



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

March 9, 2016

Minutes

Present: Melissa Stewart, Carol Gossett, Julie Greb, Kerrie Standlee, and Paul van Orden

Minutes: Kathy Couch

Call to Order

Julie Greb, as the longest standing board member, calls the meeting to order at 6:03 pm.

Elect New Noise Review Chair

Julie Greb moves to nominate Carol Gossett as Chair.

Carol accepts the nomination.

Kerrie Standlee seconds the motion.

Motion passes unanimously, 4 to 0

Request from Bureau of Environmental Services on amending a condition on the NW Sewer Repair Project

Joe Annett presents the request to propose a change in noise variance already approved for the NW Sewer Repair Project to include saw cutting during nighttime work on NW 23rd Avenue (between Thurman and Wilson), and NW Vaughn Street, due to a traffic restriction coming from the Portland Bureau of Transportation.

Specifically, the request is to add saw cutting to the original project between the hours of 9:00 pm and 12:00 midnight for the above-named streets. The variance would not change the same workdays and the 8:00 pm – 5:30 am work times have already been approved.

BES presented this at the NW District Neighborhood Association and it was approved by all 12 of the Board members. They also contacted area businesses and residents, and sent out another 1500 postcards and 500 emails about 5 weeks previously. To date, they have received 3 negative responses, sent to Noise Control Office. All 3 of the responses were from first time respondents.

The request is for night work on NW Vaughn at each intersection and NW 23rd between Wilson and Thurman. Each site will take roughly one week. Work on laterals will take another week. Night work will be 4-5 months during the 18 month project. BES contractors are encountering daytime work restrictions due to I-405 traffic. Vaughn is substantially commercial, but also includes some condos and apartments.

Questions from Noise Review Board

Melissa Stewart asks why they are working Sunday evenings through Thursday, as opposed to the standard of Monday through Friday. Joe tells her that, after doing outreach it became apparent that businesses preferred work to be done on Sunday nights instead of Friday & Saturday, since the weekend is the busiest time of the week for them.

Kerrie Standlee asks about using an electric saw. He is told that the highest noise impact was the saw actually cutting the concrete, and, no matter what powers the saw itself, the actual cutting noise would be the same (see below)

Public Testimony

Samuel Murillo, Pile Drivers Local 196

Asks how much time it took to hand out flyers

Stephanie Rysnar, Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters, Pile Drivers Local 196

She says, with regard to concrete saws, that whatever mechanism is used, it's the blade penetrating concrete that makes the noise.

Monica Gauthier, Pile Drivers Local 196

She says that she worked on the Big Pipe project. She asked how long (distance) and how deep the cuts are going to be. She is informed that at each intersection, there is a manhole as well as laterals. Manhole cuts are generally 6 feet, with four at each intersection and laterals are around 14 feet, with a depth of 18 to 26 inches. When asked if they would be using a walk line on the projects, she is told yes.

Eileen Kennedy, King Neighborhood

She says that she didn't hear what the variance was. It was explained that this is for a previously issued and approved variance, so there was not a full presentation. She asked how many decibels the work would be. Paul explains there are no specs for much of the construction activities and recaps the previous history of variance and the reason for the modification.

Julie Greb moves to approve an amendment to Permit #15-2014179 to include saw-cutting between the hours of 8:00 pm and 12:00 am midnight on NW 23rd Avenue (between Thurman and Wilson), and NW Vaughn Street, on Sunday through Thursday.

Kerrie Standlee seconds, but has questions as to whether BES has any knowledge of what the contractor is going to do simultaneously. He is told that the contractors have no restrictions as long as they follow conditions, and it is up to them to determine what work they do simultaneously.

The motion passes 3 in favor, 1 opposed (opposing member Melissa Stewart)

Discussion of Commissioner Fritz's Draft Proposal on Pile Driving Variance Process

Presenting for the Commissioner – Claire Adamsick , Policy Advisor for Commissioner Fritz and Theresa Marchetti, ONI Livability Manager

Claire explains that she is returning this month in response to NRB's request at the February Board meeting to have more time to consider the new proposal. She says that the Commissioner's position is that she became the Commissioner to Office of Neighborhood Involvement in July, when the Code changes restricting hours and days of installing driven pile was approved by City Council. She felt that the subject still needed community input, due to concerns of some residents of the Pearl District.

