CONFEDERATION LINE EXTENSION PROJECT

COMMUNITY NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (DRAFT)

West Extension Connaught Park Area

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 REGULATIONS, STANDARDS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OTHER APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	1
3.0 CRITERIA	2
3.1 Operational Noise Impact Criteria	2
3.1.1 LRT and Road Activity	
4.0 METHODOLOGY	3
4.1 Noise Modelling	
4.2 Operational Noise Impact	
4.2.1 LRT, Bus Loops, and Road Activity	
5.0 POINTS OF RECEPTION	
6.0 NOISE SOURCES	
6.1 Road Traffic	
6.2 Rail Traffic	
7.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
7.1 Background Measurements and Traffic Model Prediction Validation	
7.2 Predicted Future Road + Rail Noise Levels	
8.0 MITIGATION MEASURES	
8.1 Barrier Investigation	
9.0 CONCLUSIONS	
9.1 Background Noise Validation	
10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	5
APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Locations of the Representative Noise Receptors	6
Appendix B - Model Inputs	
Appendix C - Measured Receptors	8
LIST OF TABLES	
Table 3-1: Summary of Criteria to Warrant Noise Mitigation Investigation	2
Table 3-2: Feasibility Constraints to be Achieved before Barrier Implementation	3
Table 4-1: Steps Taken for Noise Control Assessment	2
Table 6-1: Wheel Squeal Locations Summary	3
Table 7-1: A Comparison between Field Measurements and Model Results	
Table 7-2: Future Sound Levels Evaluation	5
Table 8-1: Feasibility of Investigated Acoustic Barriers	5
Table B-1: Road Traffic Inputs	
Table B-2: Rail Inputs	7

DISCLAIMER

This document is composed of excerpts relevant to the Connaught Park area from the following report:

EWC Designers (EJV). Confederation Line Extension West Extension - Community Noise Impact
Assessment (Rev 4). Report # EJV-SOGENW-ENV-RPT-0001, dated 6/02/21

THIS DOCUMENT IS A PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY AND HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED OR APPROVED BY THE CITY OF OTTAWA.

This document is not to be considered the final report, and all information contained herein is subject to change upon further review by the City of Ottawa.



1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Noise Impact Assessment was prepared to demonstrate compliance with the Environmental Obligations for the development of the Confederation Line Extension (CLE) program.

This assessment analyses the operational noise impact of the West LRT Extension, which extends from Tunney's Pasture Station to Moodie LMSF and Algonquin Station to the Lincoln Fields merger.

Note that the operational vibration, the construction noise and the construction vibration are analyzed in separate reports.

As part of this undertaking, a Community Impact Study of the project is required to meet the requirements of the City of Ottawa's Environmental Noise Control Guidelines and the CLE Project Agreement (PA) - Schedule 17, United States Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Standards, as well as the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Guidelines.

This report documents the noise impact on the representative and sensitive receptors surrounding the project West alignment. Aerial images and zoning maps were analyzed. Field measurements were conducted to validate the acoustic model and to establish a project noise baseline.

Acoustic impact models of the project were developed to predict the noise impact of the project on the surrounding community.

2.0 REGULATIONS, STANDARDS, SPECIFICATIONS AND OTHER APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

This section lists documents, applicable regulations, standards, and specifications for the noise impact assessment.

- [1] City of Ottawa, Confederation Line Extension Project Agreement Schedule 17, 2019
- [2] City of Ottawa, Environmental Noise Control Guidelines, January 2016
- [3] City of Ottawa, Bylaw No. 2013-14
- [4] Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, Environmental Noise Guideline, Stationary and Transportation Sources Approval and Planning (Publication NPC-300), August 2013
- [5] United States Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual, September 2018
- [6] United States Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model (TMN), January 2006
- [7] ISO 1996-2, Acoustics Description, Measurement and Assessment of Environmental Noise Part 2: Determination of Sound Pressure Levels, July 2017
- [8] Ontario Provincial Standard Specification Construction Specification for Noise Barrier Systems, (OPSS 760), November 2014.

