



## 2017 Smoke Management Review Committee

December 6, 2017  
9:30 AM – 3:00 PM

Douglas County Fairgrounds  
2110 Frear St.  
Roseburg, OR 97471

---

*Objective: Review concepts/ideas and determine which to move forward.*

### ❖ Welcome, Introductions & Regroup

- Facilitator Dan Thorpe opened the meeting by welcoming everyone. Dan noted that at the previous three meetings, we've learned about the background/history, roles, and tasks. Finally, at meeting three, we started discussing opportunities for improvement and concepts. The cancellation of the October 4<sup>th</sup> meeting allowed for staff to work more on the recommendations.
- Also during that time, there was a successful joint meeting of the Board of Forestry and the EQC, which many Review Committee members attended. Public comment is scheduled on the agenda for later today.
- Introductions were made around the table. Some committee members had proxies attend in their absence.
- Dan Thorpe mentioned the many letters (approximately 20 total) of support received to date, which will be posted on the external Smoke Management Review Committee website.
- Gregory noted that this review in particular has had the most participation and engagement. He encouraged the committee to read each of the letters of support.
- Dan then reviewed the agenda noting the review of the concepts/ideas decided to date. He then reminded the committee of the exercise done at the last meeting where colored dots were put on the concepts to move forward, including priorities.
- Jim Gersbach has been working on the ideas/concepts and has put them into three categories: (1) Concepts that ODF & DEQ are already doing, (2) New concepts/ideas, and (3) Concepts/ideas unlikely to move forward as agency recommendations. Will focus most of the energy on new concepts (item 2).
- Rachel Sakata crafted the preamble which provides information on how to focus on these concepts to be successful while working on the matrix.

- Committee members were assigned “homework” to determine which concepts/ideas to move forward as final. Also, the work on changes to the Smoke Management Plan is broader than just this group. Other work done outside the committee will be presented later in the afternoon, such as the work of the Fee Structure Subcommittee and agency goals. Dan noted that some committee members may oppose some concepts and asked they let ODF/DEQ staff know. Committee members will have a chance to review all concepts before submission. Dan reminded the committee that they are not going to make this system perfect by the end of the next meeting but we will make some improvements to move forward. Dan reviewed the preamble, noting what needs to be remembered while working through the concepts is balancing the two smoke management goals of increased prescribed burning while maintaining public health. Proposals that are actionable must meet the two implementation goals.
- David Collier thanked everyone for their commitment to this committee and that we were making really good progress at the last meeting. He also noted the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC)/Board of Forestry (BOF) joint meeting with the new Commission members last November. The EQC members really appreciated it. It was a chance for them to hear about the fire danger risks around the state, and the importance of smoke management as it relates to the benefits of prescribed burning. Kirsten Aird (OHA), David Collier and Doug Grafe all presented at the joint meeting and others helped with the Board tours. Amanda Stamper from The Nature Conservancy presented on meadow burning and Dave Cramsey from Roseburg Resources gave a landowner perspective.
- David reviewed the matrix, noting that it is a compilation of what the agencies were hearing from the committee.
- Bob Palzer commented on the two smoke management goals in that they are too vague. He thinks it should be explained. Doug Grafe noted the reference is speaking to the law. Much of the law is somewhat vague but allows the policy boards to define the process and procedures and how to achieve that expectation. That law is specific to the EPA air quality standards as well. We’re not changing law in this review, just changing rules through the EQC and BOF.
- John Stromberg asked about a clarification of the interpretation of the rule of the Smoke Management Program, or whether there should be?
- Doug Grafe responded that it often expresses itself in rule under objectives of the program, how we implement the intent of law that’s given to us by the legislature. Every rule is guided by the principle of law. The objectives of the program are where that clarification of interpretation is.
- Merlyn Hough noted the need to discuss “A-concepts that ODF is already doing” as there is a key tax credit sun-setting soon regarding biomass utilization. This could be a reasonable recommendation for this group’s

consideration if that should be restored or extended. David Collier agreed that he would like to discuss the tax credit as well.

