

SECTION I

SUMMARY

SECTION I

SUMMARY

1.1 BACKGROUND

An application has been submitted for a Rezone Modification, Preliminary Plat approval, reductions to development standards, Variances to building setbacks, Site Plan approval, a Wetland/Stream Assessment Permit, a Wetland/Stream Exemption, and associated SEPA Review for the construction of *The Point at Northshore* 860-unit residential development.

An option to purchase *The Point at Northshore* property is held by Northshore Investors, LLC. The property is currently owned by North Shore Golf Associates.

The Proponent indicates that *The Point at Northshore* would result in the development and construction of 860 single-family residential units on the site (366 single-family detached homes and 494 attached, zero-lot line residential townhouses) along with necessary utilities and infrastructure.

It is anticipated that full buildout of *The Point at Northshore* could occur within a six-year timeframe in four phases.

1.1.1 Purpose of this DSEIS

The purpose of this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) is to fulfill applicable environmental requirements of SEPA relative to the analysis of possible environmental impacts associated with *The Point at Northshore* development. In essence, the impact analysis contained in this DSEIS supplements the impacts described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Northshore Country Club Estates, A Residential Development, of August 1979 and the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), published in January 1981, which are referred to in this DSEIS as the “1981 EIS.”

Impacts under this DSEIS concentrate on the following areas of the environment that were identified during the DSEIS scoping process: *Land Use Compatibility and Aesthetics, Recreation, Transportation, Schools, Critical Areas, and Stormwater*. The intent of this DSEIS is to insure that environmental information related to the project is available to decision-makers and to the public for comment prior to taking any action on the project.

Throughout this DSEIS, mitigation is proposed to address projected impacts. In addition to other code-required development conditions, where appropriate, the approval of *The Point at Northshore* could be conditioned upon meeting the mitigation called for in this document, using the City’s SEPA substantive authority in *Tacoma Municipal Code (TMC)* 13.12.660.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION and ALTERNATIVES

This DSEIS evaluates the environmental impacts expected at the project site under the *Proposed Action*, the *Proposed Action Alternative*, and the *No Action Alternative*. In this case, the proposed action is *The Point at Northshore* development. The *Proposed Action Alternative* would be similar to the *Proposed Action*, except that there would be fewer residential units constructed. The *No Action Alternative* is the currently existing 18-hole North Shore Golf Course.

1.2.1 Proposed Action

The *Proposed Action* consists of four phases of development for full completion of the proposed *The Point at Northshore* development. At full buildout, the project would include the following:

- 860 single-family residential units on the site (366 single-detached homes and 494 attached, zero-lot line residential townhouses);
- Approximately 29.4 acres consisting of view corridors, pedestrian trails, sport courts, benches, playgrounds, stormwater drainage ponds, and critical areas (wetlands and stream).
- Off-street parking, as required under the zoning code *TMC 13.06.510*, as well as public on-street parking for visitors.

1.2.2 Proposed Action Alternative

The *Proposed Action Alternative* would be similar to the *Proposed Action*, except that there would be fewer residential units constructed. Under this alternative, an open space transition area would be located between the proposed residential building lots and the existing adjacent developed areas. The proposed single-family detached residential area (i.e., the South Area) would also be developed without any reduction of lot area, lot width or setback standards, resulting in a lower overall density and intensity. The proposed townhouse residential area (i.e., the North Area) would be developed with a reduction in lot area and lot width, but no reduction in setback standards.

1.2.3 No Action Alternative

The *No Action Alternative* only contemplates the currently existing North Shore Golf Course facility, which was reviewed and expanded from a 9-hole to an 18-hole golf course under the *1981 EIS*. The course is a pay-to-play facility with associated club house, pro shop, surface parking, and service and maintenance building. Future market demand, financial considerations, and economic viability which may affect the operation of the course are not considered and are not evaluated under the *No Action Alternative*.

