

## **Noise Review Board Subcommittee on PIR**

### **July 30, 2024 Meeting Summary**

#### **Present:**

- Mary Sipe, NRB Chair
- Ryan Pittel, Neighbor Representative
- Angela Moos, Neighbor Representative
- Jason Henshaw, PIR User Representative
- Charles Freeborn, PIR User Representative
- Ron Huegli PIR Management Representative
- Nikki Gamell, PIR Management Representative
- Kerrie Standlee, Acoustic Specialist Consultant to Subcommittee
- Paul Van Orden, Noise Control Officer Consultant to Subcommittee

#### **Absent:**

- Marty Knowles

#### **City Staff:**

- Beth Benton, Property Compliance Division Manager
- Juliette Olivella-Lopez, Noise Control Program Coordinator

#### **Meeting Summary prepared by: Mary Sipe**

Subcommittee Chair and Facilitator, Mary Sipe brought the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Sipe advised guests that the Subcommittee will not take questions or comments from guests during Subcommittee discussion..

Guests will be given an opportunity to make comments after the Subcommittee finishes their business during the Public Comments period.

Chair Sipe commented that there had been some confusion about tonight's meeting. She explained that following a Kenton Neighborhood Association meeting where Beth was invited to give a presentation on the City Noise Office Title 18 Advisory Group project, someone created a website announcement and posted flyers in the North Portland community announcing that tonight the Noise Review Board would be conducting a listening session on how noise from Portland International Raceway (PIR) affects those living in surrounding neighborhoods.

The announcement and flyer stated that the Board would be reviewing PIR regulations under the City Noise Code Title 18 at tonight's meeting.

The announcement encouraged North Portland residents to submit emails to the Noise Office prior to tonight's meeting about:

- Their perception of noise from PIR during both normal and variance events
- How the noise from PIR impacts their life
- Their recommendations for changes to Title 18 related to Motor Vehicle Racing events at PIR

Ms. Sipe clarified that tonight's meeting is not a Noise Review Board meeting, it is a Noise Review Board- PIR Subcommittee meeting.

Tonight's agenda is not to review regulations in the City's Noise Code Title 18 related to Motor Vehicle Racing Events at PIR.

The agenda tonight is for the Subcommittee to finalize their Final Report and Recommendations to be submitted to the Noise Review Board.

But, she said, that is not a problem.

The Subcommittee always take Public Comments after finishing agenda items and tonight will be no different.

Anyone who came tonight to share comments about their experiences with noise from PIR can do that tonight during Public Comments.

Anyone who came tonight to share recommendations about changes to Title 18 related to Motor Vehicle Racing, can also do that tonight during Public Comments.

Chair Sipe went on to explain that the Subcommittee and the Title 18 project are two separate activities.

The NRB-PIR Subcommittee is a subcommittee formed by the Noise Review Board to identify ways to mitigate the noise from PIR.

The Title 18 Advisory Work Group is a City Noise Program project. They are reviewing all of the regulations in Title 18, including, but not exclusive to those related to Motor Vehicle Racing Events. The Title 18 Advisory Work Group will be making recommendations for revisions to City Council for approval.

There is some overlap, which, is probably why there was confusion about tonight's meeting.

As part of their work, the Subcommittee has reviewed and discussed recommendations for changes to Title 18 related Motor Vehicle Racing Events, which will be presented to the Title 18 Advisory Work Group by the Noise Review Board.

Ms. Sipe emphasized that tonight will not be the only opportunity to comment on Title 18 changes to Motor Vehicle Racing Events. There will be other opportunities.

In fact, the next opportunity will be at the August 14<sup>th</sup> monthly Noise Review Board meeting. The Title 18 Advisory Work Group's draft recommendations for changes to the section of the Noise Code addressing Motor Vehicle Racing will be presented for the Noise Review Board at that meeting. Noise Review Board members will also present any recommendations they might have.

