

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION / COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Maria Gladziszewski, Chair

February 1, 2011

I. CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Gladziszewski called the meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC)/Committee of the Whole (COW), held in Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:15 p.m.

Commissioners present: Nathan Bishop, Dan Miller, Marsha Bennett, Dennis Watson, Nicole Grewe, Frank Rue, Maria Gladziszewski

Commissioners absent: Michael Satre, Benjamin Haight

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Dale Pernula, CDD Director; Benjamin Lyman, CDD Planner

II. REGULAR AGENDA

TXT2009-00003

Discussion of an Ordinance Repealing and Reenacting the Disturbing the Peace Code, Relating to Noise, and Providing for a Penalty.

Applicant: City & Borough of Juneau

Location: Boroughwide

Chair Gladziszewski stated that a question was raised as to how long the Commissioners intend for the COW to last. Mr. Rue requested staff to provide an estimate of time they feel is required for the site visit and the COW meeting this evening. Mr. Lyman said the tentative agenda consists of briefly reviewing the packet until 6:00 p.m., and then the site visit will begin to conduct sound tests at a quiet place in the Downtown Library. They will go to the Rendezvous Bar to listen to loud music and measure it inside, outside with the door closed under the awning, and across the street. They will go up to the State Office Building (SOB) and take sound measurements outside the 8th Floor on the north side near 5th Street to hear white noise of fans running on an outdoor cooling system below. They will walk to 520 Main Street to visit a private property to take sound measurements of the same SOB fans from the porch. He explained that this property owner provided complaints years ago about noise from those fans at the SOB, which have since been enclosed after a second attempt. He noted that the previous attempt to build a structure to enclose the cooling system did not work because the fans overheated, so the enclosure was rebuilt last year and the system is quieter now. Even so, he said this exercise will give the COW a chance to listen to the white noise of those fans from a residential property across the street. In terms of the Open Meetings Act regarding the site visit, he explained that the Commissioners and staff will be on the record, so they should keep this in mind while holding discussions. He has scheduled the COW to arrive back to the Assembly

Chambers at 7:00 p.m. He said the COW would discuss their findings after the site visit, so this is also on the record. Chair Gladziszewski asked staff to describe the public notice regarding this COW meeting. Mr. Lyman said the notice states that the COW will meet at 5:15 p.m., and no public testimony will be taken. He said he spoke to the City Attorney about conducting a COW site visit during this meeting and how they should handle noticing it. He explained that the City Attorney stated that providing notice of the COW meeting as it was should be okay, as the meeting could be moved, it could continue on for 15 minutes, or 2 hours, including that notice will be provided to members of the audience of this site visit. He noted that since this is a COW work session, no decision is being made, and this is legislative matter, so even if the COW walks with members of the public there would be no ex parte contact because it is not a quasi-judicial matter. He noted that Ms. Firestack will be recording the site visit, and while sound measurements are being taken the COW will not be able to hold extensive discussions because they will have to be quiet in order to obtain meaningful readings with the sound meter.

Staff report

He said the report, dated January 25, 2011, has an attached draft noise ordinance, which combines direction provided by the PC to date into a single document. He said the PC input provided on January 11, 2011 was not included, as it was provided after this report was drafted, although the PC requested at that meeting that staff provide relevant portions of the PC meeting minutes, public comments, and background documents that were presented to the PC in the past, so an extensive list of attachments to this memorandum serve as the discussion of how the proposed noise ordinance came to be in its current form. He explained that items not included in the report are initial drafts of the proposed ordinance, comments on them, and other comments regarding noisy aircraft, OHV, motorcycle, etc., because those are not regulated under this proposed ordinance, which are stand-alone or special uses.

Draft Ordinance:

He said the Commissioners have not yet viewed the draft ordinance provided in the report, which stemmed from several meetings held in the past on specific portions. He noted that there is legalese in the beginning of the proposed noise ordinance.

42.20.310 Sound measurement.

He said this provides how sound has to be measured. He cited section (d) on page 3, explaining that base cars will continue to be driven around during the day-time hours, and this provision provides a distance prohibition for night-time hours. He noted that section (e) pertains to animal noises.

42.20.320 Definitions.

He noted that some of the terminology Mr. Rue asked for in terms of “steady and continuous noise” is not in this definition section, which he believes was previously removed from a much longer list of definitions in earlier drafts. He said this definition does not appear in the proposed noise ordinance at this point, but if this is an aspect the COW wishes to include then they could work on that.

42.20.330 Maximum permissible sound levels.

He noted that under section (b), Tables 1 and 2 are incomplete because they have not yet been assigned night-time or day-time noise limits for receiving non-residential properties. He said section (c) and (d) relate to impulsive sounds. He said section (e) calls for a reduction of 5 decibels (dB) for mechanical devices, which does not apply to residential heating,

ventilation, and cooling (HVAC) units. In terms of section (f), he has been in contact with AEL&P and the Juneau Electric Company per a request by the Commissioners about this provision. He explained that he has received some correspondence, although they have not specifically stated whether they think this might be a problem, as they wish to take measurements beforehand.

42.20.340 Exceptions.

He said some of these exceptions remained intact, or were re-phrased by the PC at an early January 2011 PC meeting.

42.20.350 Maximum limit for certain activities.

He said this provision refers to sections 42.20.340(e), (g), (l), or (m) in excess of 85 dB measured on the property for more than 5 minutes on any day, so a noise-sensitive use would be a violation. He said noise-sensitive uses include schools, hospitals, rest homes, long-term care facilities, mental health facilities, residential uses, libraries, passive recreation uses, places of worship, and special protection. He said under 42.20.340 regarding this provision, section (e), this relates to construction and demolition activities, (g) is for domestic tools, (l) is for loading/unloading activities related to marine shipping, or other tidally dependent operations, and (m) for lawfully nonconforming uses. He said even though some exceptions for these sections are provided, the exceptions will still have a cap because 85 dB is too loud for more than 5 minutes per day in noise-sensitive use areas. Mr. Miller asked, e.g., if he lived in one of the houses adjacent to Floyd Dryden Middle School, and it takes him more than 5 minutes to mow his lawn at 100 dB then he would be in violation of this section. Mr. Lyman agreed that this would be the case if the noise is 100 dB on the school property or any adjacent residential property, noting that this is a problematic provision, which appeared in previous drafts, although he wanted to point this out as being an important caveat to the exceptions in terms of protecting health, and restricting noise. Mr. Miller stated that, e.g., if he was working on a construction project at the school then he would have to use a quiet handsaw, versus a noisy powered skill saw. Mr. Lyman said it would depend on where the complaint stemmed from that the police might respond to, e.g., if a construction worker was running a jack hammer outside of a school in the middle of the day when children are inside trying to learn then it might mean that such a project would have to be timed differently. He said if the same work was taking place on an adjacent property and it is 85 dB on school grounds then that work might have to occur at a different time as well, or perhaps this is not a reasonable provision to have in the ordinance. Chair Gładziszewski asked when this provision was provided in the proposed noise ordinance. Mr. Lyman said he does not recall when/where this specifically came from, although he knows that he has cross-referenced and changed these particular citations at least 3 times in different draft ordinances.

