From: Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov
To: Spurgeon@pbworld.com
CC: Miyamoto, Faith; Hogan@pbworld.com; Renee.Marler@dot.gov; Christopher.VanWyk@dot.gov; elizabeth.zelasko@dot.gov; Carl.Bausch1111@dot.gov; WolfS@pbworld.com; NancyEllen.Zusman@dot.gov
Sent: 5/21/2010 6:06:41 AM
Subject: RE: Honolulu Noise Analysis

Lawrence:

Thanks for your response. I am surprised that it came from you and not from Steven Wolf, who is listed in the List of Preparers as the acoustics expert for the project. Please delete him from that List if he was not directly involved, and please delete any other PB person or subcontractor from the list who wasn't directly involved in the FEIS work. I am not an attorney, but it seems to me as a NEPA person that PB ought to review its corporate practices in this regard.

I had already looked at the noise technical report and it provides no more analysis on these matters than is in the draft of the FEIS. None of the details in your note below are provided in either document, but even if they were, the yard analysis would still be unacceptable.

For noise, FTA expects the use of the Detailed Noise Analysis in Chapter 6 of our noise manual to support the mitigation commitments in an FEIS. For the preferred maintenance and storage yard site, the analysis must take into account the topography, the ambient noise at the receptor, the wheel squeal from track curves (there is one very close to the College), and the distance to the nearest noise sensitive receptor (i.e., classroom). This is not a handwaving exercise, it is an analysis.

Regarding the TPSSs, the commitment to design them to meet the state regulation regarding the noise level at the property line in your note below is acceptable, but I cannot find it in the noise section of the document. Please put it in as a firm mitigation commitment. Distinguish where the state requirement is 45 dBA and where it is 50 dBA and indicate which of the TPSSs must and will meet the lower level and which will meet the 50 dBA level.

Thanks again.

Joe Ossi
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
(202) 366-1613

From: Spurgeon, Lawrence [mailto:Spurgeon@pbworld.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 10:36 PM
To: Ossi, Joseph (FTA)
Cc: Miyamoto, Faith; Hogan, Steven
Subject: FW: Honolulu Noise Analysis

Aloha Joe,

The noise analysis was based on the design and location of the facilities. If you do not have the noise and vibration technical report that was done to support the EIS, you may download it from the project website at:

http://www.honolulutransit.org/library/files/noise%20and%20vibration.pdf

Page 5-13 discusses the assessment for the Maintenance and storage and traction-power facilities. The design has progressed since the technical report was completed.

The "Option 2" maintenance and storage site is the preferred option. The site is in an industrial zone (Figure 4-2 in the EIS). As noted, it is 700 feet from the nearest sensitive use. Only Category 3 sites are near the facility. While that distance is between the noise assessment screening distances for obstructed and unobstructed situations (650 and 1,000 feet), and the site is only partially obstructed, the combination of existing highway noise (65 dBA Leq at Leeward Community College), rolling topography, and that the nearest instructional building being the engineering trades building, which is the automotive technology garage area, lead us to the determination that there would be no impact.

For the traction power sub-stations, since completing the noise report, the TPSS have been designed to be fully enclosed. State noise regulations require stationary sources to meet a property-line maximum sound level of either 45 or 50 dBA at night. The TPSS buildings will be designed to meet this requirement. All TPSS will be inside of buildings. The greatest exterior noise will be air conditioning systems. All of the TPSS sites near residential areas are sited at major highways or arterials, where air-conditioning equipment noise will not be audible over background traffic noise.

From: Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov [mailto:Joseph.Ossi@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 2:34 PM
To: Wolf, Steven (Orange)
Subject: Honolulu Noise Analysis

Steven:
I cannot find what noise analysis was done, if any, to decide that there are no noise impacts at the rail maintenance facility near the Leeward Community College. Was this issue simply dismissed or was there an analysis? Also what analysis determined that the traction power stations will not have any noise impacts?

Whatever information you can impart to enlighten us on noise questions would be greatly appreciated.
Thanks.
Joe Ossi
FTA Office of Planning and Environment
(202) 366-1613

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.