

Fact Sheet

Project Title:	Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community
Brief Description of the Proposal:	The Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community is a mixed-use development proposal for a 1,240-acre site in the southwest quadrant of the incorporated area of the City of Yelm. Under any conceptual land use alternative, the development scenario would include approximately 5,000 homes to be provided in a mix of housing types and densities; commercial development; office space; several hundred acres of permanent open space; a Regional Sports Complex; school sites; an on-site fire station; and on-site provisions for other public services (e.g., water supply; wastewater collection, treatment and reuse or disposal; stormwater management facilities; electrical power and communications; transit facilities; churches; and a possible satellite police station); and extension of Tahoma Boulevard through the site to SR 507.
Purpose and Objectives:	<p>The objectives of the proposal are to develop the southwest area of Yelm in a manner that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Be consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act and the City of Yelm <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> to provide for anticipated growth in the community.• Implement sustainable development to the maximum extent practicable within an urban area. Develop a community that thoughtfully provides for the needs of its residents with efficiency and stewardship for the future.• Implement characteristics the citizens of Yelm would like to see in their community.• Minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and preserve natural areas for public enjoyment.• Provide for efficient growth in public services and utilities required to serve phased development of the Master Planned Community.
Principal Alternatives:	The Preferred Alternative is a blend of characteristics of traditional development and an urban village concept, described below as the range of land use alternatives. The Preferred Alternative would include approximately 3,000 single-family detached homes, 546 duplex units, 509 multi-family units (3 to 4 dwelling units per building), and 945 multi-family units with 5 or more d.u. per building. Other uses would include approximately 825,000 square feet (sf) of commercial development,

135,000 sf of office space, and about 400 acres of permanent open space.

The Traditional Development Alternative would be characterized by suburban development similar to what has occurred over the past several years: a curvi-linear, gridded street system with an emphasis on single-family residential neighborhoods and small-scale neighborhood convenience commercial uses. A larger portion of the site would be allocated to a low-density zone. Traditional neighborhoods would spread the residential density out over the majority of the project site, providing larger lot sizes (5,000 to 7,000 square feet) and an average density of 4 dwelling units per buildable acre, resulting in a more automobile-oriented community. The Traditional Development Alternative would provide approximately 4,000 single-family detached homes, 400 duplex units, 400 multi-family units with 3 to 4 d.u. per building, and 200 multi-family units with 5 or more d.u. per building. Other uses would include approximately 480,000 sf of commercial development, 150,000 sf of office space, and about 315 acres of permanent open space.

The Urban Village Alternative would create compact areas of high-density residential uses inter-mixed with commercial uses around a central Village Square. This development pattern could reduce reliance on automobile travel. Neighborhoods would have much smaller single-family lots, with an average density ranging from 5 to 7 dwelling units per buildable acre. Private yards would generally be smaller, though some areas of the site would still be developed as traditional single-family residential subdivisions. The Urban Village Alternative would provide approximately 1,000 single-family detached homes, 1,240 duplex units, 1,420 multi-family units with 3 to 4 d.u. per building, and 1,340 multi-family units with 5 or more d.u. per building. Other uses would include approximately 850,000 sf of commercial development, 650,000 sf of office space, and 400 to 500 acres of permanent open space.

The No Action Alternative (no development at this time) is also evaluated in this Draft EIS.

Project Proponent:

