Smoke Management Review Committee Meeting
Oregon Department of Forestry
Santiam Conference Room, Operations Bldg, Salem
0830-1500 April 15, 2004

Attendance: Jim Russell, Erik Christiansen, Mike Dykzeul, Stan Benson, Brian Jennison, Stephen Fitzgerald, Brian Finneran, Gary Stevens, Lee Miller, Erik Christiansen, Gregory McClarren, Mike Ziolko and Cindy Smith (notetaker)
Visitors: David Hampton, Hampton Affiliates.

Editorial Note: The recording tape malfunctioned during the April meeting. A complete transcription is unavailable.

1. **Administrivia**
   Erik Christiansen will have a new proxy – Nancy Wilson, Umatilla National Forest.
2. **Minutes**
   The following corrections were noted.
   Page 4: "Paragraph 1", Bullet 9: insert "of" after the word "proportion" and correct "presided" to 'prescribed'
   "Paragraph 2", Bullet 1: Correct the name Jennison to Finneran.
   Page 8: Bullet 8: Discussion: Correct Committed to Committee
   The March minutes were approved as corrected.
3. **Recent Smoke Impacts/Intrusions**
   Recent Smoke Impacts/Intrusions were discussed by members of the Committee.
   Gregory McClarren distributed copies of the Jefferson County Smoke Management Program's weather condition report for 8/13/03
   - Gregory said there was a tremendous amount of peer pressure on seed growers.
   - Mike Ziolko added that using the flight data is where the meteorological support comes in. The forecasters can help interpret the data.
   - Nick asked who provides the meteorological support
     - Brian Finneran responded that he was not certain but would check.

   Gregory also distributed copies of "Communicating Real-Time and Forecasted AQ to the Public" and an editorial from the August 2002 *Environmental Health Perspectives*.
   - Stephen Fitzgerald asked if there were some pertinent comments in the document that needed to be included in the document. Gregory will review and respond
   - Brian Jennison noted that it's more useful to tell the public what's going to happen tomorrow.
   - Brain Finneran – Regarding – Blue sky
   - Gregory – re: ultra-fine particles in the urban air – EPA changed the PM2.5 because ..
   - Brian Finneran – was at AZ meeting last week and EPA said health studies of ultra fine vs. the bigger particles was one of the best presentations he has seen.
   - Stephen Fitzgerald added that one comment he heard was that some medical supply company wanted to know when the FS is going to burn so they could alert customers to get their oxygen bottles.

   Gregory added that his purpose in presenting these materials was not because of opposition to burning but because he wants to see the programs work.

   Mike Ziolko noted that there had been a flurry of emails regarding smoke impacts in the Sisters/Bend/Redmond area on March 20th and 23rd and as it turned out – it was not all caused by prescribed burning in the Sisters area. He added that it is just one example of prescribed burning being blamed for smoke it was not responsible for.
   - Gregory McClarren said it was a 'gentleman farmer' burning a field - unregulated ag burning.
   - Brian Finneran said that there is both regulated and unregulated ag burning.
   - Jim Russell noted that the committee could help DEQ by making recommendations… could potentially change the statute…

- Gregory agreed and added that he appreciated Mike Ziolko's technical response to his email but noted that people call to complain that smoke was in their eyes…
- Brian Finneran asked if Sisters should be a DA?
  - Mike Ziolko replied that that's one of the questions the committee is to answer in their charter.
  - Stephen Fitzgerald added that when people burn they treat Sisters like a DA
- Jim Russell responded that if each small community was a DA..
- Nick Yonker responded that one issue is the smaller areas that are a concern and not protected as a DA – and the other issue is the perseverance or loudness of the complainant…
- Mike Ziolko had been sending committee members samples of the daily burn instructions and added that they are written to avoid impacting the DA. Mike noted that if more detail were requested in forecasts for more areas, it would become a staffing issue.
- Brian Jennison was surprised that Sister's wasn't protected as a Class 1 Area.
- Erik Christiansen said the federal agencies are we cognizant of the downwind areas – it's a common way of doing business
- Brian Finneran said any good Smoke Management program has to make decisions as to what they are going to protect and do try to avoid sending a plume directly into any community. He added that the vast majority of field burning sends some smoke into the Sweet Home area.
- Jim Russell noted that, as a management model, ag burning works pretty well but for forestry burning the trade off is trying to protect communities from wildfire.
- Brian Jennison said they needed the tools to communicate _____ to the public.
- Gregory McClarren noted that the objective is not to burn – there are alternatives – burning is simply one technique/strategy – real-time data would help meet both objectives. Gregory did not favor designating every community of a certain size as a DA
- Jim Russell added that it was necessary to get the mechanism set up to communicate plans and make it available real –time

