David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

NOISE REVIEW BOARD AND PIR SUBCOMMITTEE JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES

Date of meeting:	1/22/2025
Start time:	6:03 PM
End Time:	8:06 PM
Location:	Zoom - Meeting ID: 880 2876 6900

I. Meeting Attendees

	Participants	Attendance
Board Members	Mary Sipe – Chair	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Derek Trost - Community Member At-Large	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Alex Marine - Professional in Acoustics	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Michael Diltz - Community Member At-Large	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Reeder Rice - Professional in Construction	☒Present ☐ Absent
PIR Subcommittee Members	Mary Sipe, NRB Member	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Ron Huegli, PIR Management	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Nikki Gamell, PIR Management	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Kerrie Standlee, Consultant & Acoustic Engineer	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Charles Freeborn, PIR Track User	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Jason Henshaw, PIR Track User	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Marty Knowles, Community Member	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Angela Moos, Community Member	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Ryan Pittel, Community Member	☒Present ☐ Absent
Nonvoting NRB Members	Paul Van Orden - Noise Control Officer	☒Present ☐ Absent
City Staff	Beth Benton – Manager Property Compliance Division	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Maximo Behrens, PIR Management	☒Present ☐ Absent
	Juliette Olivella – Noise Program Coordinator	☒Present ☐ Absent

II. Introductions

The Noise Review Board Chair, Mary Sipe, started the meeting by welcoming the public and Board members but clarifying the meeting facilitation would be by Paul Van Orden, the City's Noise Control Officer, as she was overseeing both the subcommittee and the Advisory Board.

Paul introduced himself, as well as all Board Members, PIR Subcommittee members and Noise Office Staff.

III. Public comments

Mary Sipe also explained to the public that comments wouldn't be taken during this work session but could still be submitted in writing at the Noise Program's email.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

IV. NRB-PIR Subcommittee Final Report & Recommendations

Paul then turned the meeting back to Mary for an overview of the final report and recommendations. Mary explained that the Noise Review Board had established a subcommittee in 2021 to address noise impacts from PIR, the Subcommittee's goal was to identify solutions that would allow the community and the racetrack to coexist harmoniously. The subcommittee's final report, which included research and recommendations, was sent to the Noise Review Board members in November 2024 for review. Subcommittee and Board members were also provided with a 3-ring binder with a printed copy of the report for reference during the meeting.

Mary proceeded to present the two key recommendations from the subcommittee:

Recommendation #1

Allocate funding for a new independent Noise Study and Noise Barrier feasibility Study.

The Noise Control Officer will be involved determining the scope of a new noise study when drafting a Request for Proposals.

The Noise Study is to include:

- Noise studies & noise modeling to determine if 103 or 105 dBA at trackside equates to 65 dBA in the neighborhood and to determine what the maximum trackside decibel level should be set at to achieve 65 dBA in the neighborhood for all non-varianced motor vehicle racing events that occur at PIR.
- Noise studies to determine if monitoring trackside decibel levels on an individual vehicle basis is sufficient to achieve 65 dBA in the neighborhood.
- Noise studies to document the frequency and location of exceedances of 65 dBA in the neighborhood.
- An assessment and recommendations for the appropriate number and locations of trackside and neighborhood sound level meters.
- A feasibility study of the availability, effectiveness, safety, location, and cost of noise mitigation/abatement options such as installation of noise barriers.

Recommendation #2

The City to provide adequate funding and staffing to the Noise Control Office

In 1989 Resolution 34626 made the following recommendation:

"The City shall assure an adequate level of funding to the Noise Control Office to effectuate these recommendations, especially as they concern monitoring and enforcement.

In 2001,the Noise Task Force made the following recommendation:

"Fund the Noise Control Office adequately to carry out the recommendations in this report including one to two additional staff and noise monitoring equipment reflecting the best technology available.

The Subcommittee recommends that increased funding and staffing to be evaluated with the next fiscal year budget process.

Mary mentioned these recommendations had been highlighted in the report, which was also posted online.

Paul emphasized the goal of the meeting was to review and accept the report into the record, and he opened the floor to any initial questions from the Board.

Derek Trost asked for more clarity on the purpose of the meeting. Paul explained the goal was to review the report and make progress in the long-term process. He also noted that Beth Benton, the Property Compliance Division Manager, would discuss next steps later in the meeting.