42.20.360 Penalty.

He said any violation of the ordinance is an infraction.

42.20.370 Enforcement.

He said the chief of police, or the chief's designee, or the code compliances officer will have the authority to enforce the provisions of the ordinance.

Blue Folder items – (3) Total:

- Attachment P – Noise Permit Process:

He said the Commissioners provided input on this a week ago.

- Un-labeled Map:

He said the map is of Stabler's Point in Auke Bay with a 1,000' buffer, which shows the surrounding properties that would receive notice under the provisions of attachment P. He said this was brought up at the last PC meeting as a sample they wanted to see because residents providing most of the complaints for these operations were from across Auke Bay along Fritz Cove Road. He said the map shows that the parcel is far enough away from the coast that it does not invoke the requirement to notify these people. He said the Commissioners might want to consider expanding the notice area if they want to provide these people notices about Stabler's Point. Mr. Watson said Mr. Tonsgard's company was blasting out the road earlier this week in an area where no houses are adjacent to it, so he asked if a noise permit would be required for such a use once the proposed noise ordinance is approved. Mr. Lyman said this is taking place in the Rural Reserve zoning district, which is listed in the Environmental Designation for Noise Abatement (EDNA) descriptions, so noise limits would apply, similarly with the comments received from residents of Shelter Island. He explained that there are no current provisions provided to exempt rural or less-developed areas from these provisions. In terms of enforcing outlying areas, they should take into consideration that if no one complains then there would not be any enforcement, and if someone does complain they probably will expect enforcement. He stated that ultimately the Juneau Police Department (JPD) would have to provide comments on this provision, but they have not yet done so.

- Letter from Kelly Corrigan & Mary Kay Pusich:

He said this letter was provided to CDD today, and it relates to noise in Downtown Douglas. Mr. Bishop said these people indicate what their problem is not, but not what it is, which he asked staff to expand on. Mr. Lyman suggested that he address this later on when he reviews a different section of the packet; to which Mr. Bishop agreed.

Attachments:

A – Common Environmental Noise Levels Factsheet, www.chchearing.org

He said this used to be from the League for the Hard of Hearing, but now it is provided by the Center for Hearing and Communication, which has a typical list for how loud a common home, work, and recreation noises are.

B – Excerpts from *Guidelines for Community Noise*, World Health Organization (WHO)

He said he has found this material to have the most authoritative review of international scientific work on how noise affects health, and he highlighted particular areas. He said a matrix titled "Table 4.1: Guideline values for community noise in specific environments" was provided to the Commissioners in the past. He noted that these are not actual noise measurements, and instead, are what the WHO recommends as guidelines for maximum noise limits in order to not affect health negatively, and to ensure children can effectively learn in school, etc.

Mr. Watson noted that the Outdoor living area in the matrix is 16 Time base [hours], so he assumes that 16 hours is what the WHO considers during the day-time and evening, which is more liberal than what the PC is proposing in this draft ordinance. Mr. Lyman said the definition verbiage of "Time base [hours]" might be on a page of the WHO publication that

he inadvertently did not include. He explained that the Time base [hours] column consists of the period of time over a 16-hour day, and most places consider about an 8-hour period to be night-time.

Ms. Bennett said the line item titled ceremonies, festivals and entertainment events in the matrix (since the COW will be conducting a site visit to the Rendezvous Bar) lists hearing impairment as being 100 to 110 dB, and the owner of the Rendezvous provided an email stating that a 110 dB level is one of the requirements of the bands playing inside that bar, not outside. She said she is pointing this out for the COW to use as a reference when they are at that bar this evening. Mr. Lyman clarified that the owner's e-mail actually was referring to the monitor levels of the speakers facing toward the band so they can hear what they sound like at 120 dB, not the speakers facing towards the audience. He explained that having talked to many people who play music, the bane of any electrified musician is bad monitors when they cannot hear what they sound like. Chair Gladziszewski said most band players use monitors that are in their ears. Mr. Lyman said he does not believe any band members in Juneau have that technology. Chair Gladziszewski clarified that some bands do have such technology. Ms. Bennett said the point she is attempting to make is in regards to the comment that bar PA systems should be excluded in the ordinance, which the Commissioners have not yet discussed as being a possible exception. Mr. Lyman explained that in a very early draft of the noise ordinance, there was a requirement that any venue offering live or other amplified events would have to have a sign posted at the entry warning people that sounds over 90 dB could be encountered in the facility. He noted that this met very widespread opposition from many different business owners in town, as it would have affected movie theaters, bars, etc., so the PC removed this aspect. Therefore, the PC has reviewed this issue somewhat, but not from a limitation standpoint, and only from posting a notice warning of health hazards in the facility, which was removed.

C – Draft PC Minutes, Regular Meeting, January 11, 2011

He said this is the meeting at which the PC discussed the exceptions, which includes the draft minutes with his edits.

D – PC Minutes, Regular Meeting, November 23, 2010

He said these are minutes where the ordinance was discussed.

E – PC Minutes, Regular Meeting, November 9, 2010

He said these are minutes where the ordinance was discussed.

F – Maximum Permissible A-Weighted Sound Levels, NJ Model Noise Ordinance

He said this is a new document, which is from a NJ Model Noise Ordinance of what they recommend for time periods and noise limits. He said this is held as a national model ordinance, and is where the enforcement officer traveled to receive training in measuring and enforcing sound issues.

