Noise Study Report

Florida Department of Transportation

District 7

State Road (SR) 50 (US 98/Cortez Boulevard) Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study From the Brooksville Bypass to west of Interstate 75

Hernando County, FL

Work Program Item Segment No. 430051-1

ETDM Project No. 13980



October 2020

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by FDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2016 and executed by FHWA and FDOT.

State Road (SR) 50 (US 98/Cortez Boulevard) From the Brooksville Bypass to west of Interstate 75

Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study

Noise Study Report

Work Program Item Segment No. 430051-1 ETDM Project No. 13980 Hernando County

Prepared for:

Florida Department of Transportation District Seven



Prepared by:

KB Environmental Sciences, Inc. 9500 Koger Boulevard N, Suite 211 St. Petersburg, FL 33702

October 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) study to evaluate alternative improvements for State Road (SR) 50 (US 98/Cortez Boulevard) from the Brooksville Bypass to west of Interstate 75 (I-75) in Hernando County. The study extends to Lockhart Road on the east end of the project for a length of approximately 7.2 miles. The section along SR 50 to the east of Lockhart Road was studied as a part of a separate Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved PD&E study – SR 50 (Cortez Boulevard) from Lockhart Road to US 301 (SR 35/Treiman Boulevard), WPI Segment No. 416732-2, with the I-75 interchange area excepted out under Work Program Item (WPI) Segment No. 411014-1. Study objectives include: determine proposed typical sections and develop preliminary conceptual design plans for proposed improvements, while minimizing impacts to the environment; consider agency and public comments; and ensure project compliance with all applicable federal and state laws. A Type 2 Categorical Exclusion is being prepared as part of this study. The highway is expected to be improved from an existing, four-lane divided rural facility to a six-lane divided facility. The proposed improvements will include construction of stormwater management and floodplain compensation facilities and various intersection improvements, in addition to multimodal facilities (pedestrian, bicycle and transit accommodations).

This Noise Study Report (NSR) was prepared as part of the PD&E Study for the project as required by the FDOT's PD&E Manual, Part 2, Chapter 18 (*Highway Traffic Noise*, January 14, 2019) and in accordance with the Title 23, Part 772 of the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 772)—Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise (July 13, 2010).

One-hundred eighty-one noise sensitive receptors (i.e., discrete representative locations on a property that has noise sensitive land uses) were evaluated within 28 common noise environments (CNEs). The evaluated receptors within the CNEs are comprised of 175 residential properties, two places of worship, a cemetery, an office building, a motel, and the outdoor dining area of a restaurant.

Of the 181 evaluated receptors, seven are predicted to be impacted by traffic noise with existing conditions and 74 are predicted to be impacted in the future without the proposed improvements. With the proposed improvements, 91 of the 181 receptors are predicted to be impacted by traffic noise. Of the 91 receptors, 89 were evaluated for residential properties and two were evaluated for the cemetery and the restaurant.

Traffic management measures, modifications to the roadway alignment, buffer zones, and noise barriers were considered as abatement measures. With the exception of the potential noise barrier for the impacted properties within the Hill 'n Dale Subdivision (Receptors 59-100, 112-115, 130-131, 133-134), noise abatement measures were not determined to be both feasible and reasonable.

The estimated total cost to construct the noise barrier ranges from \$1,414,500 to \$3,018,840 depending on barrier length and height. The FDOT is committed to the construction of the noise barrier at the above location contingent upon the following:

- Detailed noise analysis during the final design process supports the need for, and the feasibility and reasonableness of, providing the barriers as abatement;
- The detailed analysis demonstrates that the cost of the noise barrier will not exceed the cost-effective criteria;
- The residents/property owners benefitted by the noise barrier desire that a noise barrier be constructed as part of the public involvement process; and
- All safety and engineering conflicts or issues related to construction of a noise barrier are resolved.

Table of Contents

SECTION	1 INTRODUCTION1	-1
1.1	PD&E Study Purpose	-1
1.2	Project Description1	-1
1.3	Existing Facility and Proposed Improvements1	-1
1.4	Project Purpose and Need1	-4
1.5	Report Purpose1	-4
SECTION	2 METHODOLOGY2	-1
2.1	Noise Metrics	-1
2.2	Traffic Data2	-1
2.3	Noise Abatement Criteria2	-1
2.4	Noise Abatement Measures2	-3
	2.4.1 Traffic Management	-4
	2.4.2 Alignment Modifications	-4
	2.4.3 Buffer Zones	-4
	2.4.4 Noise Barriers	-4
SECTION	3 TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS	-1
3.1	Noise Sensitive Receptors	-1
3.2	Measured Noise Levels	-3
3.3	Predicted Traffic Noise Levels	-4
3.4	Abatement Considerations	-9
	3.4.1 Traffic Management	-9
	3.4.2 Alignment Modifications	-9
	3.4.3 Buffer Zones	-9
	3.4.4 Noise Barriers	10
SECTION	4 CONCLUSIONS	-1
4.1	Statement of Likelihood4	-1
SECTION	5 NOISE CONTOURS	-1
SECTION	6 CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION	-1
SECTION	7 COMMUNITY COORDINATION	-1
SECTION	8 REFERENCES8	-1

Appendices

Appendix A	Traffic Data
Appendix B	Noise Sensitive Receptors
Appendix C	Validation Documentation

List of Figures and Tables

Figure

Figure		<u>Page</u>
Figure 1-1	Project Location and Study Area Map	1-2
Figure 1-2	Existing Typical Sections	1-3
Figure 1-3	Proposed Typical Sections	1-5

Table

<u>Table</u>		Page
Table 2-1	FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria	2-2
Table 2-2	Typical Noise Levels	2-3
Table 3-1	Common Noise Environments	3-1
Table 3-2	Validation Data	3-3
Table 3-3	Traffic Noise Analysis Results	3-4
Table 3-4	Isolated Impacted Noise Sensitive Receptors	3-10
Table 3-5	Barrier 2: Results for Impacted Residences between Jefferson Street and Cobb Ro	oad,
	South of SR 50 (Receptors 9-11)	3-11
Table 3-6	Barrier 4: Results for Impacted Residences in the vicinity of Singer Lane and in the	е
	Gundermans Subdivision	3-12
Table 3-7	Barrier 6: Results for Impacted Residences East of Cedar Lane, South of	
	SR 50	3-13
Table 3-8	Barrier 7: Results for Impacted Residences East of Dorsey Smith Road,	
	North of SR 50	3-14
Table 3-9	Barrier 9: Results for Impacted Residences in the Rolling Acres Subdivision,	
	South of SR 50	3-15
Table 3-10	Barrier 10: Results for Impacted Residences in the Hill 'n Dale Subdivision	3-16
Table 3-11	Barrier 10: Additional Barrier Considerations	3-17
Table 5-1	Noise Contour Limits	5-1

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PD&E STUDY PURPOSE

The objective of this Project Development and Environment (PD&E) study is to assist the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) in reaching a decision on the type, location, and conceptual design of the proposed improvements for widening State Road (SR) 50 (US 98/Cortez Boulevard) from the Brooksville Bypass to west of Interstate 75 (I-75) in Hernando County.

The PD&E study satisfies all applicable state and federal requirements in order for this project to qualify for federal funding of subsequent development phases (design, right of way [ROW] acquisition, and construction). This project was screened through FDOT's Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) process as Project #13980. The *Final Programming Screen Summary Report* (PSSR) was published on January 7, 2014. A *Type 2 Categorical Exclusion* is being prepared as part of this study.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In order to accommodate projected traffic increases along SR 50, the FDOT is conducting a PD&E study to evaluate alternative capacity and operational improvements from the Brooksville Bypass to west of I-75 (Figure 1-1).

The study area extends to Lockhart Road on the east end of the project for a length of 7.2 miles. The section along SR 50 to the east of Lockhart Road was studied as a part of a separate Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved PD&E study (2014) – SR 50 (Cortez Boulevard) from west of I-75 to US 301 (SR 35/Treiman Boulevard), Work Program Item (WPI) Segment No. 416732-2, with the I-75 interchange area excepted out under WPI Segment No. 411014-1. Improvements for the Lockhart Road intersection were included in WPI Segment No. 416732-2. The highway is expected to be improved from an existing, four-lane divided rural facility to a six-lane divided facility. The proposed improvements will include construction of stormwater management and floodplain compensation facilities and various intersection improvements, in addition to multimodal facilities (pedestrian, bicycle and transit accommodations).

1.3 EXISTING FACILITY AND PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

SR 50 is currently a four-lane rural highway with 4-ft paved outside shoulders and 40 – 46-ft grassed median (**Figure 1-2**). The existing ROW is 200 feet wide. The posted speed limits vary from 45 mph to 60 mph. Major intersections within the project limits occur at Cortez Boulevard/Jasmine Drive, County Road (CR) 484/Spring Lake Highway and Lockhart Road (west of I-75). There is a short segment with existing sidewalk located near the west end of the project. There is a bridge culvert within the project limits located over the Bystream Overflow. This 53-ft bridge culvert was constructed in 1997 and has a sufficiency rating of 80 and a health index of 65.72 (inspected January 22, 2019). Expected improvements are described above in **Section 1.2**.





Proposed typical sections include suburban rural and rural suburban typical sections (**Figure 1-3**). A high-speed six-lane suburban rural section is proposed from the western project limits to Dorsey Smith Road, east of Mondon Hill Road/Spring Lake Highway (West Segment) and a rural suburban typical section within the 200-foot existing ROW is proposed from Dorsey Smith Road, east of Mondon Hill Road/Spring Lake Highway to Lockhart Road. No additional ROW is anticipated for the roadway improvements with the exception of small corner clips at intersections along the corridor. Additional ROW will be needed for stormwater management facilities and floodplain compensation sites. A "No-Build" Alternative is also being evaluated.

1.4 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

SR 50 is a major east-west rural principal arterial that spans central Florida from coast to coast. In Hernando County, SR 50 connects to several regionally significant corridors, including US 19, SR 589 (Suncoast Parkway), US 41, I-75, and US 301. SR 50 is also a hurricane evacuation route, a designated truck route, part of the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and part of the West Central Florida Metropolitan Planning Organization Chairs Coordinating Committee's (CCC) Regional Roadway Network. This segment of SR 50 connects the City of Brooksville to I-75.

The purpose of this project is to address projected roadway congestion for SR 50 due to future growth along the project corridor and within Hernando County. Increasing roadway capacity along this segment of SR 50 will accommodate future growth, provide for enhanced emergency response times and emergency evacuation, and work in conjunction with other projects planned or underway to increase the capacity of SR 50. The annual average daily traffic (AADT) within the study limits varied between 18,150 and 22,700 vehicles per day (VPD) in 2014. Year 2040 AADTs based on the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Model (TBRPM Version 7.2) are predicted to range from 47,400 to 59,100 VPD. This would result in level of service (LOS) "F" at the major intersections.