She convened a task force, with 4 citizen-at-large positions, 4 construction/building trades positions, and a member of the Noise Review Board. She specified that the proposal before the Board was not from the task force, but directly from the Commissioner herself. Some themes that emerged from the task force included the desire to avoid delays, developing a Citywide policy, instead of focusing on just one area of Portland, and workload concerns for Noise staff and the Noise Review Board.

No consensus came from the work of the task force. The Commissioner's staff then tried to determine if there was an administrative piece in the review process that could trigger then need for notification. After speaking with Bureau of Development Services, it was determined that BDS had a concern that the permitting process was too late in the process, and they felt more comfortable deferring to the NRB on assessing livability impacts to the community. Since last month's proposal, the Commissioner made revisions based on feedback provided.

Revisions are included in the minutes in full, but briefly, they are:

- Fee schedule removes auger drilling pile installation from the restrictions to installing by driving pile.
- If a geotechnical engineer "certifies" that there is no other way to lay foundation besides driven pile, then it would be a noise office staff decision instead of a Noise Review Board hearing
- Removal of the proposed "per day" fee for pile driving, but it would still include a noise impact fee on driven pile assessed even with a staff review
- Julie Greb asks what problem we are trying to fix with the proposal

Theresa tells her that there are difficulties with notification in the current code changes on pile driving. The only way to be looped in is through the variance process.

- Carol Gossett asks why auger is included since it talks about pile driving specifically in the code changes already approved

Theresa reached out to (City Attorney) Ben Walters, who felt that the way the changes were written, they were open ended as to what board meant. He would want to clarify the intent.

- Kerrie Standlee requested that Claire explain 2nd paragraph by reading aloud what you're talking about with this section inserted.

What would be going away would be 2 words "pile drivers"

Claire reads the proposed changes to construction code:

"Setting pile using auger or other method which would not exceed 85 dBA"

Other questions on proposal:

- "Establish fee for noise monitoring" – What are we monitoring?
- What is proposed to be monitoring if we have dBA no limit? Why is there a fee when there's no level in Code?

Theresa explains that the monitoring would be for adherence to variance conditions and that the fee would be the cost of the variance, not an extra fee.

Driving pile would be loud, even if there is no other alternative for pile installation. Fee schedule is not yet firmed up by the amount of fees. She expects there would be a spectrum in terms of projects. This schedule allows for discretion.

- Melissa expresses concern about the charge by day portion of the fee schedule.
- Kerrie says that we get a range of variances going on for more than one day, yet we don't appear to be looking at the amount of days for other sources, like concerts or races. He feels we should be opening the question of looking at the whole range of variances instead of one source
- Julie asks if it is fair to only look at construction noise-generating activities

Theresa states that this is still in draft form and they are looking at how to get to cost recovery for the noise office

- Kerrie asks if they are looking for a decision tonight. He says that typically when the Noise Review Board looks at major changes to code, there are several opportunities for public input, and that process hasn't yet occurred.

Claire suggests that maybe smaller administrative changes are possible, and the Commissioner's office is looking to the NRB for suggestions

Theresa asks if the intent of the board in the code changes from July were to only be referencing driven pile, and is told that their intent was to limit hours from driven pile.

- Melissa says that she feels this proposal is too over the top. She also states that it seems backward that it would come to the Noise Review Board first, before BDS permits.

She is told by Claire that the BDS process doesn't include asking questions. She states that since BDS deals with construction at the beginning of the project, it would be a more appropriate place.

- Carol says she doesn't understand the intent of item 4 of the proposal (Initial review process if no viable alternative to driving pile). She is very concerned that a technical determination by a geotechnical engineer should be questioned by a volunteer board and feels there would be a liability issue in case of building failure.

She is told that the variance would be a staff-level review if there were no alternatives, but would come to the Noise Review Board if there are alternatives but the property owner chooses not to use them.

