

## **CITY OF GLENDALE NOISE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN TECHNICAL APPENDIX**

 **Prepared for the 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206 CITY OF GLENDALE** 

 **Fred Greve, P.E. MESTRE GREVE ASSOCIATES 27812 El Lazo Road Laguna Niguel, CA 92677 Prepared by:**

 **December 13, 2005** 

### **GLENDALE NOISE ELEMENT TECHNICAL APPENDIX**

### **Table of Contents**



#### *1.0 INTRODUCTION*

 The Noise Element of a General Plan is a comprehensive program for including noise management in the planning process. It is a tool for local planners to use in achieving and maintaining land uses that are compatible with environmental noise levels. The Noise Element identifies noise sensitive land uses and noise sources, and defines areas of noise impact for the purpose of developing programs to ensure that Glendale residents will be protected from excessive noise intrusion. The current Noise Element of the General Plan for the City of Glendale was adopted in July 1978. It identifies roadways as the most significant source of noise in the City. While traffic noise is still the major noise source in the City, other sources have become a concern. Additionally, the method for controlling noise and incorporating noise concerns into planning decisions has become more sophisticated over the years since the first Element was adopted. Thus, the decision was made by the City to update their Noise Element to more effectively protect and plan for the residents of the City.

 This document constitutes the Technical Appendix of the Noise Element and provides the technical background for the Noise Element. Topics covered in the Technical Appendix include background information on noise, health effects related to noise pollution, methodologies used to monitor and model noise levels throughout the City, the results of the noise monitoring program, and the noise contours for the City.

 The Noise Element, including the Technical Appendix, follows the revised State guidelines ("General Plan Guidelines," Governors Office of Planning and Research, October 2003) and State Government Code Section 65302(f). The Element quantifies the community noise environment in terms of noise exposure contours for both near and long-term levels of growth and traffic activity. The information will become a guideline for the development of land use policies to achieve compatible land uses and provide baseline levels and noise source identification for local noise ordinance enforcement.

### *2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON NOISE*

 This section presents background information on the characteristics of noise and summarizes the methodologies used to study the noise environment. This section will give the reader an understanding of the metrics and methodologies used to assess noise impacts. The section is divided as follows:

- *Properties of sound that are important for technically describing sound*
- *Acoustic factors influencing human subjective response to sound.*
- *Potential disturbances to humans and health effects due to sound.*
- *Sound rating scales used in this study*
- *Summary of noise assessment criteria*

#### *2.1 Characteristics of Sound*

Sound Level and Frequency. Sound can be technically described in terms of the sound pressure (amplitude) and frequency (similar to pitch). Sound pressure is a direct measure of the magnitude of a sound without consideration for other factors that may influence its perception.

 The range of sound pressures that occur in the environment is so large that it is convenient to express these pressures as sound pressure levels on a logarithmic scale which compresses the wide range of sound pressures to a more usable range of numbers. The standard unit of measurement of sound is the decibel (dB), which describes the pressure of a sound relative to a reference pressure.

 The frequency (pitch) of a sound is expressed as Hertz (Hz) or cycles per second. The normal audible frequency for young adults is 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. Community noise, including aircraft and motor vehicles, typically ranges between 50 Hz and 5,000 Hz. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies, with some frequencies judged to be louder for a given signal than others. As a result of this, various methods of frequency weighting have been developed. The most common weighting is the A-weighted noise curve (dBA). The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) performs this compensation by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear. In the A-weighted decibel, everyday sounds normally range from 30 dBA (very quiet) to 100 dBA

 (very loud). Most community noise analyses are based upon the A-weighted decibel scale. Examples of various sound environments, expressed in dBA, are presented in Exhibit 1.

Propagation of Noise. Outdoor sound levels decrease as the distance from the source increases, and as a result of wave divergence, atmospheric absorption and ground attenuation. Sound radiating from a source in a homogeneous and undisturbed manner travels in spherical waves. As the sound wave travels away from the source, the sound energy is dispersed over a greater area decreasing the sound power of the wave. Spherical spreading of the sound wave reduces the noise level at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of the distance.

 Atmospheric absorption also influences the levels received by the observer. The greater the distance traveled, the greater the influence of the atmosphere and the resultant fluctuations. Atmospheric absorption becomes important at distances of greater than 1,000 feet. The degree of absorption varies depending on the frequency of the sound as well as the humidity and temperature of the air. For example, atmospheric absorption is lowest (i.e., sound carries farther) at high humidity and high temperatures. A schematic diagram of how weather including temperature gradients and wind can affect sound propagation is shown in Exhibit determining the degree of attenuation. Certain conditions, such as inversions, can channel or focus the sound waves resulting in higher noise levels than would result from simple spherical spreading. Absorption effects in the atmosphere vary with frequency. The higher frequencies are more readily absorbed than the lower frequencies. Over large distances, the 2. Turbulence and gradients of wind, temperature and humidity also play a significant role in lower frequencies become the dominant sound as the higher frequencies are attenuated.

Duration of Sound. Annoyance from a noise event increases with increased duration of the noise event, i.e., the longer the noise event, the more annoying it is. The "*effective duration*" of a sound is the time between when a sound rises above the background sound level until it drops back below the background level. Psycho-acoustic studies have determined the relationship between duration and annoyance and the amount a sound must be reduced to be judged equally annoying for increased duration. Duration is an important factor in describing sound in a community setting.