- [9] EWC, RFI Rationale for employing US Traffic Model (TNM 2.5) over the Ontario Road Noise Analysis Method for Environment and Transportation (ORNAMENT), EJV-SOGENR-ENV-MEM-0001, October 2019
- [10] EWC, Noise Emission Analysis of Tunnel Ventilation Fans, EJV-S2CGPW-ACO-MEM-1001
- [11] EWC, Stations Passenger Modelling Design Assumptions Report, EJV-SOGENR-COD-RPT-0001
- [12] ST2, Noise and Vibration Assessment Ottawa Light Rail Transit (Stage 2), Revision 0, January 2017
- [13] EWC, Lincoln Fields Station Acoustics Design Report, EJV-S1STLI-ACO-RPT-1001

3.0 CRITERIA

3.1 Operational Noise Impact Criteria

3.1.1 LRT and Road Activity

The operational noise impact criteria shall follow the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines [2]. The guidelines define the representative receptor as an outdoor living area being 3.0 m from the centre of a dwelling unit, and 1.5m above ground level.

Table 3-1 below identifies the transportation noise emission criteria

Table 3-1: Summary of Criteria to Warrant Noise Mitigation Investigation (from City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines [2])

Future Sound Level, L _{eq,16} (07:00 – 23:00)	Change Above Ambient [dB]	Impact Rating	Mitigation
Less than or equal to 55 dBA	N/A	N/A	
	0-3	Not generally noticeable	None required
Greater than 55 dBA and less	3-5	Generally noticeable	
than or equal to 60 dBA	5-10	Significant	
	10+	Very Significant	Investigate noise control
	0-3	Not generally noticeable	measures and mitigate to
Greater than 60 dBA	3-5	Generally noticeable	achieve retrofit criteria (min.
Greater than 60 GBA	5-10	Significant	attenuation of 6 dB)
	10+	Very Significant	

It should be noted that the objective for outdoor sound level is the higher of the Leq,16-hr 55 dBA or the Leq,16-hr ambient level that may prevail at the start of project construction (referred to as the established ambient) [2]. Therefore, if it is demonstrated that future noise levels will not exceed existing noise levels, provided levels do not exceed 60 dBA, investigation into noise controls is not required.

Where mitigation is deemed worth investigating, the final proposed noise barrier must achieve Administrative, Technical, and Economic feasibility for it to be implemented. The definition of each feasibility type is described in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2: Feasibility Constraints to be Achieved before Barrier Implementation

Feasibility Type	Definition
Administrative	 The barrier must be capable of being positioned on the right of way with a minimum 0.3m clearance to the property line¹ Noise barriers must be installed in a continuous line, though openings may be considered for access to fire hydrants.
Technical	 Barrier must be no less than 100m in length² Barrier must provide a loss of 6 dB when averaged over the first row of points of reception Barrier must be a minimum of 2.5m tall with a maximum of 3m for roads and 5m for freeways³
Economic	Cost must be less than \$100,000 ⁴ per protected (>=6 dB noise reduction) dwelling employing an estimated cost of \$550/m ² .

4.0 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Noise Modelling

It is noted in City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines Part 4 [2] that ORNAMENT (Ontario Road Noise Analysis Method for Environment and Transportation) and STEAM (Sound from Trains Environment Analysis Method) are the preferred prediction methods for determining the impact of noise from road and rail sources respectively. However, under City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines Part 4, section 3.5 [2], the City supports the preparation of noise contour mapping and encourages its submission where possible. Project Agreement – Schedule 17, section 8.5 (c) [1] permits an alternative and equivalent method of assessment.

As a result, noise modeling was completed using the CadnaA environmental noise prediction software by Datakustik. The model employed the US Federal Highway Association (US FHWA) Traffic Noise Model version 2.5 (TNM 2.5) to predict road traffic noise, the US Federal Transit Administration (US FTA) model to predict rail noise, and ISO 9613-2 to predict stationary source noise emissions. The CadnaA modeling software package employing the TNM, FTA, and ISO 9613-2 calculation methods allow for the production of noise contour mapping.

