Underwater Sound Levels Associated with Driving Steel Piles for the State Route 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Pile Installation Test Program



Prepared By: Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 505 Petaluma Blvd., South Petaluma, Ca. 94952

Prepared for: Washington State Department Of Transportation Office of Air Quality and Noise 15700 Dayton Avenue North, P.O. Box 330310 Seattle, WA 98133-9710

Final March 2010

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY	E1
List of	Tables	ii
List of	figures	iii
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
2.1	Test Pile Noise Monitoring Project	
3.0	UNDERWATER SOUND LEVELS	
3.1	Characteristics of Underwater Noise	
4.0	METHODOLOGY	
4.1	Measurement Positions	6
4.2	Measurement Equipment	6
4.3	Quality Control	7
5.0	MITIGATION MEASURES	
5.1	Bubble Curtain Design – Unconfined Bubble Ring	
5.2	Isolation Casing with Bubble Ring	
5.3	Double Walled Noise Attenuation Pile (DNAP)	
6.0	DATA PRESENTATION	
6.1	Introduction	
6.2	Location C – Portage Bay	
6.	2.1 Vibratory Driving Pile PB-3 October 26, 2009	
6.	2.2 Impact Driving – October 27, 2009	
6.3	Location B – Near Foster Island	
6.4	Location A – Between Foster Island and Edgewater Park	
6.5	Rise Time	
6.6	Airborne Noise Measurements	
6.7	Distant Underwater Measurements	
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	
8.0	REFERENCES	
9.0	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	
Appen	dix A – Daily Time History Charts of Measured Sound Levels	
	Figures A - 1 through A - 23	

Appendix B – Summary of Signal Analysis of Pile Driving Underwater Sound Pulses

Figures B - 1 through B - 66

# TABLES

Table 1:	Summary Table of Monitoring Results1
Table 2:	Summary Air Pressure and Flow in Bubble Curtain Rings
Table 3:	Summary Air Pressure and Flow in Isolation Casing Bubble Ring
Table 4:	Summary of Pile ID and Mitigation Type Used14
Table 5:	Summary of Measured Sound Levels for Vibratory Driving at Location C- Pile
	PB-3 – October 26, 2009
Table 6:	Summary of Underwater Sound Levels for Location C, Portage Bay
Table 7:	Summary of underwater Sound Levels for Location B, North of Foster Island 26
Table 8:	Summary of Underwater Sound Levels for Location A, Between Foster Island and
	Edgewater Park
Table 9:	Summary of Rise Time for selected Piles
Table 10:	Common Airborne Noise Descriptors
Table 11:	Summary of Airborne Sound Levels Measured at Location C – Portage Bay 32
Table 12:	Summary of Airborne Sound Levels at Locations A and B
Table 13:	Summary of Underwater Sound Levels Measured at 200 and 500 meters October
	27, 2009
Table 14:	Summary of Underwater Peak Sound Levels Measured at 200 and 500 meters
	October 29, 2009

## FIGURES

Figure	1:	Project Location	1
Figure	2:	Location A Measurement Sites	2
Figure	3:	Location B Measurement Sites	3
Figure	<i>4</i> :	Location C Measurement Sites	3
Figure	5:	Underwater Sound Level Measurement Equipment	6
Figure	<i>6</i> :	Diagram of hydrophone deployment at monitoring positions	7
Figure	7:	Photo of bubble curtain ring system used for this project and the bubble curtain	
0		hole spacing pattern	8
Figure	8:	Photograph of the bubble curtain being deployed	9
Figure	<b>9</b> :	Photograph of the air manifold system	10
Figure	10:	Photograph of inside of isolation casing	11
Figure	11:	Photograph of bubble action in the isolation casing	12
Figure	12:	DNAP Details	12
Figure	13:	Photograph DNAP	13
Figure	14:	Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Waveforms	15
Figure	15:	Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Accumulation of Sound Energy	15
Figure	16:	Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Narrow Band Frequency Spectra	15
Figure	17:	<b>PB-1</b> signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse	16
Figure	18:	PB-3 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings	18
Figure	19:	PB-4 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings:	19
Figure	20:	PB-2 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings:	20
Figure	21:	<b>PB-1</b> signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse	21
Figure	22:	WAB1 Signal Analysis With and Without Confined Bubble Rings	22
Figure	23:	WAB4 Signal Analysis With and Without Confined Bubble Rings	23
Figure	24:	WAB2 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings	24
Figure	25:	WAB3 signal analysis of the DNAP System.	25
Figure	26:	WAB5 signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse	27
Figure	27:	Signal Rise Time	29
Figure	28:	Airborne noise at Location A and B-Lmax	34
Figure	29:	Airborne noise at Location A and B -Leq	34
Figure	30:	Airborne noise at Locations C -Leq	35
Figure	31:	Airborne noise at Locations C -Lmax	35
Figure	32:	Comparison of Bubbles on and bubbles off and the background levels using an	-
0	-	Unconfined Bubble Ring.	38
Figure	33:	Comparison of DNAP, Confined bubble Ring and Unconfined Bubble Rings	<i>40</i>

## **EXECTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the results of hydroacoustic monitoring conducted for the State Route 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project – Pile Installation Test Program. Data was collected as required by the Test Pile Noise Monitoring Task Order and Noise Monitoring Program Work Plan. The monitoring was conducted over a three-day period in October 2009. A total of 9 steel shell test piles were driven at three locations: four 24-inch piles were installed in Portage Bay, four 30-inch piles were installed north of SR 520 in the area of Foster Island, and one 30-inch pile was driven north of SR 520 between Foster Island and Edgewater Park. There were three different mitigation devices tested to assess their sound reduction properties.

- > A confined bubble ring around the pile being driven,
- > An unconfined bubble ring consisting of two separate rings.
- A double wall steel casing with one-inch air space and four inches of acoustical insulation.

Along with the hydroacoustic measurements airborne measurements were made at close in locations (10 - 15 meters) and distant locations (125 - 250 meters).

Pile	Date	Distance (meters)	Mitigation	Peak (dB) S		Single Strike SEL	Number of Strikes	Range of Reduction (dB) <sup>5</sup>	RMS (dB) <sup>4</sup>
						( <b>aB</b> )			
	ole Rings								
PB3	10/26	10m	None	170	157	144	Vibratory	N/A	144
PR1	10/27	12m	On <sup>1</sup>	184 - 190	187	159	77	8-14	170
TDI	10/27	12111	Off	195 - 199	198	171		0-14	183
$PR2^6$	10/27	12m	Off	174 - 183	178	153	60	$0-6^{7}$	165
1.02	10/27	12111	On <sup>1</sup>	172 - 181	181	153	00	0-0	165
			On <sup>1</sup>	154 - 165	161	137	-		148
PB3	10/27	10m	Off	184 - 193	192	165	334	22-31	177
105	10/27	10111	On <sup>1</sup>	154-164	161	136		22-31	146
			Off	178 - 186	182	155			167
			Off	172 - 194	190	164	-	24-32	176
PB4	10/27	10m	On <sup>1</sup>	157 - 161	160	136	275		147
			Off <sup>1</sup>	180 - 188	183	157			169
	Locat	tion B - 30	<b>D-inch Steel</b>	Shell Pile	s with thr	ee differ	rent Mitiga	tion Systems	5
			$\mathrm{Off}^2$	191 - 196	194	169			182
WAB1	10/29	10m	On <sup>2</sup>	156 - 162	157	135	410	36-39	150
			$\mathrm{Off}^2$	195 - 196	196	169			182
			$Off^1$	191 - 196	193	169			181
WAB2	10/29	13m	$On^1$	158 - 166	161	137	450	29-35	152
			$\mathrm{Off}^1$	190 - 196	192	165			179
WAB3	10/29	10m	DNAP <sup>3</sup>	181 - 192	186	163	405	9-12 <sup>5</sup>	177
			$Off^2$	189 - 191	188	160			174
WAB4	10/29	13m	On <sup>2</sup>	158 - 165	161	138	350	32-36	151
			$\mathrm{Off}^2$	194 - 196	196	172			185

Table 1:Summary Table of Monitoring Results.

