

Item No. 22

Supplemental Material

For
City of Sacramento
City Council
Housing Authority
Redevelopment Agency
Economic Development Commission
Sacramento City Financing Authority

Agenda Packet

Submitted: 1/18/07

For the Meeting of: January 23, 2007

- Additional Material
 Revised Material

Subject: Alhambra at S Condominiums (P06-076)

(Attorney Correspondence)

Contact Information: Sally Shore, Associate Planner, 808-8001

Please include this supplemental material in your agenda packet. This material will also be published to the City's Intranet. For additional information, contact the City Clerk Department at Historic City Hall, 915 I Street, First Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604 B (916) 808-7200.

REMY, THOMAS, MOOSE and MANLEY, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

MICHAEL H REMY
1944 – 2003

TINA A THOMAS
JAMES G. MOOSE
WHITMAN F. MANLEY
ANDREA K. LEISY
TIFFANY K. WRIGHT
SABRINA V. TELLER
ASHLE T. CROCKER

455 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 210
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

Telephone: (916) 443-2745
Facsimile: (916) 443-9017
E-mail: info@rtmmlaw.com
<http://www.rtmmlaw.com>

JENNIFER S. HOLMAN
MICHELE A. TONG
AMY R. HIGUERA
HOWARD F. WILKINS III
MEGAN M. QUINN
AMANDA R. BERLIN
JASON W. HOLDER
MELANIE SENGUPTA
LAURA M. HARRIS
KATHRYN C. COTTER

BRIAN J. PLANT
OF COUNSEL

January 10, 2007

Mayor Heather Fargo
Members of the City Council
City of Sacramento
915 I Street, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Alhambra at S Appeal of Planning Commission Approval

Dear Mayor Fargo and Honorable Members of the City Council:

When the Planning Commission approved the Alhambra at S project, it recognized the applicant's extensive efforts to involve the neighbors in development of the project. In fact, the Planning Commission praised this process as a model example of effective community outreach. That effort included seeking input and approval from every neighborhood group in the area.¹ Throughout a process that involved no less than 30 meetings with various organizations, agencies and neighbors, the applicant has significantly modified the project to accommodate the wishes of the project's neighbors.

In doing so, the applicant has carefully balanced the many competing values associated with the project. For example, a few neighbors would prefer a steep reduction in the density of the site, but such a reduction is inconsistent with the preferences of several agencies that would prefer densities at levels supporting more transit modes. The project, as approved by the Planning Commission, exemplifies the "Seven Principles of Smart Growth" as set forth in SACOG's Blueprint. That is why agencies such as SACOG, Regional Transit, and the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District have endorsed the project.

The Planning Commission and the Design Review and Preservation Board, along with every neighborhood group in East Sacramento, determined that the applicant has struck the proper balance. One neighbor has appealed, and thus the project is now before the City Council. Comments from the neighbors are focused mainly on the design of the project and traffic issues. Trammell Crow takes this opportunity to respond these issues.

¹ A list of the various groups and meetings is attached.

Project Design

Opponents of the project have complained generally about the S Street façade of the project. The appeal states only that “aspects of the project do not comply with Sacramento City Code.” Previous comments indicate that opponents would prefer that the project be set back further from S Street or reduced in height. The project, however, exemplifies both the letter and spirit of the Alhambra Corridor Special Planning District while carefully balancing the competing values of the unique site.

The general intent of the Alhambra Corridor is to “provide residential uses along with neighborhood related commercial uses in commercial districts.” The District codes are intended to “assist in the preservation of the neighborhood scale and character along with providing additional housing opportunities in the area” (Sacramento Municipal Code, § 17.104.010.) Key goals of the District are to “[m]aintain the diverse character and housing opportunities provided in these urban neighborhoods; “ and to “[p]rovide the opportunity for reuse and rehabilitation of heavy commercial and industrial neighborhoods to take advantage of close-in living while reducing the number obsolete and underutilized buildings and sites.” (Municipal Code, § 17.104.010 (B), (E).)

The District codes accomplish these goals by establishing how development should transition from single-family neighborhoods to higher-density residential and commercial uses. For example, the codes include general standards for height limits within 300 feet of a residential zone. The codes also expressly provide for exceptions to these limits when design features are incorporated that reduce the “walled effect” on adjacent smaller scaled residential development or when the development is compatible in height and scale with adjacent residential neighborhoods.

