

Smoke Management Review Committee Meeting
Oregon Department of Forestry
Operations Conference Room, Salem
September 18, 2003
0930-1530

Attendance: Stephen Fitzgerald, Gregory McClarren, Mike Dykzeul, Jim Brown, Gary Stevens, Jim Russell, Erik Christiansen, Lee Miller, Stan Benson, David Collier, Brian Jennison, Stephen Fitzgerald, Mike Ziolk, and Susan Moretz (minutes).

Visitors: Jim Trost, Chris Cline, Harold Merritt (Plum Creek Timber), David Cramsey (Roseburg Resources, Eugene), Mark Wall (Roseburg Resources, Reedsport).

Not in Attendance: Geoff Babb (no proxy appointed).

1. Administrivia

- Small Wood 2004 Conference, May 18-21, Radisson Hotel, Sacramento. Contact Mike Ziolk for registration form and information.
- Burn Fee Rule Revision was distributed to the Committee. More information will be given at a later date, but public comments will be accepted 10/1/03 to 11/3/03. Information will be on the web site.
- Susan Moretz is filling in for Cindy Smith today.
- Jim Trost showed the Committee the exact location of Hurricane Isabel and the eye of the storm. The hurricane is the size of the State of Montana – it is quite an impressive storm.

2. Minutes (June, July, August)

- Amended minutes were approved for June and July.
- Review of August minutes. Correction needs to be made on page 7, 4th bullet from the bottom of the page, "add per ODF current Directive, page 8." Throughout the minutes, correct spelling of committee member name, Brian Jennison, and NAAQS. Page 9, item #10, correct spelling to NWCAPP.
- Mike Dykzeul questioned the intrusion diagram on page 7 asking if it indicates the point of intrusion occurring. Was it established on the diagram? No, just showing there are health effects from the intrusion. An intrusion is any smoke at ground level, light, moderate or heavy.
- August minutes were approved.

3. Quorum

- Stephen Fitzgerald emailed Committee members reminding them of the importance of their attendance – members need to find an if they are unable to attend in order to maintain a quorum. The Committee cannot change the number of people in the quorum since it is specified in the ODF Directive.

- Note change in meeting tentatively scheduled for Nov. 25. If the meeting is cancelled, members were asked to continue to reserve that date for subcommittee work.

4. Continuation of Issues Discussion – Matrix Items I and G

- Mike Dykzeul recommended the Committee defer discussion of Item G because decisions on Rules and Directives needing to be changed could not be made without first considering each item. He suggested that Item G be the final issue to resolve. It was agreed.

Matrix Item I – Economics/Funding of the Smoke Management Plan.

Is there a Problem?

- Mike Dykzeul noted that increasing the burn fees by 2 ½ times for pile burning is one problem.
- Gregory McClarren agreed adding that it appears that the eastside prescribed burning is exempt from the fees based on subsection 3D, A, B, & C. There is a potential for exemption.
- Jim Brown asked if the fees are supposed to cover the cost of administering the program?
 - Mike Ziolko said yes, the fees and the relatively small amount we receive from the USFS and BLM from northeast Oregon.
 - Jim Brown noted that the 2-½-time increase reflects the economic necessity at the time.
 - Mike Dykzeul explained that it is the incurred service level to match the offset of general fund reduction.
 - Jim Brown asked what pays for what gets exempted?
 - Stephen Fitzgerald explained that they are not exempted from smoke management, they are exempted from paying.
 - Gregory McClarren agreed, if there is an assumption that the smoke management program should stand on it's own feet financially, and it seems like that's what the Legislature has directed - we are beginning to create a gap.
 - Jim Brown said the problem is that the people who are paying are paying for those who are exempt and that is not appropriate. He added that a forest practices incentive should come from some place other than smoke management.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald noted that the answer appears to be "yes" for several reasons. One being the shift from general fund to fee based to the user base due to the downturn in state funding, irrespective of who's paying.
 - Mike Dykzeul said there was not a legislative intent for the smoke management program to be a stand-alone. They just took a hundred thousand dollars away from the forest practices program and internally the decision was that it would come from the smoke management program. There is not a directive for the department's smoke management program that he is aware of that says it needs to be a stand alone program based on fees.
 - Mike Ziolko agreed.