Within the limits of this PD&E study, the Hernando/Citrus Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), adopted on December 4, 2019, shows a need for improving SR 50 to 6 lanes. The LRTP shows funding for the design phase and right of way for expansion to 6 lanes in the Cost Feasible Plan.

A more detailed discussion of the project's purpose and need is included in the ETDM Programming Screen Summary Report, under ETDM project number 13980.

1.5 REPORT PURPOSE

This Noise Study Report is one of several documents that is being prepared as part of this PD&E study. This report documents the traffic noise analysis methodology and the results of the analysis.



SECTION 2 METHODOLOGY

This traffic noise analysis was prepared in accordance with all applicable guidelines as stated within both Title 23, Part 772 of the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 772) and Part 2, Chapter 18 of the FDOT PD&E Manual. As such, the analysis was performed using the FHWA's Traffic Noise Model (TNM, Version 2.5). Use of the TNM is required when evaluating the potential for traffic noise impacts during the design year of roadway improvement projects for which the regulations, policies and guidelines with 23 CFR 772 and Part 2, Chapter 18 of the PD&E Manual are applicable.

For properties with uses other than residential, the methodologies described in the FDOT's A Method to Determine Reasonableness and Feasibility of Noise Abatement at Special Use Locations were also used. Special land uses for this project include places of worship, a cemetery, the outdoor seating area at a restaurant, and a motel.

2.1 NOISE METRICS

The predicted traffic noise levels presented in this report are expressed in decibels on the "A"-weighted scale (dB(A)). This scale most closely approximates the response characteristics of the human ear to traffic noise. All traffic noise levels are reported as equivalent levels (Leq(h)). Levels reported as Leq(h) are equivalent steady-state sound levels that contain the same acoustic energy as time-varying sound levels over a period of one hour.

2.2 TRAFFIC DATA

Noise levels are low when traffic volumes are low and operating conditions are good (LOS A or B) and when traffic is so congested that movement is slow (LOS D, E, or F). Generally, the maximum hourly noise level occurs between these two conditions (i.e., LOS C).

The traffic volumes used in the analysis were either the roadway design LOS C volume or the forecast demand volume, whichever was less, so that the predicted traffic noise levels with the improvements to SR 50 represent the maximum hourly noise level during the project's design year. The Existing (year 2014), Future No-Build (year 2040) and Future Build (year 2040) traffic data used in the analysis are provided in Appendix A of this Noise Study Report (NSR).

2.3 NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA

For the purpose of evaluating traffic noise, the FHWA established Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). As shown in **Table 2-1**, these criteria vary according to a properties' activity category (i.e., land use). For comparative purposes, typical noise levels for common indoor and outdoor activities are provided in **Table 2-2**.

When predicted traffic noise levels "approach" or exceed the NAC, or when predicted future noise levels increase substantially from existing levels, the FHWA requires that noise abatement measures be considered. FDOT defines the word "approach" to mean within 1 dB(A) of the NAC. The FDOT's NAC are also shown in **Table 2-1**.

Activity	Description of Activity Cotogony	Activity Leq(h) ¹				
Category	Description of Activity Category	FHWA	FDOT			
А	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary	57	56			
	significance and serve an important public need and where	(Exterior)	(Exterior)			
	the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is					
	to continue to serve its intended purpose.					
B ²	Residential	67	66			
		(Exterior)	(Exterior)			
C ²	Active sports areas, amphitheaters, auditoriums,	67	66			
	campgrounds, cemeteries, day care centers, hospitals,	(Exterior)	(Exterior)			
	libraries, medical facilities, parks, picnic areas, places of					
	worship, playgrounds, public meeting rooms, public or					
	nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording					
	studios, recreational areas, Section 4(f) sites, schools,					
	television studios, trails and trail crossings.					
D	Auditoriums, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical	52	51			
	facilities, places of worship, public meeting rooms, public	(Interior)	(Interior)			
	or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios,					
E ²	Hotels, motels, offices, restaurants/bars and other	72	71			
	developed lands, properties or activities not included in A-	(Exterior)	(Exterior)			
	D or F.					
F	Agriculture, airports, bus yards, emergency services,					
	industrial, logging, maintenance facilities, manufacturing,					
	mining, rail yards, retail facilities, shipyards, utilities (water					
	resources, water treatment, electrical) and warehousing.					
G	Undeveloped lands that are not permitted.					
Sources: Table	1 of 23 CFR Part 772 and Table 18.1 of Chapter 18 of the FDOT's PD&E Man	ual (dated 1-14-	19).			
¹ The Leq(h) ac	tivity criteria values are for impact determination only, and are not design s	tandards for noi	se abatement			
measures.						
Note: FDOT det	fines that a substantial noise increase occurs when the existing noise level is	predicted to be	exceeded			
by 15 decibels	or more as a result of the transportation improvement project. When this o	ccurs, the requir	rement for			
abatement consideration will be followed.						

Table 2-1 FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria

Common Outdoor Activities	Noise Level dB(A)	Common Indoor Activities
	110	Rock band
Jet flyover at 1,000 feet		
	100	
Gas lawnmower at 3 feet		
	90	
Diesel truck at 50 feet at 50 mph		Food blender at 3 feet
	80	Garbage disposal at 3 feet
Noisy urban area daytime		
Gas lawnmower at 100 feet	70	Vacuum cleaner at 10 feet
Commercial area		Normal speech at 3 feet
Heavy traffic at 300 feet	60	
		Large business office
Quiet urban daytime	50	Dishwasher in next room
		Theater, large conference room
Quiet urban nighttime	40	(background)
Quiet suburban nighttime		
	30	Library
		Bedroom at night, concert hall
Quiet rural nighttime		(background)
	20	
		Broadcast/recording studio
	10	
	0	

Table 2-2Typical Noise Levels

Source: California Dept. of Transportation Technical Noise Supplement, Nov. 2009, Page 2-21.

FHWA regulations also state that a traffic noise impact is predicted to occur when predicted traffic noise levels with a proposed improvement are considered substantial when compared to existing levels. The FDOT considers a substantial increase to be when traffic noise levels are predicted to increase 15 dB(A) or more above existing conditions as a direct result of a transportation improvement project.

2.4 NOISE ABATEMENT MEASURES

When traffic noise impacts are predicted, noise abatement measures are considered for the impacted properties and the feasibility and reasonableness of providing an abatement measure are considered.

Feasibility factors are related to the acoustical and engineering properties of an abatement measure while reasonableness factors relate to the social, economic and environmental properties of a measure.

The following subsections of this NSR present and discuss four methods of abating traffic noise impacts.

2.4.1 Traffic Management

Some types of traffic management reduce noise levels. For example, trucks can be prohibited from certain streets and roads, or be permitted to only use certain streets and roads during daylight hours. The timing of traffic lights can also be changed to smooth out the flow of traffic and eliminate the need for frequent stops and starts. Speed limits can also be reduced.

2.4.2 Alignment Modifications

Modifying the horizontal and/or vertical alignment of a roadway can also be an effective traffic noise mitigation measure. When the horizontal alignment is shifted (i.e., moved) away from a noise sensitive property or when the vertical alignment is shifted below (i.e., placing the roadway below the elevation of a noise sensitive land use) or above a noise sensitive property.

2.4.3 Buffer Zones

Providing a buffer between a roadway and noise sensitive land uses is an abatement measure that can minimize/eliminate noise impacts. To abate traffic noise at an existing noise sensitive land use, the property would be acquired to create a buffer zone. Buffer zones can also be used to eliminate the potential for new noise sensitive land uses to be impacted by traffic noise. For this purpose, and to encourage use of this abatement measure through local land use planning, noise contours have been developed and are further discussed in Section 5.0 of this NSR.

2.4.4 Noise Barriers

The most common type of noise abatement measure is construction of a noise barrier. Noise barriers have the potential to reduce traffic noise levels by blocking the sound path between the motor vehicles on the roadway (the source) and the noise sensitive land uses adjacent to the roadway.

In order to effectively reduce traffic noise, a noise barrier must be relatively long, continuous (without intermittent openings) and sufficiently tall. For a noise barrier to be considered a potential abatement measure the barrier must meet the following conditions:

Minimum Noise Reduction Requirements - A barrier must provide at least a 5 dB(A) reduction in traffic noise for two or more impacted noise sensitive receptors and also provide at least a 7 dB(A) reduction (i.e., the FDOT's noise reduction design goal) for at least one impacted receptor. Receptors are discrete representative locations on a property that has noise sensitive land uses (see Table 2-1).

 Cost Effective Limit – At a cost of \$30 per square foot, a barrier should not cost more than \$42,000 per benefited noise sensitive receptor (a benefited receptor is one that receives at least a 5 dB(A) reduction in noise from a mitigation measure). For special land uses (e.g., the outdoor eating area of a restaurant), the cost of a barrier should not be more than \$995,935 per personhour per square foot (dollars/person-ft²).

If the results of the preliminary analysis indicate that a noise barrier would provide the required reduction in traffic noise at a cost at or below the cost-effective limit, additional feasibility factors are then considered. These feasibility factors relate to barrier design and construction (i.e., given site-specific details, can a barrier actually be constructed), safety, access to and from adjacent properties, ROW requirements, maintenance and impacts on utilities and drainage. The viewpoint of the impacted property owners (and renters if applicable) who may, or may not, desire a noise barrier, is also a factor that is considered when evaluating noise barriers as an abatement measure.

SECTION 3 TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS

3.1 NOISE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

As previously stated, noise sensitive receptors are representative locations of a noise sensitive land use. The locations of the receptors evaluated for the SR 50 improvements are shown on aerials provided in **Appendix B**. One-hundred eighty-one noise sensitive receptors (i.e., discrete representative locations on a property that has noise sensitive land uses) were evaluated within 28 common noise environments (CNEs). The evaluated receptors are comprised of 175 residential properties, two places of worship, a cemetery (Lang's Memorial Cemetery), benches outside of an office building, a motel (Budget Inn) and the outdoor dining area at a restaurant (Deep South BBQ).

Table 3-1 lists and describes each NSA and provides the number of evaluated noise sensitive receptorsfor each NSA.