- Doug Grafe explained that time management is key here. We only have this meeting and one more to finalize the priority recommendations and prepare for presentation to the BOF and EQC. Dan Thorpe also noted the time on the agenda today for new ideas.
- David Collier summarized the “ultimate recommendations,” which are intrusions and public health. The issues we’re discussing with regard to public engagement are more localized and there seems to be an issue with local versus statewide focus. A holistic set of recommendations for the Smoke Management Program is not only creating more opportunities for burning but also public engagement, partners, resources, etc. These build a successful program. Is that one of the recommendations this committee wants to move forward and if so, how does that happen? Who makes local strategic plans a reality and what is the funding mechanism if we want more engagement? More discussion would be appreciated including what the plans look like. The public engagement strategy is being encouraged, especially through the letters of support, but it needs defined (who, how, state or local level, resources, etc.). How do you ultimately make that happen at both state and local levels?

#### ❖ **Discussion of Recommendation 2A.**

- Doug Grafe mentioned an example of public engagement is the Pole Creek Fire report where heavy smoke got into Sisters. The outcome of that was the development of the Oregon Wildfire Smoke Protocol which included outreach to the public and allowed local jurisdictions to respond to that smoke. How do we engage with Oregonians with regard to prescribed fire? It’s broader than just response.
- David Collier noted recommendations for the agencies as to how we make more out of that and how we fund that.
- Mark Webb asked for an explanation of OHA’s role with regard to wildfire smoke protocols – why is OHA not more proactive when prescribed burning is known ahead of time.
- Kirsten Aird responded that in Oregon, public health is a decentralized, locally-controlled concept. OHA works through county infrastructure. That decentralized system is a problem and needs to be discussed. Proactive outreach is not considered emergency response so there is no funding for proactive communication because emergency response isn’t designed for that – mainly just wildfire response. Feedback from letters showed appreciation and support for proactive public health outreach. There is an opportunity to work together to be creative on the plan.
- Mark also suggested that USFS coordinate with local public health, which wouldn’t be as costly. There is a template (specifically in John Day) which is a

good education/outreach tool for public. Also, customized burn plans need communication components of early notice and monitoring the effectiveness.

- Ramona Quinn (Klamath Public Health) noted Klamath's air quality program and emergency preparedness program in which funds are used to alert the public of smoke into the air. They have received good feedback from federal partners on where prescribed burning will be done but not from ODF or private landowners. She suggested more cooperation from all burners. Many citizens of Klamath County use woodstoves as a primary heat source and when smoke from prescribed burning is in the air, the public may not be able to use their woodstove.
- Carrie Nyssen provided a summary of a call she received last week from a Klamath County citizen who mentioned Carrie's involvement on the Smoke Management Review Committee. This citizen lives in a fairly rural area and she knew there were burn piles ready to be burned but she didn't know when. She had a severe reaction to the smoke when the piles were lit when she was an otherwise healthy person. This citizen was supportive of the need for prescribed burning but she didn't know when it was going to happen so she could leave the area.
- David Collier noted that public outreach is hard work and expensive to do it right. His main question is how do we do it and how do we pay for it?
- Ramona added to Carrie's story that the only way she heard about it was through the public radio in that the fire department was called to put out a wildfire but it turned out to be just a pile burn. There was no information on it at all, including who the landowner/manager was. The more information we can provide, the better. Most county health departments will issue a public notice if they know ahead of time if there's a hazard.
- Bob Palzer brought up the topic of risk to communities. He noted the 24 hour standard but there's nothing about the annual standard. There needs to be a look at the bigger issue, other than prescribed burning, which is community exposure to particulate matter. We're discussing the topic of reducing catastrophic wildfires by increasing prescribed burning.
- Mark Webb noted the need to include a communication program if the committee decides to go ahead with the customized burn plan. It should include: early notice and education and options to respond to those who are impacted. It should be captured in best management practices. We should also should monitor how effective this is so we can improve if necessary.
- Doug Grafe noted the committee has defined the recommendations and appreciates the feedback to ensure we're capturing the committee's ideas correctly. He mentioned that the success of item 2D is one of the major policy shifts of an intrusion.
- Mayor Stromberg commented that one of the key pieces is how to make connections into actual communities that are doing prescribed burning and the public health issues there. Ashland has developed concepts that include

public health, including increase use of controlled burn opportunities. A community outreach plan was developed in Ashland, which includes refuges for those who have health issues and need to escape from the smoke. John mentioned the city of Ashland also came up with some ideas to keep air in homes cleaner such as HEPA filters and masks. They also creating a voluntary confidential registry of smoke-vulnerable people and published through medical practitioners to the community. A call could be made to those on the registry to warn them of impending smoke. We have to know where the smoke is going to go into a community and provide that information ahead of time. There is also a need to understand the level of health risk to identify how dangerous that smoke is in real-time. Ashland may have enough funding to do these things but it is very hard to keep up with the fuels that are growing.