The attached letter from the project’s architects explains the design features that effectively transition the high-density project from the single-family homes nearby. Several measures have been added to minimize the project’s visual impacts, with special attention to features that mirror the single-family homes across the street. These elements include front porches at street level, setbacks for street trees, and vertical setbacks. Many of these elements were included as a result of the applicant’s extensive efforts of involving the neighbors in the project’s planning. All of these features have been incorporated while still maintaining densities that exemplify principles of Smart Growth and Transit Oriented Development.

Traffic

Prior to preparation of the MND, a comprehensive traffic study was prepared. The traffic study analyzed the existing and “baseline” conditions at 16 intersections within the project’s vicinity. The baseline conditions included traffic generated by approved, but not yet built, projects in the area including the Sutter Medical Center Program (including the Sutter Hospital Expansion, Sutter Medical Office Building, Sutter Residential projects), the Children’s Theater of California, Trinity Cathedral, and the R Street Medical Office Building projects.

The traffic study shows that under the baseline condition, all of the intersections operate well within the acceptable level of service (LOS) of C during both the AM and PM peak hour. The addition of the project's estimated 60 PM peak hour trips will increase delay at a few of these intersections, but only slightly. For example, the intersection with the longest delay (Alhambra and T Street) will go from 24.0 seconds of delay to 24.2 seconds of delay during the peak hour. The study shows the project will result in less delay at a number of the study intersections due to replacing the existing office uses.

Opponents of the project have commented that the traffic analysis should include additional projects in the area. The Newton Booth Neighborhood Association lists the Catholic Healthcare West medical office building and the proposed Eppie's site development at 30th and O Streets in addition to the Sutter expansion. Ron Maertz of MENA also listed the Mercy expansion, the Farmer's Market MOB, the Eppie's Project, the Bakery Project, Sixtells and the Village.

Kimley-Horn has researched these projects and analyzed how they might impact traffic. The attached letter from Kimley-Horn explains that all of these project were either included in the "baseline" for the traffic analysis, or were properly excluded because no applications have yet been filed. Thus, the conclusion that the project's traffic impacts will be less-than-significant is well-supported.

Furthermore, we have asked Kimley-Horn to analyze whether the project could have any adverse impact on freeway facilities. As Kimley-Horn explains, the project will not cause any freeway facilities to go from an acceptable level of service to an unacceptable level of service ("LOS") For segments that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS, the project will not have any measurable impacts at the peak hour. Thus, there will be no significant impacts on the freeway facilities.

We believe this project will bring numerous benefits to the neighborhood, with minimal environmental impacts.

Very truly yours,



Tiffany K. Wright

cc: Jeanne Corcoran
Scott Johnson

SCHEDULE OF NEIGHBORHOOD & MATRIX MEETINGS
TRAMMELL CROW RESIDENTIAL
Alhambra and S Streets

Neighborhood Groups Consulted:

- * Newton Booth Neighborhood Association
- * East Sacramento Improvement Association
- * East Sacramento Preservation Task Force
- * McKinley-Elvas Neighborhood Association
- * East Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
- * Marshall School Neighborhood Association
- * Winn Park Neighborhood Association
- * Area One Neighborhood Advisory Group (NAAG)
- * Mid-Town Business Association
- * Elmhurst Neighborhood Association

Schedule of Outreach Meetings

- October 4, 2005 Neighborhood Leadership meeting (1)
- October 4, 2005 Meeting with Planning Staff
- October 17, 2005 Presentation to Area 1 NAAG
- October 19, 2005 Presentation to RT
- October 20, 2005 1st. Newton Booth Neighborhood Presentation
- October 21, 2005 Presentation to AQMD
- October 25, 2005 Neighborhood Leadership meeting (1)
- December 14, 2005 Meeting with RT regarding transit passes.
- April 13, 2006 Neighborhood Leadership meeting (1)
- April 20, 2006 2nd. Newton Booth presentation
- May 11, 2006 RT Presentation
- May 8, 2006 Presentation to MBA
- June 2, 2006 MATRIX meeting
- June 6, 2006 Meeting with Winn Park & Marshall School Leadership
- June 7, 2006 Meeting with Matrix on Traffic Study scope
- June 8, 2006 Meeting with Planning Staff
- June 12, 2006 Meeting with Marco Farias, etal (S Street Neighbors)
- June 15, 2006 Meeting with neighbors regarding Architecture
- June 19, 2006 Presentation to Area 1 NAAG
- June 20, 2006 RT Presentation
- June 20, 2006 AQMD Presentation
- June 26, 2006 Meeting with Planning Staff
- June 28, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX
- July 10, 2006 Meeting with Traffic Eng. Staff
- July 12, 2006 Presentation to East Sac. Chamber of Commerce