G – E-mail from Debra Purves, then-Building Official, to Benjamin Lyman, Planner, November 20, 2008

He stated that this is an e-mail from Debra Purves who was the Building Official at the time, including her conversation with the Building Code Advisory Committee (BCAC) about the possibility of having a limit on how loud fans and other mechanical systems can be when installed on a building. He noted that not many have that type of rating to begin with, and

even if they did and were poorly maintained or not maintained at all then they could quickly become very noisy. In addition, a louder well-maintained machine might over its life be quieter, so the response of the BCAC was that they did not think this was an appropriate way to deal with noise from such systems.

H – E-mails between Sue Stancliff (Alaska Department of Public Safety) and Benjamin Lyman, Planner, June-July 2009, regarding 13 AAC 04.215

He stated that he and Ms Stancliff discussed how state law covers noise from vehicles, which was pulled out of this proposed noise ordinance because it is already regulated by the federal government at the time the vehicles are manufactured and sold. He said the vehicles are also covered by the state in terms of what is required on state roads. He explained that beyond this the PC would be restricting interstate commerce, e.g., if they were to state that vehicles were not allowed in Juneau that exceed 60 dB, as many people that own Harley Davidson motorcycles who legally bought them would no longer be able to use them on local roads, etc., which opens up many other issues as well. He said the second part of the e-mail is in regards to what is in the code under 13 AAC 04.215, which is enforced by the state and local law enforcement regarding what is required in terms of mufflers. He said if the municipal government adopted a lower dB limit then it would only be enforceable by the local police department, not State Troopers. Chair Gladziszewski asked if he considered reviewing this aspect with the CBJ Law Department. Mr. Lyman said when he discussed these issues with the CBJ Attorney they basically requested that he to talk to a state representative, which he did.

I – US CFR (United States Code of Federal Regulations) Title 40

He said the US CFR is about the manufacturer, and point of sale of motorized vehicles, noting that he provided this section of Title 40 so the COW is able to review what is on the books. He said § 205.152 Noise emission standards states that motorcycles, depending on the year they are made, must meet this definition at 80-83 dB, including moped-type street motorcycles at 60 dB. He noted that these dB thresholds are over the limits the COW has been discussing for night-time use.

J – Blue Folder Items from January 11, 2011, Regular PC Meeting

He said he crossed off attachments of cases that were not germane to TXT2009-00003.

K - Blue Folder Items from November 23, 2010, Regular PC Meeting

[No discussion]

L - Blue Folder Items from November 9, 2010, Regular PC Meeting

In response to answering Mr. Bishop's question regarding the problem that people have in Downtown Douglas about noise complaints, he referred to the November 9, 2010 memorandum, which is titled Noise Measurements of AML Operations. He explained that he went on a site visit to 1st and 2nd Street in Douglas and conducted sound measurements on a relatively clear morning while AML was unloading a barge across Gastineau Channel at the Rock Dump. He said the approximate measurement locations are shown on the Zoning Map on page 1. He said the Douglas residents have complained that noisy loading/unloading barge operations take place anywhere from 9:00 p.m. into the night, which registers around 80 dB in Downtown Douglas. He noted that based on the WHO excerpt regarding *Guidelines for Community Noise*, it specifies that noise levels are expected to drop by 10 dB [actually states 15 dB] through an open window, which would reduce this noise to 70 dB

[actually 65 dB]. However, the WHO also states that 35 dB can disturb sleep inside, which would be 45 dB [actually 50] outside. He said the Commissioners still have quite a ways to go to mitigate these impacts, so the people in Downtown Douglas do not have to experience this level of noise. Mr. Bishop asked what specific type of barge operation noises are the Douglas residents hearing. Mr. Lyman said it generally consists of handling and maneuvering metal containers. He explained that, depending on the tide, the forklifts are driven up/down the ramp, which has a transition area on top where a flange used to be loose that was knocking, although this was identified and fixed by AML a year or two ago. He noted that when he previously conducted the site visit, he watched a forklift being driven over that cusp area and there was a slight delay, and then a clang, but when the forklift was being driven down the clang did not occur, so there is still some noise emanating from the ramp area. He said he informed Mr. Badger of this at AML after that visit, although he does not know if AML has resolved this yet. He said another noise that occurs is when metal shipping containers are stacked on top of each other. He explained that the containers have cones on the bottom corners, so when they are not aligned properly when placed on top of one another they make a loud noise once they fall into place. In addition, when the second container in the stack is not aligned, and the third and fourth are placed on top of it, and then the fifth container is placed on top of those then they can all fall into place at once, which is very loud. Furthermore, occasionally the operator might be a bit too excited to pull the forklift blades out of the bottom of a container, and when this takes place then the container might not be properly aligned, which is when it would make a loud clang once it later falls into alignment, noting that he heard the latter through the Juneau grapevine, not from AML or Douglas residents.

M - Blue Folder Items from November 4, 2010, Regular PC /COW Meeting

He said a letter from Don Reid, Vice President of Operations of AML, dated November 2, 2010, to the PC relates to quieter back-up alarms being installed on AML devices.

N - Blue Folder Items from October 6, 2010, Regular PC Meeting

[No discussion]

O – Tigard (OR) Municipal Code, Chapter 7 Article IV, and selected Tigard web pages

He said this is the Tigard ordinance regarding noise, which was suggested by several members of the public and a couple of Commissioners as being a possible model ordinance that the PC should review and base the proposed noise ordinance on. He said he including this attachment in the packet so the COW is able to view a snapshot of where they have come from in terms of their review of the proposed noise ordinance. He said it is important to note that Tigard is a bedroom community with essentially no industry or heavy commerce, and it is not a port city, and they do not have heliports with many tourists, or float planes. He explained that Tigard prohibits residents from working on their own cars on residential properties, and Juneau is not about to do so. Therefore, Tigard has much tighter restrictions on the types of tools that can be used at residences, i.e., they are unable to use noisy air wrenches, etc. He said it is much quieter in Tigard, which is very different than Juneau. He said another topic that was brought up years ago by the PC was that Tigard instituted a noise mediation program for when a neighbor does not like the amount of noise an adjacent resident generates, which is when they can request a city mediator to assist them in working through the process.

P - Noise Permit Process

[Already discussed earlier as a Blue Folder item.]