Reeder Rice inquired about the placement of the physical monitors, specifically questioning whether the monitors should be in the Trenton neighborhood instead of the ~~Canton~~ Kenton neighborhood. He clarified that their primary concern was ensuring everyone was aware of the two monitors and any potential better location for them.

Paul provided background information, noting that years ago, when deciding where to place community noise meters, they analyzed potential locations with Kerrie Standlee, who was on the Noise Review Board at the time. Paul recalled discussing four possible locations, with Trenton Park being the top choice but a pole to mount the meter on was not available at that time. Eventually, a location near Kenton Park was chosen but Paul noted that with current discussions, Trenton Park seemed like a better location for monitoring noise.

Derek asked Paul to clarify whether there were any poles standing in the Trenton Park location or nearby that could be used for the monitors, or if the Parks Bureau needed to be involved in determining where the infrastructure could be placed.

Paul mentioned that obtaining access to utility poles was expensive and challenging. They also discussed the logistics of placing additional monitors if the Subcommittee decided to move the report forward.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Reeder raised a question about the feasibility of using a plexiglass barrier at the racetrack, as suggested in the report, and asked for input from others on whether this would be effective or if it would become scratched and cloudy over time.

Jason Henshaw pointed out that the specific recommendation for noise mitigation measures should come from an independent acoustical firm, which could conduct a thorough analysis of the racetrack, how sound is emitted, and where it concentrates.

Mary further explained that newer technologies were available for sound barriers, referencing a study from 2008 that suggested plexiglass barriers but noting that more modern solutions were now available.

Derek emphasized that the study would assess the feasibility of any sound measures, including logistical, financial, and durability considerations.

Michael Diltz then asked how far over the 65-decibel community noise level the measurements were, and whether they were close to meeting their goal.

Paul discussed how some measurements had reached 70 to 71 decibels, noting that although there were exceedances, they were not consistent or malicious. He highlighted the need for a deeper analysis to determine if specific types of races were causing the exceedances and how they could address them.

Ron clarified that exceedances were not frequent, but at times, the noise from specific cars or motorcycles exceeded the limit. He reiterated that the exceedances were not constant but would require more detailed study to determine the exact causes.

Marty Knowles disagreed and pointed out that Ron was referring to the track side decibel levels and the neighborhood levels represents a different situation.

Jason replied explaining that their opinions are based on Paul's anecdotal study that he did over the summer.

Derek then responded that Paul's study was not anecdotal, as Paul was a trained professional and had conducted formal compliance measurements during his study.

Jason agreed and rectified his point emphasizing that the data collected showed few exceedances in the neighborhood and needed to be addressed by a different study, not just one day one point.

Marty agreed and highlighted how important is to do the new study in the neighborhood not in the racetrack.

Derek ~~empathized~~ emphasized that the measurements taken by Paul indeed have a scientific weight. ~~and~~

Kerrie supported Derek's point explaining the protocol used by the city and Paul's readings, explaining how it differed from standard procedures, such as measuring from a property line. They noted that the situation at the racetrack was unique due to the multiple noise sources involved and the need for a specialized measurement process to determine which sources contributed to the noise levels.

Kerrie also pointed out that Paul's readings also showed multiple times with no racing activity where the levels were lower at ~~tunes~~ times but there was an exceedance of the City Code with the race activity.

Paul then explained his neutral role as the city's noise officer, emphasizing that the measurement protocol used for the issue at hand is unique. Unlike traditional noise measurements, where the noise is assessed at the property line, the current protocol measures noise trackside. The challenge, as Paul described, is determining whether this method is working and how to modify it if it isn't. He noted that the situation is complex because the City Council had decided to adopt this unique measurement protocol years ago.

Paul further elaborated that the city needs to study the issue to avoid a standoff and ensure that both racing and neighborhood concerns are balanced. Paul also mentioned that the existing approach to measuring noise, particularly with the trackside measurements, may not be ideal and needs review.

Mary referenced the Greenbush study and the fact that the relationship between trackside noise and community noise has not been fully verified.

Kerrie mentioned the importance of studying the specifics of vehicle types, the number of vehicles on the track, and other variables like meteorological conditions in order to determine appropriate limits for noise. Kerrie also explained that when drag racing was more prominent, noise levels at the trackside were more of an issue, but now road racing has led to more complaints. The number of vehicles and their placement on the track significantly affect the noise levels, which is something the study should address. He hopes the study would include a comprehensive analysis of the situation, with possible recommendations for limiting vehicle numbers or other measures to manage noise.