In order to satisfy the Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guideline [2] requirement for ORNAMENT calculations, a memo containing justification for the use of TNM 2.5 as a replacement for ORNAMENT was completed [9].

Inputs to the noise model shall follow the hierarchy:

• Latest design Inputs from the EJV Design Team

¹ This is a requirement under the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines Part 5, Section 3.3.2 Barrier Design [2]. It is directed to developers requiring to place barriers at a minimum distance of 0.3m from the City right of way. The same criterion was carried forward for defining administrative feasibility.

² This is a requirement under the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines Part 3, Section 3.1[2].

³ 2.5m - 3m is the preferred barrier height range outlined in the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines Part 3, Section 4.1 Acoustic Barrier Design [2]. A 5m maximum is outlined in OPSS 760 Designer Action/Considerations [8]

⁴ This \$100,000 threshold is industry standard. Projects that used and documented this threshold in their analysis assessments include 407 Transitway - Kennedy to Brock Road and Highway 404 Extension - East Gwillimbury.

- Inputs outlined in the Project Agreement
- Inputs outlined in the Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guideline [2]
- Other sources (City of Ottawa published traffic, Ontario standards, Federal Standards, best practice international standards)

The following general assumptions are made for all noise models:

- Study area
 - o 250 m from the right of way of the LRT⁵
- Ground Characteristics
 - Include ground topography
 - o Ground absorption of 0.5
- Shielding Effects
 - Existing Berms
 - Existing Housing
 - Existing Barriers
- Underground segments do not have a community airborne noise impact, and therefore, are not modelled

4.2 Operational Noise Impact

4.2.1 LRT, Bus Loops, and Road Activity

The following noise scenarios were modeled:

- Existing Road Traffic Model
- Future Build: Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model (All Sources)
- Future Build: Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model with proposed noise controls

The above scenarios were compared as summarized in Table 4-1 below.

⁵ As noted in Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guideline, Part 1, section 2.1 [2]

Table 4-1: Steps Taken for Noise Control Assessment

No	Description	Purpose	Design Action
1	Compare Existing Road Traffic Model against Baseline Measurements	Validate Acoustic Model is a reasonable approximation to measured levels	Compare the measured 16-hr L _{eq} 6 day, 8-hr L _{eq} night, and 24-hr L _{eq} to the equivalent modeled results.
			 0-3 dB difference – good 3-5 dB difference – fair > 5 dB difference – poor
2	Compare Future Build Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model (All Sources) against Noise Criteria	Identify receptors that: Exceed 60 dBA	Investigate noise controls for these receptors
3.	Compare Future Build Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model (All Sources) against Existing Road Traffic Model	Identify receptors where: Build levels are between 55 dBA and 60 dBA, and; Build levels exceed Existing preconstruction levels by at least 5 dB	Investigate noise controls for these receptors
4.	Compare Future Build Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model against Future Build Road and OLRT Rail Traffic Model with barriers	Demonstrate barrier feasibility: Technical feasibility Administrative feasibility Economic feasibility	Size barriers to achieve compliance with project noise criteria

The following general assumptions are made:

Road Traffic

- o Future Volumes are calculated using annual increase values from the Project Agreement
- Speed is the design speed where available, otherwise it is the posted speed limit
- Percentage Medium and Heavy Trucks as per Ottawa guidelines
- Road surfaces as smooth asphalt

LRT Traffic

- Constant vehicle speed (no slowing at stations)
- Noise emitted to train noise reverberation is included. This was calculated using a reverberant noise model (RAP ONE) using tunnel geometry. The resulting levels from the reverberant model were used as an input in the Cadna/A model at the tunnel portals.

Bus Loops

 Noise impacts due to station related noise, including bus loops, are assessed in their respective station acoustic reports.

Receptor evaluation will follow the most conservative criteria: receptors will be placed at a height of 4.5m (or worst-case elevation for multi-storey dwellings) and nighttime levels will be evaluated.

⁶ The minimum measured nighttime 1-hour Leq represents the quietest periods where the noise environment is dominated by steady noises (traffic) and is the most representative of the road noise model.

