

**Noise Review Board
Minutes
October 8, 2020**

Members Present: Kerrie Standlee, Ernest Harris, Destiny Wright, Mary Sipe, Michael Wallace, Paul Van Orden

Minutes: Paul Van Orden & Kerrie Standlee

Call to Order

The October 8, 2020 Noise Review Board meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Chair Kerrie Standlee. After all attendees were in the virtual Zoom meeting, the Chair welcomed everyone and provided information concerning how the meeting would be conducted and how everyone was to use audio only for the meeting, but with their microphones on mute until invited to speak by the Chair.

General Public Comments

Public attendees to the meeting were invited to provide any general comments during the public comment period about noise concerns not specifically listed on the agenda. The Chair first recognized those who indicated they wanted to speak by showing a “raised hand” icon on the Zoom page next to their name. Those included Raymond Becich, who spoke about his concern with the increase in the number of what seemed to him to be “unmuffled” cars racing around in the Pearl District, and James Metoyer of the Powell-Hurst neighborhood who spoke about his concern with the noise radiating from a carwash located at the corner of SE Division and SE 118th Ave.

People who attended the meeting via a telephone connection were then invited one at a time to provide any comments and Ted Carlson (last name uncertain) said he had just called in to observe the meeting. No other people were interested in providing comment.

NRB Sept 10 Meeting Summary

The Board discussed the summary notes provided for the September 10 NRB meeting and Destiny Wright noted that there appeared to be two references to “Multnomah County” in the first sentence of the Leaf Blower Working Group section. Kerrie Standlee noted that a “period” placed between the two references to Multnomah County would make sense. Others agreed that it seemed there were supposed to be two sentences rather than one.

Destiny Wright also noted that the word “bit” in the discussion under the Board questions to Andersen Construction section of the minutes should be “not” so that the question would read, “Why are the workers not wearing masks or distancing”.

Mary Sipe moved that the minutes as modified be approved. Destiny Wright seconded the motion. The minutes, with noted corrections were approved.

Board Business

Public Comments Discussion

Mary Sipe said she would like to have the unmuffled cars comment made by Raymond Recich placed on a future board meeting agenda because she too had noticed more auto racing noises in the Pearl in the past few months.

Chair Kerrie Standlee provided comment on the concerns about carwash dryer noise voiced by James Metoyer. Based on his experience from past carwash projects, it is very possible that the dryer blower and vacuum noise could be exceeding the code limit so the Noise Control Officer should be checking in on the situation. Paul Van Orden said he would be placing the concern on his list of places to visit now that he had been authorized to get back out in the field to respond to noise complaints.

Noise Variance Site Visits by NRB Members

The Board, at the request of member Ernest Harris, discussed the topic of noise variance site visits after the Assistant City Attorney representing the Office of Community and Civic Life said there may be some concern with Board members conducting site visits due to liability. Chair Kerrie Standlee reported that Katherine Couch had been tasked by Michael Montoya to survey staff of other Boards to see if they had any policies or procedures in place to address site visits and that responses from staff at the Development Review Advisory Committee and the Urban Forestry Commission indicated their boards do not typically have a need to do site visits so they did not have any policies. It was also reported that we had not heard back from the Portland Design Commission or the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission, two commissions which would more likely have members that participated in site visits so it was suggested that the Noise Review Board should wait until we heard back from other commissions before moving forward with developing a policy.

2019 Noise Complaint Report

Chair Kerrie Standlee presented a verbal summary of the report he wrote to the Board concerning the results of an analysis of the 2019 Noise Complaint data that had been submitted to the Board by Kenya Williams in May of 2020 (copy of the report attached). The Chair said the results of the analysis showed that many noise complaints coming to the Noise Office were closed due to either a lack of staff time to address the complaints or because of a redirecting of staff to other tasks which were unrelated to the Noise Office. When the closed noise complaints were studied in more detail, it was found that there could have been over 500 more cases than originally reported to the Board that would have been logged into the cases requiring investigation by staff if staff time had been available to handle the complaints. The Chair also said that, with the additional numbers of complaints that would have needed investigating, it becomes very obvious that the noise office does not have enough technical staff time available to do the work required. With over 1300 complaints per year requiring investigation, it is impossible for one noise control officer to handle the investigative work and resolve the complaints.

The Board discussed the findings of the data analysis and it was concluded by the Board that the data should be pulled together into a document that can be submitted to the

Commissioner's office with a recommendation that more field investigative staff be brought into the noise office. Desi Wright made a motion that a report be pulled together to submit to the Commissioner's office and Michael Wallace seconded the motion. Michael Wallace also moved to have a one-page summary pulled together to accompany the report. The motion was approved unanimously by the Board.