- David Collier noted the difference between wildfire and prescribed fire – emergency response versus proactive response. With regard to prescribed fire, community outreach is not a substitute for also minimizing smoke. You can't burn as much as you want without protecting the community in some way.
- Kirsten Aird provided input on behalf of the OHA. OHA is 100 percent smoke-neutral. We don't care if smoke is from wildfire or prescribed fire. Smoke creates health problems. The plan is to start simple but still need to think long-term about a real infrastructure. The way to potentially go about this is with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between DEQ, OHA and ODF, being very specific to smoke management and prescribed burns. This would ensure regular communication into the future. It also sets up a model for local communities (local DEQ, local ODF, and local public health authorities). Accountability is key to each other and the people we're trying to protect.
- Rick Graw discussed his responses to the questions and provided a handout showing data on short-term health impacts at various times of the day as well as the duration.
- Merlyn Hough noted 5 key questions to ask regarding customized burn plans which is critical for public support/acceptance:
  - Is there a problem?
  - Is the problem worth solving?
  - Are the right agencies involved?
  - Are the proposed solutions reasonable?
  - Are the leaders involved and responsive to concerns?
- Rick Graw provided a few handouts showing 1 hour PM values across communities in Oregon depicting the impact of prescribed burning smoke versus wildfire smoke. Rick cautioned the committee to be equitable on how

smoke is treated to protect everyone. His quantitative risk analysis shows how and where to prioritize fuel treatments.

- Dave Cramsey noted two aspects with regard to community outreach:
  - Day-of event, which is the focus of our discussion right now. Within the day-of event, there is a need to also consider close-by communities.
  - Longer-term outreach – why, how and when we burn, which aids in public acceptance. If there is no public acceptance:
    - Agency collaborative on health impacts.
    - Landowners/operators collaborative on why there is a need for prescribed burning.
  - Intrusions tend to be low-intensity and short in duration from prescribed burning.
- David Collier asked how prescribed burning is prioritized, specifically with regard to the threat to life and safety. We have equity across the state. This strategy is about reasonable management of controlled burning and public health.

#### ❖ **Prescribed Burns to Restore the Landscape (2B)**

- Doug Grafe asked if there were specific pilot programs going on around the state that we could review.
- David Collier noted the “high-risk, high-value” areas – are these the correct areas to look at?
- Rex Storm noted that small landowner perspective needs to be included as it is just as important to the population. He cautioned not to discriminate based on land size.
- Mark Webb noted the definition of “high-value” is not explicit but areas we are concerned about could serve as a pilot project.
- David Cramsey noted the need to include NW Oregon when prioritizing prescribed burning, especially where the wildfires can start more easily.
- Amanda Stamper suggested starting in different geographical areas and applying the criteria of priorities. She is concerned with leaving some communities out. There needs to be a collaborative approach on outreach. LRAPA is a good model of a working collaborative relationship.
- Gregory McClarren noted the need to discuss more strategy (e.g. LRAPA) and how each community does their own outreach their own way under state objectives for smoke management.
- Mayor Stromberg said that he was not comfortable with Ashland being singled out as a pilot project because the city of Ashland puts its own money

into prescribed burning. Public safety and public health issues have to be even across the board. The definition of intrusion needs to be more specific and better defined.

