• SW-7. Mitigation and monitoring plan. **<u>Floodplain and Shorelines</u>** • SW-8. Reduction of on-site erosion and sediment movement.
Groundwater (Section 4.3)			
No Action Alternative		Under the No Action Alternative, the construction of the Project would not occur. No Project-related impacts to groundwater resources would result. Agriculture could continue on site, and groundwater would continue to be recharged by direct infiltration from farmed surfaces. Groundwater recharge through the upland terrace surfaces would continue to provide the same recharge volumes during similar time periods that currently support the existing floodplain wetlands to the east. There would be no significant excavation, grading, or clearing on site beyond what is normal and allowed for agricultural operations.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	**<u>Groundwater Infiltration and Wetland Recharge Potential</u>** The current proposal is likely to result in significant impacts to on-site wetlands, and most of those impacts would be initiated during construction phases. Therefore, the two primary impacts caused by changes to groundwater functions during construction phases would be: • potential slope stability impacts along the top of slope or eastern slope face of the high terrace, and • changes to the timing and total volumes of groundwater recharge to the Puyallup River and to on-site wetlands in the eastern floodplain (Wetlands A, B, and C) and in the southeastern high terrace (Wetland D). **<u>Groundwater Contamination</u>** Construction of the Project site would require the use of heavy equipment and dewatering, both of which could cause contamination of groundwater. Uncontrolled spills are unlikely because required Spill Prevention, Control, and	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities. • GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function • GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		Countermeasure plans, and local and state permit requirements would presumably be implemented and followed. Construction stormwater also has the potential to transport contaminants into local groundwater. Potentially contaminated materials during site excavation and grading could be encountered. **<u>Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Wellhead Protection Areas and Water Wells</u>** Minor decrease in groundwater discharge to the Puyallup River would be expected to have an undetectable impact on the overall flow of the river. During construction, the Project would not use any on-site water wells for water supply. No impacts on drinking water wells are expected.	
	Operation	Potential operational impacts to groundwater include the following: • Permanent subsurface modifications related to drainage systems, which may reduce or eliminate groundwater sources that support the on-site floodplain wetlands. • Stormwater management design that redirects most surface runoff to the river rather than infiltrating, which would reduce historic infiltration volumes and timing of seeps to wetlands from the high terrace, and which may eliminate on-site floodplain and high terrace wetlands. • Oil leaks and spills in the warehouse complex over time, which may contaminate shallow groundwater if not managed properly.	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities. • GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function • GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan
Alternative 1	**Construction**	Construction of Alternative 1 would result in similar construction impacts as the proposed Project. Except for a small area between the Project site and the Meeker Southern railroad, and construction of the track extensions from the BNSF mainline/Meeker Southern interchange, most of the ground disturbance for the construction of the	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		rail line would occur within the same construction footprint as the proposed Project; therefore, the impacts would be similar to those described for construction of the proposed Project.	• GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function • GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan
	Operation	The operations impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be the same as those described for the proposed Project. There might be a slight difference in total impervious surface, but it is assumed that the general approach to stormwater management would remain the same, and the risks would remain the same.	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities. • GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function • GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan
Alternative 2	**Construction**	Construction of Alternative 2 would result in similar, but slightly reduced impacts during construction as compared to the proposed Project. Due to Alternative 2's reduced footprint, temporary and permanent impacts analogous to what was described above for the proposed Project would occur, but at a smaller scale and farther from some of the environmentally sensitive areas on site. However, Alternative 2 does not change the current proposal to redirect most site runoff to the Puyallup River, and therefore, does not address the need to protect and maintain current groundwater-fed hydrology sources for the on-site wetlands. Neither does it propose revegetation of the undeveloped surfaces between the terrace edge and the warehouse zone, without which would be expected to revegetate naturally with a weed-dominated vegetation community.	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities. • GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function • GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan
	Operation	The Operations Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar but slightly reduced compared to those described for the proposed Project, due to the smaller Project site footprint. As a result of the Alternative 2 reduced impacts approach, there would be a reduction in total impervious surface and a decrease in the number of daily traffic trips, but the general approach to stormwater management would remain the same, and the impacts to wetland groundwater hydrology sources remain the same. Thus,	• GW-1. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • GW-2. Consider benefits of meeting rather than exceeding EC impervious surface limits and applying LID techniques • GW-3. Assess steep slope stability adjacent to proposed infiltration facilities. • GW-4. Test infiltration facilities location and function

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		under Alternative 2, wetlands are still expected to become smaller or disappear entirely due to a decrease in infiltration on the high terrace and associated reduction in groundwater hydrology volumes.	• GW-5. Monitor ground and surface water depth and duration in trenches and wetlands. • GW-6. Long-term wetland groundwater monitoring plan
Plants and Animals (Section 4.4)			
No Action Alternative		Under the No Action Alternative, the construction and operation of the Project would not occur. No Project-related impacts to plants and animals would result. Assuming the same agricultural activities would continue on site, then existing plant and animal communities would continue to function as they do currently. No new development or increased human activity would be introduced on site and no additional vegetation clearing would occur outside of what is standard and allowed under farming practices; no additional wildlife habitat would be disrupted; impacts to special status species would remain the same. The current degraded vegetation communities and animal habitat conditions associated with continued farming practices would persist indefinitely. Existing levels of the 6PPD pollutant in the Puyallup River would not increase as a result of proposed new flow volumes from the Project site.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	During construction, direct impacts to plants and animals could occur from release of pollutants from construction equipment—gas, diesel and/or oil spills, and from grading and clearing activities—which would gradually reduce infiltration across the upper terrace, affecting hydrology sources supporting floodplain wetland habitats. As impervious surface increases over the course of construction—pavement and buildings—potential for greater volumes of runoff containing 6PPD pollutants flowing into the Puyallup River also increases.	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall. • P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)