CNE	Receptor IDs	Name and/or Location of Noise Sensitive Properties	Sheet No. (See Appendix B)	Activity Category	Number of Evaluated Receptors
1	1	Budget Inn	1	E – Motel	1
2	2-8b	Residences west of Jasmine Drive (north of SR 50)	1-2	B – Residential	10
3	9-11a	Residences east of Sardis Street (south of SR 50)	1 B – Residential		4
4	12	Brooksville Wesleyan Church	3	C – Place of Worship	1
5	13	Receptor east of Jasmine Drive (westbound)	4	E – Office (Exterior)	1
6	14-17	Hidden Valley Campground	4	B – Residential	4
7	18-22	Residences in the vicinity of Griffin Road (south of SR 50)	4-6	B - Residential	5
8	23-25	Residences in the vicinity of Singer Lane (south of SR 50)	7	B - Residential	2
9	25-28	Gundermans Subdivision	7-8 B - Residential		4
10	29	Deep South BBQ	9	E - Restaurant	1
11	30	Receptor at Cedar Lane	9	B - Residential	1
12	31	Receptor across from Cedar Lane (north of SR 50)	9	B - Residential	1

 Table 3-1
 Common Noise Environments

CNE	Receptor IDs	Name and/or Location of Noise Sensitive Properties	Sheet No. (See Appendix B)	Activity Category	Number of Evaluated Receptors
13	32-34	Receptors east of Cedar Lane (south of SR 50)	10	B - Residential	3
14	35-38a	Receptors east of Dorsey Smith Road (north of SR 50)	10-11	B - Residential	5
15	39-39a	Residence east of Dorsey Smith Road (north of SR 50)	11	B - Residential	2
16	40-41	Residences in Highpoint Gardens Subdivision (south of SR 50)	12	B - Residential	2
17	42	Residence west of Tall Oaks Lane (north of SR 50)	13	B - Residential	1
18	43	Cemetery at WPA Road (north of SR 50)	14	C – Cemetery	1
19	44	Residence east of Olympia Road (south of SR 50)	15	B - Residential	1
20	45-57	Rolling Acres Subdivision	19-20	B - Residential	14
21	58	Grace Brethren Subdivision	20	C – Place of Worship	1
22	59-146	Hill n Dale Subdivision	20-23	B - Residential	88
23	147	Residence west of Emmanuels Way (north of SR 50)	24	B - Residential	1
24	148	Residence west of Rupe Road (south of SR 50)	26	B - Residential	1
25	149-149a	Residences west of Hadley Drive (north of SR 50)	27	B - Residential	2
26	150-166	Braewood Mobile Home Park	28-29	B - Residential	17
27	167	Residence east of Thistlebrook Lane (north of SR 50)	28	B - Residential	1
28	168-173	Potterfield Sunny Acres Subdivision	29-30	B - Residential	6
Total					181

Following FHWA/FDOT guidance, the residences were evaluated as Activity Category "B" (i.e. abatement considered at a predicted traffic noise level of 66 dB(A)). The areas of use at the cemetery and places of worship were evaluated as Activity Category "C" (i.e., abatement considered at a predicted traffic noise level of 66 dB(A)) and the office building, motel, and restaurant were evaluated as Activity Category "E" ((i.e., abatement considered at a predicted traffic noise level of 71 dB(A)).

3.2 MEASURED NOISE LEVELS

Both existing and future noise levels (with and without the proposed improvements) were modeled using the TNM. To verify the accuracy of the predictions, the computer model was validated using field measured noise levels adjacent to the project corridor. Traffic data including motor vehicle volumes, vehicle mix, vehicle speeds and meteorological conditions were recorded during each measurement period.

The field measurements were conducted in accordance with the FHWA's *Noise Measurement Handbook*. The measurements were obtained using a Larson Davis Model 831, Type II integrating sound level meter (SLM). The SLM was calibrated before and after the measurement period with a Larson Davis CAL200 calibrator.

The recorded traffic data were used as input for the TNM to determine if, given the topography and site conditions of the area, the computer model could "re-create" the measured levels with the existing roadway. Following FDOT guidelines, a noise prediction model is considered within the accepted level of accuracy if the measured and predicted noise levels are within a tolerance standard of 3 dB(A).

Table 3-2 presents the field measurements and the validation results. As shown, the ability of the model to predict noise levels within the FDOT limits of plus or minus 3 dB(A) for the project was confirmed. Documentation in support of the validation is provided in **Appendix C** of this NSR.

Location	Site	Measurement Period	Modeled (dB(A))	Measured (dB(A))	Difference
		1	65.6	64.7	0.9
SR 50 at Lockhart Rd. SW Corper	1	2	65.7	63.9	1.8
		3	66.0	64.1	1.9
			63.5	60.6	2.9
SR 50 at Frampton Ave.	2	2	65.3	62.5	2.8
NE Comer		3	63.3	62.5	0.8

Table 3-2 Validation Data

3.3 PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS

Table 3-3 presents the results of the traffic noise analysis for the proposed improvements. As shown, of the 181 evaluated receptors, seven are predicted to be impacted by traffic noise with existing conditions and 74 are predicted to be impacted in the future without the proposed improvements. With the proposed improvements, 91 of the 181 receptors are predicted to be impacted by traffic noise. Of the 91 receptors predicted to be impacted with the proposed improvements, 89 are residential properties and the remaining 2 are a cemetery and the outdoor dining area of a restaurant.

						No		Increase	Approaches, Meets, or	
CNIE	Receptor	Description of	Activity	FDOT	Existing	Build (2040)	Build	over Evicting	Exceeds the	
CINE	טו	Activity Category	el west of la	smine Dr	(2014) ive (north c	(2040)	(2040)	Existing	NAC	
		Motel (Budget Inn								
1	1	Motel)	E	71	54.1	57.6	61.6	7.5		
		Recept	tors west of	Jasmine	Drive (north	n of SR 50))	_	I	
2	2	Residential	В	66	57.4	60.9	62.9	5.5		
2	3	Residential	В	66	57.2	60.8	62.1	4.9		
2	4	Residential	В	66	56.6	60.1	61.1	4.5		
2	5	Residential	В	66	64.2	67.7	68.3	4.1	Yes	
2	6	Residential	В	66	64.4	67.9	68.5	4.1	Yes	
2	7	Residential	В	66	64.2	67.8	68.8	4.6	Yes	
2	7a	Residential	В	66	63.6	67.1	68.8	5.2	Yes	
2	8	Residential	В	66	63.6	67.1	71.1	7.5	Yes	
2	8a	Residential	В	66	61.2	64.7	67.1	5.9	Yes	
2	8b	Residential	В	66	57.3	60.8	61.1	3.8		
	Residences east of Sardis Street (south of SR 50)									
3	9	Residential	В	66	65.6	69.1	72.4	6.8	Yes	
3	10	Residential	В	66	65.2	68.7	71.7	6.5	Yes	
3	11	Residential	В	66	65.1	68.7	71.3	6.2	Yes	
3	11a	Residential	В	66	58.9	62.4	65.2	6.3		

 Table 3-3
 Traffic Noise Analysis Results

	Receptor	Description of	Activity	FDOT	Existing	No Build	Build	Increase over	Approaches, Meets, or Exceeds the	
CNE	ID	Activity Category	Category	NAC	(2014)	(2040)	(2040)	Existing	NAC?	
			linding east c	br Jasmine	e Drive (noi	rth of SK	50)		[
4	12	(benches)	E	71	61.6	65.1	70.1	8.5		
	<u> </u>	(Brooksvi	lle Wesle	yan Church					
E	12	Place of Worship -			-					
	15	Exterior	С	66	56	59.5	63	7		
	1	I	Hidden	Valley Ca	mpground	1	L	1		
6	14	Residential	В	66	57.3	60.8	64.7	7.4		
6	15	Residential	В	66	57.3	60.8	64.6	7.3		
6	16	Residential	В	66	57.2	60.7	64.5	7.3		
6	17	Residential	В	66	60.6	64.1	68.4	7.8	Yes	
	I	Residence	s in the vicin	ity of Grit	ffin Road (s	outh of S	R 50)	I		
7	18	Residential	В	66	59.8	63.3	66.0	6.2	Yes	
7	19	Residential	В	66	59.7	63.2	66.2	6.5	Yes	
7	20	Residential	В	66	61.0	64.3	65.5	4.5		
7	21	Residential	В	66	62.6	65.8	66.5	3.9	Yes	
7	22	Residential	В	66	59.1	62.4	63.5	4.4		
		Residence	s in the vicin	ity of Sin	ger Lane (so	outh of S	R 50)			
8	23	Residential	В	66	59.2	62.4	63.9	4.7		
8	24	Residential	В	66	63.1	66.3	67.7	4.6	Yes	
		T	Gunde	rmans Su	bdivision					
9	25	Residential	В	66	65.9	69.1	70.3	4.4	Yes	
9	26	Residential	В	66	59.5	62.7	64.4	4.9		
9	27	Residential	В	66	62.2	65.5	66.8	4.6	Yes	
9	28	Residential	В	66	58.2	61.4	62.6	4.4		
			De	ep South	BBQ					
10	29	Restaurant (outdoor seating)	E	71	67.6	70.9	71.3	3.7	Yes	
	1	Re	eceptor at Ce	edar Lane	south of S	SR 50)		1	F	
11	30	Residential	В	66	61.4	64.6	66	4.6	Yes	
		Recept	or across fro	om Cedar	Lane (nort	h of SR 50	D)	1		
12	31	Residential	В	66	66.3	69.6	72.3	6.0	Yes	
	I	Rece	ptors east of	f Cedar La	ane (south o	of SR 50)			F	
13	32	Residential	В	66	63.8	67.1	67.8	4.0	Yes	
13	33	Residential	В	66	70.6	73.8	74.3	3.7	Yes	
13	34	Residential	В	66	70.0	73.3	73.9	3.9	Yes	
		Recepto	rs east of Do	rsey Smit	th Road (no	orth of SR	50)			
14	35	Residential	В	66	64.7	67.9	70.3	5.6	Yes	
14	36	Residential	В	66	62.2	65.4	67.8	5.6	Yes	
14	37	Residential	В	66	63.3	66.6	69.3	6.0	Yes	
14	38	Residential	В	66	61.3	64.6	67.2	5.9	Yes	
14	38a	Residential	В	66	57.6	60.9	62.8	5.2		
	Residences east of Dorsey Smith Road (north of SR 50)									

