

[Comment-I16]
Comments from Terhesa Gamboa

I16

From: [Vallejo, Philip@DOT](mailto:Vallejo_Philip@DOT)
To: [Lugo, Jennifer@DOT](mailto:Lugo_Jennifer@DOT)
Subject: FW: SR 132 Comments
Date: Friday, March 17, 2017 1:38:04 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Terhesa Gamboa [<mailto:terhesa@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 1:00 PM
To: Vallejo, Philip@DOT <philip.vallejo@dot.ca.gov>
Subject: SR 132 Comments

Dear Mr. Vallejo,

Please accept my comments in regard to SR 132 West Freeway Expansion.

I strongly object to the SR 132 West Freeway Expansion on behalf of the Woodland West Community Neighborhood as described in the EIR Draft Document. This project will have a severe negative impact on the south west part of the neighborhood. We will have increased noise and pollution from the project. The project should be below grade along the entire length of the neighborhood from west of Morse Road to Rosemore to mitigate the negative impact. Some kind of barrier will need to be added to the plans for aesthetics, noise and safety. To suggest that the project will have minimal impact with not even a sound wall is ludicrous. It seems cost is a factor in this decision which is entirely unacceptable. Bringing truck traffic to an otherwise quiet neighborhood at grade level will no doubt have an adverse impact and should be considered. The project could and should be an asset to the neighborhood and not a detriment.

1

At this time, I support the “No Build” option until details that adversely affect the Woodland West Community Neighborhood can be solved for the greater good of the neighborhood.

2

Sincerely,

Terhesa Gamboa
2608 Albion Way,
Modesto, CA 96358

[Response-I16]
Responses to Comments from Terhesa Gamboa

Thank you for your comments.

I16-1 Please see Master Response #11 (Noise Impacts and Abatement), and refer to Section 2.2.7 (Noise) of the EIR/EA.

The SR 132 new alignment from approximately North Carpenter Road to Mercy Drive would be constructed below grade (lower than the residential dwellings). The depressed portion of the alignment would essentially preserve the existing visual quality of south-facing views for Kansas Avenue and North Rosemore Avenue residents and local motorists. Overall, the visual impact of a depressed new alignment crossing under North Rosemore Avenue would change some of the visual elements. If soundwalls are required, they could have more visual impact than a see-through rail-type barrier and would be less consistent with the existing rural character of the Agricultural landscape unit. Views of open land in the middle ground would be replaced with views of an improved North Rosemore Avenue with curb and gutter, sidewalks, pavement striping, striped bicycle lane, and a see-through railing-type barrier. Views of agricultural landscape character would be replaced with urban residential street character. However, with mitigation, the changes would not be enough to change the overall visual quality, and impacts would be considered less than significant. Visual quality for Viewshed #1 would remain as moderate.

The noise analysis for the barrier in this area (Barrier C) is shown in Appendix C of the 2016 Noise Study Report. Noise Barrier C was evaluated for feasibility but would not meet the minimum noise reduction of 7 decibels to meet the reasonable noise reduction design goal. Additional noise barriers to reduce the traffic noise levels of other nearby roadways would not be feasible due to access requirements, which would require openings in barriers as discussed above. Therefore, a noise barrier would not be considered reasonable for receivers in Area 3.

I16-2 Your preference for the No-Build Alternative is noted and has been included in the public record. The Woodland West Community neighborhood would not be adversely affected by the two build alternatives due to the following design features and avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

5, 2017. The Federal Highway Administration concurrence letter can be found in Appendix I. While mobile source air toxic emissions would occur as a result of future increases in vehicles miles traveled, as discussed in Section 2.26 (Air Quality) of the EIR/EA, emissions are estimated to be lower than if the project were not completed and would likely be lower than present emissions as a result of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's national control programs, which are intended to lower mobile source air toxic emissions. At the regional level, the 2014 Stanislaus County Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) has been developed to increase transit ridership, reduce the percentage of congested lane miles, and maintain greenhouse gas emissions per capita, as compared with the business-as-usual scenario.