He said he is placing a site visit notice on the entry door of the Municipal Building of the walking agenda for potential latecomers to this meeting, which states that the COW is conducting this. He said the walking agenda is subject to change without notice during the site visit in order to accommodate changing weather, available noise sources, and adequate time to take measurements at each stop, which is scheduled to take place from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. Chair Gladziszewski asked if the COW could take sound meter measurements of a quiet noise in the Assembly Chambers, versus the Downtown Library. Mr. Lyman said it was suggested by a Commissioner at the last PC meeting that staff add somewhere that is quiet, and that the fan system in the Assembly Chambers might be too loud, so the Downtown Library was suggested as a possibility. Mr. Miller said he asked for the COW to be presented with some quiet sounds, including different examples of ambient. Chair Gladziszewski asked if Mr. Miller wants to go to the Downtown Library. Mr. Miller said the COW does not necessarily have to, but it is really silent in the library, so they could take a sound measurement to determine what the actual dB level it is there. Chair Gladziszewski said the sound meter is unable to read below 50 dB. She requested that the sound meter measurements be written down during the site visit.

Chair Gladziszewski adjourned the COW meeting at 6:01 p.m.

Site Visit

Chair Gladziszewski convened the COW site visit at 6:02 p.m.

Mr. Miller said he just measured at 80 dB a vehicle that just went by on Egan drive, but if that was near the hospital they would get a ticket per the proposed noise ordinance; Chair Gladziszewski disagreed. Mr. Doll said it is that type of question that the public might later ask, which he believes the CBJ Attorney will have to respond to. Mr. Lyman requested the Commissioners to keep in mind that they are not to make recommendations on how loud people can talk, whether or not their families can play in the yard, how loud vehicles are, etc., as these are not land uses, so they are not going to be regulated under the proposed noise ordinance, as those aspects are outside the jurisdiction of this body. He noted that this was an aspect they previously attempted to separate out of the ordinance, but the CBJ Law Department now included the verbiage of the land use side, and the penal side, which has been confusing since then. Mr. Doll said Mr. Pernula is the person that would probably answer many of those types of questions by the public when the time comes. [Note: Mr. Doll did not participate in the site visit, outside of making these comments outdoors in front of the Municipal Building.]

Mr. Pernula said they would be taking a detour to visit the geotechnical drilling operations just off of the new dock near Marine Park. Chair Gladziszewski stated that if these operations were making these sounds, and she heard them in her yard it would make her angry. Mr. Rue said if this was happening 365 days per year for 16 hours per day it would be rather annoying. Chair Gladziszewski said it would be annoying even less than those hours if this noise could be heard from her porch. Mr. Rue stated that from a non-residential area to a residential area during the day the maximum sound threshold is 70 dB, and at night it is 60 dB in the EDNA matrix. Mr. Pernula said if a person is able to hear this sound from their porch at night, they would probably end up moving. Mr. Lyman said he is reading 67 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting. The pile driving started, and Mr. Lyman said he is reading 70-73 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting. Mr. Pernula noted that as a comparison, the initial Rainbow Foods refrigeration

unit previously registered 65 dB with the CBJ sound meter from Mr. Stey's yard a while back; Chair Gladziszewski said 65 dB is loud.

Mr. Lyman asked if the COW wants to visit the Downtown Library to take sound measurements, to which the COW did not.

Once inside of the Rendezvous bar, Mr. Lyman introduced the owner Erik Emert who will inform the COW of how his bar generally operates in terms of sounds from music, and then afterwards the COW will conduct sound tests. Mr. Emert explained that he is able to turn up the sound system quite loud, but if they had a live band in the bar right now there would be additional base amplifiers, speakers, etc., so it would be even louder. Chair Gladziszewski noted that right now the COW is able to hold a conversation, so during normal bar operations with the current music being played at this level she does not have to scream to be heard. Mr. Lyman said he is reading 70 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting. He noted that the Commissioners are not interested in regulating how much noise is in the bar, and instead, they would take the noise readings as threshold levels to use as a baseline to determine the sound level inside the bar, out on the street with the bar doors closed under the awning, and then across the street. He requested Mr. Emert to turn up the music for a couple of minutes so he could take measurements, and then he will inform Mr. Emert when he is able to turn the music back down. When the music was turned up inside the bar, Mr. Lyman said he is reading 102 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting. Once outside with the bar doors closed, Mr. Lyman said he is reading 76 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting. Once across the street, Mr. Lyman said he is reading 66-68 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting.

Once arriving at the 8th Floor outside of the SOB facing north near 5th Street, Mr. Lyman explained that a new structure with the green roof below them houses an old fan system to cool the server room, which was installed sometime around 2004 to 2006. He said unfortunately the residents who hear the noise from this system reside at the house located at 520 Main Street past Calhoun Avenue at the top of the stairs, which the COW will visit next. He said those residents complained to both the city and state about the noise emanating from this unit. At that time, the state agreed to try to enclose the fan system to lessen the noise, although they were unable to do so because the enclosed structure caused a reduction in the amount of airflow, which overheated the fan system. He explained that this year they rebuilt the new structure that the COW is now viewing. He said this fan system is just as loud now as when he checked it during the day-time a couple of days ago, so it tends to emit a fairly consistent volume. He said he is reading 55-58 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting, and 66-68 dB with a C-Weighting of the low tones of the fan system.

Mr. Pernula commented that he checked the pricing on a certified ANSI sound meter, which costs around \$1,200 each.

Upon arrival at 520 Main Street, owned by Alan and Monica Gross, the COW was greeted by Dr. Gross who offered to answer questions. Mr. Lyman asked if the sound emanating from the SOB fan system seems to be quieter now with the new structure. Dr. Gross explained that in the winter they do not notice the noise from the system as much because they are inside, but when they are outside most of the time in the summer it is much louder. Mr. Bishop said the snow should tend to dampen the sound; Mr. Lyman said there is no snow now. Dr. Gross explained that when it is windy and rainy they do not hear the system as much, so the Commissioners should probably conduct a site visit during the summer when the sound emanating from the fans

is overwhelming, but she believes the new structure they built around it has extremely helped dampen the noise. She said the initial structure they built caused the system to overheat, so they did not finish the construction of covering it, and they left the end of the structure open that faces her house. She noted that in the past four months or so they finally enclosed it, including constructing another small area that she believes is serving to cool the system as well, so she will see how this works in regards to how loud it is in the summertime. She said she believes the covered structure is helping this winter, but in the summer they tend to leave big doors open all the time so the fan system stays cool, and then it was just as noisy. She stated that noise is a weird deal because all the traffic noise distracts her, so she is not able to solely focus on the SOB fan system sound at times. She explained that if a person was in her bedroom in the middle of the night in the summertime with the windows open it is unbearable because the sound from the system is so loud. She said she realizes it sounds as though she is crazy, but she is not because the noise is really annoying, especially when she is in bed during the summertime. She said she appreciates the COW conducting this site visit, and they should feel free to go anywhere on her property to conduct sound tests of the SOB fan system.

