



Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart

Chapter 13 Noise Element **PC Final markup – 12-15-11**

Plan Alternative				Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				13.4 Goals		
A	B	C		N-G1. Excessive Noise. A quiet and healthful environment with limited disagreeable noise.	No specific goals in existing plan.	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			N-G2. Incompatible Land Uses. Land uses arranged and managed to reduce annoyance and complaints and minimize the exposure of community residents to excessive noise.	See alternative wording	R Straw Vote 4-2
				COMMENTS: 10-20-11 (Commissioners Edmonds and Krebs excused) <u>Straw vote:</u> Commissioners Faust, Edmonds, Gearheart prefer Alternative A/B; Commissioners Disiere and Nelson preferred Alternative C		
				COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Krebs voted to support the Alternative A/B		
		C		N-G2. Incompatible Land Uses. Land uses arranged to reduce annoyance and complaints and minimize the exposure of community residents to excessive noise.	Alt. C wording	D

Plan Alternative				Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
				<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Disiere – I vote for Alt C – I don’t know how you would “arrange and “<u>manage</u>” as stated in B. C. Nelson supports C also.</p>		
				13.4 Policies		
A	B			<p>N-P1. Minimize Noise from Stationary and Mobile Sources. Minimize stationary noise sources and noise emanating from temporary activities by applying appropriate standards for average and short-term noise levels during permit review and subsequent monitoring.</p>	<p>QJ, IM1, IM3, S3-9 </p>	R
				<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 All support B as written</p>		
				<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B</p>		
		C		<p>N-P1. Minimize Noise from Stationary and Mobile Sources. Minimize stationary noise sources and noise emanating from temporary activities by applying appropriate standards for average noise levels during permit review and subsequent monitoring.</p>	No standards for short-term noise.	D
				COMMENTS:		
		D		<p>3291(5)(B) Existing and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be reduced through land use planning, subdivision review, building code enforcement, and other administrative means.</p>	Closest related policy.	D
A	B			<p>N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning. Evaluate current noise levels and mitigate projected noise levels when making community planning and zoning decisions to minimize the exposure of community residents to nuisance noise levels. Minimize vehicular noise exposure by planning land uses compatible with transportation corridors and applying</p>	<p>Leg, IM1, IM2 S1-2, S8 </p>	R Straw Vote 4-2

Plan Alternative			Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
			noise attenuation designs and construction standards. Avoid zoning patterns that permit people to "move to the nuisance" unless mitigated through project conditions or recorded notice.		
			<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Disiere – what does "move the nuisance" mean? The example of Murphy's Market concerns me. K. Girard – you will see this directly when multi family is allowed in commercial zones. If you want to be sensitive to noise issues, you want to support A/B. if you think neighborhoods can adjust to mixed uses and increased noise, you may want to support C. C. Nelson – if you move there, and the noise is already there, you should live with the noise. If it moves in there, they should mitigate. (Civil code 3479) <u>Straw vote:</u> Commissioners Faust, Gearheart, Masten, support Alternative A/B Commissioner Disiere, Nelson supports Alternative C;</p>		
			<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B</p>		
	C		N-P2. Guide to Land Use Planning. Evaluate current noise levels and mitigate projected noise levels when making community planning and zoning decisions to minimize the exposure of community residents to nuisance noise levels. Minimize vehicular noise exposure by planning land uses compatible with transportation corridors and applying noise attenuation designs and construction standards.		D
			COMMENTS:		
A	B		N-P3. Noise from U.S. 101 and 299. The County shall support efforts to reduce noise levels on Highway 101 and 299 along sections in proximity to concentrated residential development through prioritized roadway surface maintenance, use of noise-reducing surface treatments, traffic safe tree or shrub plantings or, in cases of significant noise	Pol, IM4	R