Paul also referred to the historical Greenbush study and how funding issues had prevented its completion, leaving the current study to continue from where it left off. They clarified that the study's findings were delayed due to attempts to secure more funding, but ultimately, the necessary funding was not acquired.

Derek then challenged a finding in the report, which stated that the Noise Review Board had consistently followed a recommendation. He argued that the board had not consistently taken action on noise level reductions, particularly concerning the four variance events mentioned.

Derek clarified that the wording in the report was misleading.

Jason proposed that the Board reconsider how this is reported, particularly regarding the actions that were not fully carried out. The idea of reevaluating limits and considering further action was also mentioned as a potential recommendation.

Mary concluded this topic proposing that the current wording of the report be revised to more accurately reflect the Board's actions and to allow room for a reevaluation of noise limits.

Derek also referred to page 21, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that findings entering the record are clear. He questioned the wording regarding compliance with directives and sought clarification on whether the directive should be followed or revised if compliance is not possible.

Derek stated that the sentence should be revised and pointed out the ambiguity regarding enforcement. He noted inconsistencies in compliance and referenced external factors like television broadcasting schedules. He emphasized the need for clarity on whether certain races must begin at designated times and suggested that outside races should be considered when revising the directive.

Nikki questioned how to clarify the issue when broadcasting schedules are determined only a week before the event. She explained that the organization has no control over broadcasting arrangements, which are determined by NASCAR. She also noted that schedules change frequently due to unforeseen circumstances, such as weather-related delays in other locations.

Derek responded to Nikki, clarifying that the goal was not to determine the specifics but to highlight the need for a clearer directive. He referenced previous Noise Review Board variance reviews, where adjustments were made when last-minute changes occurred. He suggested that a process should be in place for notifying the Noise Office and sharing updated information with neighbors.

Nikki recalled that last year, the organization did inform the community of scheduling changes.

Ron stated that Mary had clearly outlined the findings and suggested that the directive could include provisions for external forces like weather. He mentioned the concept of force majeure and saw no issue with how Mary worded the findings.

Mary elaborated on the review of resolution 34626, noting that it was from 1989 and that conditions had since changed. She highlighted that nothing in the resolution had been codified into the administrative code or board policies. The review aimed to identify which recommendations should be codified and which were no longer applicable. She reiterated the need to address directives that are no longer enforceable under current conditions.

Derek reiterated his concern about ensuring clarity and accuracy in the findings, emphasizing that the Board must address the scheduling and programming issue in the context of current broadcasting practices. He stated that the findings should be revised accordingly.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Paul interjected, acknowledging the discussion's importance in identifying areas that need more attention. He clarified that accepting the subcommittee's work did not imply unanimous agreement among board members but rather an acknowledgment that certain aspects require further dialogue.

Derek moved on to page 22, pointing out that a reference to 9 AM should likely be corrected to 10 AM. He further identified a missing section on page 26 under the Board findings.

Derek continued by addressing page 30, highlighting the significance of ensuring compliance with Title 18 at residential properties during non-variance events. He expressed encouragement at this step forward and requested insights from the subcommittee on how they reached their conclusions.

Kerrie explained that historical records, including the Greenbush study, suggested that exceedances could occur during non-variance events. However, the Kenton meter data did not show exceedances, possibly due to its location. He noted that Paul's field measurements confirmed exceedances, which aligned with the Greenbush study's predictions. Kerrie confirmed one more time that a full study it is necessary to obtain conclusive data.

Derek asked about the decision-making process within the subcommittee about that conclusion, given the presence of different stakeholders, including experts, neighborhood representatives, and track officials.

Nikki pointed out that the previous study was nearly 20 years old and that significant changes had occurred in the neighborhood since then. She emphasized that variables such as new buildings, increased traffic, and business closures made it impractical to rely on outdated data. She noted that both sides agreed that a new study was needed to reflect current conditions.

Derek stated he was trying to get a clear picture of the discussion made, noting that the document reflected a consensus among the committee members. He emphasized that the Board should understand that the recommendations in the report were based on agreement, and any missing elements likely did not have consensus.

Nikki stated that the agreement was broad and widely accepted by everyone in the meeting.

Michael noted that he heard Jason, and others express that certain measures were necessary and that it was clearly articulated in the report. He asked if there was any opposition to this view.