Mr. Rue said Dr. Gross stated that the state allowed the doors to remain open on the structure housing the fan system over the summertime when the weather gets hotter, and they open their windows of the home as well, so he understands how it might be noisier. Mr. Miller said the leaves are going to be on the trees over the summertime, so he thinks that should help buffer the noise of the fan system, but Dr. Gross stated that noise is a weird deal, so maybe she is onto something. Mr. Bishop said in certain areas sound sometimes reverts back, so the Gross' could be hearing much more sound from their bedroom than what the COW is hearing at ground level in their yard on the edge of the bank right now. Mr. Pernula said further back in the yard he heard the fan system a lot louder a bit ago, which had an echo. Mr. Miller said he is unable to distinguish the fan system from other noise at the edge of the bank, to which Mr. Bishop agreed. From the edge of the bank in the front yard, Mr. Lyman said he is reading 50 dB on the sound meter with an A-Weighting, but he does not think the SOB fan system sound is being picked up, including a reading of 60 dB with a C-Weighting. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Lyman to explain the difference between an A- versus C-Weighting. Mr. Lyman said A-Weighting mimic human conversation, and C-Weighting is for low-frequency components.

Chair Gladziszewski adjourned the COW site visit at 7:00 p.m.

BREAK: 7:00 – 7:05 p.m.

Chair Gladziszewski reconvened the COW meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Notes: Readings taken during the site visit with the Radio Shack Sound Meter:

Chair Gladziszewski requested Ms. Firestack to only incorporate Mr. Lyman's Radio Shack sound meter measurements taken at the A-weighted scale, including the C-weighted if those measurements are available. She explained that this is to eliminate any confusion regarding varying measurements taken by others with iPhones during the site visit, to which the COW agreed.

Location	A-Weighting in dB	C-Weighting in dB
----------	----------------------	----------------------

New dock near Marine Park (Geotechnical Barge Operations) <i>Before Drilling, with machinery on barge running</i>	67	
<i>Pile driving Sound</i>	70-73	
<i>High Pitched Sound</i>	63	
Rendezvous <i>Inside-Normal Sound</i>	70	
<i>Inside-Music turned up</i>	102	
<i>Outside Bar - Doors Closed under awning on sidewalk</i>	76	
<i>Across street from Bar on the other sidewalk</i>	66-68	
(SOB) - 8th Floor-North by 5th St. <i>Fans of Heating System</i>	55-58	66-68
520 Main St. (outside private residence) <i>Outside on front yard on edge of south facing bank</i>	50	60

COW debriefing

520 Main Street

Chair Gladziszewski said the COW would work somewhat backwards, with the common reading being 50 dB with an A-Weighting, and 60 dB with a C-Weighting from the edge of the bank facing south in the front yard, noting that she was unable to distinguish noise of the fan system from other sounds in the area. Mr. Lyman stated that other noises were going on, and the noise emanating from the fan system was the quietest, which was a continuous and steady drone. Chair Gladziszewski confirmed that the consensus of the COW is to disregard sound meter readings taken from the front porch because too many people were talking, to which the COW agreed. Mr. Watson commented that some of the participants using iPhones to take sound measurements were useful, as they fluctuated, but most of the readings were fairly consistent with each other within a couple of dB, although he agrees that for these purposes at this COW meeting, they should only use Mr. Lyman's readings.

SOB-Outside 8th Floor of Fan System Below

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading from this area was 55 to 58 dB with an A-Weighting, and 66-68 dB with a C-Weighting.

New dock near Marine Park - Geotechnical Drilling operations off of barge:

- Before pile driving, with just the machinery running

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading from this area was 67 db with an A-Weighting. Mr. Rue noted that a difference between 67 dB and 70 dB would be twice as loud because 3 dB denotes a doubling effect. Mr. Pernula said it is perceived as being twice as loud, but dB measures the energy released by sound waves, not noise that a person necessarily hears. Mr. Rue confirmed that even though there might be twice as much energy, a person still might not hear it; Mr. Pernula said yes.

- Pile driving sound

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 70-73 with an A-Weighting.

- High pitched sound

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 63 with an A-Weighting.

Rendezvous Bar:

- Inside, general evening atmosphere

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 70 with an A-Weighting, stating that they were able to hold a conversation without screaming.

- Inside, music turned up

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 102 with an A-Weighting.

- Outside with music still turned up, with doors closed under awning on sidewalk

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 76 with an A-Weighting.

- Outside with music still turned up, across the street on the other sidewalk

Chair Gladziszewski said the common reading was 66 to 68 with an A-Weighting.

COW discussion

Ms. Bennett said comments provided in the packet were made about how loud the Lemon Creek area is in regards to noise stemming from the jail, with Costco and Home Depot on one side, Davis Avenue on the other side, and ongoing land fill operations. She explained that the COW has not talked about quiet neighborhoods versus noisy ones in Juneau, so it might be that people who are surrounded by noise on all sides are more tolerant than those that reside in very quiet neighborhoods. Chair Gladziszewski said 520 Main Street registered between 50 dB and 60dB, which seems reasonable for the location in Downtown Juneau, although if a neighbor installed a generator in a quiet neighborhood when the neighbors were used to 50 dB, it would seem loud. Even so, she questions how they would address this in the proposed ordinance, unless they provide a breakout of urban versus non-urban neighborhoods. Ms. Bennett said they would then have to factor in the vulnerable groups, i.e., elderly, children, etc.