1.3 SUMMARY: IMPACTS and MITIGATION MATRIX

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
<p style="text-align: center;">1.3.1 Land Use Compatibility and Aesthetics</p>	No Action Alternative	No impact to land use compatibility or aesthetics would result from the existing golf course operation.	No mitigation required.	None.
	Proposed Action	Construction of the proposed project would result in replacement of the 116-acre golf course site with residential development (860 total dwelling units). The gross density of the residential development is 7.5 dwelling units per acre, with an R-2 PRD height restriction of 35 feet.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent shall provide open space transition zones for the area of the proposed development that abuts existing adjacent uses. Recreational uses and landscaping within these open space areas would be required. • The Proponent shall provide for tree retention in some of the open space transition zones, as described in Section 3.1.2. • The Proponent shall locate the new stormwater drainage ponds in and/or adjacent to the open space transition zones to provide for separation of the proposed residential development from existing uses. Stormwater ponds shall be attractively landscaped and integrated into the site design as an amenity. 	The golf course will be replaced with residential development. The impacts will vary based on the final location of the various elements of the development. The provision of open space transition zones will reduce, but not eliminate the level of significance.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would be similar to the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but because of the open space transition zones (approx. total area of 22.5 acres) and the reduced number of dwelling units (approx. 670 dwelling units), the impacts would be proportionately reduced. The density of the residential uses would be approximately 5.8 dwelling units per acre.	Mitigation would be the same as required with the <i>Proposed Action</i> .	The golf course will be replaced with residential development. The impacts will vary based on the final location of the various elements of the development. The provision of open space transition zones will reduce, but not eliminate the level of significance.
1.3.2 Recreation	No Action Alternative	No impact to recreation would result from the existing golf course operation. The course is a pay-to-play facility. Future market demand, financial considerations, and economic viability which may affect the operation of the course are not evaluated under the <i>No Action Alternative</i> .	No mitigation required.	None.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
1.3.2 Recreation (cont.)	Proposed Action	<p>The estimated 2,107 new residents of <i>The Point at Northshore</i> and the net loss of the North Shore Golf Course will result in increased demand for onsite and offsite recreational facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent shall provide approximately 7.8 acres of parks and recreational facilities onsite, such as sports courts, playground structures, open lawn areas and trails, as described in Section 3.2.5. • The Proponent shall provide pedestrian trails, separated from sidewalks to provide pedestrian connectivity within the site. • The Proponent shall convey an easement granting public access to the trail system, and open space tracts shall be perpetually restricted to recreational use. • Parks and recreational facilities shall be designed and developed, including but not limited to, trail configurations, widths, and surfacing, as shown in the <i>Conceptual Parks Plan</i>. • The Proponent shall provide mitigation to Metro Parks Tacoma in the form of an agreement to construct and/or pay its pro-rata share of the cost to improve offsite recreational facilities. 	<p>The loss of the 116-acre North Shore Golf Course is an unavoidable impact to recreational facilities; however, this impact can be addressed through the required mitigation.</p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would generally be similar to the Proposed Action, but because of the reduced scope, impacts would also be proportionately reduced. The provision of a pedestrian walkway within the open space transition areas would bring pedestrian activity closer to the existing adjacent residential uses.	The impacts of the <i>Proposed Action Alternative</i> will be similar to those of the <i>Proposed Action</i> and, therefore, will require similar mitigation. Some items, such as the pedestrian trails connecting recreation areas to sidewalks, must be provided in full, and some recreational infrastructure must be provided with each phase of the development.	The loss of the 116-acre North Shore Golf Course is an unavoidable impact to recreational facilities; however, this impact can be addressed through the required mitigation.
1.3.3 Transportation	No Action Alternative	According to the TENW traffic impact analysis, baseline traffic volumes without the project were estimated by applying a 1% per year growth factor to existing traffic volumes.	No mitigation required.	None.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