New Business

The Chair brought up the fact that Desi Wright had suggested in a recent phone call that the Board start receiving draft minutes in a much shorter time frame than the week before the meeting so that edits could be made prior to the next meeting. After a discussion about how edits could be provided to the document in a way that makes it easy to accomplish, it was decided that the draft Word document would be sent out by the Noise Office within 10 days of the Board meeting, and the Board would review and provide comment using "Track Changes" in the following order:

Michael Wallace - 1st
Kerrie Standlee - 2nd
Mary Sipe – 3rd
Desi Wright – 4th
Ernest Harris – 5th

The final edited document would be submitted back to the Noise Office to make final and prepare to be sent to the Board as part of the next meeting's packet.

Selection of 2020/2021 NRB Chair

Michael Wallace moved that Kerrie Standlee be made the chair of the Noise Review Board for the 2020/2021 year. Desi Wright seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Next Meeting – Nov 12, 2020

Items to be considered for the next meeting would be early morning concrete pour discussion by the Board, and the unmuffled auto noise in the Pearl.

Adjournment

Adjournment of the NRB meeting occurred at 7:54 p.m. after a unanimous decision to leave the Zoom meeting room.

October 3, 2020

Portland Noise Review Board
City of Portland, Oregon

From: Kerrie Standlee, P.E.
Portland Noise Review Board Chair – 2019/2020

Re: Portland Noise Office 2019 Noise Complaint Report

Introduction

In December 2019 the Noise Review Board asked for the Noise Office to gather program data and metrics information that would allow a review of the 2019 noise complaints and variance requests. In response to the Board's request, Mr. Kenya Williams, Livability Team Lead, had Noise Program staff gather noise complaint and variance request data. Mr. Williams provided a draft report to the Board's Chair on March 11, 2020. Due to disruptions caused by the onset of the Covid 19 pandemic, a final report was not provided to Noise Review Board until May 19, 2020 when it was sent by email by Mr. Williams to each board member.

The Noise Review Board briefly discussed the complaint and variance request report at the June 2020 monthly meeting and concluded that the data in the report was difficult to understand due to the way in which it was broken down. After reviewing the data with the Noise Control Officer, Paul Van Orden, and Noise Office staff, Nicholas Carroll, I decided to break the data down into two reports; one that addresses complaints that came into the Noise Office in 2019 and a second one that addresses the Noise Variance requests that came into the Noise Office in 2019. This report addresses noise complaints that came to the Noise Office in 2019.

Basis of the 2019 Data

The data supplied to the Noise Review Board is for calendar year 2019, January 2019 to December 2019. Data historically collected before the Noise Office moved to the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, now called the Office of Community and Civic Life, used a fiscal year calendar from July 1 of one year to June 30th of the following year.

The data for 2019 will be discussed as a standard calendar year from January through December for 2019.

Basic Noise Office Nomenclature

The following discussion about terminology associated with the data comes from material provided by Paul Van Orden, Portland Noise Control Officer.

Track-ITs: This term historically referred to the online typed complaints coming into the Noise Office directly from members of the public. Historically, this was just the online complaints. On

May 11th of 2019 the incoming phone calls to the Noise Office began being forwarded directly the City of Portland's Information and Rereferral (I&R) hotline staff. At that time, I&R staff began handling voicemail calls and live incoming calls and turning complaints coming in via phone calls into a TRACK-IT complaint record. When I&R cannot answer a question coming from the public, or a live call relates to a noise variance, the call is supposed to be forwarded to Noise staff. In relation to the I&R staff handling a call that becomes a TRACK IT record, the Noise Office staff can see that I&R created the TRACKS IT from a call, as compared to a the records from a member of the public logging their own online complaint.

Phone Calls: Prior to May 11, 2019, phone calls were simply the calls that came into the Noise Office hotline at 503-823-7350. Phone calls after May 10th, 2019 were not initially available and therefore not specifically analyzed in the initial data the Noise Office had available for the Noise Review Board.

Closed: In the first report of 2019 data for the Board, the term "Closed" was used in a manner that is not consistent with the history of the Noise Office. It included cases that were Closed after receiving zero action; for example, no warning letter sent and no significant attention occurring from the Noise Office. For the review of the current set of data, Noise Office staff has reviewed the data included in the "Closed" category of the initial report and determined more detail about the items.