 The relationship between duration and noise level is the basis of the equivalent energy 3 dB reduction. Doubling the duration of the sound increases the total energy of the event by principal of sound exposure. Reducing the acoustic energy of a sound by one half results in a



# **Exhibit 2 THE EFFECTS OF WEATHER ON SOUND PROPAGATION**

Refraction of sound in an atmosphere with a **Refraction of sound in an atmosphere with** an atmosphere with an inverted lapse rate. Sound rays are bent wind present. Sound rays are bent in the upwards.<br>Inverted lapse rate.





**Source: Adapted from Vancouver International Airport, Noise Management Report.**



 3 dB. This equivalent energy principal is based upon the premise that the potential for a noise to impact a person is dependent on the total acoustical energy content of the noise. Defined in subsequent sections of this study, noise metrics such as CNEL, DNL, LEQ and SENEL are all based upon the equal energy principle.

Change in Noise. The concept of change in ambient sound levels can be understood with an explanation of the hearing mechanism's reaction to sound. The human ear is a far better detector of relative differences in sound levels than absolute values of levels. Under controlled laboratory conditions, listening to a steady unwavering pure tone sound that can be changed to slightly different sound levels, a person can just barely detect a sound level noises are heard, a young healthy ear can detect changes of two to three decibels. A five decibel change is readily noticeable while a 10 decibel change is judged by most people as a doubling or a halving of the loudness of the sound. It is typical in environmental documents change of approximately one decibel for sounds in the mid-frequency region. When ordinary to consider a 3 dB change as potentially discernable.

Masking Effect. The ability of one sound to limit a listener from hearing another sound is known as the masking effect. The presence of one sound effectively raises the threshold of audibility for the hearing of a second sound. For a signal to be heard, it must exceed the threshold of hearing for that particular individual <u>and</u> exceed the masking threshold for the background noise.

 The masking characteristics of sound depend on many factors including the spectral (frequency) characteristics of the two sounds, the sound pressure levels, and the relative start time of the sounds. Masking effect is greatest when the frequencies of the two sounds are similar or when low frequency sounds mask higher frequency sounds. High frequency sounds do not easily mask low frequency sounds.

#### *2.2 Factors Influencing Human Response to Sound*

 Many factors influence sound perception and annoyance. This includes not only physical characteristics of the sound but also secondary influences such as sociological and external factors. Molino, in the *Handbook of Noise Control* describes human response to sound in terms of both acoustic and non-acoustic factors. These factors are summarized in Table 1.

 Sound rating scales are developed in reaction to the factors affecting human response to sound. Nearly all of these factors are relevant in describing how sounds are perceived in the community. Many non-acoustic parameters play a prominent role in affecting individual response to noise. Background sound, an additional acoustic factor not specifically listed, is also important in describing sound in rural settings. Researchers have identified the effects of personal and situational variables on noise annoyance, and have identified a clear association of reported annoyance and various other individual perceptions or beliefs.

 Thus, it is important to recognize that non-acoustic factors as well as acoustic factors contribute to human response to noise.

#### **Table 1 Factors that Affect Individual Annoyance to Noise**

\_

#### **Primary Acoustic Factors**

Sound Level Frequency Duration

#### **Secondary Acoustic Factors**

Spectral Complexity Fluctuations in Sound Level Fluctuations in Frequency Rise-time of the Noise Localization of Noise Source

#### **Non-acoustic Factors**

Physiology Adaptation and Past Experience How the Listener's Activity Affects Annoyance Predictability of When a Noise will Occur Is the Noise Necessary? Individual Differences and Personality

\_

*Source: C. Harris, 1979* 

#### *2.3 Sound Rating Scales*

 The description, analysis, and reporting of community sound levels is made difficult by the developed to describe acoustic effects. Various rating scales approximate the human subjective assessment to the "loudness" or "noisiness" of a sound. Noise metrics have been developed to account for additional parameters such as duration and cumulative effect of complexity of human response to sound and myriad sound-rating scales and metrics multiple events.

 Noise metrics are categorized as single event metrics and cumulative metrics. Single event metrics describe the noise from individual events, such as one aircraft flyover. Cumulative metrics describe the noise in terms of the total noise exposure throughout the day. Noise metrics used in this study are summarized below. First single event metrics are discussed followed by discussions of the cumulative metrics.

#### *Single Event Metrics*

Frequency Weighted Metrics (dBA). In order to simplify the measurement and computation of sound loudness levels, frequency weighted networks have obtained wide acceptance. The A-weighting (dBA) scale has become the most prominent of these scales and is widely used in community noise analysis. Its advantages are that it has shown good correlation with community response and is easily measured. The metrics used in this study are all based upon the dBA scale.

Maximum Noise Level or Lmax is the highest noise level reached during a noise event. For example, as an aircraft approaches, the sound of the aircraft begins to rise above ambient noise levels. The closer the aircraft gets the louder it is until the aircraft is at its closest point directly overhead. Then as the aircraft passes, the noise level decreases until the sound level again settles to ambient levels. Such a history of a flyover is plotted at the top of Exhibit 3. It is this metric to which people generally instantaneously respond when an aircraft flyover or a loud vehicle like a truck or motorcycle passes by.

 Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) or Sound Exposure Level (SEL) is computed from dBA sound levels, and is used to quantify the total noise associated with an event such as an aircraft overflight or a train pass-by. Referring again to the top of Exhibit 3, the shaded area, or the area within 10 dB of the maximum noise level, is the area from which



 the SENEL is computed. The SENEL value is the integration of all the acoustic energy contained within the event. Speech and sleep interference research can be assessed relative to Single Event Noise Exposure Level data.

 The SENEL metric takes into account the maximum noise level of the event and the duration of the event. Single event metrics are a convenient method for describing noise from individual aircraft events. This metric is useful in that airport noise models contain aircraft noise curve data based upon the SENEL metric. In addition, cumulative noise metrics such as LEQ, CNEL and DNL can be computed from SENEL data.

#### *Cumulative Metrics*

 Cumulative noise metrics assess community response to noise by including the loudness of the noise, the duration of the noise, the total number of noise events and the time of day these events occur into one single number rating scale.

Equivalent Noise Level (Leq) is the sound level corresponding to a steady-state A- weighted sound level containing the same total energy as several SEL events during a given sample period. Leq is the "energy" average noise level during the time period of the sample. It is based on the observation that the potential for noise annoyance is dependent on the total acoustical energy content of the noise. This is graphically illustrated in the middle graph of Exhibit 3. Leq can be measured for any time period, but is typically measured for 15 minutes, 1 hour or 24-hours. Leq for a one hour period is used by the Federal Highway Administration for assessing highway noise impacts. Leq for one hour is called Hourly Noise Level (HNL) in the California Airport Noise Regulations and is used to develop Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) values for aircraft operations.

Community Noise Equivalent Level, or CNEL is a 24-hour, time-weighted energy average noise level based on the A-weighted decibel. It is a measure of the overall noise experienced during an entire day. The term "time-weighted" refers to the penalties attached to noise events occurring during certain sensitive time periods. In the CNEL scale, noise occurring between the hours of 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. is penalized by approximately 5 dB. This penalty accounts for the greater potential for noise to cause communication interference during these hours, as well as typically lower ambient noise levels during these hours. Noise that takes place during the night (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) is penalized by 10 dB. This penalty was selected to

 attempt to account for the higher sensitivity to noise in the nighttime and the expected further decrease in background noise levels that typically occur in the nighttime.

 CNEL is graphically illustrated in the bottom of Exhibit 3. Examples of various noise environments in terms of CNEL are presented in Exhibit 4. CNEL is specified for use in California by local planning agencies in their General Plan Noise Element for land use compatibility planning.

The DNL index is very similar to CNEL, but does not include the evening (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) penalty that is included in CNEL. It does include the nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) penalty. Typically, DNL is about 1 dB lower than CNEL, although the difference may be greater if there is an abnormal concentration of noise events in the 7 to 10 p.m. time period. DNL is specified for use in all States except California

L(%), Lmax and Lmin are statistical methods of describing noise which accounts for variance in noise levels throughout a given measurement period.  $L(\%)$  is a way of expressing the noise level exceeded for a percentage of time in a given measurement period. For example since 5 minutes is 25% of 20 minutes, L(25) is the noise level that is equal to or exceeded for five minutes in a twenty minute measurement period. It is  $L(\%)$  that is used for most Noise Ordinance standards. Lmax represents the loudest noise level that is measured. The Lmax only occurs for a fraction of a second with all the other noise less than the Lmax level. Lmin represents the quietest noise level during a noise measurement. All other noise during the measurement period is louder than the Lmin.



#### *3.0 HEALTH EFFECTS*

 Noise, often described as unwanted sound, is known to have several adverse effects on humans. From these known adverse effects of noise, criteria have been established to help protect the public health and safety and prevent disruption of certain human activities. These criteria are based on effects of noise on people such as hearing loss (not a factor with typical community noise), communication interference, sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Each of these potential noise impacts on people are briefly discussed in the following narrative:

Hearing Loss is generally not a concern in community noise problems, even very near a major airport or a major freeway. The potential for noise induced hearing loss is more commonly associated with occupational noise exposures in heavy industry, very noisy work environments with long term exposure, or certain very loud recreational activities such as target shooting, motorcycle or car racing, etc. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) identifies a noise exposure limit of 90 dBA for 8 hours per day to protect from hearing loss (higher limits are allowed for shorter duration exposures). Noise levels in neighborhoods, even in very noisy neighborhoods, are not sufficiently loud to cause hearing loss.

**Communication Interference** is one of the primary concerns in environmental noise problems. Communication interference includes speech interference and interference with activities such as watching television. Normal conversational speech is in the range of 60 to 65 dBA and any noise in this range or louder may interfere with speech. There are specific methods of describing speech interference as a function of distance between speaker and listener and voice level. Exhibit 5 shows the relation of quality of speech communication with respect to various noise levels.

Sleep Interference is a major noise concern in noise assessment and, of course, is most critical during nighttime hours. Sleep disturbance is one of the major causes of annoyance due to community noise. Noise can make it difficult to fall asleep, create momentary disturbances of natural sleep patterns by causing shifts from deep to lighter stages and cause awakening. Noise may even cause awakening that a person may or may not be able to recall.