	Operation	During Operations, the most significant continued impact to plants and animals would be from the significant increase in runoff volumes and an associated increase in 6PPD pollutants in the new runoff being sent to the Puyallup	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		River. The increased runoff volumes may further destabilize the existing outfall structure, affecting bank stability and sending eroded materials into the river, and may continue to cause habitat planting area failures in the Puyallup River riparian buffer. Other impacts may include a decrease in Wetlands A, B, and C acreage over time due to loss of hydrology sources, a direct loss of one-acre of Wetland and its buffers at Wetland D, and impacts to remaining off-site portions of Wetland D—water quantity and water quality.	• P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)
Alternative 1	**Construction**	Construction of Alternative 1 would result in similar construction impacts as the proposed Project. Except for a small area between the Project site and the Meeker Southern railroad, and construction of the track extensions from BNSF mainline/Meeker Southern interchange, most of the ground disturbance for the construction of the rail line would occur within the same construction footprint as the proposed Project; therefore, the impacts would be similar to those described for construction of the proposed Project.	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall. • P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)
	Operation	Alternative 1, which involves using rail rather than roads in some of the warehouse complex area, is unlikely to have a different operational impact on vegetation and wildlife—including sensitive or listed aquatic species—than the proposed Project. Despite the possibility that train noise may be more concentrated, and therefore louder near tracked areas, overall noise levels in the floodplain, most being at a distance from the primary train track (assumed to run along the western Project edge) would be similar, and it is assumed that the general approach to stormwater management would remain the same. There would be a slight decrease in the total number of trucks on site—suggesting that the level of tire oxidant pollutant would be decreased—but the trip reduction is not significant enough, based on the information in the Transportation section of this EIS, to change the analysis regarding 6PPD impacts. Therefore, Alternative 1 is likely to result in similar impacts to plants and animals, including the listed salmonids in the Puyallup River.	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall. • P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Alternative 2	**Construction**	Construction of Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts during construction as the proposed Project. Due to Alternative 2's reduced footprint, temporary and permanent impacts analogous to the proposed Project would occur, but at a smaller scale and farther from some of the environmentally sensitive areas on site.	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall. • P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)
	Operation	The Operations Impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be similar but slightly reduced compared to those described for the proposed Project, due to the smaller Project site footprint. As a result of the Alternative 2 reduced impacts approach, there would be a reduction in total impervious surface and a decrease in the number of daily traffic trips, but the general approach to stormwater management would remain the same, and the impacts to wetland groundwater hydrology sources remain the same. Thus, under Alternative 2, wetlands are still expected to become smaller or disappear entirely due to a decrease in infiltration on the high terrace and associated reduction in groundwater hydrology volumes.	• P&A-1. Clearing and grading work causing spread and colonization of noxious weeds. • P&A-2. Evaluate riverine and floodplain habitat conditions in and around the outfall. • P&A-3. Re-evaluate current stormwater management strategy. • P&A-4. Wetlands A, B, C, and D Habitat and Hydroperiod Protection • P&A-5. Wetland D Habitat Protection (more details provided in Section 4.2 Surface Water, Mitigation SW-7)
Land and Shoreline Use (Section 4.5)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the Project would not occur, the site would still be a subject of potential annexation, and collaboration between the City and County in planning for this area would still need to occur. If the Project did not occur, other opportunities for job-generating development on the site remain and there is a potential for inconsistency with the City and County Comprehensive Plan policies that require planning for economic and employment growth. The No Action Alternative would be consistent with the intent of the Pierce County Comprehensive Plan if a future proposed development aligned with the future land uses allowed in the EC designation—a mixture of future land uses under the Light Manufacturing/Warehousing, Rural Buffer	No mitigation required.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		Residential, Business/Industrial Parks, and Auto-oriented Commercial zones.	
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Significant with Mitigation.* Construction would be conducted in accordance with applicable policies and regulations of agencies with jurisdiction or discretionary authority over one or more of the Project components. The Project site includes prime farmland, currently used as farmed agricultural lands and associated single-family residences. During construction, these agricultural uses and residences would be removed. Construction of the Project would result in temporary environmental impacts within the Project site, as identified and addressed in sections of this EIS (Section 4.1, Earth Resources mitigation measures ER-1 through ER-10; Section 4.5, Land Use mitigation measures LU-1 through LU-4; Section 4.6, Recreation mitigation measures REC-1 through REC-3; Section 4.7, Aesthetics mitigation measure AES-1; Section 4.10, Health and Safety mitigation measures HS-1 through HS-5; and Section 4.13, Noise mitigation measures N-1 and N-2).	• ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design. • LU-1. Development limits on city Comprehensive Plan designation areas. • LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses. • LU-4. Conservation Easement • REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening. • AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements. • N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact T*he Project would be inconsistent with County policies around intensity of the site's use; compatibility with surrounding uses, critical areas, and utility and street capacity (Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Policies LU-44.6, LU-46.1, LU-46.2, LU-47.4, LU-47.9, LU-47.11); the Project's interference with connecting the surrounding community (Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goal PR-10, Policy PR-17.1); preservation of prime farmland and community character (AM D-1); and absence of a proposal to include restoration of shoreline ecological functions as part of industrial development (Pierce County SMP Policy B-1).	• LU-1. Development limits on city Comprehensive Plan designation areas. • LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses. • LU-4. Conservation Easement