"TRACS"/ "AMANDA": "AMANDA" is the name of the computer system that many city staff currently use for tracking their case management. It is heavily used in Portland by the building code and planning regulatory programs. Things can get extra confusing as it has also been previously referred to as "TRACS". This makes it very confusing for non-City staff who naturally have the propensity to confuse it with the online complaint in take system called "TRACK-ITs". In this report, I have used the AMAMNDA term when referring to the data that was entered into a database rather than "TRACS".

Warning Letters: Warning letters are the letters sent out from the AMANDA computer system on an individual case for a given noise issue at a property. It should be noted that, multiple different noise cases could be associated with one address. As an example, you might see two separate warning letters at an address in a case with a leaf blower complaint and another complaint for excessively amplified music at the same address. These two completely different issues are tracked as individual issues.

Each separate noise case would generally have a different warning letter sent to the property owner and to the occupant. A second warning letter copy is sent if the property is a rental property, or if there is a separate business operating at the location. The primary copy always goes to the property owner of record according to the Multnomah Tax Assessors Office.

As a standard operating practice, the Noise Office does tries not to send another warning letter for the same issue on an existing open case in AMANDA. If the case gets closed and the same issue arises again, it should result in a new warning letter to the alleged noise maker.

New Noise Case: A new noise case number is established when a complaint is entered into the AMANDA computer case tracking system to send a warning letter and have a place to track the case. A new case may be opened on an old issue, if the same issue was closed by staff and starts back up. AMANDA has limited capacity to reopen an old case and set that at case status to

OPEN. For this reason, it has been the practice to open a fresh case so the noise issue can be tracked. Noise staff will try to link back to the old case for reference to earlier notes on the location for the same type of issue.

Primary Complainant Categories

The following are the primary complaint categories the City of Portland was using in 2019 to track incoming complaints that were entered into AMANDA.

Music Stereo: This is an AMANDA case type to track noise from a stereo or pre-recorded music at a residential location. It would previously have been a combined category called residential /music stereo or band case. The Noise Office previously used an acronym of MS/B for these complaints. The Board may see that short form in older documents.

It is historically always been the Noise Office's largest case category.

These complaints are the hardest for the Noise Office to catch when the sound is actually happening without the cooperation of the Portland Police Bureau who has field staff on duty 24 hours a day in every neighborhood. These cases typically happen outside of daytime work hours and are usually very intermittent and hard to predict a time to catch. Interestingly, they are also a category that has shown a high level of resolution in the past from the Noise Office's effort to send warning letters to educate the public about the need to comply with the Noise code.

Construction: This category of complaint is for construction noise, both commercial and residential. The primary issue is for work outside the permitted hours of 7 AM to 6 PM, Mondays through Saturdays. At the staffing levels in 2019, the Noise Office did not generally open noise cases for companies that are alleged to exceed the daytime permitted decibel levels of Title 18. Complaints in this category were not fully correlated with any potential construction related noise code variances. This is an area for improvement identified by both the Noise Control Officer and the Noise Review Board in recent years.

Band: This category is of a residential nature for complaints related to a band or DJ practicing at a person's home. It is not for cases with a band performing at a bar or nightclub, or for a professional rehearsal studio. This case would appear (on the surface) to be similar to a home stereo case, but there are economic factors that appear to make the success of the warning letters less effective. With the high price of real estate and the rapid gentrification in most neighborhoods that traditionally would have had affordable band rehearsal spaces, band members have far few options if they receive a warning letter from the Noise Office.

Paying for a rehearsal space in the City of Portland in recent years has become prohibitively expensive and is not readily available. Empirically speaking, the Noise Control Officer has noted that a higher number of cases in this category are related to brand new homeowners and residents moving to Portland who have zero tolerance. This is often for a band that has been practicing with no complaints in the same location for a decade or more. It is an issue the Noise Officer has identified impacts the cultural fabric of the City and may be one that the Noise Review Board would wish to explore creative community-based solutions.

HVAC: This category is for tracking Heating, Ventilation, and AIR Conditioning (HVAC) equipment cases. It was not historically combined for both residential locations and commercial

or industrial locations, but in recent years and for 2019 it is a more generalized complaint category. In the past there was a more defined tracking of residential related HVAC cases, as compared to commercial and industrial HVAC noise cases.

Bar/ Music: This category is for specifically tracking amplified music at night clubs and bars in the City. It can include pre-recorded music, live bands, or amplified announcement voices coming from indoor and outdoor activity at a commercial establishment.