- Carol does not want onus on the board with regard to geotechnical studies or processes

Public comment

Sam Murillo and Tirzah Rogers, Pile Drivers Union Local 196 (part of Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters) both testified that it appeared that this proposal was trying to kill a craft and urged the board not to recommend it. There are real people who will be impacted by further restrictions

Tiffany Sweitzer – Hoyt Street Properties

She developed 14 projects in the Pearl District. All except 1 were built on pile. On the Comopolitan project they thought they would try something different because they were told it would save time and money. They tried the auger drilling method and in that case, it did not turn out as planned. She stated that decisions such as the type of foundation are not determined by neighborhood concerns, but by the sake of efficiency. Her company is starting another project already in the design process. They are already past the point you are talking about. They already have their geotechnical report. They are anticipating starting construction later this year and are basing costs and timing on the report. She feels that more discussion is needed on the timing of the whole issue. If they would have to come to the Noise Review Board, it would have to have happened a month ago. The building process and timing needs to be understood, before we even get to changes to it. They plan to pull the foundation permit in July based on the geotechnical report. The building is already designed based on alternative methods. In this case, they are developing on former Burlington Northern land, and they base their decisions on experts. They rely on the geotechnical experts who can tell what the soil is, and what it can hold. It isn't about choosing a method, but instead about soil conditions. She would like the Commissioner to consider what the goal is with the proposal. She felt it was important to speak because she is developing properties, and decisions are made by the pure business of what you are able to do while building.

Joel Burt – DeWitt Construction Risk Manager, former Noise Review Board member

Points and concerns were raised regarding:

- How much input from the construction industry when drafting this proposal?
- Did the task force draft this?
- Poorly thought out and anti-construction proposal
- The current board spent a year addressing issues of pile driving and came up with recommendations industry didn't like, but felt they could live with.
- Proposal seems like a solution to something he feels may not be a problem that disregarded all of the work that the current NRB and then the task force put into this issue.
- He requested documented evidence of complaints about pile driving.
- He feels that both the Noise Review Board and the Noise Control Officer are being disrespected
- This would limit discretionary decisions made by the geotechnical engineer, with the provision of only providing one choice for method of setting pile
- He feels that this would hamper scheduling and costs of upcoming projects, and there are too many hoops to jump through
- It doesn't allow for emergency work (example, hillside house sliding down, or City or County emergency work.)
- If the proposal passes, the construction industry would strongly challenge it.

Kerrie says that by pulling pile driving out of exception clause and having it go through variance procedure would essentially be slowing the process down. He says that this isn't a fix, but an administrative slow down that wouldn't accomplish any changes to outcomes

Melissa asks Joel about geotechnical engineers and the concept of "certifying". Joel explains that the contractor doesn't hire the engineers, as that is the owner's responsibility. The contractor doesn't go in with any preconceived idea. Rather, the geotechnical engineer makes recommendations. "Certify" is something city came up with. Soil determines what methods are doable, and the geotechnical engineer comes up with solutions to set pile to withstand the load, given the soil conditions. Geotechnical engineer gives alternative methods and the owner chooses the best solution for economic and scheduling reasons

Juan Sanchez, Destiny Wright, – Pile Drivers Local 196

They are union pile drivers, and state that working men and women like themselves built Portland. Pile driving has been used on things we take for granted, like the bridges that go over the Willamette River. They state that, as citizens go about their lives, they expect that building and bridges are safe, and presume that the people building knew what they were doing. They feel that it is inappropriate for the Noise Control Office to have any say in how buildings are built.

David Hahn – Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters

PNRCC represents over 5000 union carpenters in the Metro area. He states that there is no way the PNRCC or its members, could support any proposal such as this one.

Stephanie Ryznar, Monica Gauthier, Pile Drivers Local 196

They would like it noted:

- Auger cast drilling can drag the construction project out longer, which would be a bigger disruption to the neighbors.
- Pile Drivers Local 196 has one of the highest concentration of women and minorities as union members than other union locals

They request documentation of complaints

Monica says that she doesn't believe that there is a health issue involved, as far as hearing loss.

Paul clarifies that the noise is indeed a health issue for the public. This doesn't mean it can't exist, but it is worth exploring possible solutions without encumbering hardship to the building process.

Carl T Thorne – Pile Drivers Local 196

28 year member of Local 196, and his son is currently a pile driver apprentice.

He says this proposal is poorly written. He understands construction is a noisy business, but a necessary one.