									Approaches,
	Pacantar	Description of	Activity	EDOT	Evicting	No	Build	Increase	Meets, or
CNE	ID	Activity Category	Category	NAC	(2014)	(2040)	(2040)	Existing	NAC?
15	39	Residential	В	66	67.7	71.0	72.8	5.1	Yes
15	39	Residential	B	66	54.2	57.4	58.7	4.5	
		Residences in	n Highpoint (Gardens	Subdivision	(south o	f SR 50)	_	I
16	40	Residential	B	66	61.4	64.6	65.4	4.0	
16	41	Residential	В	66	61.8	65.1	65.9	4.1	
		Reside	nce west of	Tall Oaks	Lane (nort	h of SR 50)	1	I
17	42	Residential	В	66	60.4	63.7	65.8	5.4	
		Ce	emetery at V	VPA Road	(north of S	SR 50)			
		Cemetery (Lang's							
18	43	Memorial							
		Cemetery)	C	66	62.9	66.2	68.8	5.9	Yes
		Reside	ence east of (Olympia I	Road (south	n of SR 50))		
19	44	Residential	B	66	68.4	/1./	/2.5	4.1	Yes
- 20			Rolling	Acres Su	Ibdivision	CF 1	<u>сс г</u>		
20	45	Residential	В	66	61.0	65.1	66.5	5.5	Yes
20	45a	Residential	В	66	60.5	64.7	66.1	5.6	Yes
20	46	Residential	В	66	60.0	64.3	62.9	2.9	
20	4/	Residential	В	66	62.8	67.1	63.2	0.4	
20	48	Residential	В	66	65.6	69.9	67.7	2.1	Yes
20	49	Residential	В	66	60.2	64.5	63.9	3.7	
20	50	Residential	В	66	56.8	61	61.6	4.8	
20	51	Residential	В	66	60.6	64.9	65.8	5.2	
20	52	Residential	В	66	65.4	69.7	/0.0	4.6	Yes
20	53	Residential	В	66	64.8	69.1	69.4	4.6	Yes
20	54	Residential	В	66	58.0	62.4	63.3	5.3	
20	55	Residential	В	66	58.4	62.7	63.7	5.3	
20	56	Residential	В	66	61.0	65.3	66.1	5.1	Yes
20	57	Residential	B	66	65.8	/0.1	/0.4	4.6	Yes
	1		Grace	Brethrer	h Church	1			
21	59	Place of worship							
21	50	recreation area)	C	66	59.0	63.4	63.5	4.5	
		recreation area,	Hi	ill 'n Dale	Subdivisio	n			
22	59	Residential	В	66	64.0	68.4	69.9	5.9	Yes
22	60	Residential	В	66	63.6	68.0	69.3	5.7	Yes
22	61	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.8	69.2	5.8	Yes
22	62	Residential	В	66	63.5	67.8	69.4	5.9	Yes
22	63	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.8	69.5	6.1	Yes
22	64	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.1	69.9	6.1	Yes
22	65	Residential	В	66	63.6	68.0	69.7	6.1	Yes
22	66	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.0	69.9	6.2	Yes
22	67	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.0	69.9	6.2	Yes
22	68	Residential	В	66	63.6	68.0	69.9	6.3	Yes

									Approaches,
	Decenter	Description of		FDOT		No	Dtal	Increase	Meets, or
CNF	Receptor ID	Activity Category	Category	NAC	(2014)	(2040)	(2040)	over Fxisting	Exceeds the
22	69	Residential	B	66	63.8	68.2	70.1	6.3	Yes
22	70	Residential	В	66	63.6	68.0	69.8	6.2	Yes
22	71	Residential	В	66	63.5	67.8	69.6	6.1	Yes
22	72	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.1	69.6	5.8	Yes
22	73	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.1	69.4	5.7	Yes
22	74	Residential	В	66	63.9	68.3	69.4	5.5	Yes
22	75	Residential	В	66	64.2	68.5	69.6	5.4	Yes
22	76	Residential	В	66	64.2	68.6	69.7	5.5	Yes
22	77	Residential	В	66	64.3	68.7	69.9	5.6	Yes
22	78	Residential	В	66	64.2	68.6	69.9	5.7	Yes
22	79	Residential	В	66	64.2	68.6	69.8	5.6	Yes
22	80	Residential	В	66	64.3	68.6	69.8	5.5	Yes
22	81	Residential	В	66	64.1	68.5	69.6	5.5	Yes
22	82	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.2	69.2	5.4	Yes
22	83	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.2	69.1	5.3	Yes
22	84	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.2	69.1	5.3	Yes
22	85	Residential	В	66	63.6	68.0	68.9	5.3	Yes
22	86	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.7	68.7	5.3	Yes
22	87	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.2	69.1	5.3	Yes
22	88	Residential	В	66	63.9	68.2	69.2	5.3	Yes
22	89	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.1	69.0	5.3	Yes
22	90	Residential	В	66	63.5	67.9	68.4	4.9	Yes
22	91	Residential	В	66	63.2	67.6	68.1	4.9	Yes
22	92	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.0	68.6	4.9	Yes
22	93	Residential	В	66	63.7	68.0	68.7	5.0	Yes
22	94	Residential	В	66	64.1	68.5	69.2	5.1	Yes
22	95	Residential	В	66	64.0	68.3	68.9	4.9	Yes
22	96	Residential	В	66	63.9	68.2	68.7	4.8	Yes
22	97	Residential	В	66	63.8	68.1	68.6	4.8	Yes
22	98	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.7	68.2	4.8	Yes
22	99	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.8	68.3	4.9	Yes
22	100	Residential	В	66	63.0	67.3	67.8	4.8	Yes
22	101	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.5	63.7	5.5	
22	102	Residential	В	66	57.8	62.1	63.3	5.5	
22	103	Residential	В	66	58.6	62.9	64.1	5.5	
22	104	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.6	63.8	5.5	
22	105	Residential	В	66	59.3	63.6	65.0	5.7	
22	106	Residential	В	66	59.9	64.2	65.7	5.8	
22	107	Residential	В	66	59.5	63.9	65.4	5.9	
22	108	Residential	В	66	59.4	63.7	65.3	5.9	
22	109	Residential	В	66	59.4	63.8	65.6	6.2	
22	110	Residential	В	66	59.7	64.0	65.9	6.2	

								•	Approaches,
	Recentor	Description of	Activity	FDOT	Existing	NO Build	Build	Increase	Weets, or Exceeds the
CNE	ID	Activity Category	Category	NAC	(2014)	(2040)	(2040)	Existing	NAC?
22	111	Residential	В	66	59.6	63.9	65.9	6.3	
22	112	Residential	В	66	60.0	64.3	66.2	6.2	Yes
22	113	Residential	В	66	60.4	64.8	66.6	6.2	Yes
22	114	Residential	В	66	60.4	64.8	66.6	6.2	Yes
22	115	Residential	В	66	59.9	64.2	66.0	6.1	Yes
22	116	Residential	В	66	59.3	63.7	65.2	5.9	
22	117	Residential	В	66	59.5	63.8	65.0	5.5	
22	118	Residential	В	66	59.5	63.8	65.0	5.5	
22	119	Residential	В	66	59.7	64.0	65.2	5.5	
22	120	Residential	В	66	59.8	64.2	65.3	5.5	
22	121	Residential	В	66	59.7	64.0	65.1	5.4	
22	122	Residential	В	66	59.8	64.1	65.0	5.2	
22	123	Residential	В	66	59.4	63.8	64.4	5.0	
22	124	Residential	В	66	59.2	63.6	64.0	4.8	
22	125	Residential	В	66	59.3	63.6	64.0	4.7	
22	126	Residential	В	66	59.1	63.5	64.0	4.9	
22	127	Residential	В	66	59.1	63.5	64.1	5.0	
22	128	Residential	В	66	58.8	63.1	63.8	5.0	
22	129	Residential	В	66	58.6	62.9	63.6	5.0	
22	130	Residential	В	66	61.6	66.0	66.4	4.8	Yes
22	131	Residential	В	66	63.3	67.6	68.2	4.9	Yes
22	132	Residential	В	66	60.5	64.8	64.9	4.4	
22	133	Residential	В	66	67.6	72.0	71.9	4.3	Yes
22	134	Residential	В	66	66.0	70.3	70.9	4.9	Yes
22	135	Residential	В	66	52.9	57.2	58.3	5.4	
22	136	Residential	В	66	54.7	59.0	61.3	6.6	
22	137	Residential	В	66	54.5	58.8	60.6	6.1	
22	138	Residential	В	66	56.5	60.8	61.1	4.6	
22	139	Residential	В	66	56.4	60.7	60.6	4.2	
22	140	Residential	В	66	56.9	61.2	61.0	4.1	
22	141	Residential	В	66	56.4	60.7	60.6	4.2	
22	142	Residential	В	66	57.1	61.4	61.1	4.0	
22	143	Residential	В	66	60.8	65.1	65.1	4.3	
22	144	Residential	В	66	57.4	61.7	61.5	4.1	
22	145	Residential	В	66	57.5	61.8	61.8	4.3	
22	146	Residential	B	66	57.8	62.1	62.1	4.3	
22	4 47	Residential		mmanue	IS Way (nor		62.4	11	
23	147		B Banco wort r		DY.3		03.4	4.1	
24	1/0	Residential				61 9	63.2	57	
24	148	_ RESIDEIILIAI Docida		f Hadlovu	Drive (north		05.2	5.7	
25	1/10	Residential	P	66	52 5	57 8	58 5	5.0	
25	149	Residential	R	66	58.6	63.0	64.2	5.6	
	1750	nesidentia		00	30.0	00.0	U 1.2	5.5	

	Decenter	Description of		FDOT	Eviatia a	No	Duild	Increase	Approaches, Meets, or
CNE	Receptor	Activity Category			Existing (2014)	Build (2040)	Build (2040)	over Existing	
		Activity category	Braewoo	d Mobile	Home Parl	(2040)	(2040)	EXISTING	nac.
26	150	Residential	В	66	57.8	62.2	62.0	4.2	
26	151	Residential	В	66	57.9	62.3	62.5	4.6	
26	152	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.5	62.9	4.7	
26	153	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.5	63.1	4.9	
26	154	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.5	63.3	5.1	
26	155	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.6	63.3	5.1	
26	156	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.6	63.4	5.2	
26	157	Residential	В	66	52.5	56.8	57.2	4.7	
26	158	Residential	В	66	58.0	62.4	63.1	5.1	
26	159	Residential	В	66	58.0	62.4	63.0	5.0	
26	160	Residential	В	66	58.1	62.5	63.0	4.9	
26	161	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.6	62.9	4.6	
26	162	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.7	63.0	4.7	
26	163	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.6	62.9	4.6	
26	164	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.6	62.8	4.5	
26	165	Residential	В	66	58.2	62.5	62.8	4.6	
26	166	Residential	В	66	58.0	62.4	62.6	4.6	
		Residen	ce east of Th	istlebroc	k Lane (nor	th of SR	50)		
27	167	Residential	В	66	58.3	62.7	63.9	5.6	
		1	Potterfield S	Sunny Ac	res Subdivis	sion			
28	168	Residential	В	66	55.9	60.2	60.3	4.4	
28	169	Residential	В	66	62.9	67.3	69.2	6.3	Yes
28	170	Residential	В	66	63.2	67.5	69.4	6.2	Yes
28	171	Residential	В	66	63.4	67.8	69.5	6.1	Yes
28	172	Residential	В	66	63.6	67.9	69.3	5.7	Yes
28	173	Residential	В	66	63.6	67.9	69.2	5.6	Yes

3.4 ABATEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

As previously stated, when traffic noise impacts are predicted, noise abatement measures are considered for the impacted properties. The following discusses the FDOT's consideration of each of the measures for which an overview was provided in Section 2.4 of this NSR.

