

Smoke Management Review Committee Meeting  
Oregon Department of Forestry  
Operations Conference Room, Salem  
February 20, 2003  
0930-1530

In attendance: Stephen Fitzgerald, Sue Stewart (proxy for Erik Christiansen, Gregory McClarren, Mike Dykzeul, Gary Stevens, Jim Russell, Stan Benson, Lee Miller, Noelle Saint-Cyr (proxy for Geoff Babb), Jim Brown, Brian Jennison, Mike Ziolko and Cindy Smith (note taker).

Visitors: Roddy Baumann, USF&W, Kim Metzler, LRAPA, Brian Finneran, Rick Gibson, Charlie Stone, Jim Trost and Nick Yonker.

### 1. Administrivia

Stephen Fitzgerald reminded members who had not done so to please provide the names of their proxy.

### 2. Minutes

Mike Dykzeul suggested the following corrections to the January 16, 2003, minutes:

- Page 2 – In the center of the page, the response to Lee Millers question regarding tracking tonnage should read "Erik replied that ODF tracks USFS/BLM tonnage and Mike Z. added that it could be found in ODF's annual report."

- Page 6 – Under Public Comments, in response to the first comment (by Harold Merritt), should read "Mike Dykzeul responded as representing OFIC on this committee".

Greg McClarren moved that the minutes be accepted as amended and Jim Brown seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

### 3. Issues Discussion

Members discussed placement of the 35 issues (identified at the first meeting of this committee) into the following categories from the Charter of the Smoke Management Review Committee. Two additional categories were added and additional issues were identified throughout the day and categorized as well. The complete list of questions is attached at the end of the minutes.

- A. Are Air Quality Standards being met?  
1, 4, 6, 10, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 29, 30, 37, 42
- B. Burning Objectives being met?  
10, 11, 13, 21, 22, 28, 29, 38,
- C. What changes may be needed to address projected increases in prescribed burning for forest health reasons?  
9, 13, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 38,
- D. What changes may be needed to address regional (i.e. multi-state) air quality issues?  
1, 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42,
- E. How should wildfire vs. prescribed fire smoke impacts be addressed?  
6, 12, 13, 21, 26, 30, 37,
- F. Are designated areas and smoke sensitive areas adequately defined?  
10, 11, 18, 21, 26, 27,
- G. How may the administrative rules and/or statutes be changed to reflect current and future fuels and operational issues?  
4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, 42,
- H. What are feasible alternatives to burning and how should they be applied in the administration of the Smoke Management Plan?  
2, 14, 36, 38, 40, 41,

- I. Economics/Funding  
3, 9, 24, 29, 41,
- J. Communication/Education  
25, 26, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42,

**Discussion:**

- Mike Dykzeul - **How do we to address the risk/benefit of potential alternatives to burning?** This became issue **#36**.
- Jim Russell – Brought up another issue - **#37 - Balancing public health risks and hazard by emissions from wildfire vs. Prescribed fire**
- Roddy Baumann expanded on the hazard definition for USFW use. Wildlife refuges are generally established as havens for T&E's and fire management is our largest habitat management tool. Without maintaining those habitats for T&E's, T&E's become more restrictive.
- Gregory McClarren suggested it become issue **#38 – Balancing the use of prescribed fire for sensitive/TandE species management.**
- Stan Benson initiated a discussion of apparently conflicting regulations, the use of herbicides when can't burn, restrictions on spraying, Band-Aids on reforestation, reforestation requirements, etc. How do we address the risk of using herbicides when you can't burn? Stephen Fitzgerald pointed out that the landowner has a legal responsibility to reforest within 6 years with free to grow trees. No restrictions, other than Forest Practices Act requirements, on use of herbicides on private land as opposed to restrictions on federal land. The discussion concluded with an additional issue - **#39 - Conflicting rules and statutes that affect choices and abilities to use various treatments, including non-burning treatments.**
- Jim Russell – Alternatives need to include things that target emission reduction techniques as alternatives, not necessarily whether you burn or not burn. This became issue **#40 – Alternatives that target emission reduction that includes a combination of burning and non-burning alternatives.**
- Stan Benson asked how many of these issues would require a statute change? The answer is that it depends upon what is being changed and the scope of the change. Many of the issues can be addressed without statute change. Issues dealing with fees and funding will most likely to require statute change.

**4. Break**

**5. Public Comments**

Public comment was called for. There was no public comment at this time.