Derek reiterated that he wanted to make it clear to the Board that the recommendations presented reflected consensus and that any missing elements were likely due to a lack of agreement.

Angela agreed, stating that those most impacted by the sound had to find a way to move forward and determine whether their concerns were valid in the current context.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Derek concluded that different perspectives and rationales led to the same conclusion, which he wanted to bring attention to in the report.

Derek also pointed out a minor but significant issue in the report regarding noise level measurements. He noted that Paul's measurements had indicated a maximum of 71 decibels, contradicting prior mentions of 65 decibels.

Angela suggested that the report should explicitly state that a 105 or 103 decibel limit might not ensure compliance, as current readings showed it did not.

Mary clarified that the wording was intentional because the consensus was that a new noise study was needed to confirm the findings. The committee only had a few noise meter readings to rely on, which was why the report used tentative language.

Marty agreed with Mary's point, suggesting potential changes to the wording.

Charles brought up broader issues being discussed by the Title 18 work group, including factors that could alter noise measurements and how to determine an appropriate methodology. He emphasized that the racetrack had never attempted to bypass regulations and had always complied with the rules laid out for them.

Ron supported Charles' statement, adding that noise level exceedances were momentary, and that charts and graphs could demonstrate these brief spikes, which lasted only one or two seconds.

Mary asked for clarification, and Charles confirmed that the goal had always been compliance at all locations, including trackside.

Ron elaborated that compliance was measured by trackside numbers and noted that Paul's study found instances where noise exceeded the limits at Trent Park but did not always show up as overages on the trackside readings. He explained that exceedances were documented, and action was taken against those responsible.

Derek clarified that his goal was not to challenge anyone but to ensure the report was accurate, highlighting typos and areas that needed revision before submission to the Noise Review Board.

Jason stated that he stood by the wording, which had been carefully debated and crafted by Mary.

Derek questioned why the report did not mention other recommendations such as reducing the number or duration of events or modifying noise level limits.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Mary explained that the subcommittee had discussed these points but had not reached an agreement. She reiterated that a noise study was necessary to make specific recommendations and noted that the Board might later explore scheduling adjustments. She asked if everyone agreed that this was a fair representation of their work, to which the group concurred.

Derek referenced another section on page 34, which stated that eliminating troublesome events would be more effective than raising a noise barrier. He asked for more details on the discussion that led to this conclusion.

Michael confirmed that the statement came from a 1992 feasibility study. Paul added that the committee was merely repeating the study's findings.

Mary noted that this was not the first time such recommendations had been made.

Kerrie asked whether the report referenced the study explicitly. Mary confirmed that it did not but suggested adding a citation.

Derek agreed that a citation was necessary.

Kerrie attempted to recall the study's origin, noting that it was unlikely to be available digitally.

Mary speculated about who might have conducted the study and suggested that referencing it in the report would be useful.

Paul then opened the floor for additional questions from the Board.

Derek acknowledged the extraordinary effort of everyone involved, particularly Beth, Paul, and Mary, in shepherding the process. He also thanked Parks for their contribution and highlighted the dedication of those who had been engaged in the work over the past three years.

Mary shared her experience facilitating numerous workgroups throughout her career and stated that she had never encountered a group with such high participation. She noted that nearly every meeting had full attendance, which reflected the dedication of the subcommittee members.

Nikki stated that as a member, she had attended many meetings and often left feeling angry and unwilling to continue participating due to what she perceived as lopsided conversations. She mentioned that outside the subcommittee, discussions about the issue were often met with dismissal or denial. She shared that she had kept her emotions contained during meetings but frequently left feeling frustrated. She said left meetings feeling muted and with the impression that the Board's objective was to shut PIR down. She acknowledged that different perspectives existed, with some advocating for livability and others for the track's survival, and that everyone involved was passionate about their stance.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Marty spoke about the issue of variance races. He pointed out that 75% of noise complaints stemmed from non-variance races and shared that he had used a handheld noise meter to measure sound levels. While not an acoustic engineer, he noted that the noise often exceeded 65 decibels, sometimes reaching 70 dB, which was significantly higher than the city's usual 55-decibel limit. He emphasized that his neighborhood was the only one with a 65-decibel limit and that the noise level was much higher than in other parts of the city.

Paul clarified that the racetrack was considered an open space zone but was permitted to operate at an industrial sound level due to a City Council decision. He explained that while open spaces typically have a 55-decibel limit, the track's allowance of 65 dB was a unique exception. He wanted to ensure that this context was understood for future discussions.