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element			Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
			exposure; use of lower speed limits and construction of sound walls.		
			COMMENTS: all support as written.		
			COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B		
			<u>N-P4. Protection from Excessive Noise. Protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property.</u>	NEW Policy! Added by Commission on 12-15-11	M Straw Vote 6-0
			COMMENTS: (new policy added 12-15-11 - See discussion under S8) <u>N-P4. Protection from Excessive Noise. Protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property.</u> Straw vote: approved as written 6/0		
		D	3291(5)(D) Provide for periodic review and revision of the Noise Element.		D
		D	3291(5)(E) A local interagency program should be developed for the general public in the nature, extent, and solutions to noise problems in Humboldt County.		D
		D	3291(5)(F) Coordinate noise control activities with those of other responsible jurisdictions.		D

Plan Alternative			Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
		D	3291(5)(G) Identify and evaluate potential noise problem areas on a continuing basis.		D
			13.5 Standards		
A	B		N-S1. Land Use/Noise Compatibility Matrix. The Land Use/Noise Compatibility Standards(Table 13-D) shall be used as a guide to ensure compatibility of land uses. Development may occur in areas identified as “normally unacceptable” if mitigation measures can reduce indoor noise levels to “Maximum Interior Noise Levels” and outdoor noise levels to the maximum “Normally Acceptable” value for the given Land Use Category.		R
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 All support as written.		
			COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B		
		C	N- Sx. Modification or Waiver of Noise Insulation Requirements standards. Where full mitigation in accordance with the policies and standards of this Noise Element is not feasible, the Planning Commission may modify or waive such policies or standards to enable reasonable use of the property, provided that noise levels are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.		D
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 K. Girard – change the title. This allows you to waive all standards in the Noise Element. C. Disiere supports. No other support by Commissioners - delete		
			COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to delete Sx.		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
A	B		N-S2. Noise Impact Combining Zones. The 20-year projected noise contours in the Map Book Appendix and the most current Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans shall be used to identify noise impact combining zone areas to indicate where special sound insulation measures may apply.		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	N-S3. Environmental Review Process. For noise sensitive locations where noise contours do not exist, the environmental review process required by the California Environmental Quality Act shall be utilized to generate the required analysis and determine the appropriate mitigation per Plan and state standards. Future noise levels shall be predicted for a period of at least 10 years from the time of permit application.		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B		N-S4. Noise Study Requirements. When a discretionary project has the potential to generate noise levels in excess of Plan standards, a noise study together with acceptable plans to assure compliance with the standards shall be required. The noise study shall measure or model as appropriate, CNEL and Maximum Noise Level (Lmax) levels at property lines and if feasible, receptor locations. Noise studies shall be prepared by qualified individuals using calibrated equipment under currently accepted professional standards and include an analysis of the characteristics of the project in relation to noise levels, all feasible mitigations and projected noise impacts. <i>The Noise Guidebook</i> published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, or its equivalent, shall be used to guide analysis and mitigation recommendations.		R
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 All support as written.		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
				<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B</p>		
			D	<p>3291(5)(A) Existing and potential incompatible noise levels in problem areas should be reduced through operational or source controls where the County has responsibility for such controls.</p>		D
A	B	C		<p>N-S5. Uniform Building Code. Use the Uniform Building Code as adopted for California (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Appendix Chapter 12) for determining required noise separation requirements for buildings.</p>		R
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B	C		<p>N-S6. Noise Standards for Habitable Rooms. Noise reduction shall be required as necessary to achieve a maximum of 45 CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) interior noise levels in all habitable rooms per California building standards.</p>		R
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B			<p>N-S7. Noise Reduction Requirements for Exterior Areas in Residential Zones. On a Newly created single family residential lots of 5,000 square feet or more, shall contain a usable outdoor living area at least 200 square feet in size per dwelling unit that meets the 60 CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) standard. shall be maintained somewhere on the property.</p>		M Straw Vote 6-0
				<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 TH - S7 is an exterior standard (usually by HWY 101) – exceeds the noise standards. Require soundproofing somehow (soundwall, etc). C. Disiere – “maintained” – outdoor quiet space? 200 sq ft.- does this apply to Multifamily? TH - No – smaller lot it is more difficult to attain. K. Girard – we typically don’t require a green space for MF – pay a parkland fee instead. This would be a new design standard if you included MF.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D									
	<p>C. Disiere – usable area? Is that a requirement for all SFR when built? TH - Yes. We are applying in McKinleyville now. Not always achievable. C. Faust – if there are circumstances where a project could not meet this, would staff recommend denial? (yes). Gearheart - This seems to narrow- can we make this a goal? Straw vote - staff to return with revised wording</p>											
	<p>COMMENTS: 12-15-11 The Commission had concerns regarding S7 and its specificity and how an area might be “maintained”. Staff can suggest a wording change to clarify that this is a subdivision design policy. Standard N-S10 would also allow for variance of the standard, should the Commission choose to include N-S10. Staff recommended the following revision: N-S7. Noise Reduction Requirements for Exterior Areas in Residential Zones. On newly created single family residential lots of 5,000 square feet or more, shall contain a usable outdoor living area at least 200 square feet in size per dwelling unit that meets the 60 CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) standard. shall be maintained somewhere on the property. Straw vote: Approved as revised 6/0</p>											
B	<p>N-S8. Short term Noise Performance Standards (Lmax). The following noise standards, unless otherwise specifically indicated, shall apply to all property within their assigned noise zones and such standards shall constitute the maximum permissible noise level within the respective zones.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SHORT TERM NOISE STANDARDS (Lmax)</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Day (maximum)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Night (maximum)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Zoning Designation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">dBA</td> <td style="text-align: center;">dBA</td> </tr> </table> <p>CG, MC, MC, AE,</p>		Day (maximum)	Night (maximum)	Zoning Designation	6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.		dBA	dBA	Inadvertent omission of R-1.	D see Alt A
	Day (maximum)	Night (maximum)										
Zoning Designation	6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.										
	dBA	dBA										