July 13, 2006 Meeting with NBNA Leadership (lunch)
July 14, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX re: Project changes
July 17, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX re: Neg Dec issues
July 17, 2006 2nd Presentation to Area 1 NAAG
July 19, 2006 Presentation to DRPB
July 26, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX re: Design Review
July 28, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX re: Fire Access
August 2, 2006 Presentation to MENA
August 3, 2006 Presentation to ES CofC
August 21, 2006 Presentation to Elmhurst Neighborhood Assoc.
August 26, 2006 Meeting with MATRIX re DRPB comments
November 6, 2006 Presentation to East Sacramento Impt. Assoc.
November 7, 2006 Meeting with Opposing Neighbors.
December 10, 2006 Presentation to East Sac. Preservation Task Force

(1) Neighborhood Leadership invitees included:

Winn Park Neighborhood Association
Newton Booth Neighborhood Association
McKinley-Elvas Neighborhood Association
East Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
Marshall School Neighborhood Association
East Sacramento Improvement Association
East Sacramento Preservation Task Force

Community Endorsements

- * McKinley-Elvas Neighborhood Association (1)
- * East Sacramento Impt. Assoc. (1)
- * East Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
- * Mid-Town Business Association
- * Elmhurst Neighborhood Association
- * East Sacramento Preservation Task Force (1)
- * Sacramento Air Quality Management District
- * Regional Transit
- * Friends of Light Rail Transit
- * Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce

(1) subject to coordination of traffic impacts.



January 9, 2007

Tiffany Wright
REMY, THOMAS, MOOSE and MANLEY, LLP
455 Capitol Mall, Ste. 210
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Tiffany,

Below is a summary of the architectural design concepts that were presented at both the Design Review and Preservation Board and Planning Commission hearings for the Alhambra at S Street condominium project.

Architecture

Planning

Landscape Architecture

Interior Design

Graphics

The project is located in the Alhambra Corridor Special Planning District. The zoning code for the District recognizes the "mixed-use" character of the neighborhood and strives to minimize the land use impacts of locating commercial and high-density residential development near existing residential land uses.

2484 NATOMAS PARK DR. STE. 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
PHONE 916.443.0335
FAX 916.441.2823
WEB www.lpasacramento.com
EM design@lpasacramento.com

The corner of Alhambra and S Street was identified by the city planning department as a commercial node along Alhambra Boulevard. It is surrounded by a warehouse to the north, three and five story office buildings to the west, and a combination of commercial and residential uses to the south. In response, we are proposing a mixed-use building to anchor this corner. It contains approximately 4,500 square feet of neighborhood serving retail, customer parking, and the residential clubhouse and fitness center at the ground floor, and has four levels of residential units above.

The project was designed to reflect the context and scale of the surrounding neighborhood as well as provide a transition between the existing single-family and commercial uses and the project's higher-density residential uses. Several design elements have been incorporated into the project that effectively transition from the single-family homes across the street to the higher densities mandated by principles of Smart Growth and Transit Oriented Development. Specifically, the elements discussed below minimize the project's aesthetic impacts and the potential the project could create a "walled effect" as required by the District Code.

Rather than one monolithic structure, the proposed project has been designed with three separate areas. Each area is separated by open space with a pedestrian bridge connection. The S Street facade is primarily two-story with dormers above to accommodate two bedroom units. Large porches have been added to the front, replicating the scale and character of porches across the street. In order to accommodate these porches, the primary building facade setback was increased by five feet. A break in the facade and roof line is provided at the entrance to a central courtyard. A third story unit is proposed to frame each side of the primary entry drive. With the exception of two exit stairs that frame the entry drive, a building height of 35'-0" is maintained within a setback of 50'-0" where the building steps to four stories. The open space separations between each of the building areas reduced the overall number of units facing S Street by 12 units.