 Extensive research has been conducted on the effect of noise on sleep disturbance with varying results. Recommended values for desired sound levels in residential bedroom space range from 25 to 45 dBA with 35 to 40 dBA being the norm. In 1981, the National Association of Noise Control Officials published data on the probability of sleep disturbance with various single event noise levels. Based on laboratory experiments conducted in the 1970's, this data indicated noise exposure, at 75 dBA interior noise level event will cause noise induced awakening in 30 percent of the cases. Recent research from England, however showed that the probability for sleep disturbance is less than what had been earlier reported. awakenings can be expected at a much lower rate than had been expected based on earlier laboratory studies. This research showed that once a person was asleep, it is much more unlikely that they will be awakened by a noise. The significant difference in the recent data that had been the historic basis for predicting sleep disturbance. Some of this research has been criticized because it was conducted in areas where subjects had become habituated to aircraft noise. On the other hand, some of the earlier laboratory sleep studies had been criticized because of the extremely small sample sizes of most laboratory studies, and because the laboratory was not necessarily a representative sleep environment. The 1994 British sleep study compared the various causes of sleep disturbance using in home sleep studies. This field study assessed the effects of nighttime aircraft noise on sleep in 400 people (211 women and 189 men; 20-70 years of age; one per household) habitually living at eight sites adjacent to four U.K. airports, with different levels of night flying. The main finding was that only a minority of aircraft noise events affected sleep, and, for most subjects, that domestic and other non-aircraft factors had much greater effects. As shown in Field studies conducted during the 1990's, using new sophisticated techniques, indicated that English study is the use of actual in-home sleep disturbance patterns as opposed to laboratory the Exhibit 6, aircraft noise was a minor contributor among a host of other factors that lead to awakening response.

 The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) in 1992 in a document entitled Federal Interagency Review of Selected Airport Noise Analysis Issues recommended an interim dose-response curve for sleep disturbance based on laboratory studies of sleep disturbance. In June of 1997, the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise (FICAN) updated the FICON recommendation with an updated curve based on the more recent in-home sleep disturbance studies which show lower rates of awakening compared to the laboratory studies. FICAN recommended a curve based on the upper limit of the data presented and therefore considers the curve to represent the "maximum percent of the exposed population expected to be behaviorally awakened," or the "maximum awakened."



### **Exhibit 6 Exhibit 6 Causes and Prevalence of All Awakenings Causes and Prevalence of All AwakeningsGlendale General Plan Noise Element Glendale General Plan Noise Element**

 The FICAN recommendation is shown on Exhibit 7. This is a very conservative approach. A more common statistical curve for the data points reflected in Exhibit 7, for example, would indicate a 10% awakening rate at a level of approximately 100 dB SENEL, while the "maximum awakened" curve reflected in Exhibit 7 shows the 10% awakening rate being reached at 80 dB SENEL. (The full FICAN report can be found on the internet at [www.fican.org.](www.fican.org))

Physiological Responses are those measurable effects of noise on people that are realized as changes in pulse rate, blood pressure, etc. While such effects can be induced and observed, the extent is not known to which these physiological responses cause harm or are a sign of harm. Generally, physiological responses are a reaction to a loud short term noise such as a rifle shot or a very loud jet over flight.

 Health effects from noise have been studied around the world for nearly thirty years. Scientists have attempted to determine whether high noise levels can adversely affect human health-apart from auditory damage-which is amply understood. These research efforts have covered a broad range of potential impacts from cardiovascular response to fetal weight and mortality. While a relationship between noise and health effects seems plausible, it has yet to be convincingly demonstrated--that is, shown in a manner that can be repeated by other researchers while yielding similar results.

 While annoyance and sleep/speech interference have been acknowledged, health effects, if they exist, are associated with a wide variety of other environmental stressors. Isolating the effects of aircraft noise alone as a source of long term physiological change has proved to be team of international researchers concluded that, while some findings suggest that noise can affect health, improved research concepts and methods are needed to verify or discredit such a relationship. They called for more study of the numerous environmental and behavioral factors than can confound, mediate or moderate survey findings. Until science refines the research process, a direct link between aircraft noise exposure and non-auditory health almost impossible. In a review of 30 studies conducted worldwide between 1993 and 1998, a effects remains to be demonstrated.

Annoyance is the most difficult of all noise responses to describe. Annoyance is a very individual characteristic and can vary widely from person to person. What one person considers tolerable can be quite unbearable to another of equal hearing capability. The level of annoyance, of course, depends on the characteristics of the noise (i.e.; loudness,



 frequency, time, and duration), and how much activity interference (e.g. speech interference and sleep interference) results from the noise. However, the level of annoyance is also a function of the attitude of the receiver. Personal sensitivity to noise varies widely. It has been estimated that 2 to 10 percent of the population is highly susceptible to annoyance from any noise not of their own making, while approximately 20 percent are unaffected by noise. Attitudes are affected by the relationship between the person and the noise source (Is it our dog barking or the neighbor's dog?). Whether we believe that someone is trying to abate the noise will also affect our level of annoyance.

 Annoyance levels have been correlated to CNEL levels. Exhibit 8 relates DNL noise levels to community response from two of these surveys. One of the survey curves presented in Exhibit 8 is the well-known Schultz curve, developed by Theodore Schultz. It displays the percent of a populace that can be expected to be annoyed by various DNL (CNEL in California) values for residential land use with outdoor activity areas. At 65 dB DNL the Schultz curve predicts approximately 14% of the exposed population reporting themselves to be "highly annoyed." At 60 dB DNL this decreases to approximately 8% of the population.

