




---

**Date:** December 22, 2003

**To:** Ron Glass  
Florida Department of Transportation  
District 7

**From:** Daniel Doebler  
PBS&J

**Copy:** David Rast, P.E.; Carolyn Wirth  
PBS&J

**Subject:** SR 60 Links  
F.P. ID: 255630-1-32-01  
Traffic Noise Reanalysis  
Hillsborough County

---

The following documents the results of the property owner survey and addresses an issue regarding the potential to shorten the eastern noise barrier. The issue of shortening the eastern noise barrier at the west end was brought up at our meeting with property owners from Dana Shores.

**Noise Barrier Survey Results**

Table 1 summarizes the results from the December 8, 2003 meeting with property owners from Dana Shores. The summary includes responses provided by property owners attending the meeting and one e-mailed response. The location of lots referenced below are shown on the attached aerial.

Nine property owners (identified as lots 2, 3, 5 through 7, 9 and 11 through 13 on the attached aerial) of the 13 owners solicited to provide an opinion on the western barrier did not attend the meeting and were categorized as no response. The remaining four property owners (identified as lots 4, 8, 10 and 14 on the attached aerial) voted against the noise barrier. Based on the survey, the western barrier was eliminated from further consideration.

Seven property owners (identified as lots 11 through 13, 18, 19, 21 and 24 on the attached aerial) of the 18 owners solicited to provide an opinion on the eastern barrier did not attend the meeting and were categorized as no response. Three of the remaining property owners (identified as lots 14, 16 and 17 on the attached aerial) voted against the noise barrier. Eight of the remaining property owners (identified as lots 15, 20, 22, 23 and 25 through 28 on the attached aerial) voted for the barrier. In general, support for the noise barrier increased for residents in closer proximity to the eastern end of the barrier. Based on the survey, a commitment was made to include the eastern barrier in the design plans.

### **Noise Barrier Modification**

Property owners, identified by lots 16 and 17, opposed the noise barrier. They considered the view from their backyards to be more important than any traffic noise reduction provided by a noise barrier. In response to this concern, the noise barrier length was adjusted to determine the affect of shortening the barrier at the western end. Note that the property owner that benefits most from the original noise barrier location voted for the noise barrier (identified as lot 15 on the attached aerial). By shortening the barrier, this residence will no longer be provided the minimum 5 decibel reduction. However, the predicted noise level for this residence was 64.4 dBA, which is just below the 65 dBA criteria.

The length of the noise barrier presented at the property owner meeting, described as Scenario 1 below, was based on the amount of noise reduction provided. An engineering review of the barrier end that extends onto the off ramp indicated that there are no engineering issues that require the length of the barrier to be shortened. Therefore, any adjustment to the barrier end is primarily driven by aesthetic issues (i.e., view from residential backyards) such as those expressed by owners of lots 16 and 17.

The view from the backyards of residences prior to the commercial properties being removed was reviewed to develop a methodology for shortening the west end of the noise barrier. Prior to right-of-way acquisition, the Red Lobster Restaurant affected the view from the concerned owners of lots 16 and 17. Table 2 provides the results for five barrier length options. The parameters used to establish the location of the west end of the barrier are documented below.

The location of the barrier for each scenario is shown on the attached aerial. The results for each noise barrier scenario are as follows:

**Scenario 1** – For this scenario, the west end of the noise barrier was established based on the amount of noise reduction that could be provided. The west end of the barrier for Scenario 1 extends the furthest distance onto the off ramp. This is the scenario presented at the property owner meeting on December 8, 2003. The noise barrier would provide a 5 dBA reduction to ten affected residences (lots 16,17,18,19,21,22,23,26,27,28), which are generally located in the row of lots adjacent to the canal that separates the community from SR 60. An additional four residences (lots 15,20,24,25) with predicted noise levels that do not approach the Noise Abatement Criteria would also be provided at least a 5 dBA reduction. At \$32,267 per benefited residence, the noise barrier cost is below the cost criterion of \$35,000.