Thurston Highlands, L.L.C.
4200 6th Avenue SE, Suite 301
Lacey, WA 98503

Schedule for Implementation:	The Master Planned Community would be developed in phases over a period of 10 to 30 years. Phase 1 would commence as soon as the land use approval process is complete. During preparation of the Draft EIS, it was estimated that Phase 1 construction would occur between 2008 and 2010, that occupancy of Phase 1 homes would occur between 2009 and 2012, and that Phase 2 would commence in 2015.
Lead Agency:	City of Yelm, Community Development Department P.O. Box 479 105 Yelm Avenue W. Yelm, WA 98597
City of Yelm Project File No.	MPD-05-0538-YL
SEPA Responsible Official, project information contact person, and person to whom to direct comments:	Grant Beck, Community Development Director City of Yelm, Community Development Department (360) 458.3835 highlands@ci.yelm.wa.us
Permits and Approvals Required: City of Yelm	Conceptual Master Site Plan Approval Final Master Site Plan Approval Development Agreement (possible) Site Plan Review and Subdivision Approvals Civil Plan Review Building Permits
Thurston County Parks, WSDOT, and the Rails to Trails Conservancy	Review/approval of Tahoma Boulevard crossing of the Yelm/Tenino Trail
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 404 Permit for Placement of Fill in Wetlands (associated with Tahoma Boulevard construction)
Washington Department of Ecology	Section 401 Water Quality Certification (required for Section 404 permit)
Washington Department of Ecology	Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Consistency Determination (required for Section 404 permit)
Washington Department of Ecology	NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit
Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife	Hydraulic Project Approval
Washington Department of Transportation	Developer Agreement for construction of Tahoma Boulevard intersection with SR 507

**EIS Authors and
Principal Contributors:**

**City of Yelm Community Development
Department Staff:**

Grant Beck, *Director*
Tami Merriman, *Associate Planner*

Vicki Morris Consulting Services

Vicki Morris, *EIS Primary Author and Editor*

KPFF Consulting Engineers

*Conceptual Land Use Alternatives
Grading, Drainage and Utilities Technical Report*

Shea Carr & Jewell, Inc.

Transportation System Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Transportation Engineering Northwest (TENW)

*Transportation System Existing Conditions and
Impact Analysis*

Anthony Burgess Consulting (ABC), Inc.

*Technical Lead: Geology, Soils, Surface Water and
Infiltration Effects*

Pacific Groundwater Group (PGG)

*Infiltration Effects Assessment – Shallow groundwater
regime characterization: Installation of monitoring wells,
data analysis and groundwater modeling using
MODFLOW*

Brown and Caldwell

*Surface Water Technical Report: Change in shallow
groundwater recharge and affect on Thompson Creek
using HSPF and Streamflow Modeling using HEC-RAS*

Insight Geologic

Geology and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

William Parnell

Soil Characterization

R.W. Droll, Landscape Architect

Light and Glare, Aesthetics, Parks and Recreation

The Coot Company

Wetlands, Wildlife, Habitats, and Fish

Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.

Air Quality Assessment

Property Counselors

Fiscal Analysis

Draft EIS Date of Issue:

June 10, 2008

Draft EIS Comment Period:

June 10 – July 28, 2008

Address Comments to:

Grant Beck, *Community Development Director*
City of Yelm Community Development Department
P.O. Box 479
Yelm, WA 98597

Location of copies of the Draft EIS and Technical Reports for Review:

**City of Yelm
Community Development Department**
105 Yelm Avenue W.
Yelm, WA 98597
www.ci.yelm.wa.us

Yelm Timberland Library

Fay Fuller Building
210 Prairie Park Street
Yelm, WA 98597

Availability of Copies of the Draft EIS and Technical Reports to the Public:

Everyone on the Distribution List (Chapter 5) was sent a CD of electronic files of the entire contents of the Draft EIS and Technical Reports. These files can be viewed electronically, or can be printed for hard-copy review. A recommended local printer with the capability to print from electronic files and collate figures and appendices into documents is ABC Printing in Lacey:
Contact: Dale Richart, 360.456.4545.
Additional copies of the CD can be obtained from the City at no charge.

Public Meetings during the Draft EIS Comment Period:

The City intends to hold two open house public meetings during the Draft EIS comment period. Everyone on the Distribution List will receive notice of these meetings. Public notice will also be published in local newspapers: the *Nisqually Valley News*, *The Olympian*, and the *Tacoma News Tribune*.

Next Steps in the EIS Process:

Following the close of the Draft EIS comment period, the City will review and respond to all comments received. All comments and responses will be published in the Final EIS. Everyone on the Draft EIS Distribution List (Chapter 5), and persons who comment on the Draft EIS will receive notice of availability of the Final EIS and/or a CD of electronic files of that document.