- Mike White mentioned the issue of the transfer of risk between landowners.
- Mark Webb recommended setting aside an option for areas with more community support and to use areas with an adaptive management approach as pilots.
- It was noted that this is a 10-year project and there needs to be a realistic approach to how much burning can actually get done. Use the smoke intrusion complaints to gather data. Get help from public health and communities to get burn plan to ODF sooner and work to find the best burn days. That way, communities can be alerted ahead of time.
- Willie Begay commented on the need to simplify the process of partnerships and cooperation. Some of this is already happening. With regard to the increase in risk, the BLM checkerboard areas don't do prescribed burning. The update of the plan should also include a piece to allow the Smoke Management Program to allow more burn days.
- Concept 2C discussion was skipped as the committee members all agreed that concept 2D needed the most attention.

#### ❖ Discussion of Concept 2D

- Doug Grafe stressed the importance of hearing conversation around concept 2D as this is the policy piece and the definition of intrusion. We created the agenda to allow more time for discussion. 2c is off the table but we can round back if necessary.
- David Collier suggested that some of these geographical areas within this concept present challenges for prescribed burning based on certain factors. There are areas where more intensive management needs to be done.
  - Intrusions (intent/perception)
    - If the pace and scale of prescribed burning is increased, it is increasingly unrealistic that there will be no smoke impacts.
    - Need to shift the definition/thinking of intrusions. Not all smoke into a community would be an “intrusion.”
    - Federal standards are not good enough for protecting against prescribed burning smoke – need more research to make reasonable decisions on short-term protection level for risk to the public as well as flexibility on both sides of the “goal post.”
      - Additionally, there needs to be more flexibility at the local level on the plan of burn decisions to make the most of the burn opportunities.

- Doug Grafe noted that our target is still no intrusions but the key is definition of intrusion (light, medium, heavy) in terms of detectable smoke at ground level.
- Consensus to redefine intrusions with regard to measurability within AQI standards.
  - Light intrusion definition is still currently higher than public health standards – measurable at one hour spike.
  - David noted his goal is to always be minimizing smoke impacts and protecting clients at the federal standard. He also mentioned the fact that people don't breathe on a 24-hour average. This means we need to look at different incremental measurements.
- Ramona Quinn commented that in Klamath Falls, intrusions vary depending upon the time of year and what the weather conditions are at that time. She would like to see customized intrusion levels for different geographical areas. She cautioned the committee to be mindful of non-attainment areas.
- David noted that due to existing pollution in some geographical areas, we need to be mindful of these when defining intrusions.
- Carrie Nyssen noted that not everyone breathes the same (infants, children, elderly, etc.) – science shows that the federal standard is inadequate in that it isn't protection public health. She and her association cannot compromise on human health issue.
- Willie Begay suggested the need to report accomplishments not just intrusions. The hope for the burners is to be able to learn from the history of intrusion reports.
- David Collier suggested the need to look at reporting only major intrusions versus all intrusions, however there's a lot of time and energy that goes into this review. Do we want to make changes to the requirement to review all intrusions?

#### ❖ **Public Comment**

- Mark Stern (The Nature Conservancy) – need to manage risk both ways. Smoke intrusions are seasonal-dependent. This all ties back to risk management. He would like the group to consider going back to the 24 hour standard and allow more burning.
- Sally Russell (Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project/Bend City Council – handout provided – see website) encouraged the committee to work to educate the community on why prescribed burning is necessary. Fire will always come back to our forests. There needs to be a more holistic approach to forest management (prescribed burning around communities to



protect/manage risk to those communities). There is no smoke-free option and goals can't be met without smoke from prescribed burning. By putting off risk today, we are increasing the risk longer-term. Air quality monitor locations are also an issue. For example, the air quality monitor for Deschutes County is located along the Deschutes River, which doesn't do much good for Bend/Sisters, etc. There needs to be better understanding of the science behind this as well as the proposals. The hope of the Deschutes Collaborative is to consider implementation of all four proposals so they will work for all of Oregon.

- Sid Liken (Lane County Board of Commissioners) – the public health authority in Lane County is strong and there is great support for LRAPA as well as a good relationship with ODF in Western Lane District. Collaboration among different counties is necessary for community outreach/support – engage Association of Oregon Counties (AOC).

#### ❖ **Working Lunch**

- Doug Grafe presented the policy trade-offs and the intrusion “goal post” slide and provided a brief overview of the Smoke Management Program and policy of the state, including data on intrusions, prescribed burning tonnage, and reiterated the need for prescribed burning to reduce the risk of wildfires across the landscape. He asked the group to consider what's acceptable and agreeable among DEQ and ODF.
- David Collier cautioned the group to be mindful of smoke into communities, especially those communities who are already at a higher risk. He mentioned agricultural burning smoke and cautioned the group to be mindful of that as well. We need to help protect people in the future but have to be cautious to not hurt them now as well, specifically the vulnerable population.