Pile	Date	Distance (meters)	Mitigation	Peak (dB)		Single Strike SEL	Number of Strikes	Range of Reduction (dB) <sup>5</sup>	RMS (dB) <sup>4</sup>		
						Range	Average	( <b>dB</b> ) *		((12))	
		Locatio	on A - 30-in	ch Steel P	ile with U	nconfin	ed Bubble	Ring			
			$Off^1$	196 - 197	196	176		18-20	185		
			On <sup>1</sup>	173 - 179	176	153			167		
			$Off^1$	196 - 197	196	174			185		
WAR5	10/20	10m	On <sup>1</sup>	177 - 180	178	153	1 470		167		
WADJ	10/29	10111	$Off^1$	194 - 196	195	170	1,470		182		
				$Off^1$	195 - 196	196	174			181	
			On <sup>1</sup>	175 - 180	177	153			167		
			$Off^1$	192 - 197	196	173			185		

<sup>1</sup> – Unconfined Bubble Rings

<sup>2</sup> – Confined Bubble Ring

<sup>3</sup> - DNAP (Double Walled Noise Attenuation Pile)

<sup>4</sup> – Average Levels

<sup>5</sup> – Average reduction is based on the baseline pile (196 dB Peak) for pile where the DNAP was tested. All other piles the average reduction is from the same pile with the bubble curtain fully on and compared to the bubble curtain fully off.

<sup>6</sup> – The Bubble Rings were never fully in use due to problems controlling the airflow.

<sup>7</sup> – Not enough data points to be statistically valid.

On October 27, 2009 when the unconfined bubble ring was first used there were some problems with the compressors and the manifold system during the first two piles driven. The piles were driven for approximately two minutes, which did not give the crew enough time to adjust the operation. By the time the third pile was driven most of the problems had been resolved and the bubble rings became more effective. During the first two piles driven the noise levels were reduced by 3 - 11 dB and during the driving of the last two piles the reduction was 31 dB.

On October 29 the compressors and manifold worked properly for both the confined bubble ring and the unconfined bubble rings while driving at Locations B and C. The reduction with the confined bubble rings ranged from 30-35 dB and the reduction with the unconfined bubble rings ranged from 19-35 dB.

The DNAP noise reduction system was difficult and time consuming to use and was substantially less effective in reducing the noise from the pile driving. Reduction ranged from 4 - 8 dB

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This technical report presents results of underwater sound levels measured during the impact driving of four 24-inch and five 30-inch steel shell piles and the vibratory installation of one 24-inch steel shell pile at the SR 520 bridge replacement project in October of 2009.

The piles were driven at three different locations and measurements from the impact driving were made at 10 meters, 200 meters, and 500 meters for each location. Three different mitigation methods were used during the driving of the piles, unconfined bubble rings, confined bubble ring, and Doubled Walled Noise Attenuation Pile (DNAP). The bubble rings were tested with on/off cycles during each pile driving events, except on the one pile where the DNAP was tested. Results from this are discussed in the data presentation section (Section 6.2.2). The sound level from vibratory installation of one pile (PB-3) was measured at Location C. Results from this are discussed in the data presentation section 6.2.1). Figure 1 shows the project area and the location of monitored piles.



Figure 1: Project Location

1

Additionally, airborne noise levels were measured at a two locations each day. On the first day a noise shroud was used on the pile driver to test the noise reduction at a distant location. Measurements were made on the barge and at the closest receiver locations to the pile driving location. Exact measurement locations are shown in Figures 2, 3, and 4.

## 2.0 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

## 2.1 Test Pile Noise Monitoring Project.

State Route 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project – Pile Installation Test Program is designed to assess the different mitigation measures to reduce the noise impact from pile driving. The project consisted of driving piles in three locations. Figures 2, 3, and 4 show the exact locations where the pile sets were driven and the measurement locations. Different sized piles were driven, four 24 inch diameter steel shell piles were driven at Location C and a total of five 30 inch diameter steel shell piles were driven at Locations A and B. Three different noise attenuation systems were evaluated. Two consisted of bubble rings, one confined in a steel casing and one unconfined. The third system consisted of an outer steel casing with a one-inch air space and four inches of insulation and a inner steel casing all sealed together. This system is referred to as the DNAP system.





Figure 3: Location B Measurement Sites



Figure 4: Location C Measurement Sites

### 3.0 UNDERWATER SOUND LEVELS

#### 3.1 Characteristics of Underwater Noise

When a pile driving hammer strikes a pile a pressure pulse is created which propagates through the pile and radiates sound into the water and the ground substrate as well as the air. A plot of a sound pressure pulse as a function of time is referred to as the waveform. The peak pressure is the highest absolute value of the measured waveform, and can be a negative or positive pressure peak. The RMS level is determined by analyzing the waveform and computing the average of the squared pressures over the time that comprise that portion of the waveform containing 90 percent of the sound energy.<sup>1</sup> This RMS term is described as RMS<sub>90%</sub> in this report. This has been approximated in the field for pile driving sounds by measuring the signal with a precision sound level meter set to the "impulse" RMS setting (RMS<sub>impulse</sub>). Another measure of the pressure waveform that can be used to describe the pulse is the sound energy itself. The total sound energy in the pulse is referred to in many ways, such as the "total energy flux"<sup>2</sup>. The "total energy flux" is equivalent to the un-weighted sound exposure level (SEL) for a plane wave propagating in a free field, a common unit of sound energy used in airborne acoustics to describe short-duration events. The unit is dB re  $1\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>-sec. In this report, peak pressures and RMS sound pressure levels are expressed in dB re  $1 \mu$ Pa; however, in other literature they can take other forms such as a Pascal or pounds per square inch. The total sound energy in an impulse accumulates over the duration of that impulse. How rapidly the energy accumulates may be significant in assessing the potential effects of impulses on fish. Chapter 9 includes the definitions of terms commonly used to describe underwater sounds.

Researchers have indicated that high peak pressures along with the rate of change (i.e., rise time) are important considerations in assessing potential biological impacts (i.e., injury or mortality)<sup>3</sup>. Descriptors such as the peak pressure, RMS<sub>90%</sub>, and SEL are useful descriptors in describing the magnitude of these impulses. None of these descriptors adequately account for the effect of rise time for pile driving impulses. The peak pressure only refers to the magnitude of maximum pressure fluctuation, which may be only one factor causing damage. The RMS averaged over 90% of the impulse includes averaging over a relatively long period of the impulse where the pressure fluctuation is much lower. For instance, about 50% of the energy from a typical pile driving impulse accumulates in less than a quarter of the time that 90% of the energy accumulates. The SEL or "total energy flux" is basically normalized to one second and, therefore, is not as useful for discerning differences in impulses where the majority of the energy occurs within 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a second. However, SEL is useful to researchers in assessing impacts to animals. The pressure waveforms show the individual characteristics of these strikes; however, it is difficult to identify any meaningful differences in the impulses. Studying the waveforms can provide an indication of rise time; however, rise time differences are not clearly apparent due to the numerous rapid fluctuations that are characteristic to this type of impulse. A plot showing the accumulated sound energy over the duration of the impulse (or at least the portion where

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Richardson, Greene, Malone & Thomson, *Marine Mammals and Noise*, Academic Press, 1995 and Greene, personal communication.
 <sup>2</sup> Finerran, et. al., *Temporary Shift in Masked Hearing Thresholds in Odontocetes after Exposure to Single Underwater Impulses*

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Finerran, et. al., *Temporary Shift in Masked Hearing Thresholds in Odontocetes after Exposure to Single Underwater Impulses from a Seismic Watergun*, Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, June 2002.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Wardle, et.al. *Effects of Seismic Air Guns on Marine Fish*. Continental Shelf Research 21 (2001) 1005-1027. Pergamon. June 21, 2000.

much of the energy accumulates) appears to be the best available tool to illustrate the differences in source strength and rise time. An example of the characteristics of a typical pile driving pulse is shown in Figure 17.

The Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group (FHWG) representing the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration-National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California/Washington/Oregon Departments of Transportation, California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Federal Highway Administration reached an "Agreement in Principle" for interim criteria for injury to fish from pile driving activities. The agreed-upon criteria "identify sound pressure levels of 206 dB peak and 187 dB accumulated sound exposure level (SEL) for all listed fish except those that are less than 2 grams, in that case, the criteria for the accumulated SEL would be 183 dB. In an effort to develop data with respect to these criteria, the accumulated peak pressure and sound exposure level were measured.

## 4.0 METHODOLOGY

## 4.1 Measurement Positions

Hydroacoustic measurements were made at three different positions at each location. One of the measurement positions was unattended, at distances of 200 meters at location C and 500 meters at Locations A and B. One of the positions, the near position, was located on the contractor's barge 10-13 meters from the pile Measurements were typically made at one mid-water depth. The Water depth ranged from about 3 meters (10 feet) to 7 meters (23 feet). All measurement positions reported are approximate due to fluctuations caused by weather conditions.

