



El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee

APAC 2021 Board

John Davey, Chair jdavey@daveygroup.net

John Raslear, Vice Chair jrazzpub@sbcglobal.net

Timothy White, Vice Chair tjwhitejd@gmail.com

Brooke Washburn, Secretary washburn_bew@yahoo.com

1021 Harvard Way, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

<https://edhapac.org>

APAC White Rock Noise Committee Second Recommendation for an updated study.

Over the past 14+ years the communities adjacent to the proposed White Rock segment of the JPA Connector have expressed their environmental concerns about the expansion of that road.

The communities of Four Seasons, Stonebriar, Sierra Monte, Shadow Hills, and Spring Field Meadows have formed a subcommittee of the El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee to study the increased noise levels stemming from the future JPA SE Connector Project, specifically Segment D3/E1. Segment E1 is from County line to Latrobe Road.

This subcommittee's review of the Original JPA NSR (Noise Study Report), has concluded that the existing NSR is in need of updating.

Dokken Engineering, JPA Connector's engineering firm, replied to that request indicating an undated to this original study was not needed.

APAC Subcommittee Reply to JPA Connector:

We have reviewed your *“Response to El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee (APAC) White Rock Road Noise Study Report (NSR) Subcommittee Review”* provided to us on May 5th, 2021 and still believe it is flawed. NOTE: Dokken Engineering was the firm that the JPA used to develop responses.

Below, we provide some our reasoning why we feel our concerns remain unanswered!

Initially, with the existing White Rock Road, which is a lower speed 2-lane rural road being widened into a 4-lane high speed facility, our concerns were based on rule-of-thumbs for noise of:

- Doubling of traffic results in a 3 dba minimum increase
 - o 2 additional through traffic lanes are being added to existing 2 through lanes cross-section
- Reducing distance by 1/2 from noise emitter to noise receptor results in a 3 dba minimum increase
 - o With the addition of 2 through traffic lanes, traffic will be moving at least 24-feet closer to property on the north side of White Rock

OVERALL: The NSR actually shows an **equal or reduction in dba's for noise receptors in the above modeled FUTURE conditions** for the “existing” development along White Rock (receptors 1-8) of 53-62 dba's, however, for the receptors of the new Folsom Ranch, dba's are shown to increase up to 57-75 dba's.

How can there be an increase (substantial) in dba's on segment D3 (Prarie City Road to EDH County Line) but not E1 (EDH County line to Latrobe)?

Subsequently, in looking a little more at the NSR data and even various Dokken responses, the responses are still not in sync with required criteria of FHWA's 23 Code of Federal Regulations 772 (23 CFR 772) including: (Note: below, we repeated our previous provided questions as Dokken did not respond to them adequately based on accepted noise criteria)

APAC #1 - *Use speed of 55 mph for proposed facility to predict build-out, worst-case (level-of service (LOS) C) alternative vs the 40-mph used for modeling*

APAC's comment was based on the FHWA's 23 CFR 772 - Sec. 772.17 (b) Traffic noise prediction which states, “In predicting noise levels and assessing noise impacts, traffic characteristics which will yield the **worst hourly traffic noise impact** on a regular basis **for the design year shall be used**”.

APAC's suggested action is that a level-of-service (LOS) C traffic be used for predicted future (worst case) free-flow traffic which equates to a total 1,400 PM plus peak hour traffic vs the 810 – 1,300 (Table 3.5) shown in the NSR. This traffic

is based on the AASHTO Green Book. Also, the posted future speed of 55 mph needs to be used for future modeling vs the existing 40 mph that was used.

APAC #2 - *Following NSR NEPA requirements for addressing project impacts: the existing traffic studies need to be projected out to at least 2050 vs the 2035.*

APAC's comment was based on FHWA's 23 CFR 772 - Sec. 772.5 Definitions (a) which states "Design year. The **future year** used to estimate the probable traffic volume for which a highway is designed. A time, **10 to 20 years, from the start of construction** is usually used".

APAC's suggested action is that based on El Dorado County present adopted 2020 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the project will not start construction until approximately mid-to late 2039. Therefore, year 2049 – 2059 updated traffic volume & conditions accordingly, in line with the 23 CFR, should be used.

APAC #3 - *Proposed 4-lane cross-section thoroughfare in which traffic is moved closer to property, in some cases approximately 24-feet (especially on the north side of White Rock)*

APAC's comment was in response to Dokken saying they modeled for the 4-lane cross-section but did they model that the noise emitter is actually **moving closer** to the property receptors?

APAC's suggested action is for the noise model to be updated, taking into account the future reduced distances between noise emitter (traffic) and receptor properties.

APAC #4 - *Existing/new receptors as warranted - aka Receptor #R5 (represents 15 dwellings) is a public park which Section 4(f) – parkland protection could be invoked with new readings closer to the existing wall and useable area. #R6 – not sure location (end of a street) was selected?*

APAC's comment is based on not seeing any evidence of where the homes across from Rolling Hills Church area (north off of White Rock) are represented with noise readings? IE: what are the dba's readings in their backyards?

APAC's suggested action is to update the existing and future noise modeling to ensure it represents all homes along the entire widened White Rock Road segment, including those across from the Rolling Hills Church.

Moving ahead....

We are hopeful that proper data will be used to update the existing and future noise modeling to see if the updated modeling numbers trigger impacts per FHWA NEPA / Noise requirements as a Federal environmental “re-evaluation” will eventually be required for the project prior to its construction (if not earlier). And if so, consider moving ahead with a **separate noise wall only project** as we assume you already have the R/W and would want to give the existing property owners some noise relief/better living conditions. We are aware Caltrans has “NEPA Assignment” responsibility to receive FHWA’s federal environmental approval for the overall JPA project, therefore we will be addressing a copy of this letter to the responsible FHWA and Caltrans offices for their information

Thank You

John Raslear

CC:

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION - CALIFORNIA DIVISION
Vince Mammano, Division Administrator
650 Capitol Mall, Ste. 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814-4708

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Office of Natural Environment
Cecilia Ho - Team Leader HEPN-10
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

California Department of Transportation
Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis
ATTN: Philip J. Stolarski - Division Chief of Environmental Analysis
P.O. Box 942874, MS27
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

California Department of Transportation
Office of Local Assistance
ATTN: Bomasur Banzon - District Local Assistance Engineer
703 B Street
Marysville CA, 95901-5517