Mary Sipe – Pearl District resident, task force member

She says she has been coming to NRB meetings for 2 years about the issue of pile driving. I began when a project in late spring 2014 drove pile for roughly 7 weeks. She says, in answer to the question of who's complaining about pile driving, that it was a group of over 40 people who lived in close proximity to the project, in an apartment building 50 to 100 feet away. She believes that the whole city of Portland is suffering with this procedure and says she has measurements at over 100 dBA inside her apartment. She says that she is not asking to ban pile driving, but wants the Noise Review Board to protect citizens from unnecessary noise, physical and psychological damage. She says she has documentation of the serious effect of noise. She says that until 2012 "impact hammer" was the only game in town, then that year auger cast became available in the Portland area. She feels that even with the increase in costs, it is a quieter, more humane and effective method. She was on the task force and says Doug Shapiro (task force member and representative of Hoyt Street Properties) said they had to use auger cast on a project; they could not use impact hammer. She says that the last time impact hammer was used was on the previously mentioned project. She says that after the driven pile was used in 2014, she went to 13 different developers and convinced them to change to auger cast. She is not asking the NRB to tell people how to build buildings, but instead put in restrictions if there is no justification for using driven pile. After the pile driving, she was hospitalized 4 times and her neighbors dropped one by one and now she is the lone person left. She indicates that the people in her building are on restricted incomes and lack the ability to move. She says that, given the cost runs \$500,000.00, it could easily get passed to the tenants, as it would be around \$3000.00 for a condo that runs around \$1,000,000.

There is then a back and forth between Mary and Kerrie, with Kerrie asking if the removal of the dBA exemption in the Code for pile driving is the mitigation she would like. She responds

that if there is not a geotechnical reason, then yes. She feels the change to Code from last year is meaningless, and Kerrie feels that taking it out of the exemption clause and putting it into a variance won't make the end result any different.

Seth Reddy – Geotechnical Engineer with CGI

He says that he has been listening to many geotechnical terms thrown around so he wanted to clarify some things.

Initial review process (number 4) having to do with geotechnical engineers saying there is no other viable alternative is never going to happen for the most part. Based on the soils we have here in Portland, the geotechnical engineer could never in good conscience say that a project would have the only option be using driven piles.

If this was passed the way it was written, it would always have to come down to getting a noise variance via a Noise Review Board hearing. From a constructability standpoint the cost to use drilled piles or drilled shafts or auger piles are certainly more difficult to construct and a lot more expensive as evidenced by the Sellwood Bridge project. From a risk & reliability standpoint, driven piles are more reliable because of the way they're fabricated as opposed to drilling a hole in the ground. Lastly, in the big picture, the looming threat in Portland is the Cascade Subduction earthquake. Driven piles are preferable because they are more ductal, and generally you drive more piles than drilled shafts so they have a sense of redundancy favored for seismic design purposes. He says that for the longest time here in Oregon we didn't think we were subjected to large earthquakes and a lot of our building aren't built for seismic purposes, but at least the new ones are constructed properly enough, and bridges too. He urges the board to use caution trying to completely exclude driven piles from the conversation for those reasons.

Melissa asks for more specifics about not saying there is only one way to set pile on projects. She is told that citywide, Portland has pretty variable geography. There are very few geotechnical conditions where you wouldn't be able to use drilled shaft or auger placed pile. The most common time one would completely exclude drilled pile from the list of options be artesian water conditions. If you drill a hole and have water coming up out of the ground it would be pretty hard to construct a drilled pile under those conditions.

Ryan Hyke –Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters, Vice President of Pile Drivers 196 and task force member.

Ryan says that at the last Noise Review Board meeting Commissioner Fritz, had 3 suggested options for the Board.

1. accept proposal as it is
2. modify proposal
3. do nothing

He suggests we do option 3 – do nothing. He says that Commissioner Fritz said she would be happy with any options. He says that in July, they already restricted hours and days and there have been no complaints since then. It was pointed out that, to the Board's knowledge, there hadn't been any projects using driven pile since then, so it would be difficult to know if the restrictions were effective at this point