Leaf Blower: Complaints for both residential and commercial use of leaf blowers are tracked in this category. This category can be confusing for Portland Police Bureau and the public as the City Council approved leaf blower regulations do not match up with daytime hours for construction and they do not match up with the daytime Land Use based decibel standards in Title 18. Much like home stereo cases, these cases are rarely able to be witnessed by a Noise Office staff person. The leaf blower operations occur for 15 minutes at a time on average, and rarely at exactly the same time. Citations on these cases have been successfully written, at times, based on a citizen collecting photo evidence, (combined with signed affidavit) that a leaf blower being used is not on the City's approved leaf blower list.

Car Stereo: These cases relate to the use of an excessively loud car stereo that is associated with a given property address. The Board should know that at current staffing levels the Noise Office has moved away from opening cases for loud car stereos in the public right of way or at bars and restaurants. The Board may wish to look into adding this source back into a higher priority category if the data shows a need to do so.

Industrial / Commercial: In the 2019 noise complaint data received earlier in the year, the Board saw three small categories called: Mechanical Equipment – generator; Mechanical Equipment- non-HVAC; and Exterior Activities – not construction. These were historically included as a single category named “I/C” cases (Commercial/ Industrial cases). The Board may wish to ask the Noise Office to move back to characterizing them as I/C (Industrial / Commercial cases) so we have the ability to compare data sets from the past to the present Noise Office activity.

Other Categories: There are several very small categories that represent only a few cases or maybe only one case each that are listed in the data from the initial 2019 noise complaint data. These are not significant categories to track trends or develop policies at this time.

2019 Noise Complaint Data Analysis

With the aid of Paul Van Orden and Nicholas Carroll, I was able to develop the data shown below in Table 1, 2 and 3. It should be noted that, some of the data included in the original Noise Office report was found to be in error so the data included in this report may be different from what is seen in that report. The data shown in this report is as accurate as it can be, given the issues found to exist in switching over from having the Noise Office handling all of the Noise Hot Line calls versus having I&R handling the Noise Hotline calls.

To facilitate combining the data shown in the original report under the TrackITs section with the data shown in the Noise Hotline section, the Hotline data and the I&R data were first reviewed to determine if there was any possible duplication of data coming from two different sources. Once there was an understanding of the sources of the data, the data was combined to show the total

number of complaints submitted to the Noise Office (see Table 1). As noted in the top section of Table 1, the total number of calls coming into the Noise Hotline after May 11 was not known since those calls were diverted to I&R and they did not log every call the same way the Noise Office did in previous years. However, it was determined that, if I&R decided the call warranted a TrackITs entry, a TrackIT entry was made and the count of that entry was included in the number of complaints shown in the table. At this time, it is not known if all the calls going to I&R were categorized the same way the Noise Office would have categorized them so the complaints coming in after May 11 may be somewhat under counted.

Because there was some discrepancy in the original Noise Office report relative to how complaints had been handled, it was decided that the number of complaints coming into the Noise Office would first be divided into the number of complaints entered into the Amanda logging system and the number of complaints not entered into the logging system. That information along with the percentages associated with both are shown in Table 1. To further look into the data, the number of complaints not entered into the Amanda system were reviewed to determine if they was not entered because they were considered a complaint not addressed by the noise code (Title 18) or because of some other explanation. That data is shown in Table 2. Finally, the complaints not entered into the Amanda database for a reason other than the noise code does not address it were reviewed to determine if the complaint could possibly have become a noise case if it had been entered into the Amanda database. That information is shown in Table 3.

**TABLE 1
NOISE COMPLAINT DATA FOR 2019 CALENDAR YEAR**

		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
COMPLAINTS RECEIVED	From TrackITs (online form)	84	58	104	130	198 ¹	192 ¹	227 ¹	222 ¹	196 ¹	149 ¹	107 ¹	111 ¹	1778
	From Hotline² (823-7350)	56	40	94	107	48 ³	UK ⁴	345 ⁴						
	Total	140	98	198	237	246	192	227	222	196	149	107	111	2123
COMPLAINTS ENTERED IN AMANDA	From TrackITs	46	28	51	54	50	30	65	51	97	83	62	66	683
	From Hotline²	16	8	39	22	10 ³	UK ⁴	95 ⁵						
	Total	62	36	90	76	60	30	65	51	97	83	62	66	778
COMPLAINTS NOT ENTERED IN AMANDA⁶	From TrackITs	38	30	53	76	148	162	162	171	99	66	45	45	1095
	From Hotline²	40	32	55	85	38 ³	UK ⁴	250 ⁵						
	Total	78	62	108	161	186	162	162	171	99	66	45	45	1345
PERCENT OF COMPLAINT DATA	Entered in Amanda	44.3%	36.7%	45.5%	32.1%	24.4%	15.6%	28.6%	23.0%	49.5%	55.7%	57.9%	59.5%	36.6%
	Not entered in Amanda	55.7%	63.3%	54.5%	67.9%	75.6%	84.4%	71.4%	77.0%	50.5%	44.3%	42.1%	40.5%	63.4%