 However, the Schultz curve and recent updates include data having a very wide range of these noise exposure levels. For example, under contract to the FAA, Bolt Beranek & Newman conducted community attitude surveys in the residential areas south of John Wayne Airport in Orange County in 1981 as part of a study of possible "power cutback" departure procedures. That study concluded that the surveyed population (principally in Santa Ana Heights and various Newport Beach neighborhoods) had more highly annoyed individuals at various CNEL levels than would be predicted by the Schultz curve. When plotted similar to the Schultz curve, this survey indicated the populations in Santa Ana Heights and Newport Beach were approximately 5 dB CNEL more sensitive to noise than the average population predicted by the Schultz curve. While the precise reasons for this increased noise sensitivity were not identified, it is possible that non-acoustic factors, including political or the socio- economic status of the surveyed population may have played an important role in increasing the sensitivity of this community during the period of the survey. Annoyance levels have never been correlated statistically to single event noise exposure levels in airport related scatter with communities reporting much higher percentages of population highly annoyed at studies.

School Room Effects. Interference with classroom activities and learning from aircraft noise is an important consideration and the subject of much recent research. Studies from



 around the world indicate that vehicle traffic, railroad and aircraft noise can have adverse effects on reading ability, concentration, motivation, and long term learning retention. A complicating factor in this research is the extent of background noise from within the classroom itself. The studies indicating the most adverse effects examine cumulative noise levels equivalent to 65 CNEL or higher and single event maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 95 dBA. In other studies the level of noise is unstated or ambiguous. According to these studies, a variety of adverse school room effects can be expected from *interior* noise levels equal to or exceeding 65 CNEL and or 85 dBA SEL.

 Some interference with classroom activities can be expected with noise events that interfere with speech. As discussed in other sections of this report, speech interference begins at 65 dBA that is the level of normal conversation. Typical construction attenuates outdoor noise by 20 dBA with windows closed and 12 dBA with windows open. Thus some interference of classroom activities can be expected at outdoor levels of 77 to 85 dBA.

#### *4.0 Noise Measurements*

#### *4.1 Methodology*

 Twenty-two (22) sites were selected for measurement of the noise environment in Glendale. A review of noise complaints, discussions with City staff, input received at a community meeting and identification of major noise sources in the community provided the initial base for development of the community noise survey. The measurement locations were selected on the basis of proximity to major noise sources and noise sensitivity of the land use. The measurement locations are depicted in Exhibit 9.

 Noise measurements were made of the short term Leq values. These measurements provide a short 'snapshot' view of the noise environment. The noise measurements were made at a normal receptor height of about 5 feet above the ground. Measurements were made on August 16 and 17, 2005. The measurements were made with a Bruel & Kjaer Type 2236 Sound Level Meter, and calibrated every few hours. These noise measurement systems meet the American National Standards Institute "Type 1" specifications, which is the most accurate for community noise measurements. The meter and calibrator have current certification traceable to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

#### *4.2 Results*

 The results of the noise measurements are shown in Exhibit 10. These figures also depict the date and time of the measurement. The cause of the loudest event is identified and the most predominant noise source(s) are identified. The quantities measured were the Equivalent Noise Level (Leq), the maximum noise level (Lmax) and the minimum noise levels (Lmin).

 When examining the noise data shown in Exhibit 10 it is important to note that most of these sites were at the front yards of homes. These data are intended to identify noise levels over a broad range of the City and are not an assessment of impacts at these sites. In all cases the major sources of noise are motor vehicles. The noise levels measured cover a wide range of noise exposure throughout the City. The quietest environment was in a residential area where noise levels were often below 40 dBA. The loudest events were buses and trucks and these events would push the noise levels into the mid 80 dBA range. In general, aircraft noise, industrial noise, and commercial noise sources did not appear to contribute significantly to the noise levels measured. A discussion of the noise measurements is presented below on a site by site basis.



**Exhibit 10 Graphic Summary of Short-Term Ambeint Noise Measurment Results** 

<b>Site</b>	Location	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Sound Level (dBA)</b>	<b>Noise Sources</b>
$\mathbf 1$	At interface between Dunsmore Park and residential area	8/17		park, s.f. 10:00 a.m. residential school		dog bark was loudest event; ballfield, tennis court. soccer
$\overline{c}$	SE Corner of Encinal and New York Avenue	8/17	8:40 a.m.	single family residential		traffic from Foothill Freeway
3	NW Corner of Allen Ave and Bel Aire Drive	8/17		single family 12:58 p.m. residential school		loudest event was delivery truck; cars on road
4	<b>Brand Park near Friendship</b> Garden	8/17	4:10 p.m.	park		trash truck was loudest; waterfall, cars and street
5	1750 North Pacific Avenue	8/17	11:27 a.m.	single family residential		car door slam was loudest; distant const, birds
6	1981 Fern Lane	8/17	9:27 p.m.	single family residential		truck was loudest; cars, distant freeway
6	1981 Fern Lane	8/17	9:44 p.m.	single family residential		truck was loudest; cars, distant freeway
6	1981 Fern Lane	8/17	10:00 p.m.	single family residential		police car leaving was loudest; distant freeway
				30	80 40 50 60 70	90
Legend Lmin Lmax Lea City of Glendale Noise Element <b>Mestre Greve Associates</b>						

Mestre Greve Associates

#### **Exhibit 10** (cont'd) **Graphic Summary of Short-Term Ambeint Noise Measurment Results**



Mestre Greve Associates

#### **Exhibit 10** (cont'd) **Graphic Summary of Short-Term Ambeint Noise Measurment Results**



Mestre Greve Associates

#### *4.3 Detailed Discussion of Noise Measurements*

 Twenty-two (22) sites were monitored as part of the measurement program. Each site is discussed below. Exhibit 10, previously presented, includes the time of day, exact location, general land use around the site, and more detail on the measurement results. It may be useful for the reader to refer back to this exhibit during the following discussions.

