

2008 Regional Smoke Management Meeting

Small Group Break-out Session Results

Group #1: North Idaho/Eastern Washington

- One stop shopping
- Timely model products, consultation and calls
- Exempt issue: wood burning for residential development and land clearing
- AirPact: 12 km grid for WRF wildfire
- Clear sky
- Other stakeholders to be included (that were not included in this discussion)
National Weather Service, industrial and silvaculture, EPA Region 8, Tribal forestry, Idaho Dept. of Lands, Local Clean Air Agencies, NW Communicators.
Where are these PEOPLE?
- Advantages to increased coordination: public education, common data base design, level playing field, and multi jurisdictional consistency
- Drawbacks or barriers to increased coordination: jurisdictional authority, ambiguity, resources,
- Remedies/actions: support populating Fire Emissions Tracking System (FETS), communicate to create the opportunity for cooperation, more training for burners,
- Protect Public Health
- Note to the Executives: Review the community's performance and define shortcomings. Is something broken that we need to fix?

Group #2: South Central Oregon

- Burners:
 - USFS
 - BLM
 - USFWS
 - ODF
 - NPS
 - Oregon Parks and Rec
 - The Nature Conservancy
 - Private ag land
 - Private forest land
 - Domestic open burning
 - Irrigation districts
 - Residential wood combustion

Deciders:

ODF Salem
ARB Sacramento
California APCDs
Klamath Co. (wood stoves and open burning)

Gaps:

How to best use capacity of air shed

How to best use meteorological forecasting tools and coordinate between Ca., and Or.

Need 2-way communication between burners in both Ca. and Or.

Some burners do not report

Need uniform database (map) of realtime burn locations

Need accurate emission estimates of different burn types

More site specific forecast : e.g. SODAR

Nest Steps:

Need another meeting to include more burners

Finalize map of SSAs (cities > 2000) class I areas, and land use

Daily e-mail communications

Class I areas may need to be addressed

Hold annual meeting to review air quality impacts, complaints and overall progress

Identify a core group/planning team

Group #3: Eastern Oregon

- Transport: Cross boundary (Or. to Wa.) coordination is paramount due to microclimate and micro terrain that can't be forecast... need local knowledge and coordination
- Resource issues: some programs are pretty sophisticated with adequate resources