Much more information about the Title 18 recommended changes will be available at the August 14<sup>th</sup> Noise Review Board meeting and everyone was encouraged to attend.

Before introducing the first agenda item, Chair Sipe acknowledged that there were a large number of members of the public present and she wanted to be sure to allow ample time for Public Comment.

Ms. Sipe reported that the Noise Office had received over 70 emails with written comments for tonight's meeting and those emails have been shared with Subcommittee members.

She asked members of the public who had submitted written comments to please allow those who have not submitted written comments to speak tonight.

In order to get an estimate how much time to allow for Public Comments, the Chair asked for a show of hands from members of the public who wished to give Public Comment.

Six people raised their hands. Chair Sipe said she will watch the time and make sure that there is ample time at the end of the meeting for those individuals to make their Public Comments.

The first order of business on the agenda was to finalize the Subcommittee's Final Report and Recommendations to be submitted to the Noise Review Board.

For guests who might not be familiar with the Subcommittee Sipe gave a brief overview of the Subcommittee:

Ms. Sipe explained that the Subcommittee began meeting in November, 2021. The goal of the Subcommittee was to bring stakeholders together to further understand Portland

International Raceway's noise impacts to the community, and to identify productive solutions to allow all parties to co-exist in a more harmonious environment.

The subcommittee recognizes the entertainment and financial benefits PIR brings to the City and the local community.

The subcommittee also recognize that noise is a fact of life at PIR. The facility simply cannot operate without generating noise.

However, it is also a fact that members of the community are being negatively impacted by the noise and we need to find ways to mitigate the noise and that is what the Subcommittee has been working on.

The Subcommittee has completed their work and now it is time to submit their findings and recommendations to the Noise Review Board.

Ms. Sipe reported that she completed the first draft of the Noise Review Board- PIR Subcommittee's Final Report and Recommendations and sent it to Subcommittee members in April asking them for their comments and suggested edits.

After receiving everyone's feedback, revisions were made and the second draft was sent to subcommittee members to review and come to tonight's meeting prepared to ask questions, share their comments and finalize the report and recommendations.

Chair Sipe said that she would call on each Subcommittee member one at a time and ask for their feedback on the second draft of the report.

Ms. Sipe had also sent the Subcommittee members a list of a potential additional recommendations she had identified in the meeting summaries while drafting the Final Report. She said they will review and discuss those recommendations after reviewing edits to the Second Draft of the Final Report.

**Marty Knowles** sent Chair Sipe an email stating the he would not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but that he supports all of the recommendations proposed in the final report.

**Ryan Pittel** stated that he had reviewed the report and has shared comments throughout the process. He said he agreed with Marty and was in agreement with where the final report ended up, including the additional recommendations. He said he believed that it works for both parties and thinks it is a really good compromise and a good step forward.

**Angela Moos** said that she agreed with Ryan and that she supports the recommendations in the report and the additional recommendations.

She did say she had problems the noise complaint section of the report. She felt there was too much minutia and thought that some of that could be eliminated from the report.

She pointed out that at the last Subcommittee meeting Kerrie Standlee & Paul Van Orden were explicit that every noise complaint is of importance. They stated that it does not matter the number of noise complaints or verbiage in the complaints; the fact that a complaint was made indicates that there is a problem.

She also felt that the tedious process of submitting a noise complaint in the current "Track-It" system needed to be addressed in the report as an issue for people when attempting to file a noise complaint.

**Mary Sipe** told the Subcommittee that she did not address the difficulty with the current Track-It noise complaint system in the report because it is going away. She asked Beth Benton to comment on the change to the online noise complaint system.

**Beth Benton** confirmed the Track-It system is going away. With the Charter reform everyone at the City is moving to a new system. They are trying to funnel all complaints through 311 and the new system. They have something different they are getting ready to roll out to replace Track-It. They think it will make it a lot easier for the person filing a complaint and make it a lot easier for the Noise Office to respond to complaints. She said the new system should be in place before Christmas.