The overall width of the building along S Street was reduced by approximately 22 feet to improve the building proportions and to reduce the overall mass along S street. Building setbacks above the ground level provide additional building articulation and provide space for existing and future tree canopies. Additional setbacks, above the brick facade at the top residential level further reduce the overall building mass. Brick cladding provides a high level of finish at the pedestrian level as well as at major building corners.

Parking entrances have been designed to avoid existing trees and to minimize the impact on surrounding neighbors. An active community open space with pool and spa separate the mixed-use building from the rest of the development to the east. This open space is framed by an activity pavilion along the street and a pedestrian bridge along the north.

To minimize the impact of parking on the surrounding community, a seven-level resident parking structure is proposed located at the north end of the central building area facing the light rail corridor. The central area of the project contains the primary resident parking structure as well as residential units. It is designed with an industrial warehouse character with punched openings and steel sash grills. It is intended to reflect the industrial character of buildings to the West and North.

The eastern portion of the site is separated from the remainder of the project by the primary entry drive which aligns with 32nd Street. Connectivity is provided with a pedestrian bridge within the center of the site. The S Street facade continues the residential articulation proposed in the central area. Other facades have a more industrial character. Sawtooth roof forms are incorporated on the north facade to reflect the sawtooth forms within the Libby Cannery.

As originally stated, this project has been designed to integrate into the surrounding community and its architecture reflects the context and scale of the surrounding neighborhood as well as provide a transition between uses. It is difficult to describe all of the features an attribute for this project in a single letter, however, I hope that this answers some of your questions. Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Sincerely,



Ron Metzker, AIA, Vice President
LPA Sacramento, Inc.



Kimley-Horn
and Associates, Inc.

January 10, 2007
Transmitted via Email

Ms. Tiffany Wright
Remy, Thomas, Moose and Manley
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814

■
Suite 120
1430 Blue Oaks Boulevard
Roseville, California
95747

Re: Alhambra Residential Traffic Impact Analysis Review

Dear Ms Wright:

As we discussed by phone on December 15, 2006, I am writing to summarize our review of selected comments received on the Alhambra Residential development project (the "proposed project"). The project is proposed for the northwest corner of Alhambra and S Street in the City of Sacramento.

I have reviewed three sets of comments you provided (via email on December 1, 2006) regarding the proposed project. Comments included those from the Newton-Booth Neighborhood Association (NBNA)¹, the McKinley Elvas Neighborhood Association (MENA)², and Caltrans³. The comments raise questions regarding the treatment of various development projects in the area of the proposed project and the need to analyze freeway facilities. Below are summary responses to those comments.

Other Development Projects

Both NBNA and MENA suggest the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project did not account for other development projects in the vicinity of the proposed project. I have reviewed the projects noted in the comments submitted by NBNA and MENA, the traffic impact analysis (TIA) conducted for the proposed project⁴, and have spoken with City Development Service staff. Based on information gathered during this review, I have concluded the projects noted by NBNA and MENA are either included in the proposed project's TIA, or the listed projects are not far enough along in the entitlement process to be considered in the TIA.

The TIA conducted for the Alhambra Residential project is included in the project's Negative Declaration as Attachment 3. The TIA defines "Baseline" traffic conditions to be existing traffic volumes plus traffic from significant projects that are not yet adding trips to the transportation network. Table 5 of the TIA (Page 16) lists the projects included in the Baseline conditions. Those projects are:

¹ Letter from William Burg, NBNA, to Sally Shore, City of Sacramento, June 9, 2006.

² Email from Ton Maertz, MENA, to Sally Shore, City of Sacramento, August 3, 2006.

³ Letter from Bruce de Terra, Caltrans, to Sally Shore, City of Sacramento, June 9, 2006

⁴ DKS Associates *Alhambra at S Street Condominium Community Transportation Analysis*, September 29, 2006.

■
TEL 916 797 3811
FAX 916 797 3804



- Sutter Hospital Expansion
- Sutter Medical Office Building
- Sutter Residential
- Sutter Retail
- Children's Theater of California
- Trinity Cathedral Expansion
- R Street Medical Office Building

Trips from the projects listed above were added to the existing traffic volumes to establish the Baseline conditions for the analysis of the proposed project. Further, the TIA indicates impacts for the proposed project are based on the change from Baseline operating conditions to Baseline plus the Proposed Project (Page 25). As a result, the cumulative effect of the projects listed above are considered in the TIA.