 *Site 1 –* The noise measurement was taken at the interface between Dunsmore Park and the adjacent residential area. This site is in the Montrose area of the City. This site was selected to check on the compatibility of an active park area with residential uses. While the measurements were conducted, the ball field, soccer field and tennis courts were all active. There is a parking lot between the homes and the active fields that acts as a buffer zone. The noise levels measured at the residents ranged from 42 to 64 dBA with the average noise level (Leq) being just under 50 dBA. Most of the noise measured was due to the playfields, however, the loudest sound recorded came from a barking neighborhood dog. The daytime Leq is often indicative of the CNEL noise level. The CNEL in this area would be expected to be around 50 dBA. Thus, this area represents a quiet residential area, and shows that residential and active park uses can be compatible when in close proximity if properly planned.

 *Site 2 –* This site is located near the Foothill Freeway, at the southeast corner of Encinal and New York Avenues, and was selected to test the effectiveness of the soundwall located along the freeway. The noise measurements, taken during the morning peak rush period, revealed an Leq noise level of 63 dBA. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) noise criteria is essentially an Leq of 67 dBA. Therefore, the soundwall at this site is working as planned, and the noise level should be considered acceptable.

 *Site 3 –* Site 3 is at the northwest corner of Allen Avenue and Bel Aire Drive. This is a residential area with a school nearby. The noise levels varied widely for this street. When no cars or trucks driving on the street, the noise levels would drop into the 40 to 50 dBA range. However, when a loud delivery truck passed along the street the noise level increased substantially to 85 dBA. The average (Leq) noise level for the site was 61.5 dBA, which is typical for urban residential areas.

 *Site 4 –* This noise measurement of Brand Park is representative of a quiet park. The experience of being in this park would be degraded if the noise level was loud. The average noise level in the park was 45 dBA, which is a very low noise level and reflects the peace and quiet that is associated with the park. A waterfall and distant traffic noise could be heard much of the time. The loudest noise levels were just below 60 dBA and were due to a trash truck. The noise levels experienced in this park are an excellent goal for development of future parks where peace and quiet are a major goal.

 at 1750 North Pacific Avenue. Average noise levels were just above 40 dBA. The site was *Site 5* – This site was selected to be representative of a very quiet residential area. The site is at the end of a cul-de-sac.

 *Site 6 –* Site 6 is along Fern Lane, specifically measurements were made at 1981 Fern Lane. The Glendale Sports Complex was constructed at the east end of Fern Lane. Residents continue to complain about the traffic noise associated with the Sports Complex. Three 15- minute measurements were made at this site. During the first two measurements, which lasted from 9:27 p.m. to 9:59 p.m. cars were regularly traveling in a westbound direction from the Sports Complex. From 10:00 p.m. to 10:15 p.m. only one car passed the measurement site. Two factors may have effected the noise measurements. First, the police were present on the street and this may have caused people to drive slower than if the police had not been present. Second, one resident told us that about half of the playfields were not being used because it was not soccer season. We were unable to independently confirm this. The measurements during the first two periods averaged 56 and 55 dBA. The noise level during the third period was 50 dBA (Leq). The traffic on the distant freeway kept the noise levels in the 48 to 52 dBA range. Based on our limited measurements, the Sports Complex traffic does appear to increase average noise levels by about 5 dBA during the 30-minute period when the cars are leaving the Sports Complex. (A similar increase might be expected when the cars are arriving at the complex.) This increase in noise would be noticeable to the local residents. However, the noise levels remain low during this time that the time that the cars are leaving. With noise levels in the mid-50 dBA range, this neighborhood is very typical of many neighborhoods that were measured. The residents also have complained about the maximum sound levels due to cars passing by with loud exhausts. In the first vehicle's tires. In the second period, the loudest event was caused by the exhaust system on a pickup truck and reached a noise level of 66.6 dBA. Even though this level may be annoying to residents, it is at a legal level (i.e., California Motor Vehicle Code Sections measurement period, the loudest event was a pickup truck and the noise was generated by the

 27204 and 27150) and is consistent with what was measured in other neighborhoods. (A summary of findings and recommendations is provided in the main body of the Noise Element.)

 *Site 7 –* Site 7 is along Mountain Road at Nibley Park. At the community meeting some residents complained about the exhaust noise from student vehicles during the evening hours. Because there are speed bumps on this road, travel speeds are generally low. This Because there are speed bumps on this road, travel speeds are generally low. measurement was intended as a check on the situation. Measurements were initiated 8:17 p.m. and lasted for 30 minutes. It is impossible to positively identify student traffic as opposed to residents, but it was clear that a significant portion of the traffic was associated the measurement period about 15 cars passed by whose noise level was between 65 and 70 dBA. Only one car exceeded 70 dBA, and that car was responsible for the maximum sound level measured during the period (i.e., 74.1 dBA). The exhaust on the car was the loudest source of noise. The exhaust on this car, while perhaps annoying to residents, is not illegal and is consistent with noise levels typical measured on other small streets throughout the City. The Leq noise level for the measurement was 56 dBA, which is representative of a quiet urban area. When no cars were present the area was very quiet, with the Lmin noise with the college based spotting college parking tags and the general age of the driver. During level measured at 44 dBA.