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The construction impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in that the Project would result in temporary environmental impacts within the Project site as identified and addressed in sections of this EIS. Additional impacts for Alternative 1 would be associated with the extension of the existing rail line outside of the Project site on a County-owned parcel and County ROW (Figure 4-2). Construction of Alternative 1 would be temporary in nature and would require construction in accordance with applicable policies and regulations of Pierce County.	• ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design. • LU-1. Development limits on city Comprehensive Plan designation areas. • LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses. • LU-4. Conservation Easement

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening. • AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements. • N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The operations impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in that it would be consistent with County zoning and future land use designations, but inconsistent with the City's future land use designations. Alternative 1 would interfere with planned land uses in the Project site and with policy that calls for connectivity through systems of trails that link communities and parks (Pierce County Parks and Recreation Element, Goal PR-10, PR-17 and PR 17.1). Therefore, Alternative 1 would cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations pertaining to non-conformance of future land use designations and planned land uses laid out in City and County planning documents. Mitigation measures LU-1 through LU-4 would reduce these impacts to the extent feasible.	• LU-1. Development limits on city Comprehensive Plan designation areas. • LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses. • LU-4. Conservation Easement

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have a reduced footprint and construction could be expected to be at a smaller scale. However, temporary land-use related environmental impacts analogous to the proposed Project would occur as identified and addressed in sections of this EIS.	• ER-1. Implement BMPs during construction. • ER-2. Implement low impact development principles. • ER-3. Develop Geotechnical Assessment from a WA Licensed Geotechnical Engineer. • ER-4. Prepare and Implement SWPPP for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-5. Prepare Emergency Site Management Plans for large scale weather events for Erosion and Sedimentation Hazards. • ER-6. Comply with Title 18E.60 PCC for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-7. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Volcanic Activity. • ER-8. Building Occupancy Limits for Volcanic Hazards. • ER-9. Prepare Emergency Management Plan for Seismic Events. • ER-10. Conform with Title 17C PCC for Seismic Design. • LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses. • LU-4. Conservation Easement • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening. • AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements. • N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Alternative 2 may conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations pertaining to non-conformance of future land uses if established inconsistent with both jurisdiction policies around broad uses and compatibility with the local environment. Mitigation measures LU-2 and LU-3 would reduce impacts to the extent feasible.	• LU-2. Consider a broader mix of uses for the Project. • LU-3. Consider the compatibility with surrounding land uses.
Aesthetics (Section 4.6)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the existing aesthetic quality of the Project site would be preserved until future development is proposed. No substantial new infrastructure would be introduced into the aesthetic environment until future development is proposed, and no significant contrast would be created.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* During construction, increased activity and the presence of construction equipment would result in visual impacts in the Project site, a disruption and displacement of the community's sense of place during this time. To mitigate these impacts, mitigation measure AES-1 would be required.	• AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The Project would permanently convert the area from a visual environment that is generally characterized presently by rural development and agricultural uses to an industrial warehousing park. The Project would create a permanent change to the aesthetic resources in the Project site. The natural environment, the built environment, and the visual quality within those environments in the Project Mitigation measure REC-1 would eliminate the potential for impacts to the park view corridor associated with Van Lierop Park. Mitigation measures AES-2 and AES-3 would further reduce visual impacts to park users and the surrounding community.	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • AES-2. Comply with Screening, Landscape and Buffering Requirements • AES-3. Comply with Operation Lighting Requirements
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* During construction, increased activity and the presence of construction equipment would result in visual impacts in the Project site, a disruption and	• AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		displacement of the community's sense of place during this time. To mitigate these impacts, mitigation measure AES-1 would be required.	
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The aesthetic impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be the same as those described for the proposed Project in that it would permanently convert the area from a visual environment that is generally characterized presently by rural development and agricultural uses to an industrial warehousing park. Alternative 1 would compound the aesthetic environmental impacts with the addition of rail lines and rail cars in the built environment. Operation would include rail movement to and from the site and the BNSF mainline/Meeker Southern interchange extensions would be adjacent to existing rail lines. Alternative 1 would introduce a more intense level of contrast in the aesthetic environment, causing the aesthetic value of the environment to change. Impacts would be considered Mitigated Significant Impact. Mitigation measure REC-1 would eliminate the potential for impacts to the park view corridor associated with Van Lierop Park. Mitigation measures AES-2 and AES-3 would reduce impacts to the extent feasible.	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • AES-2. Comply with Screening, Landscape and Buffering Requirements • AES-3. Comply with Operation Lighting Requirements
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Although at a slightly smaller scale than the proposed Project, during construction, increased activity and the presence of construction equipment would result in visual impacts in the Project site, a disruption and displacement of the community's sense of place during this time. To mitigate these impacts, mitigation measure AES-1 would be required.	• AES-1. Comply with Construction Lighting Requirements
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The Project would permanently convert the area from a visual environment that is generally characterized presently by rural development and agricultural uses to an industrial warehousing park. The natural environment, the built environment, and the visual quality within those environments in the Project site would impact users of Van	• AES-3. Comply with Operation Lighting Requirements

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		Lierop Park. Mitigation measure AES-3 would further reduce visual impacts to park users and the surrounding community.	