Master Response #11 (Noise Impacts and Abatement)

Per 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 772 and Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects (May 2011) ("Protocol"), noise abatement must be considered for all impacted receptors. Noise abatement, in this case via the use of noise barriers, is recommended if it meets both the feasible and reasonable criteria. Each noise barrier considered (in this case, a soundwall) has been evaluated for feasibility based on constructability and an achievable noise reduction of at least 5 A-weighted decibels. For each noise barrier found to be acoustically feasible, the noise barriers were evaluated for reasonableness based on cost allowances and the noise reduction design goal of 7 A-weighted decibels at one or more benefitted receivers. Noise impacts were evaluated along the entire length of the project alignment to determine where noise abatement (e.g., barriers) would be acoustically feasible and reasonable to include as part of the design. At each location, barriers were modeled up to 16 feet tall.

A preliminary noise abatement design for each barrier and a range of barrier heights have been evaluated for feasibility and reasonableness allowances as described in the Protocol. Several evaluated noise barriers were found to provide at least 5 decibels (dB) of noise reduction at affected noise-sensitive receivers in the study area, as listed below:

- Area 3 – North of the proposed SR 132 expressway alignment, between North Dakota Avenue and North Carpenter Road, under both of the build alternatives
- Area 4 – South of the proposed SR 132 expressway alignment, east of North Carpenter Road, to areas west of SR 99, north of L Street, under both of the build alternatives
- Area 7 – East of SR 99, between North Washington Street and North Franklin Street, under both of the build alternatives

Some evaluated noise barriers were found not to be feasible, due to access restrictions or the failure of the barrier to achieve a minimum of 5 dB of noise reduction at affected receivers. Noise barriers were found not to be feasible for the following areas:

- Area 1 – SR 132 (Maze Boulevard) from the project western terminus to Garrison Avenue and areas west of North Dakota Avenue, including SR 132 (Maze Boulevard), under both of the build alternatives
- Area 2 – South of the proposed SR 132 expressway alignment, between North Dakota Avenue and North Carpenter Road, under both of the build alternatives
- Area 5 – North of the proposed SR 132 alignment, between North Carpenter Road and North Emerald Avenue, under both of the build alternatives
- Area 6 – North of the proposed SR 132 alignment, between North Emerald Avenue and SR 99 under both of the build alternatives
- Area 8 – West of SR 99, between L Street and the southern project terminus, under both of the build alternatives
- Area 9 – East of SR 99, between L Street and the southern project terminus, under both of the build alternatives

In Noise Analysis Areas 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9, impacted receivers would require driveway access to local roadways. Openings in noise barriers for driveways or intersecting streets reduce the effectiveness of barriers, making the noise barriers acoustically infeasible. In addition, for Noise Analysis Areas 3, 6, and 7, the noise barriers do not meet the minimum 5 dB of noise reduction. Therefore, noise barriers are not considered to be feasible noise abatement options for receivers in these areas.

In one location, Area 4, Caltrans intends to incorporate noise abatement in the form of a barrier (Noise Barrier D). This barrier is proposed on the south side of the proposed new alignment and east of North Carpenter Road, continuing on the west side of the frontage road along SR 99 between the proposed SR 132/SR 99 interchange and the L Street crossing. The barrier meets the noise reduction design goal of 7 A-weighted decibels at one or more benefitted receivers and meets the reasonable cost allowance for noise abatement. The barrier for Alternative 1 would be approximately 6,390 feet long with an average height of 14 feet. Calculations based on preliminary design data show that the barrier would reduce noise levels by 5 to 13 decibels (7 decibels for at least one receptor) for 121 residences at a cost of \$6,494,796. The barrier for

Alternative 2 would be approximately 7,760 feet long with an average height of 14 feet. Calculations based on preliminary design data show that the barrier would reduce noise levels by 5 to 17 decibels (7 decibels for at least one receptor) for 171 residences at a cost of \$8,544,536. In Phase 1, a portion of Noise Barrier D would be constructed along the proposed new alignment under either build alternative. The other section of the proposed barrier would be constructed in Phase 2 along SR 99. An existing noise barrier along SR 99 would tie into the proposed noise barrier along the new alignment in Phase 2. Therefore, the noise barriers would provide attenuation in the interim between Phase 1 and Phase 2.

During construction of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area of construction. No adverse noise impacts from construction are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-8. Please refer to Section 2.2.7 (Noise) of the EIR/EA.