Garth Ullakko – DeWitt Construction

He is usually the person who gets any noise complaints coming into the office. The only recent complaint he received was a call from a nearby neighbor at Hyatt House on Riverplace (currently under construction) who asked what kind of earplugs they used while pile driving. He told her (foam earplugs and sometimes headphone type over them). She then said “Thank you” and hung up. Other than the complaints regarding Block 17 (the project that led to this process), that was the only call he recalled receiving. He clarified that the auger cast jobs in the Pearl District were already designed before Block 17 began setting piles by driving. He says that feedback from neighbors didn’t have anything to do with the type of pile installation, because they were already decided by then. These projects had suitable soils for auger cast piles. He said that auger cast is not necessarily more expensive. In the right places, auger cast is cheaper than driven pile. He stated that DeWitt does use auger cast and have been using this method in the Portland area, in addition to other methods, since the company’s inception in 1979. He reiterated that not every site in Portland is suitable for auger cast. At times, it is easier and cheaper and less noisy. If there is a quieter, economical, less noisy way to install foundations, it is already being used in Portland. As you go deeper into the soil and experience a greater load, it requires driven pile or a drilled shaft. The Block 17 project consisted of 22 days with driving times averaging 3 hours and 22 minutes in an 8.5 hour shift. Duration on projects usually run between 2- 6 weeks. There are projects that can go faster on but in tight city blocks, that’s about what it takes. Adding restrictions and variances only add to owner’s costs and when driven pile is the only option, those additional costs will be passed to the tenant. He said that Mary brought that up and it’s a tiny little bit for each buyer that she sees. When drilled pier is used, (which is different than an auger cast pile, being bigger and goes deeper), the project will take longer. Current pricing for driven pile is an average of \$1,000,000.00 for 400 driven pile with a duration of 20 – 30 days. With drilled piers, even though they are bigger and there are less of them, duration averages 100 to 125 days and cost \$2,500,000.00 more. This doesn’t take into account any contaminated soils and the ensuing spoils that will need to be hauled off. When the duration increases, the amount of money goes up too. He believes what Doug Shapiro meant when talking to Mary, was that the cost was only \$500,000.00 more on that specific job. Also, there are still some places in Portland, such as South Waterfront, at the Zidell properties, (big open area south of south of Marquam Bridge) where contaminated soil will be directly under where there will be large buildings constructed. There are still a few areas left in the Pearl with contaminated soil, and there are some environmental impacts with that. Although it doesn’t really affect the environment here in Portland, it affects the environment where the soils are taken and the environment from here to there. He urges the Noise Review Board to vote against the amendment.

Jim Brunkhorst – Pacific Foundations, task force member

He clarifies some points. Pacific Foundations does promote construction in Portland and likes to see everyone working and making a living in Portland. They hire union pile drivers, take them from the hall, put them to work, give them same benefits and want to support their livelihood. They know that buildings that need a deep support system will get a deep support system. All they are asking for and supported during this whole process is that all options are explored and the most economical and efficient foundation system is used. The opinion that a diesel hammer

is used on auger cast piling (mentioned earlier) has not been the experience of Pacific Foundations. They have done 8 projects in the last 2 years and not once have they fired up a diesel hammer. The idea of driven pile versus drilled pile is all an economic decision and we know that the most efficient system should be looked at.

Mary Sipe

In response to Garth's statement regarding the 3 hours per day actually driving pile, said the analogy would be that if a person is having their fingernails pulled out and were told that they going to be pulling for 15 minutes and then come back in an hour for the next fingernail and will only be pulling for 3 hours per day, would the person be suffering any less?

Carol Gossett

She asks if there are no more comments if board would like to vote on language.

Kerrie would like to ask more questions first:

- Is Commissioner Fritz asking us to bless this right now?

Claire explains that she is asking for the board's input

- Why would it not be better for BDS to be triggering some process which requires consideration of other procedures instead of the NRB? He said that the NRB can add input to that idea.

Theresa reiterates that BDS has said that they are not the noise experts.

- Kerrie responds that the Board is not the geotechnical experts. He asks if this is more a question of what process is best to trigger communication and discussion of the issue. He feels that maybe it's better to come out of BDS instead of coming out of the Noise Review Board.

Theresa says that BDS isn't any more comfortable making decisions about excessive noise than we are making geotechnical considerations. Kerrie responds that it's not a decision about noise, but instead about more public input and that process could be initiated at BDS as much as it could the NRB. He suggests that the Noise Ordinance, instead of having an exemption, could say something to the effect "for pile driving, go through the process that BDS has", and BDS has a public hearing.

- He asks why the Noise Review Board should be the ones to have a public hearing, and feels that it may be better just to have it be part of the permitting process.
- Julie says her comment as someone who is representing the construction industry is that she understands the intent to get the NRB out in front of the permit process. She is sympathetic to neighbors who live around multiple projects but says that this proposal isn't clean enough and it currently looks like an administrative roadblock. She isn't sure if that's the right way to do it, so she is in favor of doing nothing at this time. She realizes the intent of the proposal is to streamline the process and not get in the way of work but feels it's in its infancy of discussion.
- Kerrie adds that he thinks maybe another year of discussion, since it took a year to come up with what they already recommended.