Reader's Guide for this Draft EIS

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) attempts to strike a balance between the technical information and format required by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and readability for persons interested in the project, who may be unaccustomed to this manner of organizing the document. The Reader's Guide highlights the contents of this Draft EIS, and suggests locations where information of interest can most readily be found.

The **Table of Contents** provides a complete list of the subjects covered in the document. Lists of figures and tables are also a key to the location of topics of interest.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of SEPA procedures that have been followed during EIS preparation, and public involvement opportunities. It briefly summarizes the description of the proposed Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community, conceptual land use alternatives, and the Phase 1 development concept. Potential impacts of implementing the project, and measures to avoid or minimize these impacts (mitigation measures) are summarized in a table in Chapter 1. The reader is encouraged to review more detailed information in Chapters 2 and 3 on any topic summarized in Chapter 1, to gain a more complete, "in-context" understanding.

Chapter 2 provides a more thorough description of the conceptual land use alternatives, principal features of proposed development, and the construction proposal. Figures and tables are provided to facilitate comparison of the alternatives. The Conceptual Master Site Plan is subject to revision as a result of the environmental review process. To assist public service providers with planning for early stages of the development, a Phase 1 concept is described and evaluated for the first approximately 1,000 homes.

Chapter 3 is the real substance of the environmental review presented in the Draft EIS. This chapter is organized by elements of the natural environment: Earth; Air Quality; Water Resources; Wetlands; Wildlife, Habitats, and Fish; Energy and Natural Resources; and elements of the built environment: Land Use; Noise; Relationship to the Fort Lewis Military Reservation; Population; Housing; Light and Glare; Aesthetics; Parks and Recreation; Historic and Cultural Resources; the Transportation System; Public Services; and Utilities. Existing environmental conditions are described for each of these elements, under the heading Affected Environment. Following the description of the environmental setting, Potential Impacts are described for Phase 1 and Full Build-out of the Master Planned Community, both During Construction and in the Developed Condition of the project. Each impact analysis is followed by a description of Proposed, Required, and Other Possible Mitigation Measures that could be implemented to avoid or minimize potentially adverse impacts of the project. For several elements of the environment, Chapter 3 text sections are summarized from reports prepared by technical experts. A complete list of the technical reports is provided in the Table of Contents.

The final chapters of the Draft EIS include **Chapter 4**, References, and **Chapter 5**, Distribution List.

The City's contact person is Grant Beck, Community Development Director and SEPA Responsible Official. His address, telephone number, and e-mail address are provided in the Fact Sheet that precedes this Reader's Guide. Instructions for submitting written comments also appear in the Fact Sheet. Open house public meetings will be held during the Draft EIS comment period, for the purpose of receiving comments on the EIS and comments on the proposed action from interested individuals. The date, time and location of these meetings will be announced in local area newspapers, and notices will be sent to persons on the Draft EIS Distribution List.

Table of Contents

	Fact Sheet	i
	Reader's Guide	vi
1.0	Summary	1-1
1.1	Purpose and Objectives of the Proposal	1-1
1.2	SEPA Procedures and Public Involvement	1-1
1.3	The Proposed Action and Alternatives	1-2
1.4	Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-3
1.5	Cumulative Effects	1-35
1.6	Major Issues, Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty, and Issues to be Resolved	1-37
2.0	Description of the Proposal and Alternatives	2-1
2.1	Purpose and Objectives of the Proposal	2-1
2.2	Location	2-2
2.3	History and Background of Environmental Review, Land Use Regulations, and Development Proposals for the Site	2-2
2.4	Master Site Plan Review Process	2-4
2.5	Description of the Preferred Alternative	2-5
2.6	Land Use Alternatives	2-20
2.7	Clearing, Grading and Construction Sequencing Proposal	2-29
2.8	Comparison of Environmental Impacts	2-30
2.9	Benefits and Disadvantages of Reserving Project Implementation for Some Future Time	2-43
3.0	Affected Environment, Potential Impacts, and Mitigation Measures	3.1-1
	<i>Natural Environment</i>	
3.1	Earth	3.1-1
3.2	Air Quality	3.2-1
3.3	Water Resources	3.3-1
3.4	Wetlands	3.4-1
3.5	Wildlife, Habitats and Fish	3.5-1
3.6	Energy and Natural Resources	3.6-1
	<i>Built Environment</i>	
3.7	Relationship to Plans and Policies	3.7-1
3.8	Land Use	3.8-1
3.9	Noise	3.9-1
3.10	Relationship to the Fort Lewis Military Reservation	3.10-1
3.11	Population	3.11-1
3.12	Housing	3.12-1
3.13	Light and Glare	3.13-1