## 4.2 Measurement Equipment

Measurements were made using Reson TC4013 and TC-4033 hydrophones with PCB in-line charge amplifiers (Model 422E13) and PCB Multi-Gain Signal Conditioners (Model 480M122). The signals were fed into Larson Davis Model 820 Integrating Sound Level Meters (SLM) and Marantz Model PMD 660 Solid State Recorders (Figure 5). The multi-gain signal conditioner provided the ability to increase the signal strength (i.e., add gain) so that measurements are made within the dynamic range of the instruments used to analyze the signals.

The peak pressure and sound exposure levels (SEL) were measured "live" using the SLM's, the root-mean square average sound pressure levels (RMS<sub>impulse</sub> levels) was measured from recordings captured in the field and replayed in the lab. The Larson Davis Model 820 SLM has the ability to measure the unweighted peak sound pressure. Limited additional subsequent analyses of the acoustical impulses were performed using a Larson Davis Model 3000 Real Time Analyzer. The real time analyzer provides narrow-band frequency and waveform analyses.



Figure 5: Underwater Sound Level Measurement Equipment

## 4.3 Quality Control

The measurement systems were calibrated prior to use in the field with a G.R.A.S. Type 42AA Pistonphone and hydrophone coupler. The pistonphone, when used with the hydrophone coupler, produces a continuous 136.5 dB (re 1  $\mu$ Pa) hydrophone at 250Hz. The SLMs are calibrated to this tone prior to use in the field. The tone is then measured by the SLM and is recorded on to the beginning of the digital audio recording that was used in the field. The system calibration status was checked at the end of the measurement event by both measuring the calibration tone and recording the post-measurement tone. All systems were found to be within 0.5 dB of the calibration levels. The pistonphone output was certified at an independent facility.

All field notes were recorded in water-resistant field notebooks. Such notebook entries include calibration notes, measurement positions (i.e., distance from source, depth of sensor), system gain settings, and the equipment used to make each measurement. Notebook entries were copied after each measurement day and filed for safekeeping. Digital media were labeled and stored for subsequent analysis.



Figure 6: Diagram of hydrophone deployment at monitoring positions

## 5.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

## 5.1 Bubble Curtain Design – Unconfined Bubble Ring

The bubble curtain design that was used by the contractor for this project is similar to other bubble curtains used for projects in Washington. Figure 7 shows the design that was used on this project. The airflow to the bubble rings was regulated using a manifold system connected to two Ingersoll Rand Model XP825 compressors. This system allowed either one or both compressors to be used to supply the airflow as needed. There were two air hoses connected to each bubble ring and each set of hoses was connected to the manifold so that each ring was run off one compressor. Figure 9 shows the manifold and connectors. Table 2 shows the flow rate through the bubble curtain at each pile.



Figure 7: Photo of bubble curtain ring system used for this project and the bubble curtain hole spacing pattern



Figure 8: Photograph of the bubble curtain being deployed



Dila Numbar	Pressure (PS	SI) / Flow (CFM)
File Nulliber	Upper ring	Lower Ring
PB-1	120/400	120/725
PB-2	120/450	120/750
PB-3	95/600	95/700
PB-4	100/450-650	100/400-650
WAB-2	110/690	115/680
WAB-5	110/700	110/690

Summary Air Pressure and Flow in Bubble Curtain Rings.

#### Photograph of the air manifold system Figure 9:

PSI – Pounds per Square Inch CFM - Cubic Feet per Minute

#### 5.2 **Isolation Casing with Bubble Ring**

Table 2:

The second mitigation system tested was a isolation casing with a bubble ring. The bubble ring was similar to the rings used in the bubble curtain system; except there was only one bubble ring and it used only one air compressor. The isolation casing was a steel shell pile with a bubble ring attached near the base. Figure 10 shows the inside of the isolation casing and the configuration of the bubble ring.



Figure 10: Photograph of inside of isolation casing



Figure 11: Photograph of bubble action in the isolation casing

 Table 3:
 Summary Air Pressure and Flow in Isolation Casing Bubble Ring.

Pile Number	Pressure (PSI) / Flow (CFM)
WAB-1	105/720
WAB-4	115/600

# 5.3 Double Walled Noise Attenuation Pile (DNAP)

The third method tested was a Double Walled Noise Attenuation Pile (DNAP). The DNAP is a hollow steel pile casing filled with four inches of insulation and one inch of air space Figure 12. Figure 13 shows the actual DNAP.



Figure 12: DNAP Details



Figure 13: Photograph DNAP

## 6.0 DATA PRESENTATION

#### 6.1 Introduction

This section presents measured Peak, RMS, and SEL levels. This section includes a summary presentation of the data.

Pile	Attenuation	Location
PB-1	Unconfined Bubble Rings	
PB-2	Unconfined Bubble Rings	C
PB-3	Unconfined Bubble Rings	C
PB-4	Unconfined Bubble Rings	
WAB-1	Isolation Casing with Bubble Rings	
WAB-2	Unconfined Bubble Ring	В
WAB-3	DNAP	D
WAB-4	Isolation Casing with Bubble Rings	
WAB-5	Unconfined Bubble Ring	А

## Table 4:Summary of Pile ID and Mitigation Type Used

The complete set of measured sound pressure level data is contained in Appendix A. A list of all measurement events is provided at the beginning of the appendix. The data contained in Appendix A are presented in the order of the locations where the measurements occurred beginning at location C, Portage Bay. In the waveform figures that follow, the axes all have the same scale. This facilitates visual comparisons between piles with and without mitigation. The differences between the unmitigated and the mitigated levels are large; in some cases it is difficult to see the mitigated waveform. The following example shown in Figures 14 - 16 shows a typical comparison between a mitigated and unmitigated pile strike and the no pile driving level at 10 meters. These results would be similar with the use either the unconfined bubble rings or the isolation casing with a bubble ring. The unmitigated peak sound pressure is  $5.68 \text{ E}+09\mu\text{Pa}$ (195 dB) while the mitigated strike has a peak sound pressure of 6.74 E+08µPa (177 dB) and the period between pile driving or no work period had peak sound pressure was 5.60 E+06µPa (135 dB). The period where there was no pile driving would be classified as background noise because it had other anthropogenic noise, i.e. small workboats and barge activity, occurring at the measurement time. The noise floor for the peak detector at the 10-meter location was approximately 150 dB re:  $1\mu$ Pa, at the distant locations where there was 20 dB of gain added the noise floor was about 130 dB peak re: 1µPa. The RMS noise floors were below the range of measured levels. The measured RMS levels ranged from 105 to 120 dB re: 1µPa when there was no pile driving occurring. Near the barge there was work and boat activity to the levels were higher than at the distant locations. At the 500 meter location the RMS level was slightly affected by the slap of waves on the aluminum boat.



Figure 14: Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Waveforms



Time (sec )Figure 15: Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Accumulation of Sound Energy



Figure 16: Mitigated vs. Unmitigated Narrow Band Frequency Spectra

Figure 17 shows an example waveform, narrow band frequency spectrum, accumulation of sound energy, and summary of sound pressure and sound energy levels measured at Portage Bay. The waveform is a time history of the pressure fluctuations caused by the pulse above and below zero pressure. The pulse includes sound pressures at different frequencies. The frequency analysis was conducted in 6 Hz constant bandwidths up to a frequency of 5000 Hz.



Figure 17: *PB-1 signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse.* 

# 6.2 Location C – Portage Bay

# 6.2.1 Vibratory Driving Pile PB-3 October 26, 2009

Underwater sound measurements were made on October 26, 2009 when four 0.61-meter (24inch) diameter steel pipe piles were installed just north of SR 520 in Portage Bay. An APE 200 vibratory driver/extractor was used to install the piles. Only one pile, PB-3 was measured.

Underwater sound levels were measured from two positions: (1) a fixed position from a raft that was 10 meters from the pile and (2) a dock that was 200 meters from the pile. The hydrophone at each position was set at mid depth, the water depth at the raft was 3 meters and the water depth at the dock was 4 meters. At the time of pile installation, there were no currents and it was calm with no wind.

Measurements were made at 10 meters and 200 meters from PB-3. The pile was installed at 13:37 to 14:32. Measurements of the sound pressure due to vibratory driving were not clear at 200 meters due to low source levels compared to background noise. Only the loudest levels from the vibratory pile installation could be measured over the background noise at 200 meters.