- Melissa agrees with not recommending this proposal. She feels like what they did in July was useful because but it seems to her that restricting hours was the fair thing to do.
 - Julie adds that she is not in favor of the additional fee for pile driving. It's not weighing out the overall impact on staffing
 - Kerrie says that this seems that it's taking one source of noise in the city and treating it a little bit different from all the others they deal with.
 - Claire asks if they are suggesting another year to assess the effect of the new code put in place in July when they say this needs more time.
 - Julie clarifies that this is just administrative hurdles and roadblocks, and that she understands the intent was to make people think twice about what method they use when setting pile and that the administrative hurdle is the incentive to use a different method beyond time and expense.
 - Carol says that this board and a lot of people in this room spent hours talking about this and made these changes in July and feels they were good changes. She considers some of the language to be onerous. She wouldn't be able to consider this due to the problems she is having with this language.
-
- Melissa says that if there's going to be focus on any kind of dissonance in the community it seems we should be increasing citation expenses for people who don't use the laws that are in place already. She says that there's way more of that than there is of pile driving
 - Kerrie says he applauds the Commissioner for trying to come up with a policy, but more work needs to be done to come up with a policy or code recommendation that is going to end up create differences. He doesn't see that this is going to create a difference in outcome, but will end up in the same place, only extending the process out longer and costing more. He is personally in favor of doing research on how to reduce the noise from that source and how can we put limits on the source (mitigation). The reason it's in exemptions clause is because at the time it was written in 70s there was no mitigation available. He would want to revisit that along with garbage trucks.

Claire states that there is not a mechanism in place to require compliance. Kerrie replies that he doesn't see anything in the proposal that would require it either. After more discussion, Kerrie suggests that BDS should develop a process to ask if notification has been done when issuing foundation permits.

Introduction to Noise Review Board Applicants

Eileen Kennedy

She is a retired teacher, and a former principal in a private catholic school in the Honduras She is interested in being on the Board because she likes the issue. She live in NE Portland in the King neighborhood.

Jamie Hurd

She is a project manager at OMSI and has been involved in community engagement, education, design, advisory boards and was an undergraduate in architecture. She is interested in the way noise impacts living, and growth, and is interested in learning more. She lives in NE Portland, in the Grant Park neighborhood

Garbage Truck Study

Paul says that of the 11 cities contacted, 6 haven't got back to him. Results as follows:

San Diego CA – haven't heard back

Washington DC- haven't heard back

Savannah GA – City decided in 1989 that they would have no more front loaders in residential areas. They have replaced their garbage dumpsters with compactors

Chicago IL – didn't hear back

Santa Clara County, CA – didn't hear back

Los Angeles, CA –LAPD is taxed with enforcement, and will cite offenders

Miami, FL – didn't hear back

Seattle, WA – Their rules only apply to residential areas

San Francisco, CA – didn't call back

Atlanta, GA – Police enforce their ordinance, which allows pick-up between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm weekdays and 9:00 am -9:00 pm on weekends. Citation is a misdemeanor

New Orleans, LA – Didn't hear back

Public testimony

Dave White- Oregon Refuse & Recycling Association- Regional Representative

He was part of the noise task force from 15 years ago. They looked at franchising but the business community opposed it because they wanted to select their own hauler and get a better rate. City's goal was focused on recycling

Gunnar Sacher – resident, SW Portland (downtown)

He says it's difficult to know where to make a complaint. It should be one number, and it should be the noise office.

Dean Kampfer –Waste Management

He says the challenge is making a distinction between residential and commercial, due to density and mixed use zones.

Kevin Veaudry Casous – Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

He has contacts all over country and can help with getting answers back from other municipalities. He also has a familiarity about stakeholder groups to be included in the discussion. He suggests working on a PSU partnership , possibly as a project for a statistics class.

Approve February minutes

Kerry Standlee makes a motion to approve the minutes with one amendment "Kerrie wants noise office to check"

Melissa Stewart seconds the motion

Motion passes unanimously, 4 - 0.

No formal adjournment

