



CITY OF

PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD INVOLVEMENT

AMANDA FRITZ, COMMISSIONER

Amalia Alarcón de Morris, Bureau Director

Noise Control Program

1221 SW 4th Avenue, Room 110

Portland, Oregon 97204

Promoting a culture of civic engagement

**Noise Review Board
May 11, 2016
Minutes**

Present: Melissa Stewart, Julie Greb, Paul van Orden (No quorum)

Absent: Carol Gossett, Kerrie Standlee

Minutes: Kathy Couch

Call to Order - 6:03

Melissa Stewart, as Acting Chair, calls the meeting to order

General Public Testimony

Gunnar Sacher – He has come because previously garbage truck noise was to be the focus of the NRB’s work plan. He would like to know if the board is still planning on moving forward on the issue.

Paul plans for this issue to be an agenda item on the NRB’s June hearing, with a plan to look more in depth in the fall (after the busy season). Gunnar offers his support and the next potential step is to pull a subcommittee together, including representatives from BPS, the industry, and concerned citizens, to report to the NRB.

Paul or Kathy will contact him if it gets included on next month’s agenda

Proposed Fee Schedule Increase

Paul presents an overview of 2 options for the increase; with 1 being increasing fees fully in the upcoming fiscal year, and the 2nd being an incremental increase in fees, spread between 2 years. (Document attached)

Concerns from the 2 board members present:

Melissa Stewart feels that citation fees need to be increased. Paul explains that citation schedules are an administrative rule and do not have to be approved by Council.

Julie Greb says that the rate increases are huge for motor vehicle racing & construction. She is also in favor of generating more revenue for the Noise Office.

Public Testimony

Dave Sweeney represents SOVREN (Society of Vintage Racing Enthusiasts) and SVRA (Sportscar Vintage Racing Association)

They are the only 2 racing groups that will be affected by the proposed increase. He feels that the proposed increase directly pits one city agency against another. PIR spent thousands of dollars on increasing noise sensitivity and providing metering to help protect neighboring residents of PIR, and currently has less noise impact than any time in history. The proposed increase would lead to the elimination and diminishing of most significant events at the racetrack. City Council approved in 1989 four varianced racing events, recognizing that PIR was a valuable resource and viable source of recreation. This is why the City owns it, for that reason. They allow SOVREN and SVRA to pay rent for the privilege of having events there. When Council made the recommendations for the four varianced



events, they also said that that the City shall assure an adequate level of funding for the Noise Office has in order to effectuate these recommendations. He suggests that the current fee schedule is at an adequate level. The City has had a forty year history of protocol for noise variances, especially as they concern monitoring and enforcement. Because of that, the noise has only gotten lower. PIR now only has two events instead of four. Instead of charging an adequate level, ONI seeks to fund the Noise Office on the backs of variance applicants, significantly through his two events. He says he would bet that the proposal didn't come from the Noise Review Board or the Noise Office. He has read that there is a surplus this year for the City of Portland, yet they want to fund 75% of the Noise Office through fees. Currently the program is 46% funded through the General Fund. "That's not a bad number", he states. If the proposed increases occur, SOVREN will not submit a variance application for next year. This will be the last year. If the City wants to increase fees, the increase must be equitable and used for the purpose of the fee itself, the Noise Review Board Hearing, and monitoring sound levels. The SOVREN hearing usually takes about fifteen minutes and last year took about five minutes. The motor racing charge is inequitable, not appropriate or warranted. Motor racing would pay huge increases compared to other types of events. This will have a crippling effect on marquee events at PIR. Given these factors, he would hope that the board comments have significant concerns for the necessity and impact.

Steve Baker– Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association and Organizer of the Eastmoreland 4th of July Parade. He says there seems to be the following categories of variances: revenue generators from the private sector, revenue from nonprofits, and free events. He suggests that free events and charitable events have one flat rate plus a percentage of revenues. Nonprofits have no revenue. He asked if he would be subject to more than one fee. Paul tells him that he would not.

Mary Sipe- Pearl District/former noise task force member
She is pleased that the NRB is considering recommendations she submitted as part of the noise task force. Did you review packet of info from last meeting.? This is much Broader than her recommendations. Concerns moving from 64% gen fun to 75 cost recovery, with goal of 100% cost recovery. Federal noise control program– congress punted. – left to states. Concern that future of program is in jeopardy from fees, then in jeopardy. Noise is increasing, noise is underfunded and understaffed. About 100% funding –once you lose, you will never get it back. Encourage if you approve, do with revision if you approve proposal – provision to increase, not replace. Recommend all at once instead of incremental. Already been 2 years since fees increased. Amounts seem perplexing. With limited staff processes should be streamlined whenever possible. Accelerated fees seem overly complex. Suggest consider flat rate for accelerated. Take a couple and Pencil variances out – what fee collected and what would new fees. Motor vehicles seem disproportionate. May appear construction fees getting large increase. Construction industry getting a bundle deal. Thinks it's more appropriate. All different activities, should be paying for separate variance fees. Excited to see it being looked at. Supports work we're doing – thinks it will help

Eileen Argentina PPR – PIR is parks facility. Has questions:

What is current level of fee level revenue now - \$180,000 now.

Are fees on paper Net increases in revenue? Meeting in day or two

Intended to increase overall funding or replace existing general fund? Original idea was to replace, but now her office says it's more looking at being able to add more funds to office Combination of 2 says Amy. Intent behind Commissioner's office to expand capacity but also long term funding with fees revenue based.

What is usual percent?

5% usual.

With 15 or 5 minutes – this would still work?

Average out how much it really costs.

Next meeting – who is holding hearing? – ONI staff, and they will report back

Hoping to get some changes with some input we're hearing. How do we balance out vibrant events and what noise impact

She Felt comments very relevant= from Mr. Sweeney. She shares the concern about affect PIR.

Other concern parks has - key stakeholders who are major stakeholders have not weighed in or been contacted. PIR has generous overhead, some of which goes to pay for offices like this. Deserve opportunity to weigh in. Gen fun goes to fund city offices like this. A lot that needs to be understood. About how increase relates to work associated with it.

Can't approve the minutes due to lack of quorum

Melissa moves to Adjourn at 6:55
Julie seconds.