Recreation (Section 4.7)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the potential for trail enhancements associated with the Project would not occur until either Pierce County or the City of Puyallup Parks Department(s) built the trail extensions, as planned. No new infrastructure would be placed adjacent to the existing recreation sites until future development is proposed. Potential future development could either preserve existing recreation, lead to recreation opportunities including those potentially implemented in locations closer to the shoreline.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact*. During construction, construction equipment and activity could interfere with the existing uses of surrounding recreation sites and opportunities, including Sumner Link Trail, the Foothills Trail Trailhead and Van Lierop Park's view corridor of Mount Rainier. Impacts would be minimized with the implementation of Mitigation measures REC-1, REC-2, and REC-3.	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* During operations, the Project would introduce structures and associated truck activity that would interfere with the intended uses of surrounding recreation opportunities in the area. The proposed pedestrian trail route would be visually and physically separated from the shoreline and from trails intended to connect large community park space to the regional trail network. Implementation of mitigation measures REC-1, REC-4 and REC-5 would reduce impacts to the extent feasible.	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-4. Modify the Site Plan to Provide a New Trail Location • REC-5. Provide a Trail Connection to Van Lierop Park
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The construction impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be the same as those described for the proposed Project and would require	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		implementation of mitigation measures REC-1, REC-2, and REC-3 to minimize impacts. Alternative 1 would include rail construction across 80th Street, close to the Foothills Trailhead parking. This would impact the experience of the Foothills Trail users as the aesthetic quality of their use of the trail would be interrupted. The Alternative 1 rail line on the Project site, especially outside of Warehouse C, would conflict with the proposed pedestrian trail. Further, trail users could potentially experience temporary trail closures, because of the interference of construction activity and construction equipment. Impacts would be minimized with the implementation of mitigation measure REC-6.	• REC-6. Modify Alternative 1 Site Plan to Avoid Trail Impacts
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The recreation impacts associated with Alternative 1 would be the same as those described for the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would introduce structures and associated truck activity that would interfere with the intended uses of surrounding recreation opportunities in the area. Implementation of mitigation measures REC-1, REC-2, and REC-3 would be required to minimize impacts. Alternative 1 would add to the recreation impacts by introducing rail activity. The experience of existing recreation users would likely include increased noise from train engines both running and idling, and whistles at at-grade crossings. Additionally, recreation users might experience a less safe environment, as the proposed rail would cross within direct proximity to the East Puyallup Trailhead and Trail, the Foothills Trail, and the proposed trail extension from the East Puyallup Trailhead and Trail across 80th Avenue SE. The proposed rail line on the Project site, especially outside of Warehouse C, would conflict with the proposed pedestrian trail.	• REC-1. Eliminate Van Lierop Park Prime View Corridor Obstructions • REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening. • REC-6. Modify Alternative 1 Site Plan to Avoid Trail Impacts
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact*. Alternative 2 would have similar but lesser impacts during construction than the proposed Project due to the decreased site footprint of the facility. During construction, construction equipment and	• REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		activity could interfere with the existing uses of surrounding recreation sites and opportunities, including the Puyallup Riverwalk Trail, the Foothills Trail Trailhead, and Van Lierop Park's view corridor of Mount Rainier. Impacts would be minimized with the implementation of mitigation measures REC-2 and REC-3.	
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact*. Alternative 2 would interfere with the intended uses of surrounding recreation, including the Puyallup Riverwalk Trail or the Foothills Trail Trailhead as operations would bring increased truck and other vehicular traffic to the area and compromise the user's experience. The reduced building footprints of Buildings A, C, and E as well as the addition of trail and building buffers would allow the trail location to be visually screened from the industrial uses under Scenario 2, but the recreational use would still conflict with the character of the industrial warehouse development. However, under Scenario 2, the proposed on-site trail would shift to a shoreline alignment (starting to the east of Building E, due north), lessening impacts on future recreationalists and separating incompatible uses. Scenario 2 would also reduce the building footprints of Buildings F and G by removing the portions of each building blockage of Mount Rainier from Van Lierop Park in accordance with REC-1, thereby lessening impacts on the park and recreational resources. The location of the proposed trail as shown on the proposed Project site plan would not connect to Van Lierop Park and would place the proposed development in a manner that would have substantial impacts on a community-wide park resource. Under Scenario 2, the trail would be moved from the proposed location parallel to Building G (east of Building G), and consolidated with the built and future planned extension of the trail on the eastern side of Van Lierop Park. Scenario 2 would also require that the site plan be separated by the east-west trail corridor so that no vehicular crossing of the trail would occur. Additional pedestrian improvement to facilitate safe access across 80th Street/8^{t}h Avenue SE would also need to occur under Scenario 2. Impacts would be minimized with the implementation of mitigation measures REC-2 and REC-3.	• REC-2. Identify and address recreation closures. • REC-3. Implement visual screening

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (Section 4.8)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the construction and operation of the proposed Project would not occur. Existing conditions in the study area related to air quality would continue under the No Action Alternative.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* The construction emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. The construction emissions would be intermittent in nature, temporary and spatially dispersed, and are not expected to represent a significant adverse impact.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize potential for air quality impacts during construction in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3 and ENV-4.2, CPCP Goal NE-11.5 and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulation 1, Section 9.15.
	Operation	*Less than Significant.* Operations emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. Criteria pollutant and MSAT impacts due to operational emissions from transport trucks and employee commuting would be adverse, but less than significant. Greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be less than significant.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during operations to minimize potential for localized air quality impacts during construction in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3.5 to 3.7, 3.10 and 4.1; CPCP Goal T-6.2; Title 10.50 PCC; and Chapter 21.16 PCC.
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* The construction emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. The construction emissions would be intermittent in nature, temporary and spatially dispersed, and are not expected to represent a significant adverse impact.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize potential for air quality impacts during construction in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3 and ENV-4.2, CPCP Goal NE-11.5 and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulation 1, Section 9.15.
	Operation	*Less than Significant.* Operations emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. Criteria pollutant and MSAT impacts due to operational emissions from transport trucks, employee commuting and operation of the rail line. Would be adverse, but less than significant. Greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be less than significant.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize potential for localized air quality impacts during operations in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3.5 to 3.7, 3.10 and 4.1; CPCP Goal T-6.2; Title 10.50 PCC; and Chapter 21.16 PCC.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* The construction emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. The construction emissions would be intermittent in nature, temporary and spatially dispersed, and are not expected to represent a significant adverse impact.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize potential for air quality impacts during construction in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3 and ENV-4.2, CPCP Goal NE-11.5 and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulation 1, Section 9.15.