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
	<p>defined.</p> <p>C. Faust – it is really complicated how we receive sound. I’m not sure how you go about legislating it. People react difficulty to noise levels.</p> <p>C. Disiere – I think people are more affected by the long term noise levels. This gives people some recourse in the general plan.</p> <p>C. Disiere – I vote for sending it back to staff. Land Uses may need to be segregated.</p> <p>K. Girard – it is tiered now. More noise in TPZ, ag, commercial areas than in residential. Mitigate uses that are adjacent to those lands – “right to farm”.</p> <p>TH – we heard quite a bit of testimony through the McKinleyville plan and people had no recourse for noise issues.</p> <p>K. Girard – in surveying what other jurisdictions have done, Alternative A is available but maybe not appropriate to go to those levels. What the county needs is operational levels. We don’t have pure zones.</p> <p>C. Faust – if you have a TPZ zone next to an R-1 zone, - what do you mitigate? The receptor or what they are putting out? Where does the measuring device go (at the property line).</p> <p>K. Girard offered revised wording.</p> <p>C. Disiere – since we didn’t waive the standards earlier, this can’t be mitigated. Can we make exceptions?</p> <p>TH – S10 may apply.</p> <p>Commissioners Masten and Faust support A</p> <p>Commissioners Disiere and Nelson supports B as long as there are waivers or modification (S10). C. Gearheart doesn’t object to this but feels that it is very prescriptive to have in a General Plan, supports B also.</p> <p>C. Masten – I would rather see this in an Ordinance. It gives us an opportunity for staff to review the noise levels for ag and timber. Does it change anything if we move to an Ordinance? (staff – it delays implementation).</p> <p><u>Straw vote:</u></p> <p>Commissioners Disiere, Gearheart, Nelson support B</p> <p>Commissioner Masten, Faust support A</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element		Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D						
		<p>Comments: 12-15-11 The Commission discussed at length N-S8 (Alternative B version is shown in the chart). Staff explained that the differences between the Alternative "A" and "B" version were the exceedences levels in the charts. During the October 20th meeting, Commissioners Masten and Faust supported the "A" version, with Commissioners Disiere and Nelson favoring "B", provided there could be exception, perhaps through the use of the waiver provision contained in N-S10. Commissioners Gearheart and Masten were concerned with the specificity, and thought it might be more appropriate as an ordinance. Staff was asked to review the sound level triggers for the zones, and return with the some options for Commission consideration. The revised version staff provided modified some of the zone district trigger levels, adding some missing zones and moving the RRA (Rural Residential Agriculture (sometimes abbreviated RA)) to higher thresholds for compatibility with resource production activities. The protocol for measuring exceedences is broken down into steps for easier understanding. In addition, staff recommended an additional policy that provides general guidance for the standard. As an alternative to including N-S8, a modified implementation measure (N-IM7x) is provided below that would replace N-IM6 and N-IM7. Sonoma County's Noise Element was also provided in the staff report to show another county's approach to this subject. Straw vote: Commissioners Kreb, Disiere, Faust, Gearheart, Edmonds: Alternative A; Nelson preferred Alternative B which has higher dBA thresholds in the Short-Term Noise Standards table.</p>								
A		<p>N-598 Short-term Noise Performance Standards (Lmax). The following noise standards, unless otherwise specifically indicated, shall apply to all property within their assigned noise zones and such standards shall constitute the maximum permissible noise level within the respective zones.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SHORT-TERM NOISE STANDARDS (Lmax)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Day (maximum)</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Night (maximum)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Zoning</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>dBA</u></td> </tr> </table>	Day (maximum)	Night (maximum)	6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.	<u>Zoning</u>	<u>dBA</u>		<p>M Straw Vote 5-1</p>
Day (maximum)	Night (maximum)									
6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.									
<u>Zoning</u>	<u>dBA</u>									