- 1) Noise Hotline calls were handled by Information & Referral (I&R) after May 10, 2019 and some, but not all, calls to the Hot Line resulted in “TrackITs” entries made by I&R. Calls handled by I&R that were not entered in TrackITs cannot be researched for noise source due to lack of information.
- 2) Noise Hotline calls were handled by I&R after May 10, 2019.
- 3) Data is only for May 1 thru May 10, 2019.
- 4) UK stands for “Unknown”. Data from Noise Hotline calls handled by I&R is not easily obtainable.
- 5) Data is for only January 1 thru May 10, 2019.
- 6) Complaint not entered in Amanda because:
 - a) It was deemed outside of Noise Office control, or
 - b) There was not enough staff time to make entries

**TABLE 2
ANALYSIS OF COMPLAINTS NOT ENTERED INTO AMANDA**

		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
COMPLAINTS NOT ENTERED INTO AMANDA	From TrackITs	38	30	53	76	148	162	162	171	99	66	45	45	1095
	From Hotline²	40	32	55	85	38 ³	UK ⁴	250 ⁵						
	Total	78	62	108	161	186	162	162	171	99	66	45	45	1345
# OF COMPLAINTS CLOSED FOR VARIOUS REASONS	From TrackITs	34	20	34	42	127	147	152	136	90	50	33	32	897
	From Hotline²	28	22	25	20	3								98
	Total	62	42	59	62	130	147	152	136	90	50	33	32	995
# OF COMPLAINTS CLOSED DUE TO LACK OF STAFF TIME	From TrackITs	4	10	19	34	21	15	10	35	9	16	12	13	198
	From Hotline²	12	10	30	65	35								152
	Total	16	20	49	99	56	15	10	35	9	16	12	13	350

**TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF COMPLAINTS THAT WERE CLOSED FOR VARIOUS REASONS**

		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
# OF COMPLAINTS CLOSED FOR VARIOUS REASONS	From TrackITs	34	20	34	42	127	147	152	136	90	50	33	32	897
	From Hotline	28	22	25	20	3								98
	Total	62	42	59	62	130	147	152	136	90	50	33	32	995
# OF CLOSED COMPLAINTS THAT LIKELY COULD HAVE BEEN AN AMANDA CASE	From TrackITs	6	3	3	12	71	96	93	81	36	16	7	10	434
	From Hotline	6	6	7	5	0								24
	Total	12	9	10	17	71	96	93	81	36	16	7	10	458
# OF CLOSED COMPLAINTS NEEDING MORE STAFF TIME TO DETERMINE STATUS	From TrackITs	5	6	4	5	14	16	19	17	24	8	4	3	125
	From Hotline	0	0	0	0	0								0
	Total	5	6	4	5	14	16	19	17	24	8	4	3	125
# OF CLOSED COMPLAINTS NOT OF A TYPE RESPONDED TO BY NOISE OFFICE	From TrackITs	23	11	27	25	42	35	40	38	30	26	22	19	338
	From Hotline	22	16	18	15	3								74
	Total	45	27	45	40	45	35	40	38	30	26	22	19	412

From a review of the data shown in Table 1 it can be seen that a high percentage of complaints submitted to the Noise Office in 2019 were not entered into the Amanda database system (approximately 63% of the complaints were not entered compared to approximately 37% entered). This finding indicates a high number of complaints were not entered into the tracking system, so to learn more about that data, additional analyses were made to determine the reason the complaints were not entered into the system.

The original report indicated approximately 11% of the total number of TrackIT complaints (198 of the 1781 complaints) were not entered into Amanda due to a lack of staff time to make the entries. The original report also indicated approximately 51% of the total number of received TrackIT complaints (900 out of 1781 complaints) were not entered into Amanda due to the fact the complaints concerned issues not handled by the Noise Office.