The measurements at 10 meters were pretty clear. Table 5 shows the peak sound pressures and the 1-second sound pressure levels or SELs from vibratory pile installation at PB-3. Figure A-1, in Appendix A shows the time history of the pile driving. Note that peak sound pressures at the 200-meter position were about 128 to 145 dB. The level of 128 dB was near the background level and the vibratory pile driving sound was barely audible on the recording. At the 10-meter position, peak pressures were generally in the range of 140 dB to 160 dB, with two peaks of 170 and 167 dB. At 200 meters, the highest peak measured was 145 dB. The highest 1-second sound levels (or SEL) measured at the 10-meter location was 151 dB, and at the 200 meter location the highest level was 126 dB.

Table 5:Summary of Measured Sound Levels for Vibratory Driving at Location C- PilePB-3 – October 26, 2009

		<b>.</b> .	P	eak	, in the second s	SEL	
Pile	Time	Location	dB re	e: 1µPa	dB re: 1µPa <sup>2</sup> -sec		
			Average	Range	Average	Range	
DD 3	12.27 14.22	10 meters	157	136 - 170	144	105-151	
FD-3	13.37 - 14.32	200 meters	133	128-145	115	102-126	

Vibratory pile driving is generally much slower and quieter than impact driving and is recommended as a sound reduction measure<sup>4</sup>. Although peak sound levels can be substantially less than those produced by impact hammers, the total energy imparted can be comparable to impact driving because the vibratory hammer operates continuously and requires more time to install the pile. The actual time driving for PB-3 was about 12 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> minutes out of the one-hour of time. Most of the time was spent leveling and adjusting the pile.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Caltrans Technical Guidance for Assessment and Mitigation of the Hydroacoustic Effects of Pile Driving on Fish, February 2009

## 6.2.2 Impact Driving – October 27, 2009

Four 24-inch piles were driven with an un-confined bubble ring attenuation system. The first pile, PB3 was driven approximately 20 feet. A summary of the underwater measurements taken at location C is shown in Table 6. There were two compressors running the air supply lines for the bubble rings. They were putting out 600- 700 CFM @ 95 PSI, causing very good bubble action around the piles. The first strike on PB3 was at 12:56:15 hours and the pile was 12 meters from the hydrophone. The last strike was at 13:08:31. There were a few stops during the drive and the blow count for the pile was 334 blows. Figure 18 shows the difference between the mitigated and unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of PB-3.



Figure 18: PB-3 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings

The second pile driven was PB4, was driven approximately nine feet. The drive started at 13:40:14 hours with the bubble rings off. After approximately 90 seconds the bubble rings were started. The drive was completed at 13:47:50 hours and 275 blows were used to set the pile. There was a lot of boat activity around the pile while it was being driven. Figure 19 shows the difference between the mitigated and unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of PB-4.



Figure 19: PB-4 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings:

Pile PB2 was started at 14:21:47 hours with the bubble ring turned on. The bubble ring was turned off at the end of the drive. The drive ended at 14:23:10 with only 60 pile strikes. The compressors were running at 120 PSI with one compressor putting out 450 CFM and the other 750 CFM. The contractor did not think the gages were working properly on the first compressor. It appeared that there was less bubble action when the pile was being driven. The airflow was never fully on when the driving began and by the time the air was shut off the driving was completed so there was not a time when there was either a good flow of air or a complete stoppage of air. Figure 20 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of PB-2.



Figure 20: PB-2 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings:

PB1 was also driven for a short period of approximately two minutes. During the last 25 seconds the impact hammer was running with the fuel shut off. The compressors were again both at 120 PSI and 400 CFM and 725 CFM. There were a total of 77 pile strikes during the driving period. It appeared that there was some obstruction in the air hoses causing a higher noise level when the bubble curtain was in use, because there was such a short driving period there was not enough time to fully investigate the cause. However it could have been in the manifold and valves, similar to what happened at PB-2. Figure 21 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of PB-2.



Figure 21: PB-1 signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse.

Underwater Noise Technical Report

Pile	Date	Mitigation Type	Mitigation On or Off	Maximum Peak <sup>2</sup> (dB)	Maximum RMS (dB)	Average RMS (Pascals)	Number of Strikes	Average Peak (Pascals)	Range of Reduction (dB)	Average SEL (dB)	Cumulative SEL (dB) <sup>2</sup>
$PB-1^1$	10/27/09	Un-confined	On	190	173	316	77	2239	8-14	160	187
121	10/2//02	Bubble Ring	Off	199	185	1412		7943	0 1 .	172	107
PB-2 <sup>1</sup> 10/27/09	10/27/00	Un-confined Bubble Ring	On	181	166	141	60	794	0.6	151	172
	10/27/09		Off	183	167	199	00	1122	0-0	153	172
			On	165	152	22		112		139	
DD 2	10/27/00	Un-confined	Off	193	179	708	224	3981	22.21	165	179
PD-3	10/27/09	Bubble Ring	On	164	155	22	554	112	22-31	138	
			Off	186	172	200		1259		155	
PB-4 10/27/09			Off	194	181	562		3162		165	
	10/27/09	Un-confined Bubble Ring	On	161	158	22	275	89	24-32	138	182
	Bubble King	Off	188	174	251		1413		158		

## Table 6:Summary of Underwater Sound Levels for Location C, Portage Bay.

<sup>1</sup>The Bubble Rings were never fully in use due to problems controlling the airflow.

<sup>2</sup>The Peak and accumulated SEL values did not exceed the thresholds.

## 6.3 Location B – Near Foster Island

#### October 29, 2009

At Location B (see Location Map) the barge was 10 meters from the first row of piles. Piles were designated WAB1-4. There were three attenuation systems used, with WAB1 and WAB4 the confined bubble ring system was used, with WAB2 an unconfined bubble ring system was used, and with WAB3 the DNAP system was used. A summary of the results from the measurements is shown in Table 7.

WAB1 (30-inch pile) – The hydrophone was 10 meters from the pile and the drive began at 09:59:29 hours with the bubble ring off. After 30 seconds the bubble ring was started. The pile was driven for approximately eight minutes and 30 seconds with the bubble ring on, and then the bubble ring was turned off for the last minute of driving. The contractor needed the bubble action off so he could see his mark on the pile and know when to stop. The impact hammer would not stop when the fuel was turned off. It took approximately two minutes to come to a full stop. There were 410 blows under full operation and an additional 85 blows before the hammer stopped. There was one bubble ring in the confined casing and only one compressor was used. The compressor put out 700 CFM at 105 PSI; the bubble action in the casing was very good. Figure 22 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of WAB1.



Figure 22: WAB1 Signal Analysis With and Without Confined Bubble Rings

WAB4 (30-inch pile) – The hydrophone was 13 meters from the pile. A confined air bubble ring was used at this location. The drive began at 11:32:50 hours with bubble ring off. After 30 seconds the bubble ring was started. The pile was driven for approximately six minutes with the bubble ring on, and then the bubble ring was turned off for the last two minutes of driving. The contractor needed the bubble action off so he could see his mark on the pile and know when to stop. There were 350 blows under full operation. There was one bubble ring in the confined casing and only one compressor was used. The compressor put out 600 CFM at 115 PSI; the bubble action in the casing was very good. Figure 24 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of WAB4



Figure 23: WAB4 Signal Analysis With and Without Confined Bubble Rings

WAB2 (30-inch pile)– The hydrophone was 13 meters from the pile, a set of unconfined bubble rings was used at this location. Driving started at 10:48:13 with the bubble rings off, after 30 seconds the bubble rings were started. The pile was driven for approximately eight minutes and 45 seconds with the bubble ring on. The bubble rings were turned off for the last minute of driving, the contractor needed the bubble action off so he could see his mark on the pile and know when to stop. The impact hammer would not stop when the fuel was turned off. It took approximately 30 seconds to come to a full stop. There were 450 blows before the hammer stopped. There were two bubble rings used in the unconfined system and two compressors were used, the first compressor was putting out 690CFM at 110 PSI and the second compressor was putting out 680 CFM at 115 PSI. This provided a very active bubble curtain around the pile. Figure 23 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of WAB2.



Figure 24: WAB2 Signal Analysis With and Without Unconfined Bubble Rings

WAB-3 (30-inch pile) – The final pile at location B used the DNAP attenuation system. The hydrophone was 10 meters from the pile and the drive began at 13:49:20. The pile was driven for approximately 12 minutes. There were 405 blows under full operation. Figure 25 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of WAB3.



Figure 25: WAB3 signal analysis of the DNAP System.