At that point Mary opened the second draft of the report and shared her screen in order for everyone to be able to follow the comments.

**Jason Henshaw** commented that he agreed with Angela about the Track-It system and is glad to hear there is going to be a new system. He also agreed with too much minutia in the Noise Complaint section of the report.

**Jason** commented that on page 8 of the report where his analysis of the noise complaint data was added, he took issue with the next paragraph that was added after that.

**Mary Sipe** responded that she had added the two bullets with Jason's analysis at his request.

**Jason** agreed but he said he felt that the comments following his two bulleted points was a rebuttal and should be removed.

He also took issue with the details in Appendix D.

**Mary** agreed after some back and forth and discussion about the differences of opinion about methods used in analyzing the noise complaint data that she would remove the comments she added on page 8 and Appendix D. She also felt the two bullet points with Jason's analysis should be removed.

**Jason** stated that he wanted his two bullet points to remain in the report. He said that it simply states that the majority of the complaints received came from three households.

**Kerrie** commented that it appeared the intent of what Jason presented in his data analysis was to shine a light on the fact there are only a few people who are having a problem, and that is not an accurate representation.

**Kerrie Standlee** said that he hears what Jason said about his data and he understands his concern about having other data put into the report at this point without having a discussion about it.

**Kerrie** said he thought the data that Mary added was very interesting but he did not remember having a discussion about it and if it is necessary we should have a discussion.

**Mary** commented that she presented the information she added on page 8 and Appendix D at the February 20, 2024 meeting, but that no one offered comments or feedback.

**Angela Moos** commented that she thinks the way the data is interpreted in the two bullets is intended to diminish the noise complaints and make it irrelevant and unnecessary and a waste of the subcommittee's time and it should be removed from the report.

**Mary** asked Angela if what she was saying was to remove all of it, both Jason's analysis and Mary's comments.

**Angela** responded, yes remove all of it.

**Mary** stated that she tended to agree, that both Jason's bullets and the following comments should be removed.

**Mary** added that the point of the noise complaint data gathering and analysis was to validate the problem the subcommittee was trying to solve. She said she thinks it has been validated. She asked if there is anybody on the subcommittee who thinks that it is not a big enough problem to address. She asked for a show of hands. No one raised their hand.

**Ron Huegeli** stated that he is not seeing a balance. He said the subcommittee has focused on the noise complaints, but there was never any active request for positive comments. He said we know there are just as many people who are "for it,"(the racetrack) but that has never been asked. Ron agreed with Jason that facts are facts, numbers don't lie and those are the numbers within that area.

**Mary** responded that the Noise Review Board is aware of the support for the racetrack, they received approximately 240 emails from racetrack users and supporters at the January Noise Review Board hearing in support of the four variances.

**Ron** asked if that was anywhere in this report.

**Mary** began to respond and explain why that is not contained in the report...

**Ron** interrupted and stating "Mary, it is a yes or no answer, is it or is it not in the report"...

**Mary** responded, no that is not in the report.

**Kerrie Standlee** commented that it sounded to him like Ron feels we are trying to say that PIR is a bad thing. He said that we are trying to say there is a noise problem. We now have data that shows that there are times when noise coming from PIR for unvarianced races are exceeding the City Noise Code. That has to be addressed. We cannot ignore that, even if it is one person complaining. It is no different from one person who complains about noise from a heat pump operating next door; we have to address that. We do not want to minimize the fact that there is noise impacting the North Portland neighborhood.

**Kerrie** added that he thinks this report should be more definite in that we have learned that there are exceedances of the City Noise Code by unvarianced races, and now we are saying do more of a study to determine how much exceedance there might be. We have a study, the Greenbusch Study, that showed that there could be significant exceedances. We need more analysis of the noise levels as well as looking at mitigation more closely. Like Mary said, we are trying to make this work for everybody.