**Scenario 2** – For this scenario, the west end of the noise barrier was established based on the effect that the Red Lobster Restaurant had on the view from lots 16 and 17 prior to being demolished. Although shorter than Scenario 1, the west end of the barrier for Scenario 2 would still extend onto the off ramp. The noise barrier would provide a 5 dBA reduction to ten affected residences (lots 16,17,18,19,21,22,23,26,27,28), which are generally located in the row of lots adjacent to the canal that separates the community from SR 60. An additional three residences (lots 20,24,25) with predicted noise levels that do not approach the Noise Abatement Criteria would also be provided at least a 5 dBA reduction. At \$33,032 per benefited residence, the noise barrier cost is below the cost criterion of \$35,000.

**Scenario 3** – For this scenario, the west end of the noise barrier was established by restricting the noise barrier to the portion of the roadway shoulder that is 10 feet wide (i.e., the barrier does not extend onto the narrow shoulder associated with the off ramp). Compared to Scenarios 1 and 2, this scenario further reduces the effect that a noise barrier may have on the view from lots 16 and 17. The noise barrier would provide a 5 dBA reduction to ten affected residences (lots 16,17,18,19,21,22,23,26,27,28), which are generally located in the row of lots adjacent to the canal that separates the community from SR 60. An additional two residences (lots 24,25) with predicted noise levels that do not approach the Noise Abatement Criteria would also be provided at least a 5 dBA reduction. At \$34,691 per benefited residence, the noise barrier cost is below the cost criterion of \$35,000.

**Scenario 4** – For this scenario, the west end of the noise barrier was established based on the minimum length of noise barrier required to maintain at least a 5 dBA reduction at the affected residences. The noise barrier would provide a 5 dBA reduction to ten affected residences (lots 16,17,18,19,21,22,23,26,27,28), which are generally located in the row of lots adjacent to the canal that separates the community from SR 60. An additional two residences (lots 24,25) with predicted noise levels that do not approach the Noise Abatement Criteria would also be provided at least a 5 dBA reduction. At \$34,143 per benefited residence, the noise barrier cost is below the cost criterion of \$35,000.

**Scenario 5** – For this scenario, the western end of the noise barrier was established based on the length of barrier required to maintain at least a 5 dBA reduction at the affected residences except for lots 16 and 17, which voted against the noise barrier. The noise barrier would provide a 5 dBA reduction to seven affected residences (lots 18,19,21,22,23,26,27), which are generally located in the row of lots adjacent to the canal that separates the community from SR 60. Two additional residences (lots 24,25) with predicted noise levels that do not approach the Noise Abatement Criteria would also be provided at least a 5 dBA reduction. At \$38,229 per benefited residence, the noise barrier cost exceeds the cost criterion of \$35,000. Furthermore, it was determined that in order to maintain at least a 5 dBA reduction at affected residences other than lots 16 and 17, the noise barrier had to extend beyond the perpendicular line-of-sight from residences 16 and 17. An additional consideration is that commercial buildings along SR 60 previously affected the view from lots 16 and 17. Considering the previous view and the cost per benefited residence, Scenario 5 was eliminated from consideration.

### **Recommendation**

Based on the affected residences that would benefit from a noise barrier, the effect the noise barrier would have on the view from the residential backyards and the effect that commercial buildings had on the view prior to demolition, Scenario 4 is recommended. This scenario will eliminate a major obstruction to view that would be caused by the barrier extending onto the loop ramp, maintain at least a 5 dBA reduction at the ten affected residences that can benefit from the eastern noise barrier and limit the barrier to the portion of the shoulder that is 10 feet wide.

### **Further Action**

The Department should review the recommendation and either concur or provide further direction on the establishment of the western barrier end. Once both barrier ends are established, the barrier location needs to be transmitted to design so that the final barrier configuration can be incorporated into the design plans.