- Gregory McClarren said that legislature, in a broader sense, said programs need to stand on their own or they don't exist any more, not just state forestry but across state government.
- Stephen Fitzgerald disagreed explaining that some programs are mandated. Smoke management program is not going to go away - the question is how to pay for it.
- Mike Ziolko explained that about two years ago the department did an internal prioritization of programs to be used in case of reduced funding. That prioritization was later utilized when General Fund cuts hit Smoke Management. Referring to Eastside burning, Mike pointed out that by statute consideration must be given to exemptions for forest health burning, but forest health burning can be defined by rule so it's open to change in Administrative Rule. Lastly he noted that in statute, the fee program applies only to Class 1 forestland and on Federal land. There is no Class 1 forestland in Eastern Oregon.
- Referring to the Title of the Item I, "Economics and Funding", Stan Benson suggested changing the title to Program Funding or adding the word "program" to it.
- Gregory McClarren, commented that it appeared the Committee was beginning to back into the idea that the smoke management program must be self supporting and that's not an appropriate way to get there. Gregory noted that there is no policy at the highest level that the smoke management program will be self-supporting on a funding basis. Gregory asked if it was appropriate to move towards a user based fee system or not and added that the decision needs to be made very consciously as a strategic recommendation from this Committee to the Department.
- Jim Brown noted that some how we are trying to mitigate what is generally a fire hazard by burning, when we can control it. There are alternatives and without speaking for or against it, in a way, if the smoke management program is not self-supporting then we are subsidizing burning vs. other alternatives. That is the cost? Where does the smoke go? Someone has to decide when and where? It's evident, and appropriate that the program should be self-supporting.
- Gregory McClarren asked Mike Ziolko if he has had to make staff reductions and reduce capital outlays because of program funding presently, in the last biennium?
 - Mike replied that two biennium's ago the fuels specialist position was lost. That position had been included when the fee program was initiated but was lost because of funding issues. Nothing was lost this past biennium.
- Gregory then asked if the program had suffered statewide with the loss of that person and was there a loss in service?
 - Mike replied that an outreach fuels specialist is still needed.
 - Gary Stevens added that he worried about programs run by fees and noted that one of the strategies talked about was the need for more coordination of the programs by having good oversight in the smoke management process. He pointed out that a substantial reduction in burning, for

whatever reason – use of alternatives, etc., would automatically reduce funding for the oversight of the program and leave the program weak for the coordination of all the types of burning.

- It was noted that this would be a future problem
- Jim Russell asked if the fee increase approved and Mike Ziolkko replied that the Board of Forestry had approved going forward with the public hearing.
- Jim Russell noted that the clean air act specifically directs the federal land manager to support whatever program is in place at the state level but sees that the eastside is exempt only because ODF's policy directs that smoke management only be applied to class one forestland - an internal thing.
- Mike Ziolkko explained that it is more than a policy, it's law.
- Jim Russell pointed out that it focused specifically on forest based but there is far more ag and range land burning taking place than forest based and asked if the committee should look at what is keeping that from happening statewide, based on the fact that federal managers are mandated to support the state SIP and to meet those requirements and to support what ever is needed to operate that program.
- Jim Russell sees this as a current and future problem as long as only Class One forestland is covered by the Smoke Management Plan.
- The issue is Class One land.
- In dealing with an economic topic, Jim Russell said he always work off the zero face budget, identifies the work to be done and then figures out how to fund it. He and Mike Ziolkko have been working on the requirements necessary for a different level of organization to meet the accuracy, efficiency, and other standards needed for that organization. He would then cost that organization out and give the committee an opportunity to see what that level would be and decide if this is the organization that's needed to meet current smoke management. If so, this will be the cost of that organization, and then figure out what the fee should be.
- Stephen Fitzgerald summarized Jim's statement "The idea is to re-evaluate what the organization needs to do as far as regulation and meeting the law at all levels and to cost that out. Establish from the ground up what they should be."
- Jim Russell added that having lost a fuel specialist, the program is not keeping up with technology.
 - That's important for better forecasting.
 - It was noted that implementing programs such as Blue Sky would be difficult in terms of collecting the data and needed information.
- Mike Dykzeul said he agreed with Jim Russell but was concerned that even after building up the program and increasing the fees, there would still be only limited opportunities to meet everyone's objectives, even though they have paid more. As a result, expectations in burn opportunities and maximizing those days would still not be met. He suggested that this fall under item number 6. Mike suggested that increasing tools for the meteorologists and even adding another meteorologist to increase capabilities in forecasting to

maximize the days to meet everyone's objectives should be the number 1 priority.”