Chair Gladziszewski stated that she has been under the impression that the proposed noise ordinance refers to A-Weighting threshold limits, not C-Weighting. Mr. Lyman referred to page 2 of the proposed draft ordinance, specifically section 42.20.310 Sound measurement, which states, “(a) While sound measurements are not required for the enforcement of this article, should measurements be made, they shall be made with a sound level meter. The sound level meter: (1) Shall be an instrument in operating condition certified by ANSI as meeting the requirements of a Type I or II meter; (2) Shall contain **at least** an A-weighted scale, and both fast and slow meter response capability.” He said this implies that a C-weighted scale could be used as well. Mr. Miller said when the PC set the noise limits he believed that the PC was basing them on the WHO recommendations, which are A-weighted, so the noise levels the Commissioners have set so far in the proposed ordinance are A-weighted thresholds. Even so, what he witnessed tonight is that C-Weightings range above 10 dB over A-Weightings, and this is a very important, so more discussion has to take place regarding this. In addition, the Commissioners have to determine what the ambient noise levels are because some of the measurements exceeded the night-time noise limits of 60 dB during the site visit in downtown. Furthermore, e.g., those who live on the Mendenhall wetlands is where the ambient noise might be 40 dB, so if there was an increase in noise to 55 dB then it might be too loud for that specific area, so the ambient levels might vary in different residential areas of town. Mr. Rue said at 10:00 p.m. or midnight the noise levels might very well be different as well. Ms. Bennett asked which weighting was used in terms of the EDNA table noise limits of the proposed noise ordinance, and whatever is being used should be consistent with the sound measuring exercise the COW is completing this evening. Mr. Lyman said there was no weighting applied to the EDNA table noise limits, so

whether he or the Commissioners measured sounds the evening on an A- or C-Weighting, the same limit would apply under this draft noise ordinance. He said if the Commissioners want all the noise limits to be A-Weighted, he would do so, e.g., he could state that the dB limits apply to A-Weighting, and then he could add 7 to 8 dB and state that these apply to C-Weighting. Mr. Rue stated that since this issue has been raised, the Commissioners have to discuss it further at some point because it is somewhat vague, stressing that they should be clear regarding the weighting used so the public knows what their liability is. Mr. Pernula pointed out that on page 27 of the WHO excerpt under 2.3.3 *Frequency content and loudness* is where it states, "The A-weighting is now widely used to obtain an approximate, single-number rating of the combined effects of the various frequencies," so if the Commissioners wish to use one number, they should use the A-weighting. Chair Gladziszewski said she thought they were already were doing so, noting that when she borrowed the sound meter the C-weighting generally ranged about 10 dB higher than the A-weighting readings. Mr. Pernula said this is true when measuring low-frequency noises, which can be important, so this might be a problem with only using A-weighting. Chair Gladziszewski agreed, stating that when it is supposed to be quiet, the most annoying sounds to her are the low-frequency noises of engines and motors.

Mr. Miller said he assumes that the Assembly will adopt the proposed noise ordinance, and if so, the JPD would have to enforce it, so they are going to have to purchase quite a few \$1,200 certified ANSI sound meters. Therefore, he believes it makes sense for the CBJ to purchase one \$1,200 certified ANSI sound meter now, so staff and the Commissioners know that they are relying on accurate readings of what the public is going to have to abide by, as opposed to the current four-year-old, \$40 sound meter CBJ currently has that does not read below 50 dB, to which the COW agreed. Mr. Pernula said this is a good idea, which would help the Commissioners to decide whether they wish to incorporate using the A- and/or C-Weighting scale(s) in the proposed noise ordinance.

Ms. Bennett stated that Mr. Pernula previously informed the Commissioners that there have been no complaints by residents in the surrounding area of the Rendezvous. Chair Gladziszewski clarified that the site visit conducted by the COW to the Rendezvous was not because the Rendezvous has an issue or because of possible complaints, and instead, it was a demonstration of noise to obtain sound meter measurements of what is loud per the dB readings taken from different locations inside versus outside. Ms. Bennett stressed that the JPD is going to enforce the noise ordinance per the number of complaints received over and over again from the same people about noise. Mr. Pernula explained that there are two different parts to enforcement: 1) The nuisance types of noise that the police primarily enforce; and 2) Land uses that generate noise in terms of mechanical equipment, etc., which the police will probably not enforce, and instead, the CDD enforcement officers will probably do so. If so, he will send the enforcement officer out to the site to observe and determine what type/level of noise is emanating from a use with a certified ANSI sound meter, and then they will deal with it however they can. He said this might involve the enforcement officer attempting to abate it, and if not, cite the violator, etc. He explained that when the proposed noise ordinance was previously provided to the Assembly a few months ago the Chief of Police was present who stated that they really would like to have dB threshold limits provided. He said the reason is when the police respond to an area where noise is being generated an argument generally ensues with the neighbor stating that an adjacent neighbor is being very loud, but the person making the noise states that they are not. Therefore, if the police officer has a calibrated sound meter and is able to conduct measurements, they would be able to provide a warning or citation to the violator if they are found to exceed the dB limit, so this is the type of tool the sound meters are going to be used as.

Chair Gladziszewski commented that the PC has reviewed and discussed various information from professional organizations, and the Commissioners cannot continue to take sound tests because they are not going to become noise experts while doing so, and therefore at some point the PC is going to have to pass the proposed noise ordinance on to the Assembly.

Mr. Rue said the Commissioners should continue to work on:

- Whether they should include both A- and C-Weightings;
- Whether they should include a definition of sound; and
- If the proposed noise ordinance is passed on to the Assembly, they should state that the dB levels should be confirmed when CBJ purchases certified ANSI \$1,200 sound meters, and if given the time the Commissioners would like to do so. He said the objective of the PC is to use the WHO standards so people are able to sleep at night, including that the Commissioners believe the dB levels work for Juneau given the current un-calibrated sound meter that the CBJ has.

Mr. Watson said he was not under the assumption that this body is adopting the WHO standards. Chair Gladziszewski clarified that this body is not, and instead, these are facts that the Commissioners have reviewed from a professional organization who knows about noise. Mr. Watson said this is going to be a prickly issue when the proposed noise ordinance is presented to the Assembly, so it should not include any vagueness. Instead, he said they have to provide as much concise information as possible to the Assembly because they are the body that is ultimately going to have to make the decision, or they might re-present it back to the PC if they are not satisfied with how it was presented to them. Furthermore, he read an article today where San Antonio enacted a noise ordinance in June or July 2010, which states that 72 dB would be prohibited in the entertainment district. He noted Galveston, TX later adopted San Antonio's noise ordinance, which caused a big uproar because it was not reviewed very thoroughly beforehand, so they now have to redo it. Chair Gladziszewski stressed that the PC's expertise is regarding land use, not policy issues, etc., which the Assembly is elected to do. She said the PC could have opted to address the land use aspects of the proposed noise ordinance, and leave the other non-related portions blank that are not under their expertise. She said nine Commissioners who are fairly smart have spent quite a lot of time reviewing the proposed noise ordinance, but this is not what they were initially appointed for.