While the TIA included a number of projects in the Baseline traffic conditions, the NBNA and MENA comments indicate other potential development projects in the vicinity of the proposed project should also have been considered. The table below lists each of the projects noted by NBNA and MENA. For each project, I have indicated which group included the project in their comments and the summary of my discussions with the City.

Table 1 - Other Development Projects and Relevant Comments

| Project | Referenced By | Comments |
|---|---------------|---|
| Catholic Healthcare West MOB and parking Garage | NBNA, MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is also known as "Farmers Market MOB," by MENA and more commonly known at the City as "R Street Medical Office Building."¹ ▪ This project is included in the TIA as a Baseline project. |
| Sutter Hospital Expansion | NBNA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This project is included in the TIA as a Baseline project.² |
| Eppies (30th and 0) | NBNA, MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An entitlement application has not been filed for this project.¹ |
| Mercy | MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumed to be the reconstruction of the Heart Center at the J Street facility. ▪ An entitlement application has not been filed for this project.³ |
| Bakery Project | MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An entitlement application has not been filed for this project.³ |
| Sixells | MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An entitlement application has not been filed for this project.³ ▪ This is a minor residential project at the intersection of Lanatt Street and Elvas Avenue³ (1.8 miles from the project site). |
| The Village | MENA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An entitlement application has not been filed for this project.³ |

1. Corcoran, Jeanne, Sr Planner. Phone conversation December 14, 2006

2. DKS Associates Traffic Impact Analysis, Alhambra at S Street Condominium Community September 19, 2006

3. Hajecr, Samar, Sr. Engineer Meeting, December 7, 2006



Freeway Analysis

The previously referenced June 9, 2006, comment letter from Caltrans indicates the following:

“The TIS [Traffic Impact Study] should include the SR-51 ramps and mainline segment between the SR51/SR 99 interchange and SR 51/E Street interchange. The TIS should consider all possible traffic impacts to all ramps, ramp intersections, and the mainline.”

Further, Caltrans has published the *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*, which outlines requirements for the analysis of potential impacts to freeway facilities. That document notes:

“Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS ‘C’ and LOS ‘D’...If an existing State highway facility is operating at less than the appropriate target LOS, the existing MOE should be maintained.”

The analysis conducted for the R Street Medical Office Building (the “MOB”)⁵, which is located across Alhambra Boulevard from the proposed project (on the block north east of the intersection of Alhambra Boulevard and R Street), indicates the LOS for the SR-51 facilities for the baseline without the Alhambra Residential project conditions⁶. That study presents the LOS for the freeway mainline, ramps, ramp terminals, and merge/diverge/weave areas.

The TIA prepared for the proposed project did not include analysis of the freeway facilities. Per the City⁷, a freeway analysis was not conducted due to low number of new trips generated by the project (60 in p.m. peak hour). The City’s rationale on the freeway analysis appears to be supported by the analysis completed for the MOB.

To support the City’s conclusion that analysis of the freeway is not required for the proposed project, we have reviewed the analysis of the proposed project in conjunction with the freeway analysis conducted for the MOB. For this evaluation, we considered the number of new trips the project will add to the various freeway facilities between H Street and US-50, and the analysis of the freeway facilities. The results of our review are noted below.

Freeway Mainline

The MOB study indicates the northbound freeway segments between US-50 and H Street operate at LOS D during the AM peak hours and LOS F during the PM peak hours. The southbound freeway segments operate at LOS C during both the AM and PM peak hours.

⁵ EIP Associates. *R Street Medical Office Building Draft Environment Impact Report* March 2006

⁶ This baseline condition is existing traffic plus the relevant, approved projects in the vicinity of the proposed project

⁷ Milatzo, Aelita Email to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc: December 14, 2006



Table 2 below indicates the freeway mainline segment LOS and the trips expected to be added by the proposed project. The table indicates the proposed project will add traffic to only two mainline freeway segments between H Street and US-50. The first segment is the southbound segment between the H Street Entrance and the P Street Exit. For that segment, the project adds 40 PM peak hour trips and the segment is operating at LOS C. Based on that LOS, and the fact that the freeway LOS is insensitive to small changes in traffic volume, it can be concluded there is adequate capacity to absorb this number of trips without reaching LOS D, and an impact would not likely be created.

The second segment that will see an increase in volume from the proposed project is the northbound segment between the P Street Entrance and the H Street Exit. For that segment, the project would add 12 PM peak hour trips and the segment operates at LOS F. The new trips added by the project is nominal and the freeway analysis is relatively insensitive to small changes in volume. As a result, the project is not likely to create an impact the freeway mainline segment.