Table of Contents, continued

3.14	Aesthetics	3.14-1
3.15	Parks and Recreation	3.15-1
3.16	Historic and Cultural Resources	3.16-1
3.17	Transportation System	3.17-1
3.18	Public Services	3.18-1
3.19	Utilities	3.19-1
3.20	Fiscal Analysis	3.20-1
4.0	References	4-1

5.0	Distribution List	5-1
------------	--------------------------	------------

Appendices to the Draft EIS:

A	Principles for Sustainable Development within the Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community	A-1
B	Student Population Projections by School District	B-1

Technical Appendices:

1	Aesthetics Technical Report
2	Air Quality Assessment
3	Fiscal Analysis of Development Alternatives
4	Fish, Wildlife, and Habitats Inventory and Mitigation Recommendations
5	Geotechnical Assessment Report
6	Grading, Drainage and Utilities Technical Engineering Report
7	Infiltration Effects Assessment
8	Light and Glare Technical Report
9	Parks & Recreation Technical Report
10	Surface Water Evaluation of Thompson Creek
11	Transportation Impact Analysis
12	Wetlands Inventory, Impacts and Mitigation Recommendations

List of Figures

2.2-1	Vicinity Map	2-3
2.5-1	Preferred Alternative Conceptual Land Use Plan	2-7
2.5-2	Preferred Alternative: “Zoom-In” Site Plan	2-8
2.5-3	Conceptual Streetscape: Two-Unit Townhomes	2-9
2.5-4	Conceptual Streetscape: Multi-Family Residential Development	2-9
2.5-5	Conceptual Streetscape: Farmers Market	2-10
2.5-6	Phase 1 Conceptual Land Use Plan	2-19
2.6-1	Traditional Development Alternative Conceptual Land Use Plan	2-21
2.6-2	Traditional Development Alternative: “Zoom-In” Site Plan	2-22
2.6-3	Urban Village Alternative Conceptual Land Use Plan	2-25
2.6-4	Urban Village Alternative: “Zoom-In” Site Plan	2-26
3.1-1	Site Map	3.1-4
3.1-2	Geologic Profiles A-A’ and B-B’	3.1-5
3.1-3	Geologic Profile C-C’	3.1-6
3.1-4	Test Pit Locations and Infiltration Rates	3.1-9
3.1-5	Existing Slope Conditions	3.1-10
3.3-1	Surface Water Features	3.3-2
3.3-2	February 1996 Inundation Area	3.3-5
3.3-3	Thompson Creek Flow Measured Downstream of Tahoma Terra Bridge	3.3-7
3.3-4	Comparison of Water Surface Elevations	3.3-8
3.3-5	Thompson Creek Capacity Overview	3.3-10
3.3-6	Project-Specific Subbasins	3.3-11
3.3-7	Groundwater Flow	3.3-24
3.3-8	Thurston Highlands Precipitation, Evapotranspiration and Infiltration Schematic	3.3-25
3.3-9	Model Area	3.3-27
3.3-10	Thompson Creek Segmentation	3.3-28
3.4-1	Surveyed Wetlands Map	3.4-3
3.4-2	Boulevard Wetland Crossings	3.4-7
3.4-3	H-Complex Wetland Buffers	3.4-10
3.4-4	Potential Wetland Mitigation Compensation Sites	3.4-14
3.5-1	Site Map with Habitat Areas	3.5-3