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element		Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
	<p><u>Designation</u> CG, MG, MC, AE, TPZ, TC, CS, AG CN, MB, ML, RRA, CG, CR RM RS, R1, R2, RA</p>	<p>80 75 65 60 60</p>	<p>70 65 60 60</p>	
	<p><u>Protocol for measuring exceedences:</u> 1. Calibrate and establish reference for sound meter: <u>Decibel measurement made shall be based on a reference sound pressure of 0.0002 microbars as measured with a sound level meter using the "A" weighted network.</u> 2. Determine ambient background noise levels: <u>Ambient noise without the noise source in operation shall be observed at 15 second intervals for a period of 15 minutes. The lowest reading is interpreted as the ambient noise level of that sampling point. If this reading is above the standard set for the noise zone, steps must be taken to determine the source or sources of the intruding high-level noise followed by appropriate control action before continuing the survey. If the reading is equal to or below the standard, the survey can proceed.</u> 3. Measure for exceedences: <u>With the noise source in operation, record the instantaneous response at 15 second intervals for a 15 minute period. Or, for a noise source of less than 15 minutes, record the instantaneous response at 15 second intervals for the time the noise source is in operation. The lowest response level recorded while the noise source is in operation is interpreted as the intruding noise level. Compare the intruding noise levels with the standard. If the noise level generated from the noise source exceeds the standard, the noise source is generating noise levels in excess of the allowable standards set for the noise zone.</u></p>			