Marty acknowledged that track officials kept detailed records of noise levels at the trackside limit. He understood their frustration with complaints but maintained that the current measures were insufficient. He assured he was not trying to upset anyone but was pointing out the realities as he experienced them.

Ron expressed that he understood Marty's concerns. He acknowledged that noise from the track was more noticeable during evenings and good weather, which were popular times for activities. He assured that they worked diligently to be good neighbors and highlighted that the track was surrounded by industrial land. He contrasted this with other open spaces adjacent to residential areas, noting that they managed the track accordingly. Ron shared his long history with the track, dating back to 1968, and recalled past meetings at City Hall where loud events were discussed. He mentioned that concerts after races, rather than the races themselves, had been a major noise concern in the past. He praised Mary's efforts in passing through ambiguous regulations and acknowledged that both sides felt threatened but emphasized the importance of finding a workable solution.

Ron reiterated that track officials put significant effort into maintaining the facility and fostering community goodwill, often at their own expense. He expressed pride in the track's contributions to the neighborhood and the region and believed many North Portland residents valued it as well. He acknowledged the various challenges they faced but stressed that they were committed to working hard to improve the situation.

Derek reflected on Ron's comments and recalled a surprise finding from the discussion. He pointed out that Mary had compiled a document outlining major topics discussed over the years. Mary confirmed that it was their task list, detailing issues they had worked through. Mary clarified that she had included a copy of the Subcommittee's Task List in the binders given to the NRB Board members.

Derek highlighted the concept of being a good neighbor, which he found powerful.

Angela interjected to say that they had not thoroughly discussed the good neighbor agreement, to which Mary acknowledged there had been only a brief mention of it.

Nikki stated that they attempted to establish a Good Neighbor Agreement with PIR around 2012. As a result, a meter was installed in the neighborhood. She recalled the challenges in getting Parks to agree to this and mentioned working with Paul and Ryan on this project since 2009. Nikki shared that they met with Friends of PIR and conducted a neighborhood noise survey, which revealed that many neighbors were unaware that PIR was a Parks facility. She appreciated the opportunity to be on the subcommittee, which allowed them to have a voice in more official records rather than just neighborhood association meetings. She recalled learning about Resolution 34626 and emphasized that noise mitigation should be a goal rather than maintaining the status quo.

Derek referred to documentation stating that the subcommittee had no interest in establishing a Good Neighbor Agreement or a community liaison position. He noted hearing Ron discuss the concept of a Good Neighbor and asked Angela for more information.

Angela explained that the original attempt to create a Good Neighbor Agreement failed because PIR insisted on a clause requiring neighbors to comply with a bureaucratic process before addressing issues directly with PIR. When previous staff was in charge, they could not alter this clause, which ultimately led to the agreement's failure.

Derek questioned whether the comment about no interest in the agreement was historical.

Mary clarified that the comment was from a specific meeting where she had raised the issue in the context of reviewing Resolution 34626 recommendations. She recalled receiving no response at the time.

Kerrie recalled that the topic was brought up, but the meeting was not meant to discuss that aspect.

Nikki agreed, stating that it was acknowledged but not pursued further as the meeting had a different focus.

Kerrie reiterated that the discussion did not fit within the mitigation objectives or mission statement.

Mary suggested that if the neighborhood associations and residents were interested, they should take the initiative to pursue the agreement.

Derek questioned the accuracy of stating there was no interest in the agreement.

Nikki believed that the group was more focused on prioritizing other issues first. She asked whether there was interest in pursuing the agreement, noting the lengthy process involved.

Mary shared her experience in drafting a Good Neighbor Agreement for a homeless shelter in her neighborhood. She noted that such agreements are not legally enforceable and require ongoing communication to remain effective. She emphasized the necessity of having a dedicated advisory committee to ensure continued engagement; otherwise, the agreements tend to fade over time, especially when management changes.

Derek suggested conducting a quick survey to confirm interest, observing that there seemed to be a consensus against pursuing it.

Mary then referenced page 12 of the report detailing how Title 18 addresses noise issues, indicating that it contained relevant technical information. Mary addressed concerns about the Board's objective, stating that the intention was never to shut down PIR. She recalled making that clear in early documents and meetings. She noted receiving public comments after the July 30th meeting, in which track supporters repeatedly referred to an alleged goal of shutting down the track. She wished to correct this misconception and clarify that the objective was to create a more harmonious environment rather than close PIR.