3.4.1 Traffic Management

Reducing traffic speeds and/or the traffic volume or changing the motor vehicle fleet on SR 50 is inconsistent with the goal of improving the ability of the roadway to handle the forecast traffic volume. Therefore, traffic management measures are not considered to be a reasonable noise abatement measure for the SR 50 project.

3.4.2 Alignment Modifications

The proposed improvements would be constructed to follow the existing roadway alignment. Because shifting the alignment horizontally would require ROW acquisitions and, because noise sensitive land uses are located on both sides of the roadway, a modification to the alignment of SR 50 for the purpose of reducing traffic noise impacts is not considered to be a reasonable noise abatement measure.

3.4.3 Buffer Zones

As previously stated, to abate predicted traffic noise at an existing noise sensitive land use, the property would have to be acquired. The same cost-effective limit that applies to noise barriers (i.e., \$42,000 per benefited noise sensitive receptor) would apply to the purchase price of any impacted noise sensitive property. A review of data from the Hernando County Appraisers Office indicates that the cost to acquire the developed properties adjacent to SR 50 exceed the cost-effective limit. Therefore, creating a buffer zone by acquiring existing noise sensitive properties is not considered to be a reasonable noise abatement measure.

3.4.4 Noise Barriers

The TNM was used to evaluate the ability of noise barriers to reduce traffic noise levels for the impacted noise sensitive receptors adjacent to SR 50. The barriers were evaluated on the FDOT's ROW at heights from eight to 22 feet (in two-foot increments). The length of each barrier was optimized to determine if at least the minimum noise reduction requirements (i.e., a minimum reduction of 5 dB(A) for at least two impacted receptors and a minimum reduction of 7 dB(A) for at least one impacted receptor) could be achieved.

Barriers were not considered for the impacted properties listed in **Table 3-4** because these areas only envelope one impacted receptor each and, in order for a barrier to be considered acoustically feasible and reasonable, at least two receptors are required to be benefited by a barrier.

	Receptor	
NSA	ID	Description/Location
4	17	Residence in the Hidden Valley Campground
8	30	Residence at Cedar Lane (south of SR 50)
9	31	Residence across from Cedar Lane (north of SR 50)
12	39	Residence east of Dorsey Smith Road (north of SR 50)
16	44	Residence east of Olympia Road (south of SR 50)

Table 3-4	Isolated Impacted Noise Sensitive Receptors
-----------	---

The following provides the results of the noise barrier evaluation and discusses the potential amount of noise reduction and the cost effectiveness of providing barriers as an abatement measure for the areas in which traffic noise has been predicted to impact noise sensitive properties.

Barrier 1 - Residences west of Jasmine Drive, North of SR 50 (Receptors 5-8a)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the six impacted residences west of Jasmine Drive, north of SR 50 (Receptors 5-8b). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in four segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

Due to constraints on the lengths of the barrier segments because of access requirements, the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) could not be achieved at any of the evaluated barrier heights. Therefore, the barrier is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Barrier 2 - Residences between Jefferson St. and Cobb Rd, South of SR 50 (Receptors 9-11)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the three impacted residences between Jefferson Street and Cobb Road, south of SR 50 (Receptors 9-11). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in four segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-5**. As shown, at barrier heights between 12 and 22 feet, two of the impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more and the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved. However, because the cost of the barrier at all barrier heights would be above the FDOT's cost reasonable limit, Barrier 2 is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Table 3-5Barrier 2: Results for Impacted Residences between Jefferson Street and
Cobb Road, South of SR 50 (Receptors 9-11)

Barrier Barrier		Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors (dB(A)) ¹			Numb R	er of Benefite Receptors ²	ed	Total	Cost per	Cost		
Height (feet)	Length (feet)	5 -5.9	6 – 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor ⁴	Reasonable Yes/No		
Number o	Number of Impacted Receptors = 3											
8	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵		
10	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵		
12	466	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$167,760	\$83,880	No		
14	386	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$162,120	\$81,060	No		
16	346	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$166,080	\$83,040	No		
18	334	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$180,360	\$90,180	No		
20	314	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$188,400	\$94,200	No		
22	294	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$194,040	\$97,020	No		

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

 $^{\rm 2}$ Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ Minimum 5 dB(A) reduction at two or more receptors not achieved.

Barrier 3 - Residences in the vicinity of Griffin Road, South of SR 50 (Receptors 18-21)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the three impacted residences in the vicinity of Griffin Road, south of SR 50 (Receptors 18-19, 21). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in four segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

Due to constraints on the lengths of the barrier segments due to access requirements, the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) could not be achieved at any of the evaluated barrier heights. Therefore, the barrier is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Barrier 4 - Residences in the vicinity of Singer Lane and in the Gundermans Subdivision (Receptors 24, 25 and 27)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the three impacted residences in the vicinity of Singer Lane and in the Gundermans Subdivision (Receptors 24, 25 and 27). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in three segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-6**. As shown, at barrier heights between 14 and 22 feet, two of the impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more and the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved. However, because the cost of the barrier at all barrier heights would be above the FDOT's cost reasonable limit, Barrier 4 is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Table 3-6Barrier 4: Results for Impacted Residences in the vicinity of Singer Lane and
in the Gundermans Subdivision

Barrier Barrier		Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors (dB(A)) ¹			Numb R	er of Benefite Receptors ²	ed	Total	Cost per	Cost
Height (feet)	Length (feet)	5 -5.9	6 – 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor ⁴	Yes/No
Number of Impacted Receptors = 3										
8	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵
10	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵
12	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵
14	895	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$375,900	\$187,950	No
16	735	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$352,800	\$176,400	No
18	711	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$383,940	\$191,970	No
20	691	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$414,600	\$207,300	No
22	651	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$429,660	\$214,830	No

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

 2 Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ 7 dB(A) reduction not achieved at any receptor.

Barrier 5 – Deep South BBQ Outdoor Seating Area (Receptor 29)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the impacted area of the Deep South BBQ restaurant. The impacted frequent use area is the outdoor dining area which can be described as a screened-in porch with six tables. The FDOT's special land use procedures were used to determine if a noise barrier could be considered a potential abatement measure for the impacted area.

For the purpose of this special land use evaluation, the optimal length and height for a noise barrier was determined using TNM. At an optimal length of 140 feet and an optimal height of 12 feet, a barrier would reduce predicted traffic noise levels within the impacted area a minimum of seven

dB(A). Because it is not known how frequently the impacted and benefited area of the restaurant would be used and by how many people, the minimum number of person-hours of use on an average day in order for a barrier to be considered cost effective was calculated.

The cost effectiveness calculations were based on the formulas from the special land use procedures. Based on the optimal barrier length and height, to be considered cost effective, the minimum required daily use of the impacted area that would be benefited by a barrier is 83 persons (i.e., 83 people remaining in the outdoor area one hour every day that the restaurant is open). Because it is not reasonable to assume that this level of activity would occur within the impacted/benefited area, a barrier is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure for the restaurant.

Barrier 6 – Receptors East of Cedar Lane, South of SR 50 (Receptors 32-34)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the three impacted residences east of Cedar Lane (Receptors 32-34). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in three segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-7**. As shown, at barrier heights between 10 and 22 feet, two of the three impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more and the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved. However, because the cost of the barrier at all barrier heights would be above the FDOT's cost reasonable limit, Barrier 6 is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Table 3-7Barrier 6: Results for Impacted Residences East of Cedar Lane, South of
SR 50

Barrier	Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors Barrier (dB(A)) ¹		n at tors	Number of	Benefited Rece	eptors ²	Total	Cost per	Cost		
Height (feet)	Length (feet)	5 -5.9	6 - 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor ⁴	Reasonable Yes/No	
Number of Impacted Receptors = 3											
8	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	
10	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$100,800	\$50,400	No	
12	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$120,960	\$60,480	No	
14	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$141,120	\$70,560	No	
16	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$161,280	\$80,640	No	
18	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$181,440	\$90,720	No	
20	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$201,600	\$100,800	No	
22	336	1	0	1	2	0	2	\$221,760	\$110,880	No	

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

² Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ 7 dB(A) reduction not achieved at any receptor.

Barrier 7 – Receptors East of Dorsey Smith Road, North of SR 50 (Receptors 35-38)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the four impacted residences east of Dorsey Smith Road (Receptors 35-38). The barrier was evaluated on the existing FDOT ROW.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-8**. As shown, at barrier heights between 14 and 22 feet, all four of the impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more and the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved. However, because the cost of the barrier at all barrier heights would be above the FDOT's cost reasonable limit, Barrier 7 is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Barrier	Barrier Length (feet)	Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors (dB(A)) ¹			Numb F	er of Benefit Receptors ²	ed	Total	Cost per	Cost
Height (feet)		5 -5.9	6 – 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor⁴	Reasonable Yes/No
Number of Impacted Receptors = 4										
8	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵
10	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵
12	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵
14	800	3	0	1	4	0	4	\$336,000	\$84,000	No
16	733	3	0	1	4	0	4	\$351,840	\$87,960	No
18	733	3	0	1	4	0	4	\$395,820	\$98,955	No
20	693	3	0	1	4	0	4	\$415,800	\$103,950	No
22	602	2	0	1	4	0	4	6457 290	6114 24F	Ne

Table 3-8Barrier 7: Results for Impacted Residences East of Dorsey Smith Road,
North of SR 50

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

 $^{\rm 2}$ Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ 7 dB(A) reduction not achieved at any receptor.

Barrier 8 – Lang's Memorial Cemetery (Receptor 43)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the impacted area of the Lang's Memorial Cemetery. The area of the cemetery closest to SR 50 is predicted to be impacted by traffic noise. The FDOT's special land use procedures were used to determine if a noise barrier could be considered a potential abatement measure for the impacted area.

For the purpose of this special land use evaluation, the optimal length and height for a noise barrier was determined using TNM. At an optimal length of 529 feet and an optimal height of 18 feet, a barrier would reduce predicted traffic noise levels within the impacted area a minimum of seven dB(A). Because it is not known how frequently the impacted and benefited area of the cemetery would be used and by how many people, the minimum number of person-hours of use on an average day in order for a barrier to be considered cost effective was calculated.

The cost effectiveness calculations were based on the formulas from the special land use procedures. Based on the optimal barrier length and height, to be considered cost effective, the minimum required daily use of the impacted area that would be benefited by a barrier is 569 persons (i.e., 569 people remaining in the impacted and benefited area one hour every day). Because it is not reasonable to assume that this level of activity would occur within the impacted/benefited area, a barrier is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure for the impacted area of Lang's Memorial Cemetery.