**Mary Sipe** also commented that there seems to be a false narrative being spread that the subcommittee was formed to shut down PIR. She said that is absolutely false. The subcommittee was not formed to shut down PIR. The subcommittee has never discussed shutting down the racetrack and, in fact at one of the first meetings she made it very clear that was not something that was within their scope; the focus of the subcommittee was to figure out how can we mitigate the noise from the racetrack.

**Jason Henshaw** stated that his analysis was not in any way an attempt to manipulate or minimize, he was just reporting the facts. He suggested that all the bullets be taken out of the report.

**Mary** responded that was what she suggested, that his bullets and the comments following his bullets should be removed from the report. She said that she would re-work the entire section on Noise Complaints and remove the minutia and make it more succinct.

**Jason** then said he what he was saying is that his charts should not be removed from Appendix D; just keep the table and let people draw their own conclusions. He said we could cut the bottom piece off where it shows 47outof 60 complaints came from 3 households; just leave the table with the chart. He said he also wants to keep the two bullets with his analysis and just remove the rebuttal narrative.

**Jason** added that he felt on page 34 in the Summary the section “Planes, Trains and Automobiles was unnecessary commentary.

**Mary** responded she added that because several of the subcommittee members commented that there are other noise sources in the community. Mary said she would remove or revise that section.

**Jason** next wanted to discuss a suggested comment Mary had added to Recommendation #1 which read:

- The Noise Control Officer will be involved in drafting the scope of any new noise study.

**Jason** said that he felt the Noise Officer should not be involved in the noise study

**Mary** explained that what that bullet is addressing is that someone with expertise, like Noise Officer, Paul Van Orden needs to be involved in drafting the scope of the work in the “Request for Proposal” for the noise study; she will make that more clear.

**Jason** said he was good with that.

**Kerrie Standlee** said the wording on the first page of the introduction in the 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph was confusing. Mary said she would work on making that more clear. On page 2, paragraph 3 of the Introduction the term “community members & stakeholders” is confusing. Mary said she would clarify the meaning of the term “stakeholders.” The remainder of Kerrie’s edits were “word smithing.” Kerrie did not have any changes to the content of the report.

**Nikki Gamell** felt the page numbering was confusing, others agreed. Mary said she would fix that. Also Nikki said the numbers on the Resolution #34626 Recommendations was confusing. Mary explained that there were 23 recommendations, the three or four that were listed are only those related to Noise Control. Mary agreed it is a bit confusing, she will just remove the numbers.

**Nikki** felt there should be more detail and emphasis on the economic benefits from PIR. Mary said she would take a look at that.

**Nikki** also asked in what years were the comments in Appendix B. Mary responded that she thinks she took that from the past 2 or 3 years; she will check and add that information.



**Nikki** felt that there were some personal comments or rebuttals vs. factual. She will send a list to Mary for review. Mary responded that she will review the report and remove any personal comments. Nikki also said that there be more mention in the report of the number of supporters of the racetrack.

**Ron Huegli** commented that he does not think there is enough weight given to the fact that North Portland is a regional travel corridor and the noise from the Portland Airport, trains and commercial trucks. He felt that Mary attempted to address that in the Summary under “Planes, Trains & Automobiles but it needs to be given more weight. He also felt the last paragraph in that section should be removed.

**Ron** also felt that there needs to be reference to the ambient noise that causes spikes on the Trenton sound level meter.

**Note:** In the section of the report on the Kenton sound level meter, there is reference to a report the Chair gave to the Subcommittee about her observations during an on-site visit confirming that there is a great deal of ambient noise in that location that could be causing the spikes that people see on the PIR website. There is also a comment that analysis of the Kenton sound level meter recordings by the Acoustic Consultant hired by PIR often revealed that the spikes showing on the website reported by neighbors were not racetrack noise, but crows, train horns, trucks or other activities in the neighborhood.

**Ron** also wanted more clarity about the DEQ 105 trackside decibel limit and how the racetrack uses 103 dBA to monitor at trackside.