- Mike Ziolko - We are still trying to engage other agencies to participate in this process even if they aren't official committee members. We invited Roddy Baumann to be here for the USF&W. We see some of the all encompassing issues with burning that occur on USF&W land and BIA or tribal land too. We are trying to get a broad engagement in this review.
- Mike Dykzeul asked how the public is made aware of these meetings? Mike Ziolko - News releases.
- Sue Stewart added that she was unable to find news of this committee meeting on the ODF web page. Mike is in the process of creating the page and it will be on the smoke management link.
- Visitors were invited to add their input to the days discussions.

**6. Issues Discussion (cont.)**

- Greg McClarren suggested considering the notion of an emission trading or credit program. It's being used in other arenas. Mike Ziolko responded that the same topic was brought up at the WRAP Enhanced Smoke Management Task Team ... it got watered down to make the idea palatable to the broad range of interests. The concept is in the Enhanced Smoke Management Program document – you may find opposition. The discussion culminated with it becoming issue **#41 – Consider an emission trading or credit program in the state.**
- Mike Dykzeul – Seek to coordinate various agency and department efforts pertaining to emissions, smoke mgt, clean air, etc. How does one keep track of all of it? Issue **#42 – Facilitate and coordinate air quality issues and efforts with other agencies and organizations.**

**The Next Step:** Considerable discussion followed in deciding the approach the committee would use:

- Stephen Fitzgerald – Many of the issues go across all the things that have been put to us in our charter. Copies of the “Task at hand” handout from last month were distributed. Stephen suggested:
  - Need to review rules and directives and see if there could potentially be any changes in statute as result from this process – for fees or other things.
  - Look at Smoke Management Plan Rule.
  - Refer to Smoke Management Plan which was distributed at first meeting and guidance documents
  - Do the objectives need to be changed in light of A, B, etc.?
- Mike Dykzeul said he went through the list and formulated which were alternatives, tracking, funding, operational, review needs, coordination, education, or process (rule and statute) and found that helpful for me.
- Stephen Fitzgerald added that he had done a mental thing the same way in discussing the issues under these categories and added that he was still trying to figure out with how to best consider each issue, make recommendations and see if rule change will be necessary.
- Brian Jennison – Air Quality standards being met is one of the questions that needs answered in the charter – he thought a better term would be ‘impacted’ rather than “met”..
- Stan Benson – We are in attainment – Now, are we going to stay there. Are our current practices going to keep us there? Identifying the problem is more the thing. Is there really a problem? What can we do to refine it? How can we improve things generally? If there's no problem, maybe we should focus on some other things.
  - Mike Z – Which is why we came up with the initial 8 categories in the charter. Mike suggested that the committee now prioritize the now 10 categories which includes two the committee added.
- Sue Stewart – There may be some common structure that applies to all of those elements. She suggested the following questions:
  - **Is there a problem?**
  - **Will there be a problem in the future?**
  - **What are the options to deal with it?**
  - **Will it require changes in rules, statutes, or directives?**
- Two additional questions were added later in discussion:
  - **What are the barriers and opportunities?**
  - **How will we measure success in the future?**
- Prioritization was deferred.

#### **(10. ) Forestry Program for Oregon:**

This was agenda item 10 but early discussion followed due to a scheduling conflict, Joe Misek appeared before the committee in order to answer any questions regarding the *Forestry Program for Oregon Draft*. Stephen noted that a decision was needed today, on whether or not the committee wished to comment to the Board of Forestry.

- A group discussion of how they would like to comment on the FPFO ensued:

- Mike Ziolkowski suggested looking at page 48 (Strategy D), page 62 (Strategy F), page 67 (talks about prescribed fire and restoring forest ecosystem health) of the new version (Feb 10, 2003 draft). The old version has different page numbers.
- Stephen Fitzgerald – This is an important discussion if we wish to comment. The Board of Forestry meets on April 24. It's our chance to put forth our thoughts. It is a major ODF policy document.
- Joe Misek – "It's becoming even more and more of an important document for the Oregon Department of Forestry. We have revised our strategic planning directive to where we will nest right in with the FPFO. We will also be on an eight-year planning cycle or horizon that will take that new FPFO and link directly to it and try to lay out a strategy how we are going to help achieve those objectives within the FPFO. They're sort of our marching orders for the Oregon Department of Forestry to try to achieve as much of that document as they can. It's going to be a strategic focus for the Department of Forestry. You as a board appointed committee have been invited to provide input at the Apr 24 Board of Forestry meeting. We have a core group that has been working on this document. As a committee of the board, we value your input. The board has the final decision of whether to incorporate your suggestions."
- Greg McClarren had previously sent e-mail to the committee and David Morman concerning the importance of including air as a basic resource on a par with soil and water.
- Stephen Fitzgerald – Said the first step is to decide if the committee wants to comment suggested how to present ideas – a general statement of the value of air and smoke followed by more specific suggestions for word changes, etc.
- Brian Jennison – Would it be correct to assume that the Oregon Board of Forestry doesn't consider clean air part of their charge?
  - Joe Misek responded that he thought it came under forest health.... it may be appropriate to suggest that they add air as part of that goal (protection of soil and water).
- Mike Ziolkowski – Reminded members that this document is a blue print of where ODF is going the next few years.
- Stephen Fitzgerald – We will come back to this later this afternoon. The decision to comment needs to be made this afternoon.
- Jim Russell – (Referring to page 67 in the "new" document or page 36 in the old document) "From a forest service standpoint I would have difficulty signing anything – it kind of downplays things – like the use of prescribed fire, and it references Los Alamos as an issue of why we should avoid what I interpreted as the use of prescribed fire. It does not talk about how the major fires we had last year had a direct impact based on our inability to do hazardous fuel reduction around the state and we had the largest major acreage burn on record with the Biscuit Fire and that the USFS does not put timber as a lower priority. There's an agency thing within this that the Board may view as politically astute. From the federal perspective, I have a difficult time signing on to what's being quoted, especially the part about the fact that we prioritize life, property and resources. We already discussed this before. From a federal point it will always be life, property and resources when we look at wildfire suppression. I don't know that I can respond or sign this as a group."
- Stephen Fitzgerald said he reacted much the same way when he read it. Prescribed fire is a scientifically appropriate. The issue here is risk, not controversy. The issue is liability if you're a landowner. There is no controversy over the benefits of it. There are statistics on the risk. Should we almost burn or not burn because of all these things. Maybe we could offer wording recommendations. We aren't signing off that we support it or not, just that we make these recommendations.
- Jim Brown – Our position is to make recommendation. Right?
  - Stephen Fitzgerald - yes. Recommendations, suggestions.
- Mike Dykzeul – Different agencies have different missions and those different missions may prevent us from making joint recommendations.

- Stephen Fitzgerald – It could be important how we put our comments together. One could be a section on red flags that this is how certain people on the committee responded to it. There could be others and they may want to take another look at those and make sure the wording is correct.
  - Include what the sensitivity is to a particular red flag.
- Mike Dykzeul – (Referring to Page 3 of the new document.) Also need to recognize that as critical components, there may not be alternatives – raises the importance of what we do on a regular basis to greater number of items that the board is addressing.
- Sue Stewart asked who else Joe Misek was working with on making comment?
  - Joe – Comments have been received from Region 6
- Greg McClarren asked who to make individual comments to.
  - Joe – to Howard Sohn, Board of Forestry chairman.

## 7. Working Lunch

## Jacksonville Interface

Discussion:

Mike Ziolko – This is an issue of burning and alternatives in the urban interface. The Jacksonville Woodlands Association applied for some National Fire Plan money to reduce wildfire hazard– the issues are air quality – burning and the use of alternatives. The area involved is within the Jacksonville city limits and basically surrounds the city on three sides. The burning is clearly within our smoke management plan. – Should they be using alternatives?

David Collier – Some citizens called DEQ because of all the materials being burned.

Sue Stewart asked if they (the people doing the work) were aware of their options? If they were, why did they make the choice they did? For financial reasons? There is the trade off of possible nuisance to residents for a few days versus the benefit mitigating fire hazard. Sue is aware of the same scenario playing out in at least a handful of other places that she is directly involved in now.

Jim Russell – The history of the parcel is... these piles contain a lot of poison oak. ... There is the public health issue of burning poison oak...

Greg – There is a health issue for respiratory problems even if no poison oak...

David – An example of the problems faced in the urban interface area. – Is this an issue the group would like to look at.

Jim Brown – Does this fall under smoke mgt? Yes

Gary Stevens – There is a burn ban in the winter in the area. They should burn in the spring when other people are allowed to burn. There is a philosophical issue of coordinated burning.