List of Figures, continued

3.5-2	WNRD Stream Mapping	3.5-6
3.5-3	West Boundary Wildlife Fence	3.5-11
3.10-1	Relationship of the Site to the Fort Lewis Military Reservation	3.10-2
3.14-1	Aerial Photograph: Thurston Highlands Property	3.14-2
3.14-2	Prominent Viewsheds – Thurston Highlands Property, April 2007	3.14-3
3.14-3	Conceptual Streetscape: Two-Unit Townhomes	3.14-6
3.14-4	Conceptual Streetscape: Farmers Market	3.14-6
3.14-5	Conceptual Streetscape: Commercial/Residential Mix	3.14-7
3.14-6	Conceptual Streetscape: Multi-Family (Apartments or Condominiums)	3.14-8
3.14-7	Conceptual Streetscape: 4-Plex or 6-Plex Townhomes	3.14-9
3.14-8	Conceptual Streetscape: Village Square	3.14-9
3.14-9	Conceptual Streetscape: Regional Sports Complex	3.14-10
3.15-1	City of Yelm Existing Parks and Trails	3.15-1
3.17-1	Relationship of the Thurston Highlands Site to the Regional Transportation System	3.17-2
3.17-2	Local Study Area Intersection Locations	3.17-8
3.17-3	Regional Study Area Intersection Locations	3.17-9
3.17-4	2012 Network 1 Baseline Transportation Improvement Assumptions	3.17-16
3.17-5	2015 Network 2 Baseline Transportation Improvement Assumptions	3.17-17
3.17-6	2025 Network 3 Baseline Transportation Improvement Assumptions	3.17-18
3.17-7	2012 Phase 1 Project Trip Distribution (Local Study Area)	3.17-23
3.17-8	2015 Phase 2 with Y-3 Loop Project Trip Distribution (Local Study Area)	3.17-24
3.17-9	2012 Phase 1 Project Trip Distribution (Regional Study Area)	3.17-25
3.17-10	2015 Phase 2 Project Trip Distribution (Regional Study Area)	3.17-26
3.17-11	Local Arterial Roadway Capacity Locations	3.17-36
3.18-1	Yelm Fire District No. 2 and Rainier Fire District No. 4	3.18-4
3.18-2	Police Protection Service Areas	3.18-17
3.18-3	School Districts in which the Thurston Highlands Site is Located	3.18-21
3.18-4	Traffic Analysis Zones Used as a Basis for Student Population Projections	3.18-26
3.19-1	Water System Map	3.19-3
3.19-2	Location of Existing Electrical Power and Natural Gas Facilities	3.19-23
3.20-1	Key Economic Indicators in Washington City and Town Groupings	3.20-4

List of Tables

1.4-1	Summary matrix of environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community	1-4
1.4-2	Historical context and current baseline condition of elements of the environment	1-31
1.4-3	Qualitative summary of Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community impacts and mitigation measures in relation to current baseline environmental conditions	1-33
2.5-1	Thurston Highlands projected student population with the Preferred Alternative	2-12
2.5-2	Thurston Highlands projected demand for new school facilities with the Preferred Alternative	2-12
2.6.1-1	Thurston Highlands projected student population with the Traditional Development Alternative	2-23
2.6.1-2	Thurston Highlands projected demand for new school facilities with the Traditional Development Alternative	2-23
2.6.2-1	Thurston Highlands projected student population with the Urban Village Alternative	2-27
2.6.2-2	Thurston Highlands projected demand for new school facilities with the Urban Village Alternative	2-27
2.8-1	Comparison of environmental impacts of the alternatives	2-31
3.2-1	Calculated maximum peak 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations (in ppm)	3.2-5
3.2-2	Thurston Highlands 2025 full build-out trip generation	3.2-6
3.2-3	Lifecycle GHG emissions associated with Thurston Highlands Phase 1	3.2-11
3.3-1	Simulated water surface elevations for Thompson Creek	3.3-6
3.3-2	Change in groundwater flux to Thompson Creek	3.3-13
3.3-3	Thompson Creek water level rise with additional groundwater fluxes: Thurston Highlands full build-out Preferred Alternative	3.3-14
3.3-4	Common pollutants in stormwater and some potential sources	3.3-15
3.3-5	Thurston Highlands Phase 1 change in groundwater flux to Thompson Creek	3.3-16
3.3-6	Thompson Creek water level rise with additional groundwater fluxes: Thurston Highlands Phase 1 development concept	3.3-17
3.3-7	Annualized average increases in flow and volume for Thurston Highlands Phase 1 and full build-out	3.3-18