	Operation	*Less than Significant.* Operations emissions from the proposed Project are not expected to cause a significant air quality impact and are not expected to cause an exceedance of the NAAQS. Criteria pollutant and MSAT impacts due to operational emissions from transport trucks and employee commuting would be adverse, but less than significant. Greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be less than significant.	No mitigation required. However, BMPs would be implemented during operations to minimize potential for localized air quality impacts during construction in accordance with Pierce County Comprehensive Plan Goals ENV-3.5 to 3.7, 3.10 and 4.1; CPCP Goal T-6.2; Pierce County Code Chapter 10.50; and Puyallup Municipal Code Chapter 21.16.
Transportation (Section 4.9)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the construction and operation of the proposed Project would not occur. Existing conditions in the study area related to transportation and traffic would continue under the No Action Alternative.	No Mitigation
Proposed Project	**Construction**	Less than Significant. Traffic operations and safety will be impacted within the proposed Project area. The construction of the proposed Project will generate construction traffic and may require temporary lane closures, detours, or other construction related impacts. Construction traffic will contribute to deterioration of local roads and major arterials.	Applicant will be required to develop and implement a traffic management plan for all construction traffic. Applicant will be required to repair any damage and restore roadways to a condition similar to or better than that prior to construction.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact. The Project will generate 8,724 total daily trips including 1,482 heavy trucks, reducing the capacity along the existing roadway corridors resulting in an increase delay, reduced level of service, extensive queue lengths, and increase travel time during the peak periods. The increase traffic demand and heavy trucks will reduce the remaining pavement life along the corridors within the study area.*	• Retime and coordinate the signal at Traffic Avenue/Fryar Avene & Main Street/Cannery Way • Retime and coordinate signal at Traffic Avenue & State Street • Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 westbound. Modify lane configuration and striping to allow eastbound and westbound left turns to run on the same signal phase.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 eastbound • Widen 5th Avenue to a three-lane section between Shaw Road E and 33rd Street SE. Install new signal at 5th Avenue & Shaw Road E. • Convert existing SR 162 & 80th Street unsignalized intersection into a roundabout. • Apply capacity Proportional Factor to long range estimates to determine fee in lieu to widen and vehicular capacity along E Main Avenue, Shaw Road E, E Pioneer, and SR 162 within the study area. • Improve existing roadways within the study area to meet ADA requirements. • Improve existing transit stations within the study area. • Widen 33rd Street SE from 5th Avenue SE to E Pioneer Avenue to meet City standards and the future designation in the City's Comprehensive Plan. • Widen 80th Street E/8th Avenue SE to meet City standards.
Alternative 1	**Construction**	Less than Significant. Traffic operations and safety will be impacted within the proposed Project area. The construction of the proposed Project will generate construction traffic and may require temporary lane closures, detours, or other construction related impacts. Construction traffic will contribute to deterioration of local roads and major arterials.	Applicant will be required to develop and implement a traffic management plan for all construction traffic. Applicant will be required to repair any damage and restore roadways to a condition similar to or better than that prior to construction.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact. The Project will generate 8,487 total daily trips including 1,207 heavy trucks, reducing the capacity along the existing roadway corridors resulting in an increase delay, reduced level of service, extensive queue lengths, and increase travel time during the peak periods. The increase traffic demand and heavy trucks will reduce the remaining pavement life along the corridors within the study area.*	• Retime and coordinate the signal at Traffic Avenue/Fryar Avene & Main Street/Cannery Way • Retime and coordinate signal at Traffic Avenue & State Street • Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 westbound. Modify lane configuration and striping to allow eastbound and westbound left turns to run on the same signal phase. • Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 eastbound

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• Widen 5th Avenue to a three-lane section between Shaw Road E and 33rd Street SE. Install new signal at 5th Avenue & Shaw Road E. • Convert existing SR 162 & 80th Street unsignalized intersection into a roundabout. • Apply capacity Proportional Factor to long range estimates to determine fee in lieu to widen and vehicular capacity along E Main Avenue, Shaw Road E, E Pioneer, and SR 162 within the study area. • Improve existing roadways within the study area to meet ADA requirements. • Improve existing transit stations within the study area. • Widen 33rd Street SE from 5th Avenue SE to E Pioneer Avenue to meet City standards and the future designation in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Widen 80th Street E/8th Avenue SE to meet City standards.
Alternative 2	**Construction**	Less than Significant. Traffic operations and safety will be impacted within the proposed Project area. The construction of the proposed Project will generate construction traffic and may require temporary lane closures, detours, or other construction related impacts. Construction traffic will contribute to deterioration of local roads and major arterials.	Applicant will be required to develop and implement a traffic management plan for all construction traffic. Applicant will be required to repair any damage and restore roadways to a condition similar to or better than that prior to construction.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact. The Project will generate 5,844 total daily trips including 998 heavy trucks, reducing the capacity along the existing roadway corridors resulting in an increase delay, reduced level of service, extensive queue lengths, and increase travel time during the peak periods. The increase traffic demand and heavy trucks will reduce the remaining pavement life along the corridors within the study area.*	• Retime and coordinate the signal at Traffic Avenue/Fryar Avene & Main Street/Cannery Way • Retime and coordinate signal at Traffic Avenue & State Street • Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 westbound. Modify lane configuration and striping to allow eastbound and westbound left turns to run on the same signal phase. • Retime and coordinate signal at E Main Avenue & SR 410 eastbound • Widen 5th Avenue to a three-lane section between Shaw Road E and 33rd Street SE. Install new signal at 5th Avenue & Shaw Road E. • Convert existing SR 162 & 80th Street unsignalized intersection into a roundabout.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
			• Apply capacity Proportional Factor to long range estimates to determine fee in lieu to widen and vehicular capacity along E Main Avenue, Shaw Road E, E Pioneer, and SR 162 within the study area. • Improve existing roadways within the study area to meet ADA requirements. • Improve existing transit stations within the study area. • Widen 33rd Street SE from 5th Avenue SE to E Pioneer Avenue to meet City standards and the future designation in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Widen 80th Street E/8th Avenue SE to meet City standards.