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element		Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
	COMMENTS: see discussion under Alternative B			
C	<p>N- S10. Modification or Waiver of Noise Insulation Requirements standards. Where full mitigation in accordance with the policies and standards of this Noise Element is not feasible, the Planning Commission may modify or waive such policies or standards to enable reasonable use of the property, provided that noise levels are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.</p>		<p>D Straw Vote 6-0</p>	
	<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 Staff - Recommend change of title. C. Faust – S10 does not respond to two existing uses with a noise issue (we only look at discretionary permits). If code enforcement went out on a noise issue, would we see it? (No – it would go to the board). Return – change to go to the Board with an appeals process. Need to modify for investigating a complaint too besides just new project. Straw vote - staff to return with revised wording</p>			
	<p>COMMENTS: 12-15-11 The Commission reviewed the above standard which only appears in Alternative C, and requested that staff return with revisions because it appeared to only address discretionary permits and didn't address complaint-driven situations. Straw vote – unanimous support to delete</p>			
A	<p>N-S11. Industrial Performance Standards. Add the Industrial Performance Standards currently contained in the County Coastal Zoning Code to the Inland Zoning Code as well.</p>		<p>R Straw Vote 6-0</p>	
	<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Disiere – I don't know what this means for adding the industrial performance standards from the Coastal zone? Straw vote - staff to return with wording from Coastal Zoning Code</p>			

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element		Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
		<p>COMMENTS: 12-15-11 The Commission reviewed the S11 and requested that staff return with an explanation of what the current industrial performance standards are. Attachment A in the staff report included the Industrial Performance Standards in the current coastal zoning regulations. Straw vote - approved as written 6/0</p>		
A		<p>N-S12. Helicopter Logging. For timber operations conducted under a Timber Harvest Plan, request that Cal Fire restrict helicopter logging to the hours from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. on weekdays only, with no helicopter logging permitted at any time on weekends, within 1,000 feet of a residence. Additionally, request Cal Fire to require special advance notice to any and all neighbors within a half-mile radius of any helicopter logging, stating the specific days that the logging will occur.</p>		<p>D Straw Vote 4-1</p>
		<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Gearheart - RLWG had comments on this. C. Nelson - the most environmental way to get logs out is to use helicopters. Usually not houses next to logging operations. It should be removed. C. Disiere - delete also. C. Faust - I have mixed views on this. I see the environmental benefits but I wouldn't want this happening over my property. I would keep this as a regulation for logging next to houses. C. Nelson - I don't know if it is legal for us to limit this - purview of the state. C. Faust - asking that CALFIRE do it only; not requiring. Vote Commissioners Nelson, Masten, Gearheart, Disiere vote to delete Commissioner Faust - retain next to 1000 feet of houses</p>		
	D	<p>3292(4)(A) Noise Compatibility Matrix General Plan Figure 3.2</p>	<p>Figure 3.2 is attached at the end of this chart.</p>	<p>D</p>
		<p>13.6 Implementation Measures</p>		

Plan Alternative		Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
A	B	N-IM1 Noise Impact Combining Zone. Utilize Noise Impact Combining Zone designations to identify areas where noise impact mitigations are required.		R
		<p>COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Disiere – how will combining zones work? TH – used in McKinleyville now (gave an example) - noise studies that would be mapped representing noise contours. Mitigation would be required for projects within those areas of elevated noise levels. C. Disiere – how much does this accomplish and how much does it cost? Straw vote unanimous approval 5/0</p>		
		<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B</p>		
A	B	N-IM2 Periodic Review of Combining Zones. Periodically identify and evaluate potential noise problem areas for mitigation or as candidates for noise impact combining zones, particularly during Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan updates.		R
		COMMENTS:		
A	B	N-IM3 Compliance Program. The County shall investigate complaints of excessive noise and control noise sources consistent with the standards established by the Plan. Nuisance determinations shall be based on noise levels, duration and number of noise events.		R
		COMMENTS:		
A	B	N-IM4 Noise from U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) and State Highway 299. Working through its representation on Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG), the County shall work with other affected jurisdictions and request California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to consider implementing noise reduction measures on U.S. 101 and State Highway 299 along sections in proximity to concentrated residential		R