Nikki acknowledged that meetings had been contentious, with both sides feeling unheard at times. She observed that PIR representatives occasionally felt dismissed, and public attendees who had not followed the entire discussion history might misunderstand the situation. She emphasized the importance of the noise study, warning that a drastic reduction in allowable noise levels could effectively shut down PIR's motorsports activities. She noted that racers might have to travel significant distances if restrictions became too severe.

Derek responded that the feeling that PIR was under threat should not be dismissed as a false narrative. He acknowledged that racers' concerns were valid and emphasized the complexity of the issue, as both sides had strong emotional responses.

Ron, speaking not as a track manager but as a racer, noted that discussions about noise made the motorsports community nervous. He pointed out that racetracks across the U.S. and Canada had been shutting down due to noise complaints. He highlighted that many commercially available vehicles exceed noise limits and stressed that racers are deeply concerned whenever noise discussions arise, as they often lead to closures.

Ron acknowledged the need to be responsible stewards of their sport and minimize their impact on surrounding communities.

Mary responded explaining that the subcommittee was ~~a~~ proposal made by the Noise Review Board, not by her personally. She emphasized that while there were recommendations, including one from Paul, the Board collectively decided start work on the subcommittee after community feedback. Her role was to

facilitate and keep the process moving. She acknowledged frustrations but highlighted that everyone came together, agreeing on the need for scientific data to determine possible solutions.

Charles then spoke about Ron's concerns regarding the track shutdown. He noted that initially, variance events were not on the table but were later included in discussions. He pointed out that it is difficult to compile complaint data if there is no way to confirm violations. He compared noise complaints to other city noises, such as traffic and park events, and questioned whether the goal was to solve an issue or just to air grievances. He referenced a report stating that 350,000 people use the park yearly, generating an estimated 500 local jobs and $35 million in revenue, which does not include indirect economic benefits. He warned that altering variance events could drive away major events like NASCAR, impacting finances. He urged the Noise Review Board to consider these financial implications when modifying regulations.

Charles continued by mentioning that Friends of PIR was funding a new study to assess the financial benefits of the track. He noted that international media has portrayed Portland negatively in recent years, and events at the track present a positive image of the city. He shared a personal anecdote about a relative from Paris asking if Portland was burning, illustrating how widespread these perceptions were. He urged the Board to weigh all factors carefully.

Charles also mentioned that in Long Beach, California, residents affected by the Grand Prix receive vouchers for transportation and meals to leave town during the event.

Nikki responded humorously, suggesting that the track should start paying affected neighbors.

Kerrie interjected to clarify that the report did not suggest taking specific actions. Mary reiterated that she wanted to dispel the notion that the goal was to shut down the track, and Charles responded by explaining why that perception might have emerged.

Derek agreed with Charles, stating that the issue was not simply about shutting down the track or keeping it open, but that there were middle-ground solutions with significant impacts. He acknowledged the importance of considering tipping points and unintended consequences, particularly regarding NASCAR events.

Charles agreed, stressing the need for careful consideration.

Jason supported the recommendation to be data-driven, scientific, and fact-based when making decisions. He emphasized the need to consider current topography and environmental conditions when proposing solutions. He cautioned against simply lowering the decibel limit without understanding the consequences, as it could drive away race groups.

Kerrie added that modifying requirements too drastically could make it financially unviable for race groups to attend.

Jason clarified that he was not a track user but was on the Board of Friends of PIR and had lived in the neighborhood for 33 years. He founded a nonprofit serving the local community for 21 years and was brought onto the Board because of his neighborhood involvement. He acknowledged that while he hears the track, it does not affect him as negatively as some neighbors. He warned of unintended consequences if noise limits were reduced, explaining that lowering limits by a few dB could cause half of the race groups to stop coming. He suggested alternative solutions such as structural barriers.

Reeder asked about the noise limits 103 dB and 105 dB trackside and 65 dB in the neighborhood. He requested clarification if they should be raised or lowered or if they should remain constant.