Health and Safety (Section 4.10)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed Project would not be constructed, and existing health and safety hazards would remain in the study area.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	**<u>Construction Hazards</u>** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* Public and occupational health and safety risks during construction of the Project include the potential exposure to electrical and mechanical hazards for construction workers; inadvertent release of hazardous materials; and exposure to existing hazardous materials sites. Mitigation measures HS-1 through HS-6 are identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to the extent feasible. **<u>Natural Gas Pipeline Safety</u>** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* As currently designed, the proposed Project is sited above the Williams Natural Gas Pipeline and associated 75-foot-wide easement. The pipeline is located below the parking area between Warehouses E, F, and G and these warehouses are proposed within the pipeline ROW. Any Project development activity within the 75-foot easement requires approval by Williams Northwest Pipeline LLC Construction of the Project would require excavation, grading, utility installation, and warehouse construction	**<u>Construction Hazards</u>** • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. **<u>Natural Gas Pipeline Safety</u>** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement. • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		above or near the Williams Natural Gas Pipeline. Although a release or incident involving the pipeline is unlikely, unintentional force or excavation could cause releases from the pipeline, placing construction workers and the public at risk. Depending on environmental factors such as wind, proximity of vegetation or other fuels, and dryness of the environment, a fire could spread to other nearby structures or wooded natural environments; the extent of damage would depend on various unpredictable elements. To minimize the potential for an incident to occur and resulting significant impacts, mitigation measures HS-7 and HS-8 would be required.	
	Operation	**Chemical Use and Storage** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* Potential hazardous materials associated with future tenants may include solvents, petroleum products, and metals. The Project could result in an inadvertent release of hazardous materials during operation. In the event of an inadvertent hazardous materials release, both the physical and natural environments as well as their occupants and inhabitants could be affected. Mitigation measures HS-9 and HS-10 would be required to reduce the probability of a release of stored chemicals and exposure to hazardous materials to the extent feasible. **Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* As currently designed, the proposed Project is sited above the Williams Natural Gas Pipeline and associated 75-foot-wide easement. The pipeline is located below the parking area between Warehouses E, F, and G and these warehouses are proposed within the pipeline ROW. Any Project development activity within the 75-foot easement requires approval by Williams Northwest Pipeline LLC Construction of the Project would require excavation, grading, utility installation, and warehouse construction above or near the Williams Natura Gas Pipeline. Although a release or incident involving the pipeline is unlikely,	**Chemical Use and Storage** • HS-9. Designate and carry out duties of a Facility Emergency Coordinator • HS-10. Comply with HCS of the U.S. OSHA Standards. **Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		unintentional force or excavation could cause releases from the pipeline, placing construction workers and the public at risk. Depending on environmental factors such as wind, proximity of vegetation or other fuels, and dryness of the environment, a fire could spread to other nearby structures or wooded natural environments; the extent of damage would depend on various unpredictable elements. To minimize the potential for an incident to occur and resulting significant impacts, mitigation measures HS-7 and HS-8 would be required.	
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The impacts from construction of Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in that the potential exposure to electrical and mechanical hazards for construction workers; inadvertent release of hazardous materials; and exposure to existing hazardous materials sites would still occur. Construction over the Williams Pipeline ROW would risk unintentional force or excavation that could cause releases from the pipeline, placing construction workers and the public at risk. Mitigation measures HS-1 through HS-8 are identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to the extent feasible.	**Construction Hazards** • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. **Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The impacts from operation of Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project in that Alternative 1 could also result in an inadvertent release of hazardous materials during operation. Under Alternative 1, the addition of rail activity during operations would allow for the transportation by rail of hazardous materials. Under Alternative 1, the proposed facility and rail line are sited above the Williams Pipeline. Similar to the proposed Project, there is a potential risk associated with operation of the facility above the Williams Pipeline. Based on these considerations, impacts would be Mitigated Significant Impact. Mitigation measures HS-7 and	**Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements. **Chemical Use and Storage** • HS-9. Designate and carry out duties of a Facility Emergency Coordinator • HS-10. Comply with HCS of the U.S. OSHA Standards.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		HS-8 are identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce operation of Alternative 1 Williams Pipeline impacts to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures HS-9 and HS-10 would further reduce the probability of a release of stored chemicals and exposure to hazardous materials to the extent feasible.	
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact*. Compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have reduced footprint and construction could be expected to be at a smaller scale. However, the same construction-related environmental impacts analogous to the proposed Project could still occur. A mitigated significant impact is anticipated. Mitigation measures HS-1 through HS-8 are identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to the extent feasible.	**Construction Hazards** • HS-1. Prepare a Project Health and Safety Plan • HS-2. Prepare Emergency Response Plan • HS-3. Survey for Lead Based Paint and Asbestos • HS-4. Comply with MTCA Regulations for Unexpected Encounter with Hazardous Materials. • HS-5. Comply with WISHA Rules. • HS-6. Comply with Pierce County Public Works Inspection and Enforcement. **Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would be a reduced footprint and operation could be expected to be at a smaller scale. However, the same operation-related environmental impacts analogous to the proposed Project could still occur. Based on these considerations, a mitigated significant impact is anticipated. Mitigation measures HS-7 and HS-8 are identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce operation of Alternative 2 Williams Pipeline impacts to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures HS-9 and HS-10 would further reduce the probability of a release of stored chemicals and exposure to hazardous materials to the extent feasible.	**Natural Gas Pipeline Safety** • HS-7. Obtain and comply with Williams Northwest Pipeline Encroachment Agreement • HS-8. Comply with PHSMA's Minimum Design Requirements. **Chemical Use and Storage** • HS-9. Designate and carry out duties of a Facility Emergency Coordinator • HS-10. Comply with HCS of the U.S. OSHA Standards.