5.0 POINTS OF RECEPTION

Refer to **Appendix A** to identify locations of the representative noise receptors.

6.0 NOISE SOURCES

6.1 Road Traffic

A complete list of modeled road segments identifying the day-night volume splits, percentage, truck percentage, speed, and road conditions for each scenario is listed in **Appendix B**.

6.2 Rail Traffic

All above-ground rail was modelled. Model input details for each segment volume, day-night volume splits, and speed are listed in **Appendix B**. In accordance with the US FTA railway noise prediction guidelines, sections of track within 300 ft (91 m) of jointed track are modelled with a 5 dB penalty to account for noise generated by turnout and crossover. Further, a 4 dB penalty was applied to aerial portions of the guideway. Wheel squeal penalties were applied to curves with less than 1,000 ft in radius. Table 6-1 identified the locations where wheel squeal was applied. The Sound Exposure Level (SEL) of 136 dBA was selected as per the FTA. This SEL was adjusted to account for the total squeal event time over a 16-hour period, based on train speeds, curve lengths, and train volumes.

Table 6-1: Wheel Squeal Locations Summary

Chainage					
Start	End				
57+721.99	57+793.79				
62+658.74	62+834.38				
37+719.87	37+793.84				
42+656.83	42+828.15				
93+446.15	93+727.52				
83+448.7	83+741.04				

Radiated train noise from tunnels was included as part of this assessment. Levels at the portals were predicted based on RAP-ONE reverberant calculations. These levels were then used as inputs in the CadnaA model.

A comparison between Alston train emissions and the FTA base LRV train emissions was undertaken. As per the Stage 2 Noise and Vibration Assessment dated January 2017 [12] (hereafter Stage 2 Report), Alstom provided LRV noise emission data indicating a maximum pass-by sound level of 80 dBA Lmax at 15 m and 70 km/h. Based on the FTA equation F-3, this is equivalent to a reference SEL of 83 dBA at 15 m and 80 km/h. The modelled train consists of the FTA 'AGT' with a reference SEL of 80 dBA at 15 m at 80 km/h. This SEL was bumped-up by 3 dB using the 'Train Classes and Penalty' feature in the Cadna/A rail object.

Conservatively, train speeds were modelled as 100 km/h throughout.

7.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 Background Measurements and Traffic Model Prediction Validation

Table 7-1 lists baseline measurements and the acoustic model results employing existing AADT traffic counts along the CLE east extension (Refer **Appendix C** for measure receptor). The 16-hr day, 8-hr night, minimum 1-hr night, and 24-hr Leq are compared. Typically, these metrics compare best between a 48-hr measurement and a background model based on AADT traffic counts. The following differences between measured and model results identifies the level measurement to model correlation:

- 3 dB or less = Good
- 3-5 dB = Fair
- >5 dB = Poor

The CadnaA model tended to underpredict the actual noise levels. In most cases, this is expected to be due to unquantifiable noise sources near the receptor that are significant but not modelled, or a result of traffic variation during the measurement period that was not consistent with the AADT used in the model.

In other cases where a poor correlation exists between the model and measured results, there is generally an unmodelled local road which may explain the model underprediction. These local roads were not modelled due to the unavailability of reliable traffic data. Such receptors are often a significant distance away from major noise sources such as Highway 417, increasing the relative significance of local noise sources.

Table 7-1: A Comparison between Field Measurements and Model Results

Monitored		Noise Level (L _{eq} , dBA)									
Location	В	Baseline Measurements Modeled Results Difference									
ID	Day	Night	Night	24-hr	Day	Night	24-hr	Day	Night	Night	24-hr
	(16 իք)	(8 <u>hr</u>)	(1 hr)		(16 իր)	(8 <u>hr</u> and1 <u>hr</u>)		(16 իք)	(8 իր)	(1 hr)	
QUEEN01	57	54	50	57	56	48	54	-1	-6	-2	-3

7.2 Predicted Future Road + Rail Noise Levels

Table 7-2 details the predicted Leq noise levels at each representative Outdoor Living Area (OLA) during the 16-hour daytime and 8-hour nighttime as required by the City's noise guideline. Existing [A] levels are based on current, pre-construction road conditions. The predicted Build (All Sources) [B] levels includes existing major roads, future operations of the Hwy 417 road modifications, and the new West LRT extension, as well as radiated train noise from tunnels.