1.3.3 Transportation (cont'd)	Proposed Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>Proposed Action</i> will generate an estimated 523 PM peak vehicle trips. With the agreed upon traffic improvements, no intersections will fall below the minimum LOS in the City of Tacoma. The narrowness of private access ways may lead to a deficit of on-street parking in Phases 2 and 4. There may be adverse traffic impacts to the City of Federal Way infrastructure. Pedestrian safety in surrounding neighborhoods may be impacted. Increases in traffic on 33rd Street NE will require frontage improvements. 	City of Tacoma: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public streets shall meet City of Tacoma code standards, as partially described in this document. Private access way design shall meet standards set forth in this document; and a minimum amount of on-street parking must be provided in Phases II and IV. Pedestrian safety treatments are required throughout the site. Improvements to 33rd Street NE are required, as described in this document. Private roads are to be maintained by the Homeowners' Association. 	None.
	Proposed Action		City of Federal Way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent shall pay a pro rata share of traffic mitigation fees. The Proponent shall provide traffic calming improvements for neighborhood safety. 	None.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would be similar to the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but because of the reduced scope, impacts would also be proportionately reduced.	Similar mitigation would be required as with the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but some mitigation measures, such as impact fees and parking requirements, may be similarly reduced based on development scope.	None.
1.3.4 Schools	No Action Alternative	Because no housing units would be developed under the No Action Alternative there would be no impacts on schools.	No mitigation required.	None.
	Proposed Action	The <i>Proposed Action</i> will generate a projected 497 students. Enrollment in the middle school and high school currently exceeds capacity, and there is limited capacity for the elementary schools. Therefore, the newly generated students will be an adverse impact on schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent shall pay a pro-rata share of the cost of providing portables or other structures required by the Tacoma School District to provide services to the newly generated student population. • The Proponent shall install school zone pedestrian signage and safety improvements near North Shore Boulevard pedestrian access. 	None.
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would be similar to the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but because of reduced scope, impacts would also be proportionately reduced.	Similar mitigation would be required as with the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but similarly reduced based on development scope.	None.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
1.3.5 Critical Areas	No Action Alternative	Although flooding may continue to occur at the golf course, no additional impacts to critical areas will result from the <i>No Action Alternative</i> .	No mitigation required.	None.
	Proposed Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding in flood hazard areas could be increased. • Buffers of a listed stream—Joe’s Creek—could be impacted. • Wetlands identified on the site could be impacted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent must demonstrate through an approved stormwater management plan and submittal of proposed site contours that the areas identified by FEMA as flood areas have been changed such that the areas no longer flood, or that flooding can be contained within the proposed surface water management system. • Project must adhere to “Critical Areas Preservation,” (<i>TMC</i> Chapter 13.11) and other state and federal regulations regarding critical areas, including, if necessary, extending stream buffers to encompass the frequently flooded area of Joe’s Creek. 	None.
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would be similar to the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but because of reduced scope, impacts would also be proportionately reduced.	Mitigation would be the same as required with the <i>Proposed Action</i> .	None.

Element of the Environment	Alternative	Impacts	Mitigation (See topic area sections for complete mitigation)	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts (after mitigation)
1.3.6 Stormwater	No Action Alternative	Although, as mentioned above, storm drainage and flooding are an existing issue, the <i>No Action Alternative</i> would not worsen these conditions.	No mitigation required.	None.
	Proposed Action	If insufficient detention and treatment is provided, water quality impacts could result in downstream basins.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project shall adhere to City's 2003 <i>Surface Water Management Manual</i>. • "Resource Stream Protection" enhanced water quality treatment, as described in the <i>1999 Federal Way SWDM</i>, shall apply to the portions of the <i>Proposed Action</i> that discharge to Federal Way via Joe's Creek. • All private tracts identified for stormwater ponds shall be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association and reserved exclusively for stormwater treatment, retention and/or detention purposes 	None.
	Proposed Action Alternative	Impacts would be similar to the <i>Proposed Action</i> , but reduced proportionately due to reduced development scope.	Mitigation would be the same as required with the <i>Proposed Action</i> ..	None.