Mr. Lyman requested that the COW review what the PC previously set for EDNA noise limits on page 5 of the draft noise ordinance, and compare them to the NJ model ordinance (attachment F), including the Tigard Municipal Code levels (Attachment O). He noted that the NJ model ordinance outdoors lists a day-time limit on residential property of 65 dB, and the draft noise ordinance lists 63 dB. The NJ model ordinance outdoors lists a night-time limit on residential property of 50 dB, and the draft noise ordinance lists 53 dB. The NJ model ordinance outdoors lists a limit on commercial property of 65 dB, and the draft noise ordinance lists 60 dB. In light of this, he feels that the dB limits set in the proposed noise ordinance are in the ballpark of the other ones, which are probably defensible. In addition, Tigard's noise levels are fairly low, and the WHO excerpt tends to err on the side of public health, but NJ is much more densely developed and industrialized than Alaska is, so they are a bit noisier. He said this might be taken into consideration when the COW discusses urban noise being allowed to be louder than rural noise.

Mr. Pernula stated that a noise consultant for the City of Seattle informed him that the Radio Shack sound meter the CBJ currently has works great, but the readings taken from it would not stand up in court because it cannot be calibrated, and it is not ANSI certified, so any sound meter used during enforcement has to be calibrated before/after sound readings are taken. Even so, he said the numbers they measured during the site visit this evening should be fairly good sound meter measurements.

Ms. Grewe said the Commissioners should do what is within the purview of this body and send the proposed noise ordinance on to the Assembly. She noted that the noise limits set are within the ballpark of the other locations. She believes the uneasiness is not about the numbers, and instead, it appears to be whether the Commissioners agree with regulating noise by land use, which she is in favor of trying to do so. She explained that her concern is the difference between urban areas versus rural areas, i.e., what the Gross' house and the noise levels might be at 1:00 a.m., even though they registered between 50 to 60 dB just before 7:00 p.m., which is within the proposed noise ordinance limits even though the COW thought it was loud. Chair Gladziszewski said she would not want the level heard at the Gross' house to be that loud at her house during the night because it would be too loud in her neighborhood, but it probably is not in the Gross' downtown neighborhood. Ms. Grewe agreed, stating that the noise levels vary in neighborhoods across the borough, so that would be too loud at her house as well. Chair Gladziszewski said there is a difference between her neighborhood and the Gross' neighborhood in terms of noise levels. She explained that she lives in a quiet neighborhood, so she does not want the downtown noise limit to be as high in her neighborhood, noting that if it was that loud at her house it would make her angry. Ms. Grewe noted that the noise limits set in the proposed noise ordinance solely lists residential, not different types within them. Mr. Pernula commented that nearly all the noise complaints that initiated the drafting of this ordinance were from residents who reside in Downtown Juneau, but it was later on when the Downtown Douglas residents provided additional noise complaints.

Information for the next PC meeting

Chair Gladziszewski asked the COW to provide requests to staff for work that has to be done in terms of what should take place next PC meeting regarding their continued review of the proposed noise ordinance. Mr. Rue stated that the he prefers to work on the following:

- A-Weighting versus C-Weighting;
- Ambient background questions;
- Definition of noise;
- Decide on noise levels, i.e., whether to retain the set limits as is, including determining non-residential limits; and
- Cost of noise permits.

Mr. Lyman said Mr. Rue previously requested that a definition be provided for “steady continuous noise,” which is different than a definition for “noise.” Mr. Rue requested that the PC discuss at the next meeting whether they should include the definition of “steady continuous noise” in the proposed ordinance. Mr. Lyman offered to provide the old list of definitions to see if the PC might wish to include some of them back into the current definition list and/or add new ones.

Mr. Watson said urban versus rural within residential has to be taken into account, i.e., at South Shelter Island, Horse & Colt, Admiralty Island, and Funter Bay, which are all part of the

borough, so he questions how the noise ordinance will be enforced in these outlying areas. Chair Gladziszewski said Mr. Watson is essentially requesting to distinguish urban versus rural, which has to be on the list to discuss at the next PC meeting, e.g., the PC might wish to find out what the ambient is of various types of residential areas, and then set the dB level slightly above that, etc. Mr. Lyman said they are able to split the borough up into any number of different discrete groups, with the exception of Horse & Colt Island because it is outside the borough. Even so, he explained that the police are simply not going to carry around a current copy of the Zoning Atlas to compare where the noise is being received, where the noise is coming from, look at a matrix, find out what the noise limit is at that particular time of day, and then decide whether or not to issue a citation. He said this is one of the reasons they went back to a much simpler matrix, which might not be perfect, but it is much more enforceable than many other scenarios that were previously discussed.

Mr. Miller said the PC still has to review the entire draft ordinance sentence-by-sentence or paragraph-by-paragraph, i.e., on page 3, 42.20.310 Sound measurement (d) states, "No person shall play, continue to play, or allow to be played, any sound system from, within, or on any motor vehicle so that any sound, music, or vibration emanating therefrom can be heard at a distance of more than 30 feet except during the day-time hours at 42.20.330 (b) Table 3 unless otherwise provided in this Title." Chair Gladziszewski stated that she understands there is specific language that the PC has to work on, but she is instead requesting what other facts they want to be provided at the next meeting.

Mr. Watson said the exceptions table of the proposed noise ordinance has to be updated with the changes the PC previously recommended at a PC meeting, which has not yet been finalized. Mr. Lyman clarified that this document is not meant to be formally adopted, and instead, it solely provides graphical information of when exceptions apply, which he offered to update and provide to the PC.