- Stephen Fitzgerald noted that these could be committee recommendations.
- Referring to Jim Russell's earlier comment on number 3, Mike Dykzeul said that attempting to address fuels to prevent wildfire situations is one part and the other part is sustainability and the silvicultural goals in reforestation efforts. If the program is successful and its fee based funding would diminish and he suggested that should be when a general fund contribution should come back since the public benefits from it.
- Jim Brown noted that the general public has a right to clean air. He suggested that with a level playing field for the various ways to mitigate fire hazard and create the silvicultural conditions for regeneration less burning would be required and there could be more opportunities to dispose of more material.
- Jim Russell added that what is done for fire hazard is also done for forest health and noted that forest health is just as important and is accomplished simultaneously with fuel hazard reduction - from a duty stand point and from a protection stand point, it is the primary objective of this committee. He suggested adding forest health protection and fuel hazard reduction.”
- Gregory McClarren said it is not a level playing field. With only Class One forestlands regulated, if those east of the Cascades have a different set of rules. The small non-industrial forestland owner has a different set of rules. If you're in a county protection zone, you don't work for state forestry, you work for somebody else... As a result, it's not easy for 95% of the players to know what rules to play by and how the smoke management program gets funded. He sees the level playing field notion as a key. According to McClarren, there are at least three state level programs operating in the state – DEQ, ODA, and ODF and 36 at the county level. And the rules keep getting tighter and tighter with respect to clean air.”
- Stan Benson commented that Forest health is on existing forest stands, and said that Mike's comment on stand establishment is really important.
- Jim Russell reminded committee members that there are several upcoming mandates including the mutual haze rule.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald noted that a general statement referring to un-funded mandates could go in the next column.
 - Jim Brown asked for clarification of “un-funded” mandate.
 - Jim Russell explained that the reason it's un-funded is because right now, as an example, a lot of what would contribute to class one air visibility reduction, is old burning on the eastside. That will increase costs and when DEQ tries to implement the Hazes Rule, the approach, necessary staffing levels, monitoring, and tracking are all things that are up for grabs, that WRAP's been trying to deal with, but its still going to fall back on the state for implementation plan. We need to start dealing with that. There isn't any money currently appropriated or held in reserve to implement that strategy.
- Stan Benson asked what percentage of slash burn smoke falls into the small particulate matter category like exhaust smoke because of a draft report he had

read that noted greater problems had been recognized with small particulate matter.

- Mike Ziolkko replied that 80-90% of most smoke produced from a fire falls in that category whether it's from slash-burning, wood stoves or whatever. Mike was referring to PM 2.5.
- Stan pointed out the potential for a much larger problem because of this.
- Gregory McClarren noted that there had not been a lot of work done in terms of worker exposure.
 - Mike Ziolkko disagreed adding that PNW had done work on the issue.

Will there be a Problem in the Future?

- Stephen Fitzgerald noted that the answer to this question was yes because of un-funded mandates and expressed his concern about a 2.5 time increase in pile burning being enough.
- Gregory McClarren reminded committee members of Jim Brown's comment about the general fund needing to contribute some if in fact there's a broad public benefit derived.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald agreed that there needs to be public share because of the mandates.
- Jim Brown noted that an un-funded mandate, could be funded by fees which would raise the cost of burning and could result in alternatives becoming appropriate in more instances."
 - That would be an opportunity because it's the true cost of doing business.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald - Increasing the cost of burning would allow alternatives to become more economically viable. That could be an opportunity, a barrier or just an economic market out come.
 - Lee Miller disagreed and pointed out that with increased fees, people would not look for alternatives, they just wouldn't burn. The result could be increased smoke coming into the Willamette Valley like it did this year because of the B and B Complex.
 - An unintended consequence noted Stephen Fitzgerald.
- Stan Benson expressed his concern over the philosophy that raising fees would result in a change in behavior. He pointed out that raising fees would have an effect on behavior but should not be used to force the change.
 - Stan added that it could be a future problem.
- Jim Brown noted that theoretically, he who cuts a tree down is responsible for leaving the forest in a state where it can regenerate and there is not a fire hazard and expressed his concern that the follow-up checking may not get done. He added that anyone wishing to buy out should be paying the true cost of the buy out – like an insurance policy.
- Mike Dykzeul said he didn't think responsible landowners would want to buy out unless the circumstances warranted it, on a very unique location because they suffer huge consequences at the time of rotation in stocking reductions if they've left all the slash and there is no ability to mitigate it. Buying out is one

option, but the optimum goal is to treat it, reduce the fuels, but then also provide the regeneration spots to get that next profit back from rotation.