List of Tables, continued

3.3-8	Effects of raising groundwater levels on extent of high groundwater hazard areas (Thompson Creek Segment 10)	3.3-30
3.3-9	Infiltration amounts for existing conditions and the conceptual land use alternatives	3.3-30
3.4-1	Thurston Highlands wetlands summary	3.4-4
3.4-2	Isolated low-value wetlands that may be filled	3.4-8
3.4-3	Potential wetland mitigation compensation sites	3.4-15
3.8-1	City of Yelm and Yelm UGA population projections: 2010–2030	3.8-1
3.8-2	Comparative non-residential land use data for the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives	3.8-2
3.11-1	Population projections for the City of Yelm and its UGA: 2005	3.11-1
3.11-2	Revised population projections for the City of Yelm and its UGA: October 2007	3.11-1
3.11-3	Population projections per household, by dwelling unit type	3.11-2
3.11-4	Thurston Highlands build-out population and dwelling unit projections for the conceptual land use alternatives	3.11-2
3.14-1	Description of prominent viewsheds – Thurston Highlands property	3.14-4
3.14-2	Landscaping responsibilities – Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community	3.14-11
3.15-1	Yelm Community Schools – Existing recreation facilities in 2006	3.15-3
3.15-2	Yelm Community Schools – Recreation facilities use by community sports groups	3.15-4
3.15-3	City of Yelm/UGA park land needs: 2005 – 2030	3.15-5
3.15-4	Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community park land needs – project build-out, each conceptual land use alternative	3.15-7
3.15-5	Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community – projected recreation facility minimum needs and recommended space requirements	3.15-8
3.15-6	Capital development projections, by park classification	3.15-9
3.15-7	Thurston Highlands Master Planned Community park land needs, Phase 1: 2008 – 2012	3.15-9
3.17.3-1	Level of Service criteria	3.17-7
3.17.3-2	Local study area PM peak hour level of service and delay summary: 2007	3.17-11
3.17.3-3	Regional study area PM peak hour level of service and delay summary: 2007	3.17-12
3.17.5-1	Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 project trip generation: 2012	3.17-19

List of Tables, continued

3.17.5-2	Thurston Highlands Phase 2 project trip generation: 2015	3.17-20
3.17.5-3	Thurston Highlands full build-out trip generation: 2025	3.17-21
3.17.6-1	Local study area PM peak hour intersection level of service impacts: 2012 with and without Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 development	3.17-27
3.17.6-2	Regional study area PM peak hour intersection level of service impacts: 2012 with and without Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 development	3.17-29
3.17.6-3	Local study area PM peak hour intersection level of service impacts: 2015 with and without Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 and Phase 2 development	3.17-31
3.17.6-4	Regional study area PM peak hour intersection level of service impacts: 2015 with and without Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1/Phase 2 development	3.17-33
3.17.6-5	Arterial LOS impacts: 2012 with and without Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 build-out	3.17-35
3.17.6-6	Arterial LOS impacts: 2015 with and without conceptual Phase 1/Phase 2 build-out	3.17-35
3.17.6-7	Arterial capacity threshold analysis (with proposed site access roadways): 2025	3.17-37
3.17.7-1	Thurston Highlands Phase 1 mitigation: 2012	3.17-45
3.17.7-2	Thurston Highlands Phase 2 mitigation: 2015	3.17-46
3.18.2-1	Southeast Thurston Fire/EMS revenue and expense preliminary budget – 2007	3.18-5
3.18.2-2	Potential operating impacts of Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives on Southeast Thurston Fire/EMS (in 2006 \$)	3.18-9
3.18.2-3	Comparison of the potential capital facility impacts of Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives on Southeast Thurston Fire/EMS (in 2006 \$)	3.18-10
3.18.2-4	Estimated operating impact of Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 development on Yelm Fire and Emergency Medical Services	3.18-12
3.18.2-5	Estimated capital impact of Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 development on Yelm Fire and Emergency Medical Services	3.18-13
3.18.4-1	Key revenue and expense factor for Yelm Community Schools and the Rainier School District	3.18-23
3.18.4-2	Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 estimated operating impact to Yelm Community Schools (in 2006 \$)	3.18-27
3.18.4-3	Capital cost factors derived from cost per student factors (in 2006 \$)	3.18-28