#### ❖ **Continued discussion on concept 2D (intrusions)**

- Mark Webb asked why the intrusion level is where it's at. He encouraged DEQ/EQC to examine the intrusion levels and focus on the issue of air undermining their other mission of protecting the landscape. There needs to be consensus from each member of this committee on intrusion levels.
- Amanda Stamper (The Nature Conservancy – proxy for Peter Caligiuri) cautioned on the need to not isolate intrusions with regard to the hourly threshold. She asked if other states base their intrusions on the same one-hour threshold. David Collier noted that Idaho has a one-hour guide but it is not an enforceable standard. Amanda noted the need to clearly identify what happens if you have an intrusion – consequences for NAAQS exceedance. From a burner's perspective, an intrusion is the same as a NAAQS exceedance versus an intrusion that is a nuisance. If we keep the one-hour threshold, we need to explain why.

- Chris Chambers (Ashland) – advocated for hitting the right-hand goal post as intrusions are not equal. He noted the EPA “exceptional event” rule which occasionally allows intrusions for certain circumstances.
- Bob Palzer (citizen at large) – concerned with seasonality and prescribed burning in that the current method doesn’t measure or single out prescribed burning from other smoke intrusions. He cautioned the group that it cannot consider exceedance of the NAAQS, even with regard to prescribed burning.
- David Cramsey suggested changing the definition of “light intrusions” (concept 2D) to something else. The goal is zero intrusions. To move all the way to NAAQS violations is too extreme and will lose acceptance from the burning community. The Smoke Management Program needs the ability to look at particulate matter in the future for a community. If they are unable to predict correctly, an intrusion occurs. He suggested more help for the SMP to change their financial structure. Emission reduction techniques study (polyethylene – PE) results show how to incorporate ERTs into the rating system.
- Willie Begay commented that moving to the left of the “goal post” will reduce the amount of acres treated. There are not enough smoke monitors in high risk areas and this needs to be looked at. He also noted that DEQ will soon be acquiring 30 nephelometers which will need certified smoke monitor(s) to measure exceptional events. Current monitoring is not adequate enough to determine what level of intrusion is best.
- Doug Grafe noted the need for changing the culture of Oregon to help the public understand the need for prescribed burning and that there will be smoke.
- Rick Graw mentioned that USFS is working to reduce air quality impacts and risk from wildfire, however there isn’t enough staff at DEQ with PhDs to determine what is a healthy standard or not, compared to EPA’s staff with PhDs. Additionally, EPA doesn’t have the science to back up shorter one-hour thresholds.
- Gregory McClarren said there is minimal concern with low and moderate level intrusions. The big concern are heavy intrusions.
- Kirsten Aird commented that agencies and boards will have to make decisions. OHA will not take a position to say smoke (even a little) from prescribed burning is “good” for public health. She suggested the need to find a middle ground where OHA accepts the fact that there will be a little risk to public health but will not support major risks.
- Merlyn Hough noted that on the Air Quality Index (AQI) part of the “goal post”, the 24-hour standard needs to be in green and intrusions are between the goal posts. He also mentioned the need for the Smoke Management Program to let the districts know how intrusions are categorized.

## ❖ Presentation of agency recommendations/rule changes from Fee Structure Subcommittee and Agencies (Nick Yonker)

- Fee Structure Subcommittee recommendations
  - Nick Yonker presented the results of the Fee Structure Subcommittee of the Smoke Management Review Committee (see website for PowerPoint). The end result/consensus from that subgroup is to not make any changes at this time and to review again at the next Smoke Management Review in five years.
  - Doug Grafe noted that there is no capacity to expand the Smoke Management Program.
  - Willie Begay commented that USFS/BLM has put in almost half of the fees to the SMP. Some fees are being paid from burning outside of the forestry boundary areas. He mentioned the new process for a single annual fee for BLM and USFS due to funding for fuels treatment at the regional level. The fees are for the amount registered not amount actually burned, which indirectly affects units at the forest/resource level.
  - Doug Grafe noted that ODF wanted to be transparent with fees for the Smoke Management Program so this committee understood the financial side.
  - Gregory McClarren asked who should pay for additional smoke monitors.
  - Mark Webb responded that landowners should and use their own discretion. He noted the need for frank conversation on how to achieve goals.
  