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element			Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
			development.		
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 all support the Alternative A/B		
			COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative A/B		
A			N-IM5 Adoption of Performance Standards. Adopt Industrial Performance Standards Countywide.		R Straw Vote 6-0
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Faust – what are industrial performance standards? TH – we have them in the coastal zone – we will bring those back to you. Straw vote- staff to return with explanations of standards referred to in N-IM5		
			COMMENTS: 12-15-11 The Commission reviewed S11 and IM5 and requested that staff return with an explanation of what the current industrial performance standards are. Staff included the Industrial Performance Standards in Attachment A of the staff report for the current coastal zoning regulations. After review, the commission recommended inclusion of S11 and IM5. Straw vote - approved as written 6/0		
A			N-IM6 Noise Ordinance. Adopt a noise ordinance based on current zoning districts, tailored to community noise standards that address construction noise and other non-transportation noise sources.		D See new IM-7x
			COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Faust - what did staff have in mind when preparing this? K. Girard – customize a standard to the source. This would refine the Noise Ordinance.		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
	All support.		
	COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to supports Alternative A		
	COMMENTS: 12-15-11 See discussion under N-IM7		
A	N-IM7 Exterior Noise Reduction Standards. Adopt standards specifying appropriate measures to reduce exterior noise levels in noise impact areas. Standards shall consider the portion of a lot where noise level reduction measures would apply, acceptable sound wall designs, and standards for achieving noise level reductions through effective site planning techniques.		D See new IM-7x
	<u>N-IM7x Noise Control Ordinance. Prepare and consider a noise control ordinance to regulate noise sources in order to protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property. The ordinance shall define excessive levels of noise and may exempt or modify noise requirements for agricultural uses, construction activities, school functions, property maintenance, waste collection and other sources. The ordinance shall include responsibilities and procedures for enforcement, abatement and variances.</u>	NEW IM! Added by Commission on 12-15-11	M Straw Vote 6-0
	COMMENTS: 10-20-11 C. Faust – what does staff wish to accomplish by IM7? K. Girard – I don't particularly like the wording for this – it was intended to recognize that it is complicated to design noise reduction standards - this should be written more as a guide. Straw vote: Return		
	COMMENTS: 12-15-11(see discussion under S8) As an addition to including N-S8 , the Commission considered a modified implementation measure (N-IM7x) as shown below that would replace N-IM6 and N-IM7:		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 13. Noise Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
				<p>N-IM7x Noise Control Ordinance. Prepare and consider a noise control ordinance to regulate noise sources in order to protect persons from existing or future excessive levels of noise which interfere with sleep, communication, relaxation, health or legally permitted use of property. The ordinance shall define excessive levels of noise and may exempt or modify noise requirements for agricultural uses, construction activities, school functions, property maintenance, waste collection and other sources. The ordinance shall include responsibilities and procedures for enforcement, abatement and variances.</p> <p>Straw vote: approved unanimously 6/0</p>		
			D	<p>5-3200(4)(A) N-IM8 Highways Noise Contours. Request CalTrans to update current and projected noise contours for highways.</p>		R
			D	<p>5-3200(4)(B) Incorporate new noise contour data for airports from Airport Master Plan.</p>		R
				<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Commissioner Kreb voted to support the Alternative D version above</p>		
			D	<p>5-3200(4)(C) Revise CEQA and subdivision review processes as necessary.</p>		D

Figure 3-2 (Noise Compatibility Matrix From Existing General Plan)

CLEARLY ACCEPTABLE	NORMALLY ACCEPTABLE	NORMALLY UNACCEPTABLE	CLEARLY UNACCEPTABLE

		LAND USE INTERPRETATION FOR Ldn VALUE									
LAND USE CATEGORY	Maximum interior exposure, Ldn*	55		65	75			85			
Residential-Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	45										
Residential-Multiple Family, Dormitories, etc.	45										
Transient Lodging	45										
School Classrooms, Libraries, Churches	45										
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	45										
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Music Shells	35										
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports											
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks											
Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Rec., Cemeteries											
Office Buildings, Personal, Business and Professional	50										
Commercial-Retail, Movie Theaters, Restaurants	50										
Commercial-Wholesale, Some Retail, Ind., Mfg., Util.											
Manufacturing, Communications (Noise Sensitive)											