Public Services and Utilities (Section 4.11)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed Project would not be constructed at the Project site. No	No mitigation required.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		changes to existing public services or utilities would occur as a result of Project activities. Development at the Project site and in adjacent areas would continue according to current planning goals and service demands outlined within the UGA.	
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* Available service levels for any public service or utility during construction would not be exceeded.	No mitigation required.
	Operation	**Police/Sheriff Services, Fire Services, Electricity, Natural Gas and Solid Waste** *Less than Significant.* Available service levels for public services or utility during operations would not be exceeded. **Domestic Water** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* The City anticipates having water capacity to serve the Project; however, a final determination, including any appropriate utility permit conditions or system development charges will be made following publication of the EIS. City of Puyallup Code Chapter 14.02 sets forth water system development charges that may be required once an end user and final water usage projections are known. As such, implementation of mitigation measure PS-1 is required to avoid a significant impact to the City of Puyallup water system. **Sanitary Sewer** *Mitigated Significant Impact.* During the preparation of the utility permit application, physical capacity improvements may be required by the City of Puyallup to correct any failures in the downstream system resulting from the Project occupancy (final user(s)) build out. If there are potential failures, mitigation measure PS-2 would be required to avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to the extent feasible. **Stormwater**	**Police/Sheriff Services, Fire Services, Electricity, Natural Gas and Solid Waste** No mitigation required. **Domestic Water** • PS-1. Comply with Title 14.02 PCC for Water Usage **Sanitary Sewer** • PS-2. Conduct a Sanitary Sewer Assessment **Stormwater** • PS-3. Comply with Stormwater Quality Requirements • PS-4. Conduct Groundwater Monitoring • PS-5. Comply with Infiltration and Dispersion Trench Design Requirements

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		Mitigated Significant Impact. The Project would result in substantial increases in the impervious surface of the Project site and, thus, the rate and amount of surface runoff is expected to increase with Project implementation. Implementation of mitigation measure PS-3 would be required to avoid, minimize, or reduce impacts to the extent feasible. There have been issues with the stormwater system at the Viking Warehouse on the property adjacent to the Project site. Groundwater was encountered that was nearer the surface than expected during design, which has necessitated the installation of dewatering trenches to manage post construction groundwater intrusion coming through the surface through pavement and foundations on the adjacent Viking warehouse site. Given the proximity of the Viking warehouse to the Project site, it is likely that similar issues would be encountered with the stormwater system for the proposed Project. Implementation of groundwater monitoring in accordance with mitigation measure PS-4 would be required to ensure that facilities are designed to avoid groundwater intrusion issues. The second stormwater system would convey rooftop runoff from Warehouses A, C, D, and E to one of three infiltration/dispersion systems along the northeast bench of the site. Design of the infiltration/dispersion systems appears feasible based on the preliminary geotechnical information provided; however, it is unclear where flows above the Minimum Requirement would be directed. Therefore, the infiltration and dispersion trench design need to take into account the requirements of the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Ecology 2019), in accordance with mitigation measure PS-5.	
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* Available service levels for any public service or utility during construction would not be exceeded.	No mitigation required.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The public services and utilities impacts associated with operation of Alternative 1 would be similar to those described for the proposed Project. The addition of rail operations would not notably increase the demand for any public service or utility. The domestic water, stormwater and sanitary sewer issues identified under the proposed Project would also occur under Alternative 1. Implementation of mitigation measures PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, PS-4, and PS-5 would be required to minimize potential impacts to stormwater and sanitary sewer services.	**Police/Sheriff Services, Fire Services, Domestic Water, Electricity, Natural Gas and Solid Waste** No Mitigation required. **Domestic Water** • PS-1. Comply with Title 14.02 PCC for Water Usage **Sanitary Sewer** • PS-2. Conduct a Sanitary Sewer Assessment **Stormwater** • PS-3. Comply with Stormwater Quality Requirements • PS-4. Conduct Groundwater Monitoring • PS-5. Comply with Infiltration and Dispersion Trench Design Requirements
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Less than Significant.* Available service levels for any public service or utility during construction would not be exceeded.	No Mitigation required.
	Operation	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The public services and utilities impacts associated with operation of Alternative 2 would be similar to but less than those described for the proposed Project. The stormwater and sanitary sewer issues identified under the proposed Project would also occur under Alternative 2. Implementation of mitigation measures PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, PS-4, and PS-5 would be required to minimize potential impacts to domestic water, stormwater and sanitary sewer services.	**Police/Sheriff Services, Fire Services, Domestic Water, Electricity, Natural Gas and Solid Waste** No mitigation required. **Domestic Water** • PS-1. Comply with Title 14.02 PCC for Water Usage **Sanitary Sewer** • PS-2. Conduct a Sanitary Sewer Assessment **Stormwater** • PS-3. Comply with Stormwater Quality Requirements • PS-4. Conduct Groundwater Monitoring • PS-5. Comply with Infiltration and Dispersion Trench Design Requirements
Cultural Resources (Section 4.12)			

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, the Project would not be built and the recommended NRHP, WHR, and PCRHP-eligible historic built environment resource would remain in its current state and not be impacted.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Significant Impact.* The recommended-eligible historic built environment resource is located within the right-of-way (ROW) of 74th Street E and the northeast corner of the proposed footprint of Building D. As such, the residence and its functionally related units would be demolished and the associated farmland would be converted to new uses, which would be a significant impact because the resource is recommended as eligible for listing in local, state, and national registers of historic places.	No mitigation required.