Underwater Noise Technical Report

Maximum Maximum Average Number Average Average Average Mitigation Mitigation Cumulative Pile Date Peak<sup>2</sup> RMS RMS of Peak Reduction SEL On or Off SEL (dB) Туре (**dB**) (**dB**) (Pascals) Strikes (Pascals) (**dB**) (**dB**) Off 196 183 1122 5012 169 Confined 410  $192^{3}$ WAB1 10/29/09 36-39 79 On 162 150 14 134 Bubble Ring 196 Off 185 1000 4467 169 196 Off 183 1000 3981 168 Unconfined On  $187^{4}$ WAB2 10/29/09 450 29-35 166 163 32 112 138 Bubble Ring Off 794 196 183 3162 165 9-12<sup>1</sup> WAB3 10/29/09 DNAP N/A 192 181 562 405 1995 189 163 Off 191 174 398 2512 160 Confined 191<sup>3</sup> WAB4 10/29/09 On 165 162 28 350 32-36 126 138 Bubble Ring 172 Off 196 186 1413 5623

#### Table 7:Summary of underwater Sound Levels for Location B, North of Foster Island.

<sup>1</sup> Average reduction is based on the baseline pile for pile where the DNAP was tested. All other piles the average reduction is from the same pile with the bubble curtain on and compared to the bubble curtain off.

<sup>2</sup> Peak values did not exceed the threshold

<sup>3</sup> Accumulated SEL Values would not have exceed the threshold had the attenuation system been left on

<sup>4</sup> Accumulated SEL value did not exceed the threshold.

March 2010

## 6.4 Location A – Between Foster Island and Edgewater Park

At Location A (see Location Map) there was one 30" steel shell pile driven. The barge was placed 10 meters from the Pile which was designated WAB5. The attenuation system used was the unconfined bubble ring system. A summary of the results of the measurements at location A is shown in Table 8.

WAB5 (30-inch pile)– The barge was moved to Location A (see Location Map) after completion of pile driving at Location "B". The water depth was 24 feet and the hydrophone was set at 12 feet depth and 10 meters from the pile. The pile driving started at 3:40:05 using an unconfined bubble ring system. The airflow was off to begin the drive. After 45 seconds the air was started and the pile was driven for approximately 10 minutes. The airflow was then turned off for two minutes and then restarted for five minutes and stopped again for 30 seconds. At that time there was an approximate 10-minute pause to allow the pile Dynamic Analysis equipment to be installed on the pile. Driving resumed at 4:07:56 with the airflow off for approximately 20 seconds. The airflow was on for 15 minutes and was turned off for the last three minutes of the drive. Two compressors were used and they both were putting out 690 -700 CFM at 110 PSI. A total of 1,470 pile strikes were used to drive the pile. Figure 26 shows the difference between the partially mitigated and partially unmitigated waveform and frequency distribution of WAB5.



Figure 26: WAB5 signal analysis of a pile driving underwater sound pulse

Pile	Date	Mitigation Type	Mitigation On or Off	Maximum Peak <sup>1</sup> (dB)	Maximum RMS (dB)	Average RMS (Pascals)	Number of Strikes	Average Peak (Pascals)	Average Reduction (dB)	Average SEL (dB)	Cumulative SEL (dB) <sup>2</sup>
			Off	197	185	1585		6310		176	
		Unconfined	On	179	168	178		631	18 20	153	
			Off	197	186	1413		6310		174	
WAD5	10/20/00		On	180	166	178	1470	794		153	100
WADJ	10/29/09	Bubble Ring	Off	196	183	1000	1470	5623	16-20	170	199
			Off	196	185	1000		6310		174	
			On	180	167	178		708		153	
			Off	197	184	1413		6310		173	

## Table 8:Summary of Underwater Sound Levels for Location A, Between Foster Island and Edgewater Park

Peak values did not exceed the threshold

1

<sup>2</sup> Accumulated SEL Values would not have exceed the threshold had the attenuation system been left on

## 6.5 Rise Time

Rise time is a descriptor used in waveform analysis to describe the characteristics of underwater impulses. In general rise time is the time in microseconds (ms) it takes the waveform to go from background levels to absolute peak level. There have been different definitions used in the calculation of rise time. Rise time has been calculated using the time required to go from zero, or the lowest value, to the maximum value. A different method is calculate the time it takes to go from beginning of the wave, or background level, to the maximum level. Figure 27 shows graphically how the rise time is calculated following the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard definition. This is the method that was used in this study and the results are shown in Table 9.

In 1973 Yelverton indicated rise time could be the cause of injury to fish. According to Yelverton (1973), the closer the peak is to the front of the impulse wave the greater the chance of injury. In other words, the shorter the rise time the higher the likelihood for effects on fish. Yelvertons studies were directed to a single blast in water.



Figure 27: Signal Rise Time

Table 9:Summary of Rise Time for selected Piles

Pile	Date	Mitigation Type	Mitigation On or Off	Maximum Peak (dB)	Rise Time (ms)
DD 1	10/27/00	Unconfined	On	190	0.33
FDI	10/27/09	Bubble Rings	Off	199	0.50
001	10/27/00	Unconfined	On	181	0.31
FD2	10/27/09	Bubble Rings	Off	183	0.30
DD 2	10/27/00	Unconfined	On	164	0.48
rd5	10/27/09	Bubble Rings	Off	193	0.19
DD /	10/27/00	Unconfined	Off	194	0.32
rd4	10/27/09	Bubble Rings	On	161	4.53
WAD1	10/20/00	Confined	Off	196	0.71
WADI	10/29/09	Bubble Ring	On	164	0.42
WAB3	10/29/09	DNAP		192	0.63
WAR5	Unconfined		Off	195	0.16
WAB5	10/29/09	Bubble Rings	On	177	0.10
#### Airborne Noise Measurements

Sound from a single source (i.e., a "point" source) radiates uniformly outward in a spherical pattern as it travels away from the source. The sound level typically attenuates (or drops off) at a rate of six dBA for each doubling of distance.

Usually the noise path between the source and the observer is very close to the ground. Noise attenuation from ground absorption and reflective wave canceling adds to the rate of attenuation. Traditionally, the excess attenuation has also been expressed in terms of attenuation per doubling of distance. This approximation is done for simplification only; for distances of less than 300 feet, prediction results based on this scheme are sufficiently accurate. For acoustically "hard" sites (i.e., sites with a reflective surface, such as a parking lot or a smooth body of water, between the source and the receiver), no excess ground attenuation is assumed. For acoustically absorptive or "soft" sites (i.e., sites with an absorptive ground surface, such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees), an excess ground attenuation value of 1.5 dBA per doubling of distance is normally assumed.

Noises generated from construction activities are considered point sources, rather than a line source such as a freeway or roadway. The area around the Alviso Pedestrian Bridge is heavily vegetative and would be considered a "soft" site. The combination of these two creates a drop off rate of 6 to 7.5 dB per doubling distance. The formula for calculating the drop off is the source level plus  $10*Log_{10}(D_1/D_2)$ , where  $D_1$  is the reference position and  $D_2$  is the receiver position. For example if a impact pile driver has a reference level of 113 dBA at 50 feet the noise level at 500 feet would be calculated as follows for conditions where excess attenuation is not anticipated:

Received level =  $113dBA + 20Log_{10}(50/500) dBA$ Received level = 113+(-20) dBAReceived level = 93 dBA

Various descriptors are used to characterize noise levels, depending on the noise source and environment. The Department *Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol* (TNAP) and the *Technical Noise Supplement* (TeNS) contain explanations of the noise descriptors normally associated with traffic noise. Common descriptors used in environmental noise studies evaluating airborne noise are shown in Table 10.

The  $L_{eq}$  Noise descriptor is primarily used when the noise source is non-impulsive or a more steady noise. The  $L_{eq(h)}$  the worst noise hour, is routinely used by the most State Departments of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration to address impacts of highway noise on surrounding areas. The  $L_{max}$  noise descriptor is generally the most appropriate descriptor to use when discussing impulsive noise impacts, such as from pile driving. Construction noise is generally shorter in duration and the sound are more impulsive, such as with pile driving. The signal from pile driving is very short in duration and is not accurately characterized by averaging the source over a period of time. The  $L_{max}$  is the instantaneous highest level measured. Unlike the  $L_{eq}$  the Lmax does not have a time constant attached to it.