F:\COMMON\PD\TECHTASK\NOISE\SR 60 Links 2003 update\Memo for east barrier 12\_17\_03.doc

**Table 1  
Noise Barrier Survey Results**

**Western Noise Barrier**

Map Parcel No.	Property Owner Name	Address	For	Against
2	Kelley, Timothy J	3902 Versailles Drive	No Response	
3	Blanton, Lywood W	3901 Versailles Drive	No Response	
4	Holcomb, Richard A	3903 Versailles Drive		X
5	Rogers II ET AL, Norman	3905 Versailles Drive	No Response	
6	Traister, Robert M	3907 Versailles Drive	No Response	
7	Bett, Kenneth J	3909 Versailles Drive	No Response	
8	Fouts, Callie D	3911 Versailles Drive		X
9	Leigh, William	3913 Versailles Drive	No Response	
10	Mawn, Thomas J	3915 Versailles Drive	No Response	X
11	Lang, William F	3906 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
12	Quiroz, Jose A	3904 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
13	Clements, Marie E	3903 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
14	Hoopough, Denise	3905 Fontainebleau Drive		X
	<b>Total</b>		0	4

**Eastern Noise Barrier**

Map Parcel No.	Property Owner Name	Address	For	Against
15	Le Floch, Eugene M	3906 W Eden Roc Circle	X	
16	Lopez, Lazaro C	3904 W Eden Roc Circle		X
17	Adams Jr, H W	3902 W Eden Roc Circle		X
18	Martin, George J	3901 E Eden Roc Circle	No Response	
19	Overbeck, Scott	3903 E Eden Roc Circle	No Response	
20	Rose, Eli L	3905 E Eden Roc Circle	X	
21	Smith, John C	3904 Venetian Way	No Response	
22	Pitsokos, Donna	3902 Venetian Way	X	
23	Llanes, Leo	3901 Venetian Way	X	
24	Spiro, Frances	3903 Venetian Way	No Response	
25	Mueller, Robert	3904 Doral drive	X	
26	Shadday, Lawrence R	3902 Doral drive	X	
27	Drossos, Janna L	3901 Doral drive	X	
28	Reference File No. 1709	3903 Doral drive	X	
11	Lang, William F	3906 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
12	Quiroz, Jose A	3904 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
13	Clements, Marie E	3903 Fontainebleau Drive	No Response	
14	Hoopough, Denise	3905 Fontainebleau Drive		X
	<b>Total</b>		8	3

**Table 2  
Noise Barrier Evaluation Summary**

Scenario	Barrier Height (meters [feet])	Barrier Length (meters [feet])	Barrier Ends (Station Numbers <sup>1</sup> )	Average Insertion Loss	Number of Benefitted Residences			Total Cost	Cost per Benefitted Residence
					Affected	Other	Total		
Scenario 1	2.44 [8]	688 [2,257]	90+65 <sup>1</sup> to 61+31 <sup>2</sup>	6.1	10	4	14	\$451,744	\$32,267
Scenario 2	2.44 [8]	654 [2,146]	90+35 <sup>1</sup> to 61+31 <sup>2</sup>	6.1	10	3	13	\$429,419	\$33,032
Scenario 3	2.44 [8]	634 [2,080]	90+09 <sup>1</sup> to 61+31 <sup>2</sup>	6.1	10	2	12	\$416,287	\$34,691
Scenario 4	2.44 [8]	624 [2,047]	407+18 <sup>3</sup> to 61+31 <sup>2</sup>	6.0	10	2	12	\$409,721	\$34,143
Scenario 5	2.44 [8]	524 [1,719]	408+17 <sup>3</sup> to 61+31 <sup>2</sup>	5.6	7	2	9	\$334,060	\$38,229

<sup>1</sup> Station number is referenced to the SR 60 westbound to frontage road eastbound off ramp.

<sup>2</sup> Station number is referenced to the Veterans Expressway southbound to SR 60 westbound off ramp.

<sup>3</sup> Station number is referenced to the SR 60 mainline