**Note:** The following statement to that effect is on page 15 of the report under the “Trackside Sound Level Meter”

*The maximum decibel limit used by the racetrack for individual vehicle monitoring is 103 dBA, rather than the DEQ 105 dBA.*

**Ron** also wanted more clarity about the comments about the racetrack is allowed to hold events six days a week, with four days going until 10:00 p.m.

**Mary** responded that she will re-word that to be more clear.

**Ron** asked about the sentence in the Introduction that states:

*Since its earliest years, neighbors living near the racetrack have voiced concern about the noise generated by PIR and the negative impact the noise has on livability.* Ron asked if “earliest years” meant from the 1960’s...1970’s....

**Mary** said she would look at changing that phrase to be more specific or to something like “for many years.”

**Ron** stated that he had shared the report with someone who is not a racetrack user and that person’s feedback was that there was nothing positive in the report. Ron’s final

comment was that he felt there needed to be more emphasis on the financial benefits of PIR.

**Charles Freeborn** stated that he echoed most of what Ron said. He stated he felt the report is very one-sided. When the subcommittee was established over 2 years ago, it was his understanding that it would be looking at complaints, but also looking at ways to solve the problem. As the process evolved, the problem solving kept getting pushed down and down on the task list... and was ignored entirely... in his opinion...this has completely turned into a complaint driven series of meetings and largely in this report.

Charles stated: *“one of the things that grinds me a little bit when it comes to complaining, is that a lot of these complaints are coming out of bias. They are people that simply do not like motorsports. I personally am not a fan of golf, but that does not give me the right to disallow somebody else to enjoy their chosen sport. To quote a subcommittee member at one of our meetings... “if it has a motor on it, I hear it.” Another comment or another phrase that came up in the Title 18 Work Group that I’ve been privileged to work on is that we can’t weaponize laws or rules to fit people’s preferences, including things they do not like. I have said repeatedly that I don’t think that complaints that aren’t backed up by data are as valid as ones that are. And I understand it’s been difficult to collect on the spot accurate data and correlate those with complaints. But this laundry list of complaints that you’ve shown here, I’m passing right over them, because I’m not seeing proof to back them up.*

**Charles** continued...*“to listen to Kerrie’s comments, you would think that if a person violates the rules, they are allowed to continue to do so. That is not true. I think that this report needs a complete section with a heading on it discussing how the track addresses sound overages, which we do and we do it very strictly.”*

**Note:** Under the “Sound Level Meter” section of the report there is a very detailed outline of the trackside sound level meter and how it is used to monitor overages and what occurs when a vehicle is over 103 dBA.

**Charles** reported that the Formula E, electric motor vehicle racing event would not be returning to PIR. He did not say why.

**Charles** also took exception with references and documentation regarding the health impact of noise. He said *“all of the various medical advice that has been inserted into this report and that was put out into all of our various documents was not presented by a medical professional. I am not saying it is not valid. I am saying it was not vetted correctly as its applicability to what we are discussing here, so I am not in favor of including all of the horror stories that are laid out for the damages that sound can do...that is just my opinion.*

**Note:** The “horror stories” in Appendix B are quotes from noise complaints where residents have described the physical and psychological effects they experience as a result of the noise from the racetrack.

**Charles** said variances do not belong in this discussion because a variance follows a different set of parameters and rules. He also reiterated the fact that in the “Comparison of Noise Complaint data to PIR Events,” noise complaints do not equal violations. He also commented that Resolution 34626 and the Greenbusch Report are obsolete.

**Charles** pointed out that the monies in the North Portland Trust Fund, which the race promoters have dutifully paid into, have not been spent for anything having to do with improving the situation at the track, be it monitoring or mitigation. The money is just sitting there, not being used. Freezing the North Portland Trust Fund (Grant Program) was not PIR’s fault.

**Ron Huegeli** commented that it is not called the North Portland Trust Fund any more. It is now referred in the City Cost Center as the North Portland Fund.