Lmax	The highest instantaneous noise level during a specified period. This descriptor is
(maximum noise level)	sometimes referred to as 'peak (noise) level. The use of 'peak' level should be
(maximum noise lever)	discouraged because it may be interpreted as a non- RMS value noise signal.
Lx	The noise level exceeded X percent of a specified time period. The value of X is
(a statistical descriptor)	commonly 10. Other values of 50 and 90 are also used. Examples: L10, L50, L90.
Leq	The equivalent steady-state noise level in a stated period of time that would contain the
(equivalent noise level)	same acoustic energy as the time-varying noise level during the same period.
Idn	Commonly used to describe the community noise level A 24-hour average with a
(day/night noise level)	"penalty" of 10 dBA added during the night hours (2200–0700). The penalty is added
(day/lingint noise level)	because this time is normally sleeping time.
CNEL	A common community noise descriptor; also used to describe airport noise Same as the
(community noise	Ldn with an additional penalty of 4.77 dBA (or 10 Log3) for the hours 1900–2200,
equivalent level)	which are usually reserved for relaxation, TV, reading, and conversation.
	Used mainly for aircraft noise; it enables comparing noise created by a loud but fast
SEL	overflight with that of a quieter but slow overflight. The acoustical energy during a
(single-event level)	single noise event, such as an aircraft overflight, compressed into a period of 1 second,
	expressed in decibels.

### Table 10: Common Airborne Noise Descriptors

Airborne measurements were made at two different locations during the impact driving for all pile locations. The distant sites are shown in Figures 2 and 4, they were mounted on local docks ranging from approximately 125 meters at location C to approximately 250 meters at locations A and B. The near location site was located on the front portion of the barge approximately 15 to 20 meters from the pile driver. During the pile driving at Location C, Portage Bay, there was a noise blanket tested to determine its effectiveness at reducing the potential noise impact at distant receivers. Tables 10 and 11 show the airborne Lmax and Leq values for each pile driven. There were some problems with one of the meters shutting off part way through the first day and then again at the beginning of the second day. Measurements were complete at the distant location with no loss of data. Piles PB3 and PB4 were driven with the noise blanket and PB1 and PB2 were driven without the noise blanket. A review of the limited data shows that the noise blanket was not effective at reducing the noise from the impact hammer. The main problem was that there was very short driving times without the noise blanket (one to two minutes per pile) compared to with the noise blanket (seven to eight minutes per pile). There was also some variability in the noise levels, which may have been due to the rate the piles were installed. It took less energy to install PB1 and PB2 (60 to 77 total blows) than to install PB3 and PB4 (275 to 334 total blows) this would mean that piles PB1 and PB 2 were hit softer than piles PB3 and PB4.

				Backgro	ound Leve	ls	Pile Strike Sound Levels				
Pile	Pile Size Distance	Date	L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	
Noise Levels Measured on the Barge											
PB3- Vibratory	24-inch 11 meters	10/26	89	94	78	83	95	102	88	93	
PB1	24-inch 10 meters	10/27	Α	A	Α	А	Α	A	А	А	
PB2	24-inch 14 meters	10/27	79	87	74	83	Α	Α	А	А	
PB3	24-inch 11 meters	10/27	76	95	73	87	75	103	74	100	
PB4	24-inch 15 meters	10/27	78	88	75	83	74	97	74	95	
Noise Levels Measured on the Dock											
PB3- Vibratory	24-inch 125 meters	10/26	72	77	71	73	76	82	71	75	
PB1	24-inch 125 meters	10/27	71	72	69	71	74	81	73	79	
PB2	24-inch 128 meters	10/27	72	79	71	78	72	79	71	78	
PB3	24-inch 125 meters	10/27	71	80	68	73	74	85	76	81	
PB4	24-inch 128 meters	10/27	72	75	69	70	73	82	75	81	

	Table 11:	Summary of Airborne Sound Levels Measured at Location C – Portage Bay
--	-----------	---

<sup>A</sup> Sound Level Meter Failure No Data Data that is in Bold Italics is where the noise blanket was used

				Backgro	ound Leve	ls	Pile Strike Sound Levels				
Pile	Pile Size Distance	Date	L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>eq</sub> (dBA)	Average L <sub>MAX</sub> (dBA)	
			Noise I	Levels M	leasured o	on the Bar	ge				
WAB-1	30-inch 10 meters	10/29	А	Α	А	А	А	А	А	А	
WAB-2	30-inch 14 meters	10/29	83	84	78	79	100	109	99	105	
WAB-3	30-inch 11 meters	10/29	86	84	77	79	101	110	97	106	
WAB-4	30-inch 15 meters	10/29	83	92	79	78	98	108	97	106	
WAB-5	30-inch 12 meters	10/29	79	80	79	80	100	109	97	103	
Noise Levels Measured on the Dock											
WAB-1	30-inch 250 meters	10/29	66	68	63	63	72	81	70	75	
WAB-2	30-inch 250 meters	10/29	64	65	63	63	71	83	70	75	
WAB-3	30-inch 250 meters	10/29	71	72	66	67	73	83	70	75	
WAB-4	30-inch 250 meters	10/29	68	69	65	66	71	80	69	74	
WAB-5	30-inch 240 meters	10/29	67	72	66	66	74	83	72	80	

Table 12:Summary of Airborne Sound Levels at Locations A and B

<sup>A</sup> Sound Level Meter Failure No Data

The transmission loss or amount of reduction did not follow any preconceived patterns. Typically when measuring airborne noise levels the attenuation rate, or drop off rate is determined by several factors. The two easiest to define would be the type noise source, (line or point) and the type ground the noise will propagate over (hard or soft surface). Once these are determined if there are no extenuating circumstances it is fairly easy and accurate to predict the noise level at a given location. There are some variables that can make predicting noise levels and the drop off rate rather difficult and inaccurate. The most common factor is shielding between the noise source and the receiver. The amount of shielding can be relatively small and it will affect the noise levels. Another factor is other noise sources that may add to the noise level you are trying to measure. This could be some loud equipment working in the area or a freeway between the receiver and the noise source that you are concerned with. On this job there were two factors that may have added to excess attenuation to the pile driving noise.

At location C the crane was between the measurement site and the pile driving and at locations A and B the freeway was between the pile driving and the receiver. While the crane body is not that large, it may block the line of sight and therefore it may have affected the measured noise level. The freeway at location locations A and B is between the pile driving operations and the receivers, which could affect the transmission loss.







Figure 29: Airborne noise at Location A and B -Leq

#### SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Pile Installation Test Program Underwater Noise Technical Report

#### Airborne Noise - Impact Driving $L_{max}$ October 27, 2009 110 • 10 - 15 meter Lmax PB-4 With 105 PB-3 With Noise 125 - 128 meter Lmax Noise Blanket Blanket 100 PB-1 Without PB-2 Without Noise Noise Blanket Blanket 95 90 dBA 85 80 75 70 65 60 2.<sup>37</sup>, 10:00 12:45:00 14:00:00 J.J. 73:25:00 J.J. 4.05:00 3:<sup>10</sup>, 3:000 , <sup>0,00</sup>, <sup>0,0</sup> , <sup>1,1,0,0</sup>, <sup>1,1,5,1</sup>, <sup>1,2,0</sup>, <sup>1,2,0,1</sup>, 0,3:35: 1,3:40:00,13:45:00 Time

**Figure 30:** *Airborne noise at Locations C -Leq* 



Figure 31: Airborne noise at Locations C -Lmax

March 2010

#### 6.7 Distant Underwater Measurements

Noise levels from the pile driving at the distant locations were very low and difficult to measure. The systems used at the 200 meter and 500 meter location had the gain in the PCB in-line charge amplifiers adjusted to amplify the signal by 20 dB. Even with this adjustment at times it was not possible to detect the pile driving above the other noises in the Lake. Table 12 shows the levels from the SLM at the unmanned 200-meter site and the manned 500-meter site at Location C. At the unmanned 200 meter location the solid-state recorder malfunctioned at 11:29:53, prior to any pile driving. The SLM continued to function normally, however it is not possible to determine what portion of the noise was solely from the pile driving at this site. At the manned 500-meter site at this site the pile driving could not be detected above the other noises in the water, most of the noise at this site was from the wave action hitting the bottom of the aluminum boat.

	October 27, 2009									
			200 n	neters		500 meters				
Pile ID	Bubble Rings On/Off	Μ	ax Average		Μ	ax	Average			
		(dB)		(dB)		(dB)		(dB)		
		Peak	<sup>1</sup> RMS	Peak	<sup>1</sup> RMS	Peak	<sup>2</sup> RMS	Peak	<sup>2</sup> RMS	
DD 1	On	134	ND	132	ND	143	ND	137	ND	
PB1	Off	136	ND	134	ND	145	ND	137	ND	
PB2	Off	134	ND	131	ND	149	ND	138	ND	
	On	138	ND	132	ND	143	ND	135	ND	
PB3	On	140	ND	137	ND	150	ND	138	ND	
	Off	136	ND	134	ND	147	ND	136	ND	
	On	139	ND	134	ND	146	ND	142	ND	
	Off	138	ND	136	ND	146	ND	144	ND	
	Off	134	ND	132	ND	149	ND	139	ND	
PB4	On	138	ND	136	ND	143	ND	134	ND	
	Off	138	ND	134	ND	145	ND	135	ND	

Table 13:Summary of Underwater Sound Levels Measured at 200 and 500 metersOctober 27, 2009.