List of Tables, continued

3.18.4-4	Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 estimated capital impact to Yelm Community Schools (in 2006 \$)	3.18-30
3.18.4-5	Projected student population with the Preferred Alternative	3.18-31
3.18.4-6	Projected student population with the Traditional Neighborhood Alternative	3.18-32
3.18.4-7	Projected student population with the Urban Village Alternative	3.18-32
3.18.4-8	Thurston Highlands full build-out estimated operating impact on Yelm Community Schools	3.18-34
3.18.4-9	Thurston Highlands full build-out estimated operating impact on the Rainier School District	3.18-35
3.18.4-10	Yelm Community Schools capital facility requirements to serve Thurston Highlands full build-out (in 2006 \$)	3.18-36
3.18.4-11	Rainier School District capital facility requirements to serve Thurston highlands full build-out (in 2006 \$)	3.18-37
3.19.2-1	Projected wastewater volumes associated with the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives	3.19-9
3.19.4-1	Total estimated impervious cover by conceptual land use alternatives	3.19-16
3.19.4-2	Estimated stormwater management parameters and facility requirements	3.19-17
3.19.5-1	All-electric demand estimates for the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives	3.19-25
3.19.5-2	Electrical demand estimates of the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives assuming natural gas will be used for space heating and hot water	3.19-27
3.20-1	City of Yelm trends in operating revenues and expenditures	3.20-3
3.20-2	Comparison of per capita revenues and expenses, cities classified by the Association of Washington Cities as Small Commercial Centers	3.20-5
3.20-3	Comparison of per capita operating revenues and expenses, averages for cities in selected AWC categories	3.20-6
3.20-4	Thurston County revenue and expense general fund and special revenue funds – 2005	3.20-7
3.20-5	Comparison of estimated tax base for construction period activities	3.20-8
3.20-6	Comparison of revenues from Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 construction activity (in 2006 \$)	3.20-9
3.20-7	Comparison of revenues from construction activity associated with full build-out of the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives (in 2006 \$)	3.20-9
3.20-8	Summary of development components: Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives	3.20-10

List of Tables, continued

3.20-9	Comparison of estimated tax base	3.20-11
3.20-10	Assumed tax rates	3.20-12
3.20-11	Equivalent dwelling units	3.20-13
3.20-12	City of Yelm operating expenses	3.20-13
3.20-13	Comparison of operating impact to City of Yelm with Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 development (in 2006 \$)	3.20-14
3.20-14	Capital impact of Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 to City of Yelm parks and recreation	3.20-15
3.20-15	Estimated operating impact of Thurston Highlands conceptual Phase 1 to other taxing districts	3.20-16
3.20-16	Estimated operating impact to the City of Yelm at full build-out of Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives (in 2006 \$)	3.20-17
3.20-17	Capital facility impacts to City of Yelm parks and recreation at full build-out of the Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives	3.20-18
3.20-18	Capital facility impact, City of Yelm wastewater collection and treatment	3.20-19
3.20-19	Comparison of the operating impact of Thurston Highlands conceptual land use alternatives to other taxing jurisdictions	3.20-20