Barrier 9 – Rolling Acres Subdivision (Receptors 45, 45a, 48, 52-53, and 56-57)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the seven impacted residences in the Rolling Acres Subdivision (Receptors 45, 45a, 48, 52-53, and 56-57). The barrier was evaluated five feet inside the existing ROW and in three segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-9**. As shown, at barrier heights between 14 and 22 feet, two of the impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more and the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved. However, because the cost of the barrier at all barrier heights would be above the FDOT's cost reasonable limit, Barrier 9 is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

Table 3-9Barrier 9: Results for Impacted Residences in the Rolling Acres Subdivision,
South of SR 50

Barrier	Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors Barrier (dB(A)) ¹		Number of	Benefited Rece	eptors ²	Total	Cost per	Cost			
Height (feet)	Length (feet)	5 -5.9	6 - 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor⁴	Reasonable Yes/No	
Number o	Number of Impacted Receptors = 7										
8	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	
10	1,073	1	0	2	3	0	3	\$321,900	\$107,300	No	
12	1,280	1	1	2	4	1	5	\$460,800	\$92,160	No	
14	1,112	2	1	2	5	1	6	\$467,040	\$77,840	No	
16	1,032	2	2	1	5	1	6	\$495,360	\$82,560	No	
18	1,012	2	2	1	5	1	6	\$546,480	\$91,080	No	
20	972	2	2	1	5	1	6	\$583,200	\$97,200	No	
22	952	2	1	2	5	1	6	\$628,320	\$104,750	No	

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

² Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ 7 dB(A) reduction not achieved at any receptor.

Barrier 10 – Hill 'n Dale Subdivision (Receptors 59-100, 112-115, 130-131, and 133-134)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the 50 impacted residences in the Hill 'n Dale Subdivision (Receptors 59-100, 112-115, 130-131, and 133-134). The barrier was evaluated on the proposed FDOT ROW and in six segments.

The results of the barrier analysis are provided in **Table 3-10**. As shown, at barrier heights between 12 and 22 feet, at least 44 impacted residences would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise of 5 dB(A) or more, the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) would be achieved and the cost of the barrier would be below the FDOT's cost reasonable limit. Because Barrier 10 is predicted to provide the minimum noise reduction requirements at a cost below the cost-effective limit, the barrier was evaluated further. The results of the evaluation are provided in **Table 3-11**.

Table 3-10 Barrier 10: Results for Impacted Residences in the Hill 'n Dale Subdivision

Barrier	Nois Impa Barrier		Noise Reduction at Impacted Receptors (dB(A)) ¹		Number of	Benefited Rece	eptors ²	Total	Cost per	Cost	
Height (feet)	Length (feet)	5 -5.9	6 - 6.9	≥7	Impacted	Not Impacted	Total	Estimated Cost ³	Benefited Receptor⁴	Reasonable Yes/No	
Number of Impacted Receptors = 50											
8	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	NA⁵	NA ⁵	NA⁵	
10	4,448	14	6	6	26	0	26	\$1,334,400	\$51,323	No	
12	3,997	8	14	22	44	3	47	\$1,438,920	\$30,615	Yes	
14	4,586	3	2	40	45	22	67	\$1,926,120	\$28,748	Yes	
16	4,579	4	1	41	46	23	69	\$2,197,920	\$31,854	Yes	
18	4,459	6	2	39	47	26	73	\$2,393,280	\$32,785	Yes	
20	4,399	7	1	39	47	27	74	\$2,647,200	\$35,773	Yes	
22	4,379	6	2	39	47	28	75	\$2,911,920	\$38,826	Yes	

¹ Receptors with a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) or greater.

 $^{\rm 2}$ Receptors with a predicted reduction of 5 dB(A) or more are considered benefited.

³ Based on a unit cost of \$30 per square foot.

⁴ FDOT cost reasonable criterion is \$42,000 per benefited receptor.

⁵ 7 dB(A) reduction not achieved at any receptor.

Type of Factor	Evaluation Criteria	Comment
Feasibility	Design and Construction	A determination of whether a noise barrier can be constructed using standard construction methods and techniques will be made during the project's design phase. Notably, additional costs to solely construct a noise barrier will be included in the final cost
	Safety	reasonableness evaluation of a noise barrier at this location. Safety concerns associated with a noise barrier at this location will be addressed during the project's design phase.
	Accessibility	The barrier would be located within the FDOT's ROW for SR 50 and would not block ingress or egress to any property.
	ROW	No acquisition of ROW or easements for construction/ maintenance would be necessary to construct a barrier within the FDOT's ROW.
	Maintenance	The FDOT should be able to maintain a barrier at this location using standard practices.
	Drainage	A determination as to whether the barrier can be design so that water would be directed along, under, or away from the barrier will be made during the project's design phase.
	Utilities	A determination of utility conflicts will be made during the project's design phase. Notably, there are existing poles within the FDOT ROW that may cause a conflict with a noise barrier.
Reasonable- ness	Community desires	The desires of the property owners and renters (if applicable) will be solicited during the design phase of the project.

 Table 3-11
 Barrier 10: Additional Barrier Considerations

Barrier 11 – Receptors in the Potterfield Sunnyside Acres Subdivision, North of SR 50 (Receptors 169-173)

A noise barrier was evaluated for the five impacted residences in the Potterfield Sunnyside Acres Subdivision, north of SR 50 (Receptors 169-173). The barrier was evaluated on the existing ROW and in six segments to accommodate access to/from the properties.

Due to constraints on the length of the barrier segments due to access requirements, the noise reduction design goal of 7 dB(A) could not be achieved at any of the evaluated barrier heights. Therefore, the barrier is not considered a reasonable noise abatement measure.

SECTION 4 CONCLUSIONS

As previously stated, future traffic noise levels with the proposed improvements are predicted to approach, meet, or exceed the NAC at 92 noise sensitive receptors. These sites are predicted to experience future traffic noise levels with the proposed improvements to SR 50 that would range from 66.0 to 74.3 dB(A).

The results of the evaluation indicate that construction of a noise barrier is a potentially reasonable and feasible noise abatement method to reduce the predicted traffic noise levels for up to 47 of the 92 impacted receptors. The benefitted residences are located in the Hill 'n Dale Subdivision (Receptors 59-100, 112-115, 130-131, and 133-134). The estimated total cost to construct the noise barrier ranges from \$1,438,920 to \$2,911,920 depending on barrier length and height.

4.1 STATEMENT OF LIKELIHOOD

The FDOT is committed to the construction of a noise barrier at the location above, contingent upon the following:

- Detailed noise analysis during the final design process supports the need for, and the feasibility and reasonableness of providing the barriers as abatement;
- The detailed analysis demonstrates that the cost of the noise barrier will not exceed the costeffective criteria;
- The residents/property owners benefitted by the noise barrier desire that a noise barrier be constructed as part of the public involvement process; and
- All safety and engineering conflicts or issues related to construction of a noise barrier are resolved.

SECTION 5 NOISE CONTOURS

Land uses such as residences and recreational areas are considered incompatible with highway noise levels that approach or exceed the NAC. To reduce the possibility of additional traffic noise-related impacts, noise level contours were developed for the future improved roadway facility. These noise contours delineate the extent of the predicted traffic noise impact area from the improved roadway's edge-of-travel lane for each of the land use Activity Categories (**Table 2-1**). **Table 5-1** provides the distance from the edge-of-travel lane at which traffic noise levels are predicted to be 56 dB(A)—the NAC for land uses classified as Activity Category A, to 66 dB(A)—the NAC for land uses classified as Activity Category E.

Local officials will be provided a copy of the Final NSR to promote compatibility between any future land developments in this area and the proposed project.

	Distance from Improved Roadway's Edge-of-Travel Lane (ft)*		
SR 50 Roadway Segment	Activity Category A 56 dB(A)	Activity Category B/C 66 dB(A)	Activity Category E 71 dB(A)
Cortez Blvd/Jasmine Dr to Griffin Rd/Redbud Ln	695	230	120
Griffin Rd/Redbud Ln to Spring Lake Hwy/Mondon Hill Rd	675	220	110
Spring Lake Hwy/Mondon Hill Rd to Lockhart Rd	635	190	85

Table 5-1	Noise Contour	Limits
-----------	---------------	--------

* See Table 2-1 for a description of the activities that occur within each category. Distances do not reflect any reduction in noise levels that would occur from existing structures (shielding) and should be used for planning purposes only.

SECTION 6 CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION

Some land uses adjacent SR 50 are identified on the FDOT listing of noise- and vibration-sensitive sites (e.g., residential use). Construction of the proposed roadway improvements is not expected to have a significant noise or vibration effect. Additionally, the application of the *FDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction* may minimize or eliminate potential issues. Should unanticipated noise or vibration issues arise during the construction process, the Project Engineer, in coordination with the District Noise Specialist and the Contractor, will investigate additional methods of controlling these impacts.
SECTION 7 COMMUNITY COORDINATION

A public hearing for the PD&E was held on December 10, 2019. This public hearing was conducted to give interested persons an opportunity to express their views concerning the conceptual design, and social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed improvements. Three public comments were received at or following the hearing specific to noise. These comments will be addressed further during the design phase once a detailed noise analysis for this project has been completed. Additional public coordination specific to potential noise barriers may be conducted during this time.

SECTION 8 REFERENCES

Federal Highway Administration. U.S. Department of Transportation. July 13, 2010. Title 23 CFR, Part 772. Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise.

Federal Highway Administration. February 2004. Traffic Noise Model, Version 2.5.

Federal Highway Administration. December 2011. Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance.

Federal Highway Administration. June 2018. Noise Measurement Handbook. FHWA-HEP-18-065.

Florida Department of Transportation. January 14, 2019. Project Development and Environment Manual, Part 2, Chapter 18 – Highway Traffic Noise.

Florida Department of Transportation. July 1, 2017. Plans Preparation Manual, Volume 1, Chapter 32 – Noise Walls and Perimeter Walls.

Florida Department of Transportation. 2019. Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction.

California Department of Transportation. September 2013. Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol.

Appendix A Traffic Data

This spreadsheet is designed to calculate the appropriate traffic data for use in the noise model - do not input values for items in "red".

TRAFFIC	DATA	FOR	NOISE	STUDIES

Project:	SR 50 PD&E Study	Date:	10/23/2019	
State Project Number(s):		Prepared By	American (AG)	
Financial Project ID:	430051-1			
Federal Aid Number(s):				
Segment Description:	From Cortez Blvd/Jamine Dr to Griffin Rd/Redbud Ln			

(Data sheets are to be filled out for every segment having a change in traffic parameters such as volumes, posted speeds, typical section, etc.)