Greg McClarren – Now all of a sudden we have to deal with risk reduction issues in the urban interface... Do SIPS need to be adjusted?

Sue Stewart – There may be an opportunity to have some influence over this through the grant program by favoring projects that don't burn.

Lee Miller – Operationally, it may be another story. It may not be right for us to make any kind of judgement.

Dave – There was nothing motivating them to utilize any alternative.... And they have spent their budget. What kind guidance is available for them?

Mike Ziolko – ODF has service foresters who provide guidance to landowners on managing risk. In Josephine County and other areas of the state, they have been going out to individual landowners. Jacksonville deals with a larger contiguous acreage spot...most small landowners would not fall under the Smoke Management Plan jurisdiction since they are not managing forestland for forest management purposes.

Roddy Baumann – The skills and knowledge base that you work from is limited so the ability to be global in their scoping of alternatives isn't there.

Mike Dykzeul said he thinks a good contact within ODF is Jim Wolf in the Medford area that's devising the rules for the urban interface and fuels reduction and everything else within ODF. Then to refer everyone back to item #14 of our issues list that we were going to come back to – how to dispose of fuels in the urban interface area...

They accepted the grant with chipping and burning identified as disposal methods. Maybe they should have to repay it since they are now out of compliance with the terms of the agreement...

Stephen Fitzgerald - The poison oak in the smoke just adds to the situation a little more.

Jim Brown said he thinks that with a little more expertise/oversight, maybe with the local fire department, people could look at it ahead of time. Poison oak can be left to decay harmlessly. What are the standards? Some could be lying around and not be a fire hazard.

Jim Russell – They had limited options.

Stan Benson added that the issue has become the health hazard – we have a lot of forested land that has a lot of poison oak on it - we don't want to get into that field. We need to be careful we don't intrude into that particular field.

Stephen Fitzgerald – Maybe some of these grants need to be looked at closely.

Sue Stewart said she believes that National Fire Plan grants should never be issued to a solitary applicant – at a minimum every NFP Grant should involve a partner with the adjacent community that would be impacted. Collaboration is not just a good idea, it should be a prerequisite for spending national grant funds. That would resolve a lot of these problems before they ever start.

Greg said the grant application is outside the purview of this group, but added that nobody should be granted an outright exception to the smoke management or air quality rules. There are too many individual organizations that don't play by the rules.

Gary said they were struggling to put together a SIP for Southern Oregon and a ban on open burning and the curtailment of woodstoves are essential elements of that plan. His question is ...if we have an abundance of urban interface burning that is outside of our curtailment requirements because it's under the Smoke management plan and even though it's mitigated to some extent because of good meteorological calls, it's still going to impact to some extent. One perspective is that this urban interface burning shows that our processes have to be rethought.

## **8. Regional Haze Rule Requirements**

**Brian Finneran, DEQ**

Members were provided copies of Brian's Regional Haze Presentation.

Background – Clean Air Act identifies the need to address visibility problems within our National Parks and Scenic areas and entrusted EPA to come up with some regulations to deal with the problems way back in the 70's. EPA took a two-phase approach. One was to come up with rules in 1980 that addressed the kind of visibility problem where the source causing the visibility problem was relatively close to the national park and caused a direct impact – like fire, a stationary source. Then there was the bigger picture of how cumulatively all sources contribute to the problem on a regional scale. In 1980, EPA adopted phase one rules. The Visibility Plan for Oregon was adopted based on phase one rules back in 1986. In 1980 when EPA adopted phase one rules, Regional haze rule was postponed. They spent years and years studying the issue until 1999. In the interim, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 formed the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission to study the regional haze problem in the Grand Canyon and in class one areas around the Grand Canyon. A lot of that work in the 1990's ended up in the Regional Haze Rules.

The Regional Haze Rule itself focuses on looking at the best and worst days – trying to improve the best days and trying to avoid any worsening of the best days.

It consists of two different sections, Section 308 is basic for all states. Section 309 gives 9 western states, including Oregon, the option of including pre-identified control strategies for all sources by basically adopting the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commissions recommendations.

“Natural” in “natural visibility conditions” includes fire as part of the background.

There are two different time frames for sections 308 and 309. As a result, if Oregon follows the 309 path, we follow it out until 2018 and then are subject to 308 just like all other states.

Brian discussed the timeline differences between 308 and 309. If Oregon were to choose to go with 308, we would enter in a partnership with our neighboring states and work together to develop the 308 SIP with revision updates every 5 years and a comprehensive revision every ten years. The first SIP would likely be due in 2005.