 *Site 8 -* This site is located at 818 Foxkirk near the Glendale Freeway (SR-2). The site was selected to test the effectiveness of the soundwall located along the freeway. The noise measurements, taken during the morning peak rush period, revealed an Leq noise level of 60.5 dBA. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) noise criteria is essentially an Leq of 67 dBA. Therefore, the soundwall at this site is working as planned, and the noise level should be considered acceptable.

 *Site 9 –* The area around this site is a mix of residential and commercial uses. Specifically, the site was at apartments along Glenoaks Avenue near Thompson Avenue. The site was selected as an example to determine if commercial noise was an issue for the nearby residents. Noise from the commercial uses was insignificant and the site was dominated by the noise from Glenoaks Avenue. The average noise level (Leq) was 69.4 dBA, and is a strong indicator that the CNEL noise level would also be in the upper 60s. This noise level communities consider noise levels in excess of 65 CNEL to be unacceptable for private spaces (e.g., yards and patios) around residential developments. Additionally, when noise is very loud for residential uses, and is generally considered unacceptable. Most

 levels exceed 65 CNEL additional construction upgrades (e.g., upgraded windows) are needed to insure that the State standard of 45 CNEL is achieved in indoor areas. A Beeline bus was the loudest noise recorded during the measurements with the noise reaching nearly 86 dBA.

 *Site 10 –* Noise measurements were made in front of Franklin Elementary School. This site is a school site in a primarily residential neighborhood. The loudest noise levels were caused by the occasional vehicle on the local roadway. The Golden State Freeway (I-5) was a constant source of noise. This site was measured as part of the work for the original Noise Element. We measured it at about the same time of day as the measurements in 1978. In 1978, the Leq noise level was 57.9 dBA during the evening. We measured the noise at 59.4 dBA, or about 1.5 dBA higher than was measured 27 years ago. In other words, based on our noise measurements the noise levels in this area are about the same as they were in the 1970s.

 *Site 11 –* Measurements were made at the apartment complex near the Golden State Freeway (I-5) and Ventura Freeway (SR-134). These apartments are located just west of Paula Avenue. It appears that a soundwall was constructed by Caltrans along the I-5 north of the apartment complex, but no soundwall runs along the apartment complex. The Leq noise levels at the site were 70 dBA, which is above the Caltrans standard of 67 dBA (Leq) and is generally considered unacceptable for residential development. The measurement also indicates that the CNEL noise level is in the upper 60s or low 70s, which is higher than the 65 CNEL level generally considered acceptable for residential development.

 *Site 12 –* Noise measurements were made early in the morning at 854 Norton Avenue. At the community meeting, residents had complained that trucks in the early morning cut through on this street and cause unacceptable noise levels. We counted trucks while we conducted our noise measurements and did not see a single truck (including 2 axle delivery trucks). Noise levels were fairly low during the measurement with the Leq at 52 dBA. The loudest event was a car on Norton Avenue, which was nearly 70 dBA.

*Site 13* – Site 13 is located at 669 Fairmont Avenue and is exposed to noise from the Ventura Freeway (SR-134). Caltrans recently constructed a soundwall along this area. The Leq noise level was measured at 59 dBA, which should be considered as very acceptable.

 *Site 14 –* This site represents a residential area and school that are on the future edge of the Downtown Corridor. Currently the noise levels are low at this site (502 Columbus Avenue) with the Leq measured at 54 dBA. The loudest noises were due to cars driving on this street and reached 70 dBA.

 *Site 15 –* The site at 630 Isabel is a residential area of multi-family dwellings along the Ventura Freeway (SR-134). The freeway is depressed through this area and there are no soundwalls present. The majority of the noise at this site was due to the freeway traffic. The noise level (Leq) was measured at 67.8 dBA, which is slightly above the Caltrans criteria of 67 dBA (Leq). Peak noise levels from traffic on the freeway were almost 74 dBA. This would be considered a loud residential area.

 *Site 16 –* This site is in a residential area just off of San Fernando Road. A Home Depot store uses this road for customer and delivery access. The measurements were made in front of 633 Harvard. The loudest noise measured was 77 dBA and was due to a delivery truck. Traffic on Harvard was the primary source of noise at this location, and most of the traffic appeared to be associated with Home Depot. The Leq noise level was 60.7 dBA, and this noise level is generally acceptable for residential areas.

 *Site 17 –* Site 17 was measured because it is representative of a downtown urban park. The park is located at 201 East Colorado Boulevard. Buses and trucks were the cause of the loudest noise levels, while traffic on Colorado Boulevard was a constant source of noise. The noise level was fairly high for a park use at 67.8 dBA. People tended to accumulate a little farther from the roadway than where we made our measurement, and appeared to be able to communicate and enjoy the park.

 a mix of commercial and residential uses. The loudest events measured were due to the buses on Broadway with the maximum sound level being 83 dBA. The average sound level (Leq) was 67 dBA. This noise level is slightly above what is typically considered acceptable *Site 18 –* This area is representative of an urban residential area. The area along Broadway is for residential development.