Where daytime Build (All Sources) [B] levels exceed 60 dBA, barriers are investigated. Where daytime Build (All Sources) [B] levels are between 55 dBA and 60 dBA, barriers are investigated if the difference between the Build (All Sources) [B] and Existing [A] case is at least 5 dB.

Table 7-2: Future Sound Levels Evaluation

	Existi	ing [A]		Build (All Sources) Future Leg (16hr) Evaluation		Build (All Sources)			Future Leg (16hr) Evaluation			
Representative	D	Night	Roa	Roadway LRV		RV	Overa	II [B]				Bar ID.
Receptor ID	Day (dBA)	Night (dBA)	Day (dBA)	Night (dBA)	Day (dBA)	Night (dBA)	Day (dBA)	Night (dBA)	> 60 dBA?	> 60 dBA? [B]-[A]	Investigation	Bai iB.
W_RR_35	52	44	55	44	61	54	62	54	Y	10	✓	BW19
W_RR_36	57	49	57	49	63	58	64	58	Y	7	✓	BW19
W_RR_41	57	50	56	50	62	56	63	57	Y	6	✓	BW18
W_RR_42	56	49	57	50	59	52	61	54	Υ	5	✓	BW18

8.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

8.1 Barrier Investigation

As documented in Table 7-2, exceedances at receivers (beyond those explicitly required under the project agreement) were identified. Subsequently, mitigation for each of these receptors was reviewed using the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines feasibility criteria (as summarized in Table 3-2)

Table 8-1 lists all investigated noise barriers and identifies barriers that achieve the City's feasibility criteria.

Table 8-1: Feasibility of Investigated Acoustic Barriers

Barrier ID	Approx. Start	Approx. End	Modelled Length (m)	Modelled Height (m)	No. Rec. Protected	Avg. Reduction (dB)	Cost / Rec.	Feasibility (and reason for non- feasibility, if applicable)
BW05	93+000	93+300	368	5	0	2	N/A	Not Feasible (Tech.)
BW18	83+400	83+400	277	5	0	2	N/A	Not Feasible (Tech.)
BW19	43+100	43+700	663	5	0	3	N/A	Not Feasible (Tech.)

As noted in Table 3-2 and the City of Ottawa Environmental Noise Control Guidelines, barriers achieving an average 6 dB of mitigation are deemed technically feasible.

As noted in Table 3-2, a noise barrier is deemed economically feasible if it costs \$100,000 or less per protected receiver. This cost is calculated based on noise barrier surface area multiplied by a cost of \$550 per m2, divided by the number of protected receivers.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

9.1 Background Noise Validation

There is a good level of confidence that the model is capable of accurately predicting future noise levels arising from the upgraded road and new rail activities. Furthermore, the model results can be relied upon to verify the feasibility of the barriers proposed to mitigate noise levels for areas of interest within the surrounding community.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

No recommendations were provided for noise mitigation in the Connaught Park area.

APPENDIX A - LOCATIONS OF THE REPRESENTATIVE NOISE RECEPTORS



APPENDIX B - MODEL INPUTS

Table B-1: Road Traffic Inputs

Road Name	Current Traffic Counts (Hourly)		Future Traffic Counts - With project (Hourly)		% of Heavy Vehicles		Speed Limit
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	(km/h)
Queensway 416 to Richmond E	8257	1436	10327	1796	8.5	8.5	100
Queensway 416 to Richmond W	8257	1436	10327	1796	8.5	8.5	100

Table 10-2: Rail Inputs

Rail	Traffic	Volume	Train Length (m)	Speed Limit (km/h)
Segment	Day	Night		
All Lines	318	63	107	100

APPENDIX C - MEASURED RECEPTORS