Mike Ziolko said there had been an other smoke impact. Prescribed burning occurred on a Sunday, April 4. There was a definite spike on the nephelometer in Bend the next morning. ODF did a lot of checking on this smoke impact. The data does not seem to support the intrusion from prescribed burning and staff were unable to determine where it came from. The spike was at 7 am on April 5 (Monday) and they could not attribute it to slash burning.

- Gregory volunteered to check in to other possible sources of the smoke and he suspected it could be an illegal burn.
  - Nick said it was not characteristic of wood stoves

An intrusion into Eugene occurred on April 3rd and Brian Jennison said he had seen it and it was more of a visual thing. Nick Yonker provided details on the intrusion.

Brian Finneran noted the value of this discussion and suggested an annual review by the committee to review the years smoke management activity as well as intrusions/complaints.

- Jim Brown noted that it already being done – by the Smoke Management Advisory Committee.
- Stephen said it may need to be done quarterly rather than annually
- Jim Brown suggested that it could be done via email as problems arise.

Gregory McClarren commented that this was a positive discussion and added that within 60 miles of Bend, thousands of acres of burning has been going on – without any problem.

- Mike Dykzeul noted that he was hesitant that they may weigh down something that works really well – real-time communication is a good idea and an enhancement to forecasting tools.
- Mike Ziolko pointed out that the committee had just spent an hour discussing two or three days burning and added that there's a lot of work involved in tracking all burning.

**4. Second Draft** M. Dykzeul, G. McClarren
**"Are Burning Objectives Being Met" - Matrix B**

- Gregory noted that Mike Dykzeul and he had incorporated comments from the last meeting into the second draft and noted that the highlighted notes were unresolved. The draft was revised as attached with discussion of some topics deferred until the next meeting. Paragraph four on page three will be re-worded by Gregory, McClarren, Mike Dykzeul, Brian Finneran, Brian Jennison and Jim Russell.
- Lee Miller asked to see the data supporting the first paragraph on page four under "Relevant facts/Trends". Brian Finneran will provide a pie chart showing all source contributions that reduce visibility in Class 1 Areas.
- Discussion of the Best Burn Day Definition for the second paragraph, page four was tabled for future discussion with the forecasters present.
- All suggestions for Directive changes will be referred to Mike Ziolko.
- There was considerable discussion regarding discontinuation of the term 'regulated area'. Jim Russell suggested that the Committee should adopt either the term 'regulated' or 'restricted', but not both. Jim noted that that right now all land in Oregon is considered regulated and asked what the impact would be if everything was designated a 'restricted' area?
- It would require permits on the east side and Mike Ziolko said it would present a workload issue for the District offices and landowners. There is already daily reporting from the federal lands on the eastside. Mike Dykzeul noted that he used to burn 60,000 acres on the eastside and paid no fees even though they went through the same process.
    - Mike Ziolko said the large landowners do report monthly but it would be a workload issue to get the reporting on a daily basis. He added that it could be helpful to have that data for management purposes.
    - Jim Russell expressed his concern about coordination between the feds and the state. He noted that the appearance of a lack of coordination would limit burning. Jim Brown added that it would take more manpower.
    - Mike Dykzeul added that it (the eastside) is being regulated even if there no fee was attached. Mike Ziolko noted that there is latitude for different types of restricted areas. He then read the applicable Directive. Stephen Fitzgerald interpreted it to "regulated" being the umbrella over "restricted".
- Discussion of fees or no fees for registration on new lands, page 6, final paragraph, was tabled for discussion with Matrix Item I.
- Further discussion of whether photo quality is lost in transferring fuels photo-series imagery to the web was postponed until the fuels characteristics class system is available. According to Jim Russell and Erik Christiansen, the first draft is due in October 2004.
- See the attached draft document for further changes that were made in response to the discussion.