Table 2 - Freeway LOS and Trips Added by the Project

| Freeway Segment | | Mainline LOS ¹ | | New Trips ² | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|----|------------------------|----|
| | | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| NB | US 50 Entrance to N Street Exit | D | F | 0 | 0 |
| | N Street Exit to P Street Entrance | D | F | 0 | 0 |
| | P Street Entrance to H Street Exit | C | F | -6 | 12 |
| SB | H Street Entrance to P Street Exit | C | C | -30 | 40 |
| | P Street Exit to N Street Entrance | C | C | 0 | 0 |
| | N Street Entrance to US 50 Exit | C | C | 0 | 0 |

¹ EIP Associates R Street Medical Office Building Draft Environment Impact Report. March 2006

² DKS Associates. Alhambra at S Street Condominium Community Transportation Analysis. September 19, 2006.

Freeway Ramps

For the freeway ramp analysis, the MOB analysis indicates there is adequate storage length on the ramps in the area of the project to accommodate baseline conditions for the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project will add a nominal amount of trips to the ramp (on average, less than one vehicle per signal cycle at the P Street off-ramp) and the ramps are relatively insensitive to nominal amounts of additional vehicles. As a result, impacts to the freeway ramps is not expected to occur as a result of the project.

Ramp Terminal Intersections

The analysis for the proposed project includes analysis of ramp intersections as deemed appropriate by the City. That study found the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts at those locations.



Freeway Merge/Diverge/Weave Areas

The standard of significance for the freeway merge/diverge/weave areas is noted in the DEIR for the MOB. That document indicates the an impact at a freeway merge/diverge area is considered significant if:

The project traffic increases any ramp's merge/diverge level of service to be worse than the freeway's Level of Service

Table 3 indicates the LOS of the merge/diverge/weave areas without the proposed project and the number of project trips to be added to the merge/diverge/weave sections. The table indicates the project will not add trips to any merge/diverge/weave sections during the AM peak hour and will add trips to only two merge/diverge/weave sections during the PM peak hour. The sections that will see an increase in trips during the PM peak hour are northbound, between the P Street Entrance and the H Street Exit, and southbound, between the H Street Entrance and the P Street Exit.

For the northbound section, the project will add 12 PM peak hour trips. However, the project will not cause the merge/diverge/weave LOS to be worse than the mainline LOS since the mainline and merge area both have a LOS of F. For the southbound section, the project will add approximately 40 vehicles to the southbound diverge area. However, the diverge area has a LOS C and the analysis conducted for the MOB indicates the LOS is relatively insensitive to such small changes in volume. As a result, the project is not expected to result in a significant impact at the merge/diverge/weave areas.

Table 3 Freeway Merge/Diverge/Weave LOS

| Merge/Diverge Section | | Merge/Diverge LOS ¹ | | Freeway Mainline LOS ¹ | | New Trips ² | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|------------------------|----|
| | | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| NB | US 50 Entrance to N Street Exit | E | F | D | F | 0 | 0 |
| | P Street Entrance to H Street Exit | C | F | C | F | -6 | 12 |
| SB | H Street Entrance to P Street Exit | D | C | C | C | -30 | 40 |
| | N Street Entrance to US 50 Exit | D | E | C | C | 0 | 0 |

¹ EIP Associates R Street Medical Office Building Draft Environment Impact Report . March 2006.

² DKS Associates *Alhambra at S Street Condominium Community Transportation Analysis September 19, 2006

Conclusions

The TIA for the proposed residential development did account for the cumulative effects of foreseeable development projects in the vicinity of the proposed project. In addition, although not quantitatively evaluated, there appears to be little likelihood of the proposed project having a significant impact on the freeway facilities.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (916) 797-3811, or via e-mail at steve.pyburn@kimley-horn.com.



Kimley-Horn
and Associates, Inc.

*Ms. Tiffany Wright
Alhambra Residential Traffic Impact Analysis Review
January 10, 2007. Page 6*

Sincerely

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Stephen M. Pyburn, C.E., T.E.
Senior Project Manager

Copy to, via email: Peter Solar, Trammel Crow Residential
Steve Hester, Trammel Crow Residential
Brian Holloway, Holloway, Rasmusson & Molodonof