The Section 309 SIP would be based on the findings of the Grand Canyon Commission. It includes a requirement to identify the clean air corridor because of the effect it could have on maintaining air quality standards. If Oregon participates in the 309, the first SIP is due December 31<sup>st</sup> of this year. The first SIP should be relatively simple for us to do because we don't have much impact in this area and the second one isn't due until 2008. That gives us 5 years to work on it.

It looks like Oregon will be in attainment for the entire state and first SIP will be due in 2003 under section 309. WRAP is a successor organization of the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission. They are doing much of the works for the states but the states are very actively involved.

When you read the fire requirements under Section 309 some specifically refer to prescribed fire only and other requirements talk about all fire sources. Under 309, our first SIP would have to address all the fire requirements with the exception of those that directly protecting Oregon's class one areas.

Section 309 specifies 7 basic elements that must be included in all prescribed fire SIP's - as a minimum. Those are: Actions to minimize emissions, evaluate smoke dispersion, promote non-burning alternatives, provide public notification of burning, conduct air quality monitoring, surveillance and enforcement, and program evaluation.

Jim Brown – Prescribed fire as defined there means piles, rangeland burning, ag burning or prescribed underburning for wildfire risk reduction? Yes.

Mike Ziolko– The policies and requirements for the enhanced smoke management program that were adopted by WRAP were handed out at an earlier meeting of the committee.

All fire sources includes all vegetative material – includes ag, forest, open burning (not backyard burning), rangeland burning, grass field burning and forest whether it's prescribed fire or wildfire.

Wildfires are exempt from management strategies? Mike Ziolko answered that you may have to manage smoke vs. controlling it. There is some impact on wildfire. Wild fire is not something that is being focused on right now. WRAP and the Fire Emissions Joint Forum had lengthy discussions on this when developing the natural background policy.

Mike Ziolko reminded members that the bullet is talking about minimizing emission increases not emissions.

Brian Finneran continued, stating that Oregon is fairly close to meeting the first SIP requirement. The second requirement will result in comprehensive reference documents that you adopt into the SIP. The third and fourth requirements are close to completion also for the 2003 SIP.

The Oregon Visibility commission wrestled with these and made recommendations when they met.

Next week there will be a meeting in Portland and, in the following weeks, throughout the state to provide basic information and gather feed back on whether to adopt 309 or 308. Meeting dates are available on DEQ's website at [www.deq.state.or.us/aq/regionalhaze/index.htm](http://www.deq.state.or.us/aq/regionalhaze/index.htm)

Jim Russell asked about the template Brian made for Sect 309 – Brian replied that a draft would be available soon.

Brian Finneran - #4 on slide 19 (Expanding visibility monitoring network) was done because the money was made available for the RHR.

Nephelometers track smoke impacts on a real time basis.

The New Improve sites do a chemical analysis of the smoke, they don't necessarily run every day.

## DISCUSSION:

Roddy Baumann asked how the data is shared along the gorge? Brian replied that it's not a Class I area, so it isn't part of this program.

Brian - Improved data collection allows analysis of the emissions data.

Mike Ziolko explained that overall operations today include many more nephelometers than shown on the map. The sites on the map are depicted for Class I Visibility. ODF uses other DEQ/USFS nephelometers to monitor smoke impacts in other areas.

Brian said that one direction we may be going – after feed back – is to go through the rule making process - put together all the pieces of the SIP - come back to this committee, and others, with information – hold public hearings – and, if all goes well, have it ready to give to the EPA by December.

309 does establish the strategies and were developed with many years of research data.

Mike Dykzeul asked if there were similar presentations for other interests – industry, etc.?

Brian responded that will be addressed at the meeting next week in Portland. Guest speakers from WRAP will discuss how Oregon fits into the regional haze picture. It will be a four-hour meeting. Similar meetings are scheduled around the state: Wednesday the 26<sup>th</sup> in Portland, Thursday, the 27<sup>th</sup> in Springfield, March 3<sup>rd</sup> in Medford, March 4<sup>th</sup> in Bend, and March 5<sup>th</sup> in Pendleton.

## **9. Break**

## **10. Forestry Program for Oregon**

What kind of comment do we want to make?

Mike Dykzeul – There is the issue of coming out with public comment – recognition of the fact that verbiage could be better.