Paul responded explaining that the main issue causing tension was the 105-decibel limit tied to the DEQ standards for Oregon racetracks. He explained that there has been ongoing debate for decades about whether the 105 limit ensures compliance with the 65-decibel limit in the neighborhood. He shared that his experience as both a professional and an engine builder allowed him to appreciate both sides of the discussion. Paul emphasized that he had not seen malice from either side but rather a genuine effort to find a resolution. He highlighted the importance of maintaining economic vitality while also ensuring that noise disturbances were minimized. He acknowledged that a perfect solution might not exist but believed improvements could be made.

Reeder also questioned how the study on the issue would be funded, especially given the City's financial deficit.

Charles proposed that the funding should be split three ways between the track, which had already contributed to the North Portland Trust, the city, and the neighborhood. He argued that financial contributions from all parties would ensure that everyone had a stake in the study. He acknowledged that a full 3-3-3 split might not be possible but maintained that all parties needed to contribute in some capacity. He pointed out that the City was facing a significant deficit and would be unlikely to cover the full cost without additional financial involvement.

Michael countered that the neighborhood's "skin in the game" was already evident through their daily experience of the noise and their ongoing advocacy. He questioned whether financial contributions were necessary from residents who were already affected by the issue. He stated that the City had a responsibility to address concerns from its citizens and suggested that the financial burden should not fall primarily on the neighborhood.

Reeder expressed a personal connection to the track and emphasized that many neighbors were invested in it. He stated that he was not taking sides but wanted to acknowledge the differing perspectives within the neighborhood.

Jason suggested looking at alternative solutions, such as sound-deadening technology, rather than focusing solely on dB limits. He stressed the importance of letting scientific research guide decision-making. He acknowledged funding challenges but stated that finding creative solutions was beyond the scope of the committee. He then brought up concerns about the wording in a document, specifically on page 8, regarding complaints about racetrack noise. He objected to the phrase stating that the belief existed that most complaints came from the same few neighbors, arguing that this was a fact rather than a belief. He provided data showing that three or four addresses had accounted for the majority of complaints in recent years. He requested that a statement implying noise from the racetrack was not a significant issue be removed, as he believed it misrepresented the concerns of affected residents.

Marty supported Jason's concerns and noted that noise was not an issue for some residents, but the statement in the document should not suggest that concerns from affected neighbors were irrelevant.

Mary agreed to remove the paragraph in question. She also distributed copies of Jason's noise complaint analysis charts along with rebuttal to that analysis that she had provided to the subcommittee.

Derek asked if any other subcommittee members had comments on the issue or other topics.

Jason reiterated that a small group of residents was particularly vocal about the issue and appreciated the removal of the contested language from the document.

Michael added that the wording of the paragraph was not neutral and could be interpreted as dismissive.

Derek agreed, stating that the wording contained hyperbole and thanked the group for adjusting it.

Charles stated that he conducted a word search in the document and found that terms like "audiologist," "position," and "doctor" did not appear. He pointed out that while the document references the medical harmful effects of sound, no committee member holds a medical position. He questioned whether such statements should be included without expert testimony.

Derek asked if Paul, as an Environmental Health Specialist, could provide insight. Paul clarified that Charles was referring to references to scientific work without a medical professional presenting it. Paul disagreed with Charles but acknowledged his concern about making such statements without direct expert involvement.

Charles reiterated that it was an overstep.

Derek emphasized that Paul was chosen for the subcommittee due to his expertise in environmental health.

Charles countered that the document included medical references.

David Kuhnhausen, Interim Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
TTY: 711
www.portland.gov/ppd

Mary noted that the citations came from experts.

Charles insisted that while cited, these references were not presented by medical professionals directly in their proceedings.

Derek acknowledged Charles's concern while reinforcing the environmental health expertise present in the subcommittee.

Charles then mentioned that "gentrification" was absent from the document and questioned whether building codes had been adapted accordingly. He asked if the City's permitting process had changed to address such concerns over the past 30 years.

Paul responded that the city was currently rewriting the Noise Code, and Charles clarified that he was referring to building codes.

Beth explained that building codes evolve continuously, updating every three years. She stated that sound requirements exist in both local planning and building codes, with most recent changes occurring within the last 10 years. She noted that such requirements were likely nonexistent 20-30 years ago.

Derek agreed, affirming that building codes have evolved alongside city development.

Charles acknowledged this but stated that the City could design neighborhoods to incorporate barriers and buffers.

Michael stated that such planning was outside the subcommittee's scope.

Paul suggested that while not directly within their scope, the concept had been discussed in broader terms. He referenced considerations for protecting nightclubs from new residential developments through building code adjustments. Charles confirmed that this was his point.