Mr. Miller said the President of the Rough Riders Alaska Inc. and Heather Marlow of CBJ Lands and Resources were the co-applicants of a previous OHV Park case, and they are both very knowledgeable regarding how noise accumulates, e.g., two OHVs running at the same time, etc. He explained that the PC was provided quite a lot of information regarding noise during that OHV Park review. He said perhaps the PC might invite these people to question them about noise, e.g., regarding whether 3 dB constitutes a doubling of noise, etc. In addition, he requested staff to provide the proposed noise ordinance to Rough Riders so they are aware of it. Chair Gladziszewski said she is not sure that she would characterize Ms. Marlow or the President of the Rough Riders as being noise experts that the PC should hear from in the context of the proposed noise ordinance review. She explained that both of these people honed up on OHV noise in direct relation to a potential OHV Park site, so she does not feel that they are general experts on noise. Mr. Pernula said the co-applicants brought in a noise expert from Portland who he believes was very good, and he retained some pamphlets provided at that time, which is in regards to some of the information being discussed this evening. Mr. Lyman explained that making determinations of OHV or different types of noise is not what this proposed noise ordinance is about, and instead, it is in regards to placing a threshold limit on noise in general so they have a bar in which to measure noisy activities, so in stating that they have to understand the dynamics of how many OHVs it takes to get to 90 dB before they can set a limit is moving somewhat backwards. He said the idea is for the COW to place a limit on noise for public health and safety, regardless of what the cause of the noise is. Mr. Rue said he thinks it is fine to let groups such the Rough Riders, etc. know what they are doing in regards to the proposed noise

ordinance, but he would like to know what dB levels were discussed when the PC was debating that OHV Park issue because specific readings were provided at the property line in relation to the threshold levels they thought might be received in the neighborhood based on the opinion of the noise expert. Mr. Pernula said the CDD also has a report prepared by the noise expert, which he offered to provide to the PC at the next meeting. Chair Gladziszewski said there might be other groups who should review the proposed noise ordinance as well. Mr. Pernula stated that the remote rural areas are where there is the potential for conflict because the people who travel to those areas sometimes assume that since there are very few people they can be as loud as they want, i.e., the Rough Riders, etc., although some people choose to live in those areas because they are quiet.

Chair Gladziszewski said she is concerned about making it louder in certain residential types of areas where it is already quiet in Juneau. Mr. Rue said this is what they would be doing, but maybe that is okay.

Mr. Watson said he wants to make sure that the Commissioners are not creating a proposed noise ordinance that can be used to limit two of the largest industries in this community, which is mining. He said these two mines are located within the borough, so the noise produced at both of them would exceed the dB levels set in the EDNA matrix, but he does not want to reduce their efficiency or the ability to operate. Mr. Pernula said the sound measurements would be taken at the property line, which is probably a long ways away from any residential zone. Mr. Rue said if the downtown mine begins operations it would be good to have a noise ordinance to review during its start up, e.g., they might condition the noise permit to state the ball mill has to be located within the mountain, otherwise if it was located outside then it would be too noisy for the residents who reside in Downtown Juneau, so they might have to obtain a permit to exceed the permitted dB levels.

Mr. Lyman said he captured the following items for the next PC meeting:

- Discussing A-Weighting versus C-Weighting;
- Ambient noise;
- Definitions of noise, and steady continuous noise;
- Revisiting the dB levels in the EDNA matrix;
- The cost of permits;
- Follow-up with AEL&P about noise;
- Rural versus urban noise; and
- Decibels levels discussed in the OHV Park case.

Chair Gladziszewski explained that the rural versus urban is similar to the ambient of quiet versus loud neighborhoods in terms of enforcement. Mr. Lyman said the WHO *Guidelines for Community Noise* recommends developing noise regulations, and it states that the first thing they should do is to have a very clear idea of what the ambient noise levels are in the community, including what problems there are that they are attempting to solve. He stated that unfortunately because there is no budget for this project, they do not have one certified ANSI sound meter, so they do not have an accurate idea of ambient noise in this community. He said there is data that dates back to when they were measuring helicopter noise from specific sites, etc., but they do not have extensive ambient data for Juneau, which would be a large undertaking, but if the PC states that this is required then such a request would have to be presented to the Assembly. Chair Gladziszewski asked if the helicopter report was provided to the PC before. Mr. Lyman said he

may have provided it to them when the proposed noise ordinance idea was first presented, whereby he offered to provide to the PC at the next meeting any information that might be germane to local ambient noise levels. He noted that he does not recall how many Rough Riders are on his current e-mail noise distribution list, although most people who provided public testimony has asked to be updated on the proposed noise ordinance, so they are provided e-mails, which includes bar owners, and other special interest groups. Chair Gladziszewski stated that if any Commissioners wish to add to Mr. Lyman's e-mail noise distribution list, they should contact him to do so.

Ms. Bennett commented that the WHO mentions vulnerable groups, and many of the people who complain about noise are the elderly, have small children, or have mental health issues that cause them to be very sensitive to noise, which the Commissioners have to pay attention to.

Ms. Grewe said staff can scratch off the rural versus urban homework. She explained that Chair Gladziszewski stated best what her concern was. She said she liked the method in which the EDNA matrix is set up now, but it appears that because they are trying to find one common way to do so they might end up increasing the noise levels in the quietest neighborhoods, but she does not think it is in the interest of the borough to figure different geographic ways of doing so. In addition, she stated that they now have a short list of sites that they visited this evening, which includes the Radio Shack sound meter readings, and several individual iPhone readings. Mr. Lyman clarified that it was the consensus of the PC to only include the Radio Shack sound meter readings in the minutes. Mr. Watson interjected stating that he initially brought up his concerns in relation to outlying rural areas, but Ms. Grewe said to scratch this off. Chair Gladziszewski said rural versus urban noise is still on the list. Mr. Rue agreed, clarifying that Ms. Grewe just mentioned scratching the homework. Mr. Watson said he wants the PC to discuss this at the next meeting, but he heard the words "scratch off" and his interpretation was that staff does not need to bother with it. Ms. Grewe explained that she meant that she did not want to send staff "down a rabbit hole."

Mr. Lyman said he will provide a bulleted list of the items at the next PC meeting, and where appropriate he will provide background information. He said he is not able to provide a new packet next week, as the publishing deadline is today, so items might be provided in the Blue Folder, including that there are other cases beside the proposed noise ordinance on the next PC agenda.

III. COW COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - None

IV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *by Mr. Watson, to adjourn the PC/COW meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the PC/COW meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.