Greg McClarren – I feel strongly that clean air is a resource. Clean air is necessary for a healthy forest

Jim Brown – Healthy forests produce clean air.

Mike Ziolko – You probably want to give some suggested wording – they probably need some guidance.

Greg McClarren - Air quality impacted by smoke doesn't do justice to clean air.

Mike Dykzeul – Prescription burning is an issue and smoke management concerns need to be addressed in the FPFO.

Jim Brown -Mitigating the effect on public health – surprised me that the smoke management program is not in there.

Greg McClarren – That makes it look like they may not consider it important to the future.

Jim Brown – If you discuss burning as a practice, you should also address the smoke and what to do with it.

**Stephen Fitzgerald called for the question if this committee wants to make comment to the board. Members were in unanimous agreement to weigh in with a comment.**

**Stephen Fitzgerald will draft a letter for presentation to the Board of Forestry including that air quality is important to Oregonians and will point out red flags they may want to revisit and suggest language that may be more acceptable.**

**At the next we meeting will devote some time to this discussion of the letter.**

**April 20 – The committee will be asked to "tweak" the letter and have it ready for presentation on the 24<sup>th</sup>**

**Mike Dykzeul suggested members email bullet items to Stephen Fitzgerald.**

**Stephen Fitzgerald requested that members work from the Feb 10 draft and reminded them he will need their comments by the week of Mar 10.**

## **11. Public Comments**

Public comment was called for. There was no public comment at this time.

## **12. Private Land Burning**

**Mike Ziolko, ODF**

Mike Ziolko provided committee members with a handout, which graphically portrayed the *Acres Burned by Burn Type on State and Private Land East and West of the Cascades*. He pointed out that comparing private land burning east and West of the Cascades,

- There is little broadcast burning east of the cascades
- There is more grapple pile burning on the East Side.
- The 1997 landing acres in west Oregon may reflect a reporting error
- Didn't include underburning because there was very little on private land.

Jim Brown – If the whole tree ends up on the landing – that's a lot of material

Sue Stewart - Is your data more tied to billing?

Mike Ziolko – No, we did grapple with the process of how to report so we could meet all of our needs.

Lee Miller – Tonnage is more important than the acres - acreage doesn't tell us anything...

Mike Dykzeul - How you prepared the pile has a lot to do with how it burns and the emissions.

Mike Ziolko – If the tractor pile is in the unit – it probably has more dirt in it than a grapple pile.

Mike Dykzeul added that in the year 2000 Walker Range had a lot of tractor piles because Gilchrist changed ownership and they moved a lot of material.

Jim Brown commented that some landowners just aren't into burning, others clean out everything – leave it like a park rather than a woodland – that could be an area for education. They don't seem to value their labor – they just want to make it look good. It really could stay there – it doesn't have to go into the air as smoke.

Greg McClarren asked if there was any data from Fish and Wildlife or NPS? Mike replied that there was nothing on USFW since there burning has not been part of the program. The NPS is part of the program but hasn't reported data to us. They may burn 100-500 acres per year.

Sue Stewart added that National Park Service manages the national monuments – they may be grasslands and not reporting to us, so we don't have a clear picture. Looks like there will be a lot of overlap and muddying of the picture...

Mike – There is a lot of latitude in what we can include in the smoke management plan – not for the fees - but we can include more types of lands.

### 13. Futuring

- Committee members tasked with applying these questions to each of the 10 categories from the Smoke Management Review Committee Charter:
  - Is there a problem?**
  - Will there be a problem in the future?**
  - What are the options to deal with it?**
  - Will it require changes in rules, statutes, or directive?**
  - What are the barriers and opportunities?**
  - How will we measure success in the future?**

- Roddy Baumann of the USF&W was asked to make a short ad hoc presentation. Roddy explained that his area includes six states. In Oregon F&W has four major refuge complex area – the Willamette Valley, Malheur Refuge, the Umatilla Refuge and Hart Mountain. Out of those, they average about 15,000 – 20,000 acres of prescribed burning. None of the F&W refuges are timbered – except Bear Valley and smoke management is done through the Ag program. USF&W has a number of issues they have to deal with. I.e. sage grouse issues - the sage grouse habitat is shrinking on a national scale. Southeast Oregon and Northeast Nevada is one of the largest contiguous area of habitat left. It's a dynamic ecosystem and if you don't have young habitat mixed with old, it goes away.