When the revised and combined TrackIT and Noise Hotline data in Table 2 of this report were analyzed, the results showed approximately 16.5% of the total complaints received by the Noise Office (the 350 shown in Table 2 compared to the 2123 total received complaints shown in Table 1) were not entered into Amanda due to lack of staff time (an increase of approximately 5.5% over the value shown in the original report). When the remaining complaints not entered into Amanda due to something other than staff time issues was examined further, it was found that approximately 19.4% of the total number of complaints (412 out of a total of 2123) were not entered due to the fact that complaint was about an issue the Noise Office does not handle (a significant reduction of the 51% amount stated in the original report).

When Noise Office staff were asked about potential reasons for the significant differences in the number of complaints not entered into Amanda, it was learned that, during approximately 4 to 5 months of the busy months of 2019, some Noise Office administrative staff time was split between noise-related work and work under another division of the Office of Community and Civic Live, namely the Liquor Control program. During that time, the entering of information about noise complaints suffered. By the time many of the complaints got addressed, some complainants did not respond to any updated inquiries about the complaint from the Noise Office. In such instances, the complaint may have no longer been considered a valid complaint and the initial complaint was considered “closed”. Due to the possibility that there have been more legitimate complaints than was reported in the original report, complaint intake staff were asked to review the cases that had been “closed” and determine if there were complaints that would likely have been considered potential Amanda cases. Staff were also asked to determine if there were complaints which, with additional staff time, might have become an Amanda case.

Table 3 above shows the results of the additional analysis of “closed” complaints and the results shows there could have been approximately 583 more Amanda cases than were initially reported. With that additional information, the Board would see that a total of 1361 complaints could have been entered in the Amanda tracking system rather than the 778 shown in Table 1. This is a significant increase in the number of complaint calls requiring the attention of the Noise Office.

Given the potential size of the pool of complaint calls requiring a Noise Office response, the Board might want to discuss if it is reasonable to have only one person in the Noise Office who can handle the technical requirements in dealing with noise complaints. Especially when the one person currently in the Noise Office with the ability to address noise from a technical standpoint is also responsible for addressing request for variances to the Noise Ordinance.

The Board should also note that in 1976 the Noise Office, under the direction of Noise Control Officer Dr. Paul Herman, reviewed far less than 50 noise variances per year with the aid of two Deputies to assist in that duty. In 2019, a non-pandemic year, the Noise Control Officer was trying to administer over 600 annual noise variances as well as deal with over 1000 complaints from the community. Given the enormity of the task in today’s conditions, I do not see how the Noise Officer can adequately track and respond to complaints about those variances, let alone all the complaints that have nothing to do with a noise variance.

Complaint Categories

The May 2020 report presented to the Noise Review Board provided two tables that identified a breakdown of complaints that came into the Noise Office in the 2019 calendar year. The first table was associated with the complaints that came in through the TrackIT system and the second table was associated with the complaints that came in through the Noise Hotline system. The categories shown in the two tables were not the same and that was apparently due to the fact the two data bases were not programed to provide the same information. In the case of the TrackIT data, the categories were broken down by the number of cases. It was stated in the report that some cases may have had multiple calls associated with them but the data in the category table does not show that information. The Noise Hotline table, on the other hand, provides a breakdown of categories relative to the number of calls that came in rather than the number of cases generated by the calls.

Having two different sets of noise complaint categories makes it very difficult to draw any conclusions about the source of noise causing complaints in the City. To help the Board come to some conclusions regarding noise complaints in the City, an effort was made to bring data from the two tables into a single table. Table 4 below shows a listing of noise complaints broken out into the eight (8) categories with the highest number of complaints, assuming that each case in the TrackIT data was associated with a single call.

Table 4: Top Noise Sources Causing Complaints in 2019

Noise Source	Number of Complaints
Construction	201
Stereo Music	189
Human Voice, Animals, Alarms	57
Band Practice	39
Vehicle	35
Mechanical Equipment	33
HVAC Equipment	26
Live band/Bar Music	17
TOTAL	597

If there were multiple calls about the same case shown in the TrackIT data, the data shown in Table 4 could be affected. It should also be pointed out that the data in Table 4 does not include any of the 583 potential complaints that were closed without being added into Amanda. Given

that fact, it is possible that there could have been well over 1000 complaints during the 2019 calendar year spread over the eight top categories of complaints. Regardless of the fact the data is incomplete, it should at least be an indicator of the source of noise complaints within the City. I believe the data should give the Board a starting point in assessing the effectiveness of the Noise Code as directed within the Noise Code.