**Charles** commented that while PIR may have the highest number of noise complaints from a single location, it is not the greatest number overall. There are parks spread all over the city, which in a cumulative manner generate more noise complaints than PIR.

**Noise Officer, Paul Van Orden** responded that Charles statement is not correct; City Parks cumulatively do not generate more noise complaints than PIR.

**Charles** said he wanted to point out that if you take the total number of complaints by category and not by location, motorsports are not the largest generator of noise complaints in the City.

He also felt the comment about “special interest group” should be removed, along with the quote from Terrance Moses, the Kenton Neighborhood Association President related to an article about leaded fuel.

**Mary** responded she would remove those items.

**Charles** had some additional comments about items in the Appendix. He said he would just send his list to Mary

That completed the discussion about the Subcommittee Final Report.

The next order of business was to discuss the suggested additional Subcommittee recommendations that Mary sent to the subcommittee prior to the meeting.

**Charles, Jason, Ron and Nikki** all commented that they felt the additional recommendations were premature and that the subcommittee should wait until a new noise study has been completed.

**Ryan and Angela** had previously commented that they were in support of the suggested additional comments.

**Chair Sipe** said she would table the additional recommendations for now.

**Jason** asked if this would be the last Subcommittee meeting.

**Chair Sipe** responded that she did not think we would need another meeting, but if we did, it would be very short, probably an hour or less.

Mary explained the process will be that she will take all of the feedback from tonight's meeting and make appropriate edits to the second draft. She will send the third draft to the subcommittee members for one final review. That will be the final opportunity for subcommittee members to give feedback for any additional revisions. She is not looking for additional word-smithing or formatting changes, she is looking for additional appropriate changes to the content of the report. Subcommittee members will email Mary with either their acceptance of the third draft, or their suggestions for any further changes. If need be, the subcommittee could have one more short meeting to finalize the report and recommendations.

**Ron Huegli** then asked if the subcommittee would be voting on the final report.

**Chair Sipe** reminded everyone that based on the Noise Review Board Bylaws, which are a standard boiler plate the City established for all Citizen Advisory Committees/Boards, only Board members on a Noise Review Board Subcommittee that includes non-board members can vote. She said that since the other two Noise Review Board members resigned from the Subcommittee, leaving Mary as the only voting member, it would not make sense or be fair to vote when only one member of the subcommittee is a voting member.

Therefore, the Chair said she would take everyone's feedback and consider the general consensus when editing and finalizing the report to be submitted to the Noise Review Board.

### **Next Steps**

Mary explained that the final report and recommendations will be presented to the Noise Review Board at a special meeting in October. Subcommittee members will, of course, be invited to that meeting.

The Noise Review Board will review the final report and recommendations and decide if they accept the report and recommendations, if they wish to modify recommendations and/or add their own recommendations.

The Noise Review Board will determine the next steps and create an implementation plan. They will not just hand this off and hope that something happens.

For example, with the recommendation for a new Noise Study, the next steps or actions would be for the Noise Review Board to direct BDS/The Noise Office to identify qualified acoustic consulting firms and send out a Request for Proposal outlining the scope of the work for the noise study. When responses to the RFP are received, they will be evaluated, following City requirements and a selection will be made. The same steps

could apply for a noise barrier feasibility study which could be incorporated into the noise study or be a separate process and RFP.

Another action could be that the Noise Review Board directs BDS/The Noise Office to do an analysis of the funding and staffing needs for the Noise Program and include a request during the next fiscal budget process for additional funding and staffing.

Chair Sipe then called for Public Comments.