- Jim Russell said that the fee is miniscule as a total percentage of what you're willing to invest in that site. He suggested that the BLM and USFS would rather approach a system in which they were presented a lump sum billing on an annual basis because they would rather avoid time spent tracking, reporting and doing the cost accounting of the current fee system.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald asked if that would be an option as it relates to how the fee is structured.
 - Jim Russell said it would be an option on both sides.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Dave Cramsey, Roseburg Resources, was present to discuss his perspective of how smoke management affects the company. Cramsey manages about one hundred ten thousand acres of industrial forestland west of Eugene, in burn zone 603, where the terrain varies from rolling to very steep. Because of the proximity to Eugene, burning has always been extraordinarily difficult in that area. Roseburg Resources treats about 40% of their slash and of that 40%, about 10% is broadcast burn – where the terrain is too steep to put equipment on.

Cramsey pointed out that he just doesn't get enough burn days to accomplish even that and getting a day that allows him to burn the acreage and tonnage he wants is even more rare. Multiple burn days increase his costs as does holding units over from year to year. The costs of planting unburned units don't meet corporate goals either, noted Cramsey. Additionally, the company risks a monetary fine for not being able to meet the two-year reforestation plan.

- Mike Dykzeul asked if there was much latitude between asking for a 1000-ton day as opposed to an 800-ton day. Is there much latitude in forecasting and getting the ability on the unit?
- Harold Merritt said that he works closely with the forecasters and found them to be fairly flexible, depending on the location and added that they do an excellent job of working with landowners.
- Jim Brown asked if Dave was able to reach stocking goals after having to plant into an area that was not burned and not get the regeneration he would like.
 - Dave replied that he does multiple replants after the slash breaks down and there are the associated costs.

Mark Wall, Roseburg Resources, Reedsport, has managed about 120,000 acres for nearly 15 years in Zones 603, 615, and 616 which includes properties in Western Lane, DFPA, and CFPA. He noted a more positive burning experience than Dave but added that he faces problems similar to Dave - having to split units up and occasionally not burning units because he didn't get the window needed. Mark provided committee members with handouts detailing the costs and consequences resulting from lost burn opportunities in 2003, resulting in a \$9,000 cost to the company due to not getting the burn off.

Mark credited the forecasters with flexibility in being able to increase tonnage on good burn days.

Although the objective of the Smoke Management Plan is to reduce or minimize intrusions, Mark said his impression was that it appeared to be driven by a zero tolerance approach resulting in missed opportunities for burning. Mark also noted that he didn't have a good definition of intrusion and asked if there were degrees of intrusion in the reporting system.

Mike Ziolkko referred Mark to the Directive and said there are light, moderate and heavy intrusions. He further explained that visibility measurements or air quality monitoring are an indication that there are impacts on the monitoring sites.

Mark said he had an intrusion in Florence last year resulting in a further tightening of burn dates. He would like to see the program work with the landowners to facilitate more burning where appropriate. According to Mark, Roseburg Resources is looking for more opportunities to burn safely and efficiently because there are few alternatives that allow them to meet stand management objectives in the Coast Range.

Mark expressed his concern over how much federal burning is going to be done under the forest hill and as such be exempt from the burn fees. Historically, he viewed the smoke management program as having done a lot to reduce problems with the smoke and minimize complaints and in conclusion said that Roseburg Resources would like to request more opportunities to burn within the burn windows.

In reference to Matrix Item 3A, Mark disagreed that increasing burn fees would encourage more use of alternatives and suggested that it would be more likely that the landowners just wouldn't burn the piles with a resulting increase in fire danger.

Discussion:

- Brian Jennison asked if they though it would be realistic to remove plastic from piles.
 - Dave Cramsey replied that it was not and that the benefit of the plastic was to allow burning after the heavy rains start in November.
 - Gregory McClarren pointed out the additional costs associated with removal of the plastic – if it could even be removed after having material placed on top of it to prevent it from blowing off and the additional weight due to moisture on top of the plastic.
- Gregory McClarren commented that rule is to minimize smoke impacts on populated areas, not to eliminate burning from forestry and agriculture.
- Lee Miller noted that forest practices foresters are very willing to identify high-risk land bodies that must be burned in a given year but there is no mechanism to prioritize those units within the smoke management program.