NOTE: Modeled ADT is the LOS(C) volume referenced in the FDOT LOS tables or demand, whichever is less.



	_			STAMINA/TNM INPU	T			
	The follow	ving are spreads	sheet calculatio	ns based on the inpl	it above - do n	iot enter data be	elow this line	
Existing Fac	ility Model:	Demand	No-Build (De	No-Build (Design Year) Model:		Build (Desig	n Year) Model:	Demand
	LOS (C)			LOS (C)			LOS (C)	
Southbound:	Autos	2173	Southbound:	Autos	2173	Southbound:	Autos	3260
	Med Trucks	115	1.	Med Trucks	115	STOCK CONTRACTOR	Med Trucks	172
	Hvy Trucks	129		Hvy Trucks	129		Hvy Trucks	194
	Buses	20		Buses	20		Buses	29
	Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	6
Northbound:	Autos	1978	Northbound:	Autos	1978	Northbound:	Autos	2967
	Med Trucks	104		Med Trucks	104		Med Trucks	157
	Hvy Trucks	118		Hvy Trucks	118		Hvy Trucks	177
	Buses	18		Buses	18		Buses	27
	Motorcycles	3		Motorcycles	3		Motorcycles	5
	Demand			Demand			Demand	
Southbound:	Autos	952	Southbound:	Autos	2159	Southbound:	Autos	2159
	Med Trucks	50		Med Trucks	114		Med Trucks	114
	Hvy Trucks	57		Hvy Trucks	128		Hvy Trucks	128
	Buses	9		Buses	19		Buses	19
	Motorcycles	2		Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	4
Northbound:	Autos	867	Northbound:	Autos	1965	Northbound:	Autos	1965
	Med Trucks	46		Med Trucks	104		Med Trucks	104
	Hvy Trucks	52		Hvy Trucks	117		Hvy Trucks	117
	Buses	8		Buses	18		Buses	18
	Motorcycles	2		Motorcycles	3		Motorcycles	3

Z(1 - Project Files/Highway/H024006_ACE - SR 50 from Brooksville Bypass to Lockhart/From ACE/ Revised Traffic Noise Form_D7_SR 50

This spreadsheet is designed to calculate the appropriate traffic data for use in the noise model - do not input values for items in "red".

Project:	SR 50 PD&E Study	Date:	10/23/2019	
State Project Number(s):		Prepared By:	American (AG)	
Financial Project ID:	430051-1			
Federal Aid Number(s):				
Segment Description:	From Griffin Rd/Redbud Ln to East of Spring La	ike Hwy/Mondon Hill Rd		_

TRAFFIC DATA FOR NOISE STUDIES

(Data sheets are to be filled out for every segment having a change in traffic parameters such as volumes, posted speeds, typical section, etc.)

NOTE: Modeled ADT is the LOS(C) volume referenced in the FDOT LOS tables or demand, whichever is less.

	Existing Facility		No-Build (Design Year)	Build (Design Year)		
Lanes:	4	Lanes:	4	Lanes:	6	
Year:	2014	Year:	2040	Year:	2040	
ADT: LOS (C)	49,600	ADT: LOS (C)	49,600	ADT: LOS (C)	77,700	
Demand	22,350	Demand	47,400	Demand	47,400	
Speed:	60 mph 97 <mark>km</mark> h	Speed:	60 mph 97 kmh	Speed:	60 mph 97 kmh	
К=	9.0 %	к=	9.0 %	к=	9.0 %	
D=	52.4 %	D=	52.4 %	D=	52.4 %	
Т=	20.2 % for 24 hrs.	T=	20.2 % for 24 hrs.	Т=	20.2 % for 24 hrs.	
т=	10.0 % Design hr	T=	10.0 % Design hr	Т=	10.0 % Design hr	
4.7	% Medium Trucks DHV	4.7	% Medium Trucks DHV	4.7	% Medium Trucks DHV	
5.3	% Heavy Trucks DHV	5.3	% Heavy Trucks DHV	5.3	% Heavy Trucks DHV	
0.8	% Buses DHV	0.8	% Buses DHV	0.8	% Buses DHV	
0.2	% Motorcycles DHV	0.2	% Motorcycles DHV	0.2	% Motorcycles DHV	

	The follow	ving are spreads	sheet calculatio	STAMINA/TNM INPU ns based on the inpu	ut above - do n	iot enter data be	elow this line	
Existing Fac	ility Model:	Demand	No-Build (De	No-Build (Design Year) Model:		Demand Build (Design Year) Model:		Demand
	LOS (C)			LOS (C)			LOS (C)	
Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	2081 110 124 19 4 1894 100 113 17 3	Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	2081 110 124 19 4 1894 100 113 17 3	Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	3260 172 194 29 6 2967 157 177 27 5
	Demand			Demand			Demand	
Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	938 49 56 8 2	Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	1989 105 118 18 3	Southbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	1989 105 118 18 3
Northbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	853 45 51 8 1	Northbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	1810 96 108 16 3	Northbound:	Autos Med Trucks Hvy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	1810 96 108 16 3

 $Z{:}1$ - Project Files\HighwayH024006_ACE - SR 50 from Brooksville Bypass to Lockhart\From ACE\ Revised Traffic Noise Form_D7_SR 50

This spreadsheet is designed to calculate the appropriate traffic data for use in the noise model - do not input values for items in "red".

TRAFFIC DATA FOR NOISE STUDIES

Project:	SR 50 PD&E Study	Date:	10/23/2019
State Project Number(s):		Prepared By:	American (AG)
Financial Project ID:	430051-1		
Federal Aid Number(s):			
Segment Description:	From East of Spring Lake Hwy/Mondon Hill Rd to Lockhart Rd		

(Data sheets are to be filled out for every segment having a change in traffic parameters such as volumes, posted speeds, typical section, etc.)

NOTE: Modeled ADT is the LOS(C) volume referenced in the FDOT LOS tables or demand, whichever is less.



				STAMINA/TNM INPU				
	The follow	ving are spreads	sheet calculatio	ns based on the inpu	rt above - do r	not enter data be	low this line	
Existing Fac	ility Model:	Demand	No-Build (De	esign Year) Model:	LOS (C)	Build (Desig	n Year) Model:	Demand
	LOS (C)			LOS (C)			LOS (C)	
Southbound:	Autos	2134	Southbound:	Autos	2134	Southbound:	Autos	3343
	Med Trucks	72		Med Trucks	72		Med Trucks	113
	Hvy Trucks	115		Hvy Trucks	115		Hvy Trucks	179
	Buses	12		Buses	12		Buses	18
	Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	7
Northbound:	Autos	1942	Northbound:	Autos	1942	Northbound:	Autos	3043
	Med Trucks	66		Med Trucks	66		Med Trucks	103
	Hvy Trucks	104		Hvy Trucks	104		Hvy Trucks	163
	Buses	11		Buses	11		Buses	17
	Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	4		Motorcycles	6
	Demand			Demand			Demand	
Southbound:	Autos	781	Southbound:	Autos	2543	Southbound:	Autos	2543
	Med Trucks	27		Med Trucks	86		Med Trucks	86
	Hvy Trucks	42		Hvy Trucks	136		Hvy Trucks	136
	Buses	4		Buses	14		Buses	14
	Motorcycles	2		Motorcycles	5		Motorcycles	5
Northbound:	Autos	711	Northbound:	Autos	2314	Northbound:	Autos	2314
	Med Trucks	24		Med Trucks	79		Med Trucks	79
	Hvy Trucks	38		Hvy Trucks	124		Hvy Trucks	124
	Buses	4		Buses	13		Buses	13
		-						

 $Z\,{\rm M}$ - Project Files/Highway/H024006_ACE - SR 50 from Brooksville Bypass to Lockhart/From ACE\ Revised Traffic Noise Form_D7_SR 50

Appendix B Noise Sensitive Receptors

































SMF 7-8C SMF 7-8C EXTENDS APPROX. 400' FROM AERIAL BOUNDARY. SEE SHEET 35.

5' SIDEWALK OR 10' WIDENED SIDEWALK SEE PER FOR DETAILS.





5 SIDEWALK


























Appendix C Validation Documentation

Aeasurements Taken By: <u>L.</u> 'ime Study Started: <u>1</u> ? Project Identification:	Baumaister, C. S 2:03	Schoonard, N. Rhos _Time Study Ende	ads Da d:2:40	ate: <u>10/15/2015</u>
Financial Project ID: Project Location:	430051-1-22-01 SR 50 from Brc	ooksville Bypass to	Lockhart Road	
Site Identification:	Site 1 – SR 50 a	t Lockhart (SW Co	orner)	
Veather Conditions:	rtly Cloudy	Cloudy Othe	e.	
Temperature <u>88°F_</u> V	Vind Speed	Wind Direction _	<u>E to W</u> Humi	dity <u>49%</u>
Equipment:	1			
Sound Level Meter:	D : 021		() 1005	
Type: La	rson Davis 831	Serial Numbe	r(s): 1285	<u> </u>
Calibr	ou check the batter ration Readings.	Start 114.1	$\frac{100}{3}$ End 114.0	2
D	nge Settings:	Fact	Slow V	<u> </u>
Kespo	mse settings.	1°asi	<u> </u>	
Weigl	hting:	A X	Other	
Respo Weigl Calibrator:	hting:	A X	Other	
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larsc</u>	hting:	$A = \frac{1}{X}$	Other	
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye	hting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batte	A X	Other er: 5592 No	
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye	hting: on <u>Davis_CAL 2(</u> ou check the batte TRA	$A \underline{X}$ $00 \text{Serial Numbrane}$ $Bright Provide A = 1$ $Bright Provide A = 1$ $Bright Provide A = 1$ $FFIC DATA$	other	
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification	hting: on <u>Davis_CAL 2(</u> ou check the batte TRA SR 50 E	A X <u>A</u> X <u>O</u> Serial Numb- ery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound	Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W	estbound
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification	hting: on <u>Davis</u> CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru	A X 00 Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3	other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run	estbound n 2-Run 3
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type	ntse Settings. htting: ou check the batte TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume	A X O Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph)	Other Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph)
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos	on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93	A X A X O	Stow Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 100-88-82	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks	on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6	A X A X O_Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56	SIGW Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks	on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12	A X A X O_Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56 61-55-58	SIGW Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Matematica	nise settings. htting: ou check the batter TRA: SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0	A X A X \underline{X} 	Other Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration	Setting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut	A X A X O	SR 50 W er: 5592 No	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vel	nise isettings: htting: ou Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut icle types.	A X A X DO Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DA TA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56 61-55-58 n/a n/a ¹ es per run	SR 50 W er: 5592 No	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vet	nise settings. htting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut nicle types. RESU	A X A X DO Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56 61-55-58 n/a n/a ¹ es per run LTS [dB(A)]	SR 50 W er: 5592 No	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ya Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vet	nise settings: htting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut hicle types. RESU	A X A X (0) Serial Numburst FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56 61-55-58 n/a n/a ¹ es per run LTS [dB(A)] 0.(41 L (10))	SR 50 W er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0 0-3-0 10 minute	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vet	nise settings: htting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut nicle types. RESU L _{EQ} 64.7-63.	A X A X (0) Serial Numburst Serial Numburst FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 61-62-60 59-58-56 61-55-58 n/a n/a ¹ es per run LTS [dB(A)] 9-64.1 Lmax 91.4	Other Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0 0-3-0 10 minute 1-86.4-89.1	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vel Background Noise:	$\begin{array}{c} \text{on Davis CAL 20} \\ \text{ou check the batted} \\ \text{TRA}^{\text{OU}} \\ \text{CAL 20} \\ \text{ou check the batted} \\ \text{TRA}^{\text{OU}} \\ \text{TRA}^{\text{OU}} \\ \text{SR 50 E} \\ \text{Run 1-Ru} \\ \text{Volume} \\ \hline \text{79-75-93} \\ 2-4-6 \\ \hline 10-17-12 \\ 0-0-0 \\ 4-0-2 \\ \hline 10-0-0 \\ 4-0-2 \\ \hline 10 \\ \text{minut} \\ \text{nicle types.} \\ \text{RESU} \\ \text{Leq 64.7-63.} \end{array}$	A X A X \underline{X} 	Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0 0-3-0 10 minute 10 minute	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run
Respo Weigh Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vet Background Noise: <u>SR 50</u>	nhse settings: htting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA: SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut nicle types. RESU L_{EQ} 64.7-63.	A X A X A X A X A X A X A A A A	Other er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Run Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0 0-3-0 10 minute 100-86.4-89.1	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ 25 per run
Respo Weigl Calibrator: Type: <u>Larse</u> Did ye Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all vet Background Noise: <u></u> fajor Sources: <u>SR 50</u> Juusual Events: <u></u> cars tu	nise Settings. htting: on Davis CAL 20 ou check the batto TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 79-75-93 2-4-6 10-17-12 0-0-0 4-0-2 10 minut nicle types. RESU LEQ 64.7-63.	A X A X A X (A X) A X A X A X A X A X A X A X A X	SIGW Other Other No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 100-88-82 6-3-2 9-17-10 0-0-0 0-3-0 10 minute	estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 60-58-59 54-58-55 44-55-54 n/a n/a ¹ es per run