By and large, most of the refuges are highly managed refuges for a variety of purposes. Most are duck farms. We do a variety of things to maximize the waterfowl holding capacity of those refuges – reduces predation on farmer and gives migratory fowl a place to fatten up on their way to Canada or to Mexico.

Burning is for habitat management. The DOI has four bureaus – BLM, Park Service, BIA, and F&W. Each has a bit different charter and purpose for its existence. The primary purpose of F&W is to provide habitat for endangered species. On a national scale up until a few years ago, USFWS burned more acres on prescribed fire than all the other agencies together. F&W has a long history of utilizing fire as a habitat management tool. Lots of fuels management activity – i.e. protect roost trees for the bald eagles.

Most burning done about three time periods per year – about 3,000 acres in the winter, 10,000 in the spring and 6,000 acres in the fall. Most is spring burning.

Smoke data rarely goes into the ODF system because most is rangeland (non-forest) so goes into the ag system.

In terms of the Regional Haze, we probably have some issues that we should encapsulate. We do participate in WUI. We don't have a lot of metropolitan centers near our refuges in Oregon. We collaboratively work with our other partners in sharing those dollars and opportunities - gave a grant to Walker Range and others up towards John Day.

- **Proxies were reminded to update their counterparts.**

### 14. Adjourn

**Next Meeting March 20, 2003**

February 20, 2003 Smoke Mgt Review

- 1) Slash burns are initiated and continue to smolder and burn beyond acceptable limits.
- 2) Emphasis on alternatives to burning.
- 3) Essential to have adequate funds.
  - Legislative proposal to increase fees?
- 4) Conflict between burning on hillside and on valley floor.
- 5) Need for statewide emissions tracking (Permits)
- 6) Define “monitoring”
  - Ambient air
  - Permit
- 7) Would like to see a presentation from DEQ and Ag re: burning.
- 8) Would like to see a presentation by USFS/BLM re: NFP/Fuels treatment plans.
- 9) Definition of forest health and fee structure, particularly with federal forests (lump sum rather than per acre fee?)
- 10) Low intensity burns and local smoke.
- 11) Review smoke management strategies re: forecasting, instructions.
- 12) Interface with regional organizations/other states.
- 13) Availability of burning opportunities and flexibility.
- 14) How to dispose of fuels in the urban interface areas?
  - Outreach efforts
  - Funding
  - NFP Grants?
- 15) Review Southwest/South central recommendations from DEQ groups
- 16) Would like to see a presentation from DEQ
  - Maintenance Plans
  - NAA status
  - Prevention of future problems
- 17) Would like to see a presentation from WRAP forum on non-burning alternatives
- 18) Types of Smoke columns
  - How far does smoke go?
  - What happens to the smoke?
- 19) Would like to see a presentation on Blue Sky /RAINS
- 20) Look at smoke drift from underburning.
- 21) More flexibility in smoke management system.
- 22) Dirty Piles – Forest Practices (construction)
- 23) Track Emissions - from rangeland and other burning
- Statewide restrictions?
  - 24) Standardize fees, permit tracking (California?)
  - 25) Outreach regarding Smoke Management Plan (SMP) or changes in SMP.
  - 26) Definition of intrusion VS complaint.
  - 27) Review definition of designated area and smoke sensitive area
  - 28) Paperwork holding up burning.
  - 29) More aggressive use of mop up (mandatory) – smoldering produces smoke that stays on the ground.
  - 30) Look at the politics of smoke in general – is there a smoke number for the public to call – people don’t know where to call and forestry gets the rap for it. Coordinated (CENTRAL) call center?
  - 31) The Process – logical way for the committee to deal with the issues. – an overall agenda. What to handle first? Work with department to identify.
  - 32) Prioritize work.
  - 33) Understand our charter.
  - 34) Review Appendix 3 and update especially for emissions.
  - 35) Bring forward visibility plan recommendations.
  - 36) How do we address risk/benefit of alternatives to burning
  - 37) Balancing public health risks and hazard by emissions of wildfire vs. Prescribed fire..
  - 38) Balancing the use of Rx fire for sensitive/T&E species management
  - 39) Conflicting rules & statutes that affect choices and abilities to use various treatments, including non-burning treatments.
  - 40) Alternative that target emission reduction that include a combination of burning and non-burning alternatives.
  - 41) Consider an emissions trading or credit program in the state.
  - 42) Facilitate and coordinate air quality issues and efforts with other agencies and organizations.