<sup>1</sup> Noise on solid-state recorder was from waves slapping the side of the boat, not pile driving

<sup>2</sup> Data recorder malfunctioned, no recorded data.

At locations A and B the equipment at both of the 200 meter and 500 meter sites functioned properly the entire day. The noise from the pile driving was recorded and samples of the signals from a selected few of the pile strikes were analyzed and are shown in the back of Appendix B. The unattenuated (bubbles off) pile strikes were clearly heard, however at the 200-meter site when the bubbles were turned on the pile strikes were no longer audible. While at the 500-meter site the attenuated pile strikes could be heard above the background noise. The unmitigated noise from the pile driving was greater at the 200-meter site, while the mitigated noise from the pile driving was greater at the 500-meter site. This difference has been observed on several different projects and is mainly due to the ground borne noise from the pile being released beyond the 200-meter location. The ground borne portion of the noise is not attenuated by the bubble ring(s). There is no obvious explanation for the higher levels measured at 500m. The sound propagation is quite complex (through the bubble curtain, bottom substrates, and water) and cannot be understood very well from these few measurements. This type of Flanking has been observed on the San Francisco Bay Bridge Project on different occasions<sup>5</sup>

ctober 2	29, 2009.									
			Oc	tober	29, 200	)9				
				200 n	neters			500 1	meters	
Pile T ID Miti	Type Mitigation	Bubble Ring(s) On/Off	Max (dB)		Average (dB)		Max (dB)		Average (dB)	
			Peak	RMS	Peak	RMS	Peak	RMS	Peak	RMS
WAB1 Confined Bubble Ring	Confined	Off	165	147	157	141	160	142	154	137
	Bubble	On	146	127	138	120	154	137	148	132
	Ring	Off	163	145	157	142	159	141	152	139
	Unconfined Bubble Rings	Off	161	135	150	125	161	145	153	139
WAB2		On	153	131	138	120	156	138	148	134
		Off	157	140	151	133	157	140	151	137
WAB3	DNAP	N/A	151	156	145	135	156	136	149	132
	Confined	Off	141	142	135	135	152	136	146	134
WAB4	Bubble Ring	On	144	136	137	129	153	136	147	133
		Off	159	132	154	130	158	141	153	138
	Unconfined Bubble Rings	Off	177	164	175	155	163	135	158	134
WAB5		On	154	135	138	121	139	121	132	117
		Off	177	162	174	159	158	140	152	135
		On	166	146	142	124	140	118	132	130
		Off	176	160	170	155	152	134	145	116
		Off	177	161	173	159	158	137	152	134
		On	167	145	142	127	149	130	141	122
		Off	177	161	174	157	157	137	153	135

Table 14:Summary of Underwater Peak Sound Levels Measured at 200 and 500 metersOctober 29, 2009.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Memo from James Reyff to Mara Melandry Dated July 24, 2003; SFOBB East Span Construction Pier 16E

### 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

Of the three types of mitigation tested, Unconfined Bubble Rings, confined Bubble rings and DNAP, the DNAP was the least effective in reducing the underwater sound levels. While all three reduced the underwater sound pressure the DNAP was the only one of the three that would have caused an exceedance of the 187 dB re1 $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>-sec cumulative SEL threshold, had the two types of bubble ring(s) been used the entire driving period. Both of the bubble ring systems worked extremely well, once all the operational problems were resolved. The 206 dB re: 1 $\mu$ Pa peak threshold was not exceeded, even with the mitigation turned off. Figure 32 shows the effect of a typical bubble ring(s) along with the background level.

# **Figure 32:** Comparison of Bubbles on and bubbles off and the background levels using an Unconfined Bubble Ring.







**B. Narrow Band Frequency Spectra** 



The bubble ring(s) were very effective when working properly and easier to setup and use than the DNAP. Figure 33 shows the difference between the DNAP and the confined bubble ring system. The unconfined or confined bubble ring will produce similar results.



**Figure 33:** Comparison of DNAP, Confined bubble Ring and Unconfined Bubble Rings

Airborne  $L_{max}$  noise measurements made at the docks indicate that the levels at the distant receptor locations will be about 10 dBA above the background levels. This is in part due to the close proximity of SR520 to the homes near the project site. The  $L_{eq}$  values were about 5 dBA above the background or no pile driving periods. The use of the noise blanket is not be recommended as it did not show any benefit and caused additional effort by the contractor in trying to drive the piles.

Monitoring was conducted at one mid channel depth at three fixed distances, including the prescribed distances of approximately 10 meters, 200 meters, and 500 meters. Data were obtained for the peak, RMS, and SEL levels. Preliminary summary reports, including measured peak and accumulated sound exposure levels, and RMS impulse levels were prepared after the completion of the driving period. Data were obtained during both vibratory and impact pile driving.

Some general conclusions from the monitoring are:

- The hydroacoustic monitoring fulfilled the objectives outlined in the Hydroacoustic Monitoring Plan. The Plan called for monitoring four piles, a total of nine piles were monitored.
- Both vibratory pile driving and impact pile driving were monitored.
- Peak sound pressures typically reached maximum levels of 199 dB at the close-in reference (nominal 10 meter) position. The 206 dB peak interim threshold was not reached.
- The maximum RMS level measured at 10 meters was 186 dB unmitigated and was 173 dB mitigated.
- The daily-accumulated SEL varied during the monitoring days, depending upon the numbers and types of piles being driven and the location. On a typical driving day, with 4 piles being driven, the distance to the 187 dB accumulated SEL threshold ranged from less than 10 meters to 60 meters. If either the confined or unconfined bubble ring(s) had been used during the entire driving time, the cumulative SEL level would have remained below the 187 dB re:  $1\mu Pa^2$ -sec threshold.
- The measured noise level from the pile driving was much lower than those published in WSDOT 's compendium of noise measurements. The peak level shown for a 24 to 30-inch pile are 212 dB and 189 to 195 dB RMS. The measured levels were much lower than the data in the compendium, the typical unmitigated peak noise level measured was 195 dB and the RMS level is approximately 183 dB. With the use of mitigation the peak sound levels were approximately 170 dB and the RMS levels with mitigation were typically 155 dB re:  $\mu$ Pa 1.
- The driving time at WAB-5 was substantially longer than at WAB-1 through WAB-4. This was because at WAB1 through WAB-4 the piles were vibrated in deeper and it only required between 325 to 450 blows to reach final tip elevation, while WAB-5 it required 1,470 blows to reach final tip elevation. The Accumulated SEL for piles WAB-1 through

WAB 4, if the mitigation had been used during the entire drive would have remained below 150 dB re:  $1\mu Pa^2$ -sec not have accumulated, while at WAB-5 the Accumulated SEL would have been approximately 185 dB re:  $1\mu Pa^2$ -sec. It is not clear what part of the higher level can be attributed to the pile not being vibrated in to the same depth that WAB-1 through WAB –4 were or was there a difference in the substrate that caused the

• Based on the measurements predictions can be made for future pile driving on this project. These predictions would be based on the assumptions that the piles will be driven with the same type process and the soil type will be the same as where the pile were driven for the test pile project. A conservative 20log function can be use when predicting noise levels from pile driving at 500 meters. A 25log function fits best for distances up to 200-meters. This should allow for a conservative impact assessment.

#### 8.0 REFERENCES

- Blackwell, S, Burgess, W.C. 2004. Underwater Measurements of Pile Driving Sounds during the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Safety Project. Greeneridge Report 305-1. June, 25, 2004.
- Caltrans. 2002. Fisheries and hydroacoustic monitoring program work plan. September 2002.
- Caltrans 2004. Fisheries and hydroacoustic monitoring program compliance report. June 2004.
- Caltrans 2005. Addendum to the Fisheries and hydroacoustic monitoring program compliance report.
- Greene, C. R., Jr. 2001. Proposed construction impact avoidance and minimization measures, regarding the interaction between fish and sounds from pile driving while building the new San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. Caltrans District 4.
- Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2001. Final data report: Noise and vibration measurements associated with the Pile Installation Demonstration Project for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge East Span. August 2001.
- ICF Jones and Stokes and Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., Technical Guidance for Assessment and Mitigation of the Hydroacoustic Effects of Pile Driving on Fish. Prepared for Caltrans. February 2009.
- Reyff 2003. Underwater sound pressures associated with the re-strike of the pile installation demonstration project piles. Prepared for Caltrans District 4. July 2003
- Laughlin, Jim, 2007. Underwater Sound Levels Associated with Driving Steel and Concrete Piles near the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal. WSDOT monitoring report, March 2007.