**5. Public Comments**

David Hampton, Hampton Affiliates, Salem, OR, expressed his concern that the SMP is becoming too restrictive and that they are having more and more difficulty getting a day to burn. He advocates spring burning and noted that Hampton's does not have the luxury of waiting – they need to get the land ready for planting.

He added that piling is expensive, but does allow burning later in the year and on days when otherwise could not burn. But, there was a need to have more days to burn the piles. David said burning is an art and the public needs to be educated that it is a tool that landowners must have. He was also concerned that they were losing qualified burners.

He concluded with the statement that slash has to be taken care of and the public educated and added that wildfire doesn't care if it's a burn day or not. He noted that it's irresponsible to say that smoke from a wildfire doesn't impact the air quality. David expressed his wish that the state indemnify the landowner to protect them from lawsuit. David said the system is working but, he would like to see more burn days.

**Discussion:**

- Jim Russell asked where Hampton Affiliates does most of their work.
    - David responded that most of it was West of Dallas in the Grand Ronde/McMinnville area.
- Gregory McClarren asked if it was old growth.
    - David replied that it was not that the average unit is about 80 acres – an industrial forest.

- Brian asked if David has seen a decrease in burning days in the spring?
  - David said the forest managers are struggling
- Erik Christiansen asked if he knew anyone who had been or was being sued because of a prescribed burn?
  - David explained that he did not but he felt it was only a matter of time before someone was and added that they took precautions to avoid it. They would lodge a person in a hotel if they were burning near the individual and that person had already contacted them and they were aware of the person's allergy to smoke.
- Stephen Fitzgerald asked if competition for burn days is an issue.
  - David responded affirmatively and added that they put in their plans as soon as possible.
- Mike Dykzeul questioned whether Hampton Affiliates also owns property in Washington and was it tougher to burn there.
  - David replied that they do and that it is much tougher in Washington and added that there is no broadcast burning in Washington…. just pile burning.
  - Mike Ziolko concurred, adding that there is very little, if any, broadcast burning in western Washington.
- Mike Dykzeul inquired about the financial impacts.
  - David said there were increased planting costs as well as a decreased survival rate,
- Mike Dykzeul asked for David's recommendations.
  - Relax the marginal days and allow companies to burn on marginal days.
- Gregory McClarren asked if he were given the choice, would he prefer more tonnage on a best burn day or more burn days.
  - David answered that if you had the former, you wouldn't need the latter.
- David noted that resources are changing and they are leaving less and less on the ground.
- Jim Russell asked how many acres Hampton Affiliates burns each season.
  - About 300 acres on a good year
- Jim Russell asked if the state helps prioritize the units?
  - David replied yes and added that Jerry Peiring, Dallas, does a good job of helping.
  - Mike Ziolko asked if that applied to competition with other landowners.
    - David said generally not, that he is aware of anyway and added that he does have a problem with competition for good, experienced helicopters noting that more people need to learn to burn.

**6. First Draft** B. Jennison, G. Stevens

**"Are AQ Standards and Objectives Being Met" - Matrix A and K**

**Discussion:** See attached draft document for further changes that were made in response to the discussion.

- Gary Stevens provided a memo outlining ideas for this section of the report. Gary will condense the memo into a paragraph to be used as the second paragraph under "Are Air Quality Standards being met" for the second draft of this Matrix report.
- Jim Russell will also write a paragraph pertaining to _____ to be included.

**7. Next Section Assignment**

**Matrix Item C** – Erik, Jim and Lee will prepare a draft report for the next meeting.

**8. Adjourn**

**Next Meeting May 27, 2004**

Committee information may be found on the web at:
http://www.odf.state.or.us/DIVISIONS/protection/fire_protection/smp/SMR/SM_Review.asp