Measurements Taken By: <u>I</u> Fime Study Started: Project Identification: Financial Project ID	<u>. Baumaister, C. S</u> 12:59 pm : _430051-1-22-01	Cehoonard, N. Rho Time Study En	ads D nde <u>d: 1:32 pm</u>	ate: <u>10/15/2015</u>
Project Location:	SR 50 from Bro	ooksville Bypass to	Lockhart Road	
Site Identification:	Site 2 – SR 50 a	t Frampton (NE ec	orner)	
Weather Conditions:				
Temperature <u>87°F</u>	Wind Speed <u>2.2</u>	Oth Wind Direction	er E to W Humidi	<u>y_49%</u>
Equipment:				
Sound Level Meter:	argon Davis 921	Social Numbe	(a). 1 7 95	
Did	vou check the batte	erv? Yes X	No	
Calil	oration Readings:	Start 114.0	9 End 114.1	4
Resp	onse Settings:	Fast	SlowX	
Weig	ghting:	A <u>X</u>	Other	
Calibrator:		0 0 0	5.502	
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u>	son Davis CAL 20	00 Serial Numb	er <u>: 5592</u>	
Calibrator: Type: <u>Larr</u> Did	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batte	00 Serial Numb ery? Yes <u>X</u>	er <u>: 5592</u> No	
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> : Did :	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batte TRA	<u>)0</u> Serial Numb ery?Yes <u>X</u> FFIC DATA	er <u>: 5592</u> No	
Calibrator: Type: <u>Larr</u> Did y	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA	00 Serial Numb ery? Yes <u>X</u> FFIC DATA	er <u>: 5592</u> No	
Calibrator: Type: <u>Larr</u> Did <u></u>	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batte TRA SR 50 E	00 Serial Numb ery? Yes <u>X</u> FFIC DATA astbound	er: 5592 No	/estbound
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did <u></u> Roadway Identification	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batte TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume	00_ Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph)	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume	/estbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph)
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batte TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81	00 Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DA TA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 53-55-52	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76	/estbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3	00 Serial Numbery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 53-55-52 47-n/a ¹ -40	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4	Vestbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9	00 Serial Number ery? Yes X FFIC DATA	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14	Vestbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0	00 Serial Numbers ery? Yes X FFIC DATA	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0	/estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles	Son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1	00 Serial Numbers ery? Yes X FFIC DATA	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1	⁷ estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did Notorcycles Duration	Son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minutt 10 minutt	$\begin{array}{c c} \hline 00 & Serial Number \\ ery? & Yes & X \\ \hline FFIC DATA \\ \hline astbound \\ m 2-Run 3 \\ \hline Speed (mph) \\ 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a^1 \\ es per run \\ \hline \end{array}$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	Zestbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: Lars Did ; Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut shicle types.	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numbery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \hline \text{m 2-Run 3} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a^1 \\ \hline \text{es per run} \\ \hline \text{ITS LIP(A)} \\ \hline \end{array}$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	Zestbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Nedium Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all ve	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut chicle types. RESU	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numbery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \hline \text{m 2-Run 3} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a^1 \\ \hline \text{es per run} \\ \hline \text{LTS [dB(A)]} \end{array}$	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	'estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: Lars Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all ve	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut ehicle types. RESU LEO 69.5-71	$\begin{array}{c c} \hline 00 & Serial Number \\ \hline 00 & Serial Number \\ \hline 00 & X \\ $	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	restbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all verses Background Noise: dogs	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut shicle types. RESU LEQ 69.5-71. barking. Lextreme	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numburgery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \underline{m2-Run 3} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a^1 \\ \hline \text{es per run} \\ \hline \text{LTS [dB(A)]} \\ \hline 7-71.4 \ \text{Lmax} \ 93.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	Vestbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration *Speeds were not documented for all version Background Noise: <u>dogs</u> Major Sources: US 39	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batted TRA: SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut shicle types. RESU LEQ 69.5-71. barking. 01	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numburgery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \underline{\text{m 2-Run 3}} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline 0.48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline 1.48 \\ \hline 0.48-46 \\ \hline 0.48 \\ \hline 0$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut	⁷ estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all vo Background Noise: <u>dogs</u> Major Sources: <u>US 30</u> Jnusual Events: cars t	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA: SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut shicle types. RESU LEQ 69.5-71. barking. 01 urning into lodge.	00Serial Numberery?YesXFFIC DATAastboundin 2-Run 3Speed (mph)53-55-5247-n/a ¹ -4050-48-46n/an/a ¹ es per run'LTS [dB(A)]7-71.4 Lmax 93.4Run 1: horn; Run 3	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut -109.3-107.4 3: dog barking/o	'estbound in 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all vo Background Noise: <u>dogs</u> Major Sources: <u>US 30</u> Jnusual Events: <u>cars t</u>	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA: SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut shicle types. RESU L _{EQ} 69.5-71. barking. D1 urning into lodge. horn	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numbery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \hline \text{m 2-Run 3} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline 0/a^1 \\ \hline \text{es per run} \\ \hline \text{LTS [dB(A)]} \\ \hline 7-71.4 \text{ Lmax 93.4} \\ \hline \\ \hline \text{Run 1: horn; Run 3} \\ \hline \end{array}$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut -109.3-107.4 3: dog barking/o	'estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type:arr Did ; Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all vo Background Noise:dogs Major Sources:US 30 Jnusual Events:cars t truck	son DavisCAL 20you check the batterTRA:SR 50 ERun 1-RuVolume $67-85-81$ $3-1-3$ $12-4-9$ $0-0-0$ $6-1-1$ 10 minutchicle types.RESULEQ 69.5-71.barking. 01 urning into lodge.horn	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{00} & \text{Serial Numbery?} & \text{Yes} & \underline{X} \\ \hline \text{FFIC DATA} \\ \hline \text{astbound} \\ \hline \text{m 2-Run 3} \\ \hline \text{Speed (mph)} \\ \hline 53-55-52 \\ \hline 47-n/a^1-40 \\ \hline 50-48-46 \\ \hline n/a \\ \hline n/a^1 \\ \hline \text{es per run} \\ \hline \text{LTS [dB(A)]} \\ \hline 7-71.4 \ \text{Lmax 93.4} \\ \hline \hline \text{Run 1: horn; Run 1} \\ \hline \end{array}$	er: 5592 No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut -109.3-107.4 3: dog barking/o	/estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> : Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all vents: Speeds were not documented for all vents: Calibration 'Speeds were not documented for all vents: Calibration Calibration 'Speeds were not documented for all vents: Calibration Calibration Calibration Calibration 'Speeds were not documented for all vents: Calibration Calib	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut chicle types. RESU LEQ 69.5-71. barking. D1 urning into lodge. horn	00 Serial Number ery? Yes X FFIC DATA astbound m 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 53-55-52 47-n/a ¹ -40 50-48-46 n/a n/a ¹ es per run LTS [dB(A)] 7-71.4 Lmax 93.4	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut -109.3-107.4 3: dog barking/o	/estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run
Calibrator: Type: <u>Lar</u> Did : Did : Roadway Identification Vehicle Type Autos Medium Trucks Heavy Trucks Buses Motorcycles Duration 'Speeds were not documented for all w Background Noise: <u>dogs</u> Major Sources: <u>US 3</u> Jnusual Events: <u>cars t</u> <u>truck</u>	son Davis CAL 20 you check the batter TRA SR 50 E Run 1-Ru Volume 67-85-81 3-1-3 12-4-9 0-0-0 6-1-1 10 minut chicle types. RESU L _{EQ} 69.5-71. barking. D1 urning into lodge. horn	00Serial Numberery?YesXFFIC DATAastboundm 2-Run 3Speed (mph)53-55-5247-n/a ¹ -4050-48-46n/an/a ¹ es per runLTS [dB(A)]7-71.4 Lmax93.4Run 1: horn; Run 2KBvironmental	er <u>: 5592</u> No SR 50 W Run 1-Ru Volume 87-95-76 4-3-4 4-12-14 0-0-0 1-11-1 10 minut -109.3-107.4 3: dog barking/o	'estbound n 2-Run 3 Speed (mph) 59-59-59 54-51-55 59-58-54 n/a n/a ¹ -n/a ¹ -57 es per run