6. Break

7. Continuation of Issues Discussion

8. Working Lunch

Topics for Discussion with the State Forester

Committee members agreed on the following agenda for that portion of the November Smoke Management Review Committee Meeting that is to be attended by State Forester Marvin Brown:

Introductions	15 minutes	All
National Fire Plan	5 minutes	Erik Christiansen
FPFO Letter	2 minutes	Stephen Fitzgerald
NWCAPP	5 minutes	Mike Dykzeul
NAAQS & PM 2.5	5 minutes	David Collier
Questions	45 minutes	

- Difficult Issues:
 1. Designing and funding a smoke management organization that maintains leadership yet achieves objectives: people, technology and programs.
 2. Conflicting goals of air quality improvement with forest health, silviculture and hazard reduction.
 3. Smoke management coordination. There are multiple agencies responsible for smoke management – with conflicting goals and approaches. This is a place for leadership by ODF in coordination and streamlining.
 4. Fee based program
- Issues Most Likely to be presented to the board
 1. Fee Exemptions for non Class 1 land
- Consensus
 1. Too early
- Marvins's Support
 1. To provide flexibility and funding for the smoke management program.
 2. Advocate keeping Oregon in a leadership role.

Marvins Time	15 minutes	
--------------	------------	--

- Department Budget
- Other Items

Additionally, white papers will be provided for Marvin at a pre-committee meeting with Mike Ziolko to provide background information on the history of the Smoke Management Plan, the National Fire Plan, the Regional Haze Rule, the relationship between air quality and DEQ, ODF, LRAPA and the Smoke Management Plan, the Forestry Plan for Oregon, and a current copy of the matrix with the sections on "Is there a problem?" and "barriers and opportunities" highlighted.

The white papers need to be sent to Mike Ziolko by October 8. Jim Russell commented that what is needed is a comprehensive smoke management system in place that allows the state forester to assume a leadership role when managing all the emissions within the State of Oregon to benefit ag, forestry, etc. and suggested discussion of the organizational needs of making sure that Oregon maintains the leadership in the west in terms of managing it's emissions and accomplishing it's resource management objectives.

Gregory McClarren brought up the DEQ 'HAPS' program which is scheduled to

be adopted next month, HAPS being the Hazardous Air Polutants, or air toxins, and suggested that it be included in the DEQ white paper for Marvin.

9. Regional Haze Draft SIP

Brian Finneran, DEQ

Copies of the Draft of the Fire Section of the Draft Regional Haze were provided to committee members followed by a brief review of the process.

December 31, 2003, is the deadline for submission of the SIP to EPA Region 10. There are no extensions and failure to meet the deadline would require meeting the 308 SIP, which according to Brian would be much more difficult. Therefore, he has been scrambling to get it out for public hearing.

Public hearings are scheduled for November 19 and 20th throughout the state. Pendleton, Bend, Medford, Eugene/Springfield and Portland.

Brian plans to have the draft 309 SIP completed by mid-October.

In briefly reviewing the draft for the committee, Brian noted that there are five required elements for the SIP for fire and explained that "Identification and removal of Administrative Barriers" is the portion that refers to alternatives. Brian continues to work on Emission Inventory and Tracking, Identification of Administrative Barriers and Annual Emission Goals.

This first SIP needs only to address Oregon's contribution to the 16 Class 1 areas around the Grand Canyon. (The second SIP is when we have to look at our own Class 1 areas.)

Discussion:

- Emission tracking and Inventory System. Because Oregon DEQ needs to be able to provide BPA with fire emissions data on an annual basis to show what the trends are in terms of the use of fire, in a manner consistent with other states, ODF (and ODA) will need to provide the basic components for DEQ to calculate annual emissions – from other pollutants that impair visibility as well as PM 2.5. That data will then be passed on to the Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP), which will assist in collecting this data in a consistent manner and put out an annual emission reports describing the trend for fire emissions, multi-source emissions, dust emissions etc.
 - Two documents came out of WRAP that were designed to help calculate fire emissions - the WRAP Policy on Fire Tracking Systems (FTS), a checklist of all the post burn activity information that you need to make the calculations – elements that ODF already utilizes in the Smoke Management Annual Report, and the WRAP Emissions Data Management System (EDMS), which details how to make the calculations of emissions.
 - Committee members were reminded that A WRAP Fire Emissions Joint Forum was scheduled for September 24 at which emissions inventory requirements is a scheduled topic.
- Identification and Removal of Administrative Barriers – alternatives to burning.
 - Brian noted that an important part of this would be a comprehensive document on non-burning alternatives for vegetation and fuels management. The document is to include costs and benefits of the various alternatives. According to Brian, the document was scheduled

for completion the following week. That document will be used to show the process of how alternatives to prescribed burning are to be pursued.