### 9.0 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Ambient Sound Level -** The background sound level, which is a composite of sound from all sources near and far. The normal or existing level of environmental sound at a given location.

**Attenuation** – A decrease in sound pressure at a receiver caused by a physical or mechanical difference in system. A physical barrier will often cause attenuation in sound pressures when place in between a noise source and a noise receiver.

**Digital Audio Tape (DAT)** – Underwater sounds were measured and stored digitally on digital audiotapes using a Sony Model TCD-D100 DAT Recorder for playback and subsequent analysis.

**Decibel (dB)** – A unit describing the amplitude of sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the pressure of the sound measured to the reference pressure. The reference pressure for water is 1 micro Pascal ( $\mu$ Pa) and air is 20 micro Pascals (the threshold of healthy human audibility).

**Frequency Spectrum** – Distribution of sound pressure vs. frequency for a waveform, dimension in RMS pressure and defined frequency bandwidth.

**Hertz (Hz)** – A unit of frequency. Defined as the number of complete oscillations of a quantity during a period of time. Hertz is equivalent to cycles per second. Normal human hearing is between 20 Hz and 20,000 Hz. Infrasonic sounds are below 20 Hz and Ultrasonic sounds are above 20,000 Hz.

**Impulse** – Impulse is defined as the time integral of a force. It recognizes that a short duration pulse may do less damage than a longer duration pulse of the same pressure. Sound pressure is equivalent to kilowatts while impulse is equivalent to kilowatt-hours. It is typically described in units of psi/msec.

**Kilo Joule (kJ)** – A unit of energy equal to one thousand Joules, or one Newton-meter. One kilo Joule of energy will move a body exerting one kilo Newton of resistance a distance of one meter. One kilo Joule is equivalent to 738 foot-pounds (ft-lbs).

**MHU 500T** – Menck hydraulic hammer, underwater series, with an energy range of 50 to 550 kilojoules and maximum blow rate of 38 blows per minute.

**MHU 1700T** – Menck hydraulic hammer, underwater series, with an energy range of 70 to 1,730 kilojoules and maximum blow rate of 35 blows per minute.

**Micro Pascal (\muPa)** – A unit of pressure that is equal to one millionth of a Pascal. Most underwater acoustic sound pressure levels are reported with a reference pressure of one micro Pascal.

**Monitoring Pile** – A large (2.5-meter) diameter steel pipe pile. Each pile consisted of two sections. Monitoring was usually conducted only when the last section of the pile was driven. Small temporary piles were not monitored.

Acoustic near field – An area in close proximity to a noise source where appreciable variations in sound pressure may exist along a given radius or annulus to the noise source.

**Pascal (Pa)** – A unit of pressure equal to one Newton per square meter.

**Peak Sound Pressure** (unweighted), dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa - Peak sound pressure level based on the largest absolute value of the instantaneous sound pressure over the frequency range from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. This pressure is expressed in this report as a decibel (referenced to a pressure of 1  $\mu$ Pa) but can also be expressed in units of pressure, such as  $\mu$ Pa or PSI.

**Pier** – The new East Span will consist of two side-by-side bridge structures, supported by a series of piers. Each pier will be supported by 6 piles. Piers for the Skyway, located to the east of the main

```
March 2010
```

span, are labeled E2 through E16. An "E" at the end of the label denotes eastbound and a "W" denotes westbound (e.g., E6E and E6W).

**Pile Driving Time** – The time period to drive a section of pile to its predetermined elevation. **PSI** – A pressure unit, pounds per square inch.

**Pulse** – A brief and sudden change in a normally constant quantity.

**Rise Time** – Time interval a signal takes to rise from 10% to 90% of its highest peak.

Root Mean Square – The absolute average of a set of numbers, usually time variant quantity.

**Root Mean Square 90% (RMS**<sub>90%</sub>) – The root mean square over the time that comprises 90 percent of the sound energy for one pile driving pulse. Commonly used in repetitive or relatively continuous measurements such as in speech or highway noise. It is not applicable to certain transient signals such as explosions. It is used in calculating longer duration sound pulses such as pile driving pulses. RMS impulse is expressed in dB re 1 micro Pascal measured over the frequency range of 20 Hz to 20 kHz.

**RMS Impulse** – Maximum root mean square of a quantity measured in an interval. Measured using the standard "impulse" setting of a sound level meter, the time window is 35 milliseconds. RMS impulse is expressed in dB re 1 micro Pascal measured over the frequency range of 20 Hz to 20 kHz.

**Sound level Meter (SLM)** – Instrument used to measure the underwater sound pressure signals sensed by the hydrophone. A Larson Davis Model 820 precision integrating sound level meter was used to measure underwater sound pressures in the field.

**Sound Exposure Level (SEL)** – A common unit of sound energy used in airborne acoustics to describe short-duration events. The time integral of frequency weighted squared instantaneous sound pressures. Proportionally equivalent to the time integral of the pressure squared and can be described in terms of  $\mu$  Pa<sup>2</sup> sec over the duration of the impulse.

**Sound Pressure Level (SPL)** – Sound pressure is the sound force per unit area, usually expressed in micro Pascals (or 20 micro Newtons per square meter), where 1 Pascal is the pressure resulting from a force of 1 Newton exerted over an area of 1 square meter. The sound pressure level is expressed in decibels as 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio between the pressure exerted by the sound to a reference sound pressure (e.g., 20 micro Pascals) SPL =  $20 \log \left\{ \frac{P_1}{1 \mu P_0} \right\}$ . Sound pressure level is the quantity that is directly

measured by a sound level meter.

Total Acoustic Energy, dB re  $1 \mu Pa^2 \sec$  - Proportionally equivalent to the time integral of the pressure squared and is described in this report in terms of  $\mu Pa^2 \sec$  over the duration of the impulse. Similar to the unweighted Sound Exposure Level (SEL) standardized in airborne acoustics to study noise from single events.

**Waveform -** A graphical representation of the time variant acoustic pressure of an individual pile driving pulse plotted with the pressure unit micro Pascal (µPa) and the time unit seconds (sec).

## Appendix A

### **Daily Time History Charts of Measured Sound Levels**

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 26, 2009 Site C - Pile ID PB-3 10 Meter- Vibrating Pile



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 26, 2009 Site C - Pile ID PB-3 200 Meter - Vibrating Pile



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-1 Peak Levels @ 10m From Pile

Figure A-3



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-1 SEL Levels @ 10m From Pile

Figure A-4



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-2 Peak Levels @ 10m From Pile



Figure A-5

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-2 SEL Levels @ 10m From Pile



Figure A-6

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-3 Peak levels @ 12m from Pile



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-3 SEL Levels @ 12m from Pile



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-4 Peak Levels @12m From Pile





#### SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Pile ID PB-4 SEL levels @12m From Pile



Figure A-10

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 27, 2009 Site C Daily Cumulative SEL Levels @ 10-12m From Pile



Figure A-11

### SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Background Peak Levels



Time

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Background SEL Levels



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-1 SEL Data Confined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 14

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-1 Peak Levels Confined Bubble Ring



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-2 SEL Data Unconfined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 16

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-2 Peak Levels Unconfined Bubble Ring

Figure A - 17



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-3 SEL Data Doublewall Noise Attenuation Pile - DNAP

Figure A - 18



SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-3 Peak Levels Doublewall Noise Attenuation Pile - DNAP

Figure A - 19


SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-4 SEL Data 2 Confined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 20

Time

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-4 Peak Levels Confined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 21

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site B - Pile ID WAB-5 SEL Data Unconfined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 22

SR 520 Bridge Test Pile Project October 29, 2009 Site A - Pile ID WAB-5 Peak Levels Unconfined Bubble Ring



Figure A - 23

March 2010

## Appendix B

## **Summary of Signal Analysis of Pile Driving Underwater Sound Pulses**













Figure B - 6







Figure B - 9





Figure B - 11



Figure B - 12



Figure B - 13









Figure B - 17



Figure B - 18




























































Figure B - 48















Figure B - 55























Figure B - 66