	Operations	*No impacts.* No operational impacts to archaeology resources or the recommended-eligible historic built environment resource are anticipated since it would have been demolished prior to construction.	No mitigation required.
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Significant Impact*. The recommended-eligible historic built environment resource is located within the ROW of 74th Street E and the northeast corner of the proposed footprint of Building D. As such, the residence and its functionally related units would be demolished and the associated farmland would be converted to new uses, which would be a significant impact because the resource is recommended as eligible for listing in local, state, and national registers of historic places.	No mitigation required.
	Operations	*No impacts.* No operational impacts to archaeology resources or the recommended-eligible historic built environment resource are anticipated since it would have been demolished prior to construction.	No mitigation required.
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Significant Impact*. The recommended-eligible historic built environment resource is located within the ROW of 74th Street E and the northeast corner of the proposed footprint of Building D. As such, the residence and its functionally related units would be demolished and the associated farmland would be converted to new uses, which would be a significant impact because the resource is recommended	No mitigation required.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		as eligible for listing in local, state, and national registers of historic places.	
	Operations	*No impacts.* No operational impacts to archaeology resources or the recommended-eligible historic built environment resource are anticipated since it would have been demolished prior to construction.	No mitigation required.
Noise (Section 4.13)			
No Action Alternative		*No impacts.* Under the No Action Alternative, Project construction activities would not occur. Because no construction or operation would take place under this alternative, there would be no noise impacts.	No mitigation required.
Proposed Project	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Day-time construction would temporarily increase noise levels in the study area. Although daytime construction noise is exempt from regulation, the exemption is not intended to preclude requirements for implementation of BMPs to abate noise (WAC 173-60-050[6]). The Applicant and its construction contractors are required to ensure that noise from construction equipment and activities complies with applicable noise rules and minimizes the potential for annoyance/disturbance. As such, implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 would be required to minimize potential noise disturbance.	• N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Truck and passenger/light duty vehicles would generate noise during operations and would be subject to the maximum permissible noise levels under WAC 173-60-040. As such, Project-related heavy trucks would not be permitted to be closer than 50 feet to a Class A EDNA parcel during daytime hours, and 200 feet during nighttime hours. Project-related passenger/light duty vehicles cannot be closer than 25 feet to a Class A EDNA parcel during daytime or nighttime hours. This vehicle activity on the site would constitute a significant impact on these Class A environments that would require implementation of mitigation measure N-3 to minimize noise impacts at the park and nearby residential areas.	• N-3. Construct Noise Walls.

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
		The wide range of potential end uses outlined in Table 3-2 precludes identification of all potential operation-related noise impacts. As such, once a final end-user has been identified for the proposed facility, the specific noise levels would be required to be measured and analyzed during permitting and appropriate mitigation measures would be identified by the permitting agency.	
Alternative 1	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Day-time construction would temporarily increase noise levels in the study area. Although daytime construction noise is exempt from regulation, the exemption is not intended to preclude requirements for implementation of BMPs to abate noise (WAC 173-60-050[6]). The Applicant and its construction contractors are required to ensure that noise from construction equipment and activities complies with applicable noise rules and minimizes the potential for annoyance/disturbance. As such, implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 would be required to minimize potential noise disturbance.	• N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Alternative 1 would eliminate up to 330 trucks from daily traffic levels, which would reduce noise levels on noise-sensitive lands. This would be offset by increased noise from up to two trains per day arriving at the site. The net effect would be a reduction in the areal extent of transportation-related noise and a reduction in the amount of time the noise events occur, thus reducing the overall Project-related noise exposure. However, as discussed under the proposed Project, truck traffic on site would still be anticipated to generate noise levels that exceed maximum permissible noise levels at Class A noise environments (i.e., Van Lierop Park and nearby residential zones); therefore, implementation of mitigation measure N-1 would be required. The wide range of potential end uses outlined in Table 3-2 precludes identification of all potential operation-related noise impacts. As such, once a final end-user has been identified for the proposed facility, the specific noise levels would be required to be measured and analyzed during permitting and appropriate mitigation measures would be identified by the permitting agency.	• N-3. Construct Noise Walls

Resource(s)/Alternative		Impact	Mitigation
Alternative 2	**Construction**	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* The size and scale of the proposed development is smaller under Alternative 2; therefore, construction noise impacts associated with Alternative 2 are expected to be less than those discussed for the proposed Project. The nature of the construction noise would be similar to the proposed Project, but the duration of construction would be lessened. Although daytime construction noise is exempt from regulation, the exemption is not intended to preclude requirements for implementation of BMPs to abate noise (WAC 173-60-050[6]). The Applicant and its construction contractors are required to ensure that noise from construction equipment and activities complies with applicable noise rules and minimizes the potential for annoyance/disturbance. As such, implementation of mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 would be required to minimize potential noise disturbance.	• N-1. Develop Construction Noise Control Plan • N-2. Prioritize Construction of Noise Restricting Project Elements
	Operations	*Mitigated Significant Impact.* Operations impacts associated with Alternative 2 are expected to generally be similar to those discussed for proposed Project, although the size and scale of the proposed development is smaller in Alternative 2. Truck traffic on site would still be anticipated to generate noise levels that exceed maximum permissible noise levels at Class A noise environments (i.e., Van Lierop Park and nearby residential zones); therefore, implementation of mitigation measure N-3 would be required.	• N-3. Construct Noise Walls