Derek recalled that about a year and a half ago, discussions took place regarding planning office encouragement to address noise in zoning and construction standards. He cited regulations requiring acoustical engineering for buildings near airports as an example and suggested similar measures for other high-noise areas. He emphasized that increasing urban density necessitated revised building standards and encouraged relevant stakeholders to advocate for such changes.

Derek further explained that the subcommittee aimed to propose updated standards for high-density areas. He noted that planning and zoning should consider noise mitigation in places beyond airports, such as PIR. He suggested that organizations, including those in the racing community, could formally present recommendations to planning and zoning.

Paul interjected and moved to the next agenda item. He stated that future Noise Board meetings would provide opportunities for continued discussion.

Beth then spoke about the next steps. She acknowledged prior work and thanked those involved. She shared that community outreach efforts, including surveys and upcoming district-specific meetings, were underway.

Beth stated that funding for necessary studies was a primary concern. She expressed commitment to identifying funding sources and exploring creative solutions, acknowledging budget constraints. She indicated that multiple funding sources would likely be required. She assured the Board that the Noise Office would remain accountable for advancing recommendations.

Beth mentioned that the Board had been actively working on a comprehensive rewrite of Title 18 for over a year. She highlighted the formation of a Noise Advisory Work Group, comprising City Staff, County representatives, PIR stakeholders, and industry professionals, including Charles. She described their efforts in revising regulations and noted that an administrative rule could provide a framework for addressing PIR-related concerns.

Beth emphasized the importance of balancing community interests, recognizing PIR as an economic and recreational asset while ensuring neighborhood residents could enjoy their homes. She expressed openness to exploring various solutions and emphasized that future studies would guide decision-making.

Paul handed the meeting back to Mary as Chair so the Board could go through the normal steps to move the report back to the Board.

Ron interjected and requested that Mary consider moving the third paragraph on page one of the PIR report to the beginning. He explained that some people, including himself, tend to gloss over details unless they are presented upfront. He emphasized that many people within the City and their own bureau do not realize that PIR does not receive any general funds, which is why he had originally included that paragraph. Given the current climate of major budget shifts, he believed it was important to make it clear from the beginning that PIR is financially independent and not a burden on the city.

Mary responded that she would hold the paragraph where it was, as moving it to the beginning would disrupt the flow of the document.

Ron reiterated the importance of ensuring people understand that PIR does not receive general funds, mentioning that even some employees within their bureau are unaware of this. He stressed the need for continuous education on the matter.

Derek asked whether "sustaining" would be an appropriate term or if "Enterprise Fund" was a better choice. He noted that some people do not fully understand what a Fund is but clarified that PIR is self-sustaining and generates all its revenue.

Maximo agreed with Ron's point and stated that the wording was fine but needed to emphasize PIR's financial independence. He highlighted that, despite being City employees, PIR pays for all its expenses, including reimbursements to the city.

Ron confirmed this and added that PIR covers its own costs.

Nikki elaborated that the city pays nothing toward PIR. In fact, PIR pays the city for services such as phone, internet, and computers, even though they could find cheaper alternatives. She expressed frustration over the high cost of services but reiterated that PIR is fortunate to be self-sustaining, especially given the City's current budget crisis, which has placed many jobs at risk. She noted that PIR's small staff is fortunate to be an Enterprise Fund in these difficult times.

Mary then moved to the next item and made a motion that the Noise Review Board accept the PIR Subcommittee's final report and recommendations with the suggested changes on pages 8, 28, and 1, and that the subcommittee be dissolved and that the next steps be taken to move the work forward.

Michael seconded the motion.

Mary called for a vote: Alex voted aye. Derek voted aye. Reeder voted aye. Michael voted aye.

Mary confirmed that the motion was officially passed. She stated that the report was now being handed off to the Noise Review Board and that all future work would take place within that body.

Mary thanked everyone for their participation and noted that it was a good way to conclude three years of work. She expressed her appreciation for the effort put in by everyone involved.

V. Adjournment

NRB Chair Mary Sipe adjourned the meeting at 8:06 PM

Document Version Control Table

Version	*Author*	*Date*	*Control*
0.0	*Juliette Olivella Lopez*	*01/30/25*	*Creation*
0.1	*Mary Sipe*	*40/10/25*	*Added wording from final report*
0.2	*Derek Trost*	*05/14/25*	*Corrected attendance*