## **Public Comments**

### **Eileen Kelly:**

*I have been living somewhere in North Portland since 1969. I am new to this. I only found out about this meeting because of the North Peninsular Review. I bought a house 26 years ago in Arbor Lodge, so I have been listening to PIR for many, many years. I would like to know more about this process. I am going to be transparent; I am a secretary in the City Attorney's office, I work for the City. Is there information where we can go to find out about agendas, and more about Title 18 meetings. I am also wondering how many people on this subcommittee live in North Portland? Living in North Portland for so long, sometimes we've been excluded from a variety of things, so I appreciate getting the agenda. I have to say in the article (North Peninsular Review) where Jason talks about 3 households, I guess I'm going to start complaining more too. I guess I had assumed that more people were complaining about the noise. That's definitely what I'm going to do and let my neighbors know, because we talk about the noise, that's part of the neighborhood. I get that PIR brings money to the community. I just want to emphasize that we have been living with the noise for many years. I want to become more active about it.*

**Beth** said she would send Eileen a link to information.

**Mary** responded that there are three Subcommittee Community Representatives who are residents of the Kenton neighborhood and one PIR Racetrack "User" Representative who is a resident of the Portsmouth neighborhood.

### **Chris Kennard**

*"I'm a Kenton resident and the Vice Chair of the Kenton Neighborhood Association. I am aware of PIR events frequently, at least weekly when they happen. I can hear them regularly in my backyard, in the Portland public parks and plazas that I go to while I try to enjoy the outdoors. I am sure there are both varianced and non-varianced events that I can hear inside my house with the windows closed. One thing that I saw brought up today is that there not that many complaints on the scale of the Portland population. Speaking in my role as Vice Chair of the Kenton Neighborhood Association, I have talked with numerous neighbors over the last two months who were not even aware that they could complain about PIR noise. The Noise Program brochure put out by the City explicitly calls out that vehicle noise is not covered under the Noise Program. I guess,*

*since that does not clarify that you can complain about PIR noise, people are confused about whether they are able to complain or not.*

*I agree like other people, that PIR brings income to the City and provides enjoyment for the people that attend and drive. But, I do not see a reason why it should be zoned differently from other businesses that also bring money into the City.*

*If we have decided that as a city that according to the (noise) code (Title 18) that... "It is the intent of the City Council to minimize the exposure of citizens to the potential negative physiological and psychological effects of excessive noise and protect, promote and preserve the public health, safety and welfare. It is the intent of the City Council to control the level of noise in a manner that promotes the use, value, and enjoyment of property, conduct of business, sleep and repose and reduces unnecessary and excessive sound in the environment.".. and in that goal they have determined a decibel level that's acceptable to have in residential areas, we should apply equally across all businesses regardless of whether they are motorsports or whether they are industrial or retail.*

*I think it should be a relatively straightforward thing to agree on. If it is unhealthy for an industrial site to produce that much noise, why is it healthy for a racetrack to produce that much noise?*

*I think we need more exposure from folks who are residents in North Portland into this process. I know there are community members on the board (subcommittee) but we are the ones who have to live directly next to the track. We are the ones who are facing the majority of the impact.*

*Additionally, I think that we have heard today that we shouldn't weaponize laws or rules; that we should apply equally. I agree we should not be trying to create a carve out specifically for PIR. I think that we should be applying the standards that we have decided are fair and safe for the rest of the city to PIR.*

*I think there are some common sense recommendations that I saw today. Although I have not had a chance to read the report, I support PIR being held to the same rules as everybody else that lives in the city to minimize the impact."*

**Mary Margaret Weber Wheeler**

*"I'm really glad to be here. For those who I haven't met. I'm Mary Margaret Wheeler Weber. I'm vice chair of the Portsmouth Neighborhood Association, and I attended a meeting back in September of 2021, when this committee was being proposed. And at that time I was very pessimistic that this committee would achieve anything with this issue. I've lived in in Portsmouth since 2001 and Saint John's since the eighties.*

*This issue has been like a poison in North Portland for decades. It's extremely unpleasant to talk about the negative impact of PIR noise. You risk either being gaslit or pilloried. That is just my truth.*