- ODF/DEQ agency recommendations
  - Nick Yonker also presented on the agency recommendations (see website for PowerPoint). Review of burning outside district boundaries was the main focus of discussion and it was determined the way current rules and statutes are structured, significant changes would be necessary to legally allow this type of jurisdictional control.
  - Policy changes
    - Polyethylene (PE) study results
      - Found that there were no more emissions with 6 mil and larger PE on burn piles.
      - Found that there is less emissions to use PE on piles to keep them dry prior to burning versus burning wet piles.
  - Mark Webb asked why legislative changes with burning outside district boundaries wasn't considered.
  - Nick Yonker responded that it is a lot of work and effort to push a legislative change through and neither ODF nor DEQ have the capacity to do so at this time.
  - Scott Hanson asked how often DEQ does a review of the rule burning outside district boundaries.

- David Collier responded that he is unsure but will look into it.

### ❖ **Wrap Up / Next Steps**

- David Collier stated that over the next month, ODF and DEQ will work to firm up the agency recommendations for review at the final meeting of this committee. There will also be a meeting with DEQ Air Quality Director and the State Forester.
- Doug Grafe commented that this has been a great process and the agencies will be doing staff work behind the scenes to finalize the recommendations.
- Mayor Stromberg mentioned that he will be going to Ashland City Council with a “Smoke-wise” program to get formal backing. He will report back to them on participation on this committee as well as propose a change so more burning can be done.
- Doug Grafe also noted that this committee’s proposals will be brought before the Board of Forestry at their April meeting.
- Ken Kestner mentioned that he would like data comparing the health effects of prescribed burning versus health effects of wildfire smoke in concept 2C, which wasn’t discussed today.

### ❖ **Next meeting**

- March 9, 2018 – Oregon Department of Forestry – Salem, OR

### ❖ **Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM**

### ❖ **Attendees**

- David Collier, DEQ Project Sponsor
- Doug Grafe, ODF Project Sponsor
- Dan Thorpe, ODF Facilitator
- Nick Yonker, ODF Project Manager
- Jim Gersbach, ODF Public Affairs
- Chrystal Bader, ODF Executive Support
- Gregory McClarren, Public Rep, SMAC Chair
- Dave Cramsey, Large Industrial Landowner Rep
- Scott Hanson, Non-industrial Landowner Rep
- Willie Begay, BLM Rep
- Rick Graw, USFS Rep
- Ramona Quinn (for Courtney Vanbragt), Klamath County Public Health
- Merlyn Hough, LRAPA Director
- Carrie Nyssen, American Lung Assoc.
- John Stromberg, Ashland Mayor
- Chris Chambers (City of Ashland Fire Dept. – attended with Mayor Stromberg)
- Bob Palzer, Citizen at Large
- Mike White, CFPA

- Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers & Oregon Tree Farm System
- Amanda Stamper (for Pete Caligiuri), The Nature Conservancy
- Mark Webb, Blue Mountain Forest Collaborative
- Jim James, Oregon Small Woodlands Association (OSWA)
- Kirsten Aird, Oregon Health Authority
- Ken Kestner, Lake County Commissioner

#### Public Participants

- Ed Keith, Deschutes County Forester
- Peter Brewer, DEQ
- Gary Springer, Starker Forests
- Mark Stern, The Nature Conservancy
- Katherine Benenati, DEQ
- Pat Skrip, DFPA
- Jeremy Felty, OSWA
- Jeff Classen, ODF
- Christina Clemons, ODF
- Mike Jackson, DFPA
- Richard Wise, (on behalf of Curry County Commissioner Boyce)
- Tracy Depew, Cow Creek Indian Tribe
- Sherry Fountain, USFS
- Sid Leiken, Lane County
- Sally Russell, Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project/Bend City Council
- Gary Leif, Douglas County Commissioners