 *Site 19 –* This site, 124 Garfield Avenue, is directly adjacent to an automotive service center. This site is of interest because it represents many locations in this area where residents are located directly adjacent to automotive uses. At this site the noise both in terms of peak noise levels and predominate noise sources were due to the traffic on Garfield Avenue. The  service center intercom was heard and was about 47 dBA; near the low end of the noise range. At this site there appears to be no noise incompatibility between the automotive use and the residential area.

 *Site 20 –* Site 20 is at one of the busiest intersections in Glendale and is located in a commercial area. The measurement was near the corner of Los Feliz and San Fernando Roads. The noise at this site was cause by the traffic on these two roadways. This was the loudest site measured with an Leq of 72 dBA.

 *Site 21 –* This site is representative of the Adams Hill residential area. The cars on Adams Street were responsible for the noise at this site. The Lmax was due to a very loud delivery truck that reached a noise of 83 dBA. When no traffic was present, the noise levels dropped very low to the low 40 dBA and lower range. The average noise level was 65 dBA (Leq).

 *Site 22 –* Site 22 is a senior housing complex across the street from a banquet facility. This was our fourth time trying to measure noise, if any, generated by a banquet facility. Unfortunately, the banquet facility was not operating during any of the four attempted monitoring times. The loudest event was due to a bus on Glenoaks Boulevard. Traffic on Glenoaks was the predominant noise source. The Leq noise level at this site was 65 dBA, which is at the upper end of what is normally considered acceptable for residential development.

#### *5.0 NOISE CONTOURS*

 The noise environment in Glendale is attributable primarily to roadways, which include both surface roadways and freeways. Along the southwest border of the City, the Union Pacific Railroad is also a significant noise source. There are no airplane or helicopter operations that are loud enough and consistent enough to be significant.

 The noise contours for the City of Glendale are presented in Exhibits 11 and 12 for existing and future conditions respectively. The existing contours are based on the existing conditions of traffic volumes and other sources of noise in the community. Both sets of traffic data were provided by the Glendale Traffic Department. The future contours represent a year 2030 scenario. (The traffic noise contours, including the average daily traffic, are also presented in a tabular form at the end of this report.)

 The noise contours were generated using a mathematical model developed by the Federal Highway Administration ("Traffic Noise Model," FHWA-EP-02-031, April 2004). The Traffic Noise Model (TNM) model uses traffic volume, vehicle mix, average vehicle speed, roadway geometry, and sound propagation path characteristics to predict hourly A-weighted Leq values adjacent to a road. Vehicle mix is reported in terms of the number of automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks. The truck categories are defined in the TNM model by number of axles and weight. In order to compute a CNEL value for roadways the hourly data for a 24 hour period are used according to the CNEL formula. Vehicle distribution over the 24 hour day must be known, i.e., the percent of vehicles in the daytime a.m.). The mix of automobiles, medium trucks and heavy trucks has an effect on noise levels. The assumption used to model noise is based on known traffic mix data. For arterial roadways the vehicle mix data are obtained from mix data collected by the County of Orange during extensive surveys of 53 intersections within the County. This survey is the most comprehensive conducted in Southern California and is considered representative for the vast majority of arterial highways in this area. The arterial roadway mix data are provided in period (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.), evening period (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) and night period (10 p.m. to 7 Table 2.







#### Table 2 **Arterial Roadway Vehicle Mix Data**  (Traffic distribution per time of day in percent of Average Daily Traffic – ADT)

 Caltrans conducts periodic traffic counts on freeways and publishes them on the internet (<www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata>/). The various truck percentages reported by Caltrans were used for the projections.

 The Union Pacific Railroad line handles three types of train in the Glendale area; Metrolink, Amtrak, and freight. In terms of noise Metrolink is the dominant noise source. Published train schedules were consulted and it was determined that 64 Metrolink trains run through Glendale each day. Two Amtrak trains are currently scheduled each day. Representatives from Union Pacific Railroad were contacted and no precise numbers of daily freight train operations could be provided, however on those discussions and our observations, we estimated that 10 freight trains pass through each day. According to Metrolink representatives, by the year 2030 ninety-six (96) Metrolink trains are anticipated each day. There are no plans to increase Amtrak trains at this time. Freight train usage was increased to 15 trains per day. These data were used to generate the train noise contours included in Exhibit 11 and 12.

 Noise contours represent lines of equal noise exposure, just as the contour lines on a topographic map are lines of equal elevation. The contours shown on the map are the 60, 65 and 70 dB CNEL noise level. The noise contours presented can be used as a guide for land use planning. The 60 CNEL contour defines the Noise Referral Zone. This is the noise level for which noise considerations should be included when making land use policy decisions.

 The contours presented in this report are a graphic representation of the noise environment. These distances to contour values are also shown in tabulated format in the appendix. Topography and intervening buildings or barriers have a very complex effect on the

 propagation of noise. To present a worst case estimate, the topographic affect is not included in these contours to present a worst case projection. Exhibit 11 presents the CNEL noise contours for existing conditions and Exhibit 12 presents estimated contours for 25 years in the future (2030).

 Exhibits 11 and 12 also show the land uses in the City of Glendale. Residential land uses are considered noise sensitive and can be identified by the key on the exhibit. Residential land use identifiers all begin with the letter "R" (e.g., R-1250).

# APPENDIX

# Traffic Noise Contours



