*Before coming to this meeting, I wasn't able to completely parse what your specific recommendations are. And I wasn't able to track that from today's meeting or the minutes that I reviewed before coming, but you really do appear to have moved forward. And for that I really want to deeply and sincerely thank all the members. This is work that means a lot to a lot of us. And I know it's really hard. And so I want to thank all the members, your chair and the staff.*

*And it's particularly encouraging to see in the notes that I read and the comments I heard tonight the truth of what so many of us experience; that the PIR noise does negatively impact our peaceful enjoyment of our homes and our yards. Year after year, summer over summer. I also want to give credence to the fact that if you take the time to complain about something and nothing happens, it is very hard to keep it up. I gave up about ten years ago.*

*So, I will look for the next opportunity to weigh in; which sounds like it will be at the Noise Review Board itself. I know it is probably confusing or frustrating when we come to you, when we should be talking about something else, and we're talking about the same old things, or whatever. I appreciate your patience. And you're making time for us to make this comment. And again, I just really appreciate your work, and I am encouraged by what you've done, and that means a lot to me. So thank you."*

**Oksana Yurovsky**

*"I am a new member of the Kenton Neighborhood Association. I already submitted a comment, but I had a clarifying question about something you were discussing about the time during which events could take place; between 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.*

*When you say event, does that mean any event? Because I know that PIR holds more than just races, so is that encompassing all kinds of events or is it races specifically?"*

**Ron Huegli** explained that based on code, from Tuesday through Sunday from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. the racetrack can generate noise levels up to 105 decibels at trackside, but they police it at 103 decibels. That does not mean that they hold events every day from Tuesday through Sunday that generate noise up to 105 decibels. On Monday and Tuesday, they have bicycle racing events that do not generate any noise.

**Noise Officer, Paul Van Orden** clarified that the 105 decibel limit applies only to motor vehicle racing. Non-motor vehicle racing events, such as concerts are subject to the Noise Code decibel limits for Open Space zoning of 55 dBA in the neighborhood.

**Note:** The City of Portland Noise Code, Title 18 does not regulate the decibel limit at trackside, it only regulates the decibel level in the neighborhood. The 105 trackside decibel limit is a DEQ regulation, however, DEQ no longer monitors or enforces this regulation. The Title 18 City Noise Code maximum decibel limit in the neighborhood for motor vehicle racing events is 65 decibels.

**Andrew**

*“A couple of things worth mentioning regarding the report, I was speed reading it as you were presenting portions of it on the screen. A couple of trends not reflected, or perhaps types of noise emissions from PIR may change over the years. Things like electric cars and electric racing are quite new. I think over the coming decades we are likely to see a decrease in the amount of noise because of lot of these electric events tend to be significantly quieter, so that may be work mentioning or factoring in, or trying to project in some way in this report.*

*I think another important thing worth mentioning that I did not see captured anywhere is regarding public safety. It is pretty well known that PIR has the Friday and Saturday night drag race events. There is a lot of useful exuberance in the community among those attracted to cars, that is not necessarily well reflected in this report. PIR captures some of that energy. But we see vestiges of that in things like news and media reports about street takeover events.*

*So I think, if there are additional restrictions that are ultimately placed on PIR, that actually raises some public safety concerns surrounding perhaps an increasing prevalence of these street takeover events. And as a community member that worries me a lot because a lot of these takeover events are just not well controlled or controllable by the PPB. For whatever reason. And so there are pretty significant public safety concerns. I think PIR actually helps alleviate by giving an outlet for a lot of these street racer types on Friday and Saturday nights. So that sort of thing is worth encompassing in this report as well. I would also, just from the perspective of operations and sort of those most familiar with track operations, try to give a lot of weight to things that Charles and Ron said here in the report as well, there are a lot of things I think, that they raised that would resonate with general members of the public surrounding this issue and this report moving forward.”*

There being no further Public Comments or subcommittee comments, Chair Mary Sipe thanked the subcommittee members for their work and the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.