- The Enhanced Smoke Management Program
Of the nine elements (listed on page 7 of the Draft SIP) that are to be part of the Enhanced Smoke Management Program, Brian noted that the current Smoke Management Plan addresses each of the elements. He suggested that only the regional coordination and the enforcement sections might require further work.
 - Gregory McClarren noted that the Draft frequently refers to ODF Directives and suggested that reference should be made to other agencies as well.
 - Mike Dykzeul suggested that a project of the NW CAPP was regional smoke management coordination and could be cited in the 309 SIP.
- Annual Emissions Goal

Brian reminded committee members that these are goals and are not intended to be emission caps or limits. He further explained that a WRAP committee has developed a process to identify all of the emission reduction techniques (ERT's) that are being used and Oregon DEQ will work with ODF and ODA to apply that WRAP Policy to Oregon in order to quantify ERT's.

Brian noted that the first step would be to identify the ERT's used in Oregon and quantify them.

- Lee Miller noted that wildfire appears to be excluded even though it impacts emissions.
- It was noted that the term fire as used in the document refers to prescribed forestry burning (and does not include prescribed range land burning)
- Erik Christiansen added that it needs to differentiate between the different types of fire to avoid confusion.

Brian Finneran suggested that committee members review the draft and make comments/suggestions at the next Smoke Management Review Committee meeting.

10. Continuation of Issues Discussion

Discussion was taken out of order and occurred after the Agenda Item 13. See attached Matrix.

- Lee Miller asked what the cost of administering the current Smoke Management Program is.
 - Mike Ziolkowski said that information was not readily available but that finance was currently working on a study that would provide that information.
 - Lee commented that keeping track of the fees was a nuisance and he had considerable administration costs for paying a relatively small bill.
 - Evaluating lump sum fees based on program needs was suggested.
- Gregory McClarren commented that much of the current discussion is predicated on how the program has operated in the past and how we want to update it. He suggested organizing for the future program, not based on the past.
- Mike Ziolkowski noted that the program depends on what the Committee comes up with, is accepted by the State Forester and taken to the Board of Forestry and

DEQ. Then the funding is determined and the committee has the opportunity to provide input - lump sum, per acre fee, or something else.

Will there be a Future Problem?

Discussion:

- Yes there will be problems in the future.
 - It is questionable if fees could pay for future programs.
 - Gregory McClarren commented that the East Side being exempt creates a playing field that is not level.
 - It was suggested that uniform application of the smoke management plan would level the playing field.

What are the Options?

Discussion:

- Increasing fees.
- Redesign of the Smoke Management Plan
- Level the playing field.
- Jim Russell noted that rangeland burning is currently not regulated by any State body - Fish and Wildlife is also excluded.
- Temporary relaxation of rules where there is a high risk of wildfire – specific to place and time frame.
- Public education campaign.
- Prioritize areas where burning is the only option.

Barriers and Opportunities:

Discussion:

Opportunities -

- Stabilize funding
- Standardize rates
- Reduce administrative overhead
- Everybody pays – including rangeland and fish habitat.
- Education
- Opportunity to qualify for the 309 SIP
- Re-evaluate ODF – looking at future needs and positioning the Smoke Management Program to deal with it.

11. Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

12. Break

13. Plastic on Piles Update

Sub-Committee

Jim Russell reported that the literature review is due from the contractor next Friday. It will be sent to the entire committee for review and comment. After the contractor receives the comments, the final draft will be available in two weeks.

Jim noted that the most toxic thing that seems to have come up in the review is the product used to make the plastic black and added that there was considerable variation in toxicity depending on the agent used. Clear plastic contains none of that toxic agent. Secondly, he noted that the by-product of poly-ethelene is a wax-based substance that becomes wax when burned

It was noted that pure, clear poly-ethelene is readily available.

Jim Russell will e-mail committee members with the date for their review.

14. Next Steps

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was post-poned to the next meeting.

14. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. **The next meeting of the Smoke Management Review Committee is scheduled for October 16, 2003.**

- Burn fee rule revision comments are being accepted Oct 1st – Nov 3rd and must in by 1700, Nov 3rd.
- The “white papers being prepared for the state forester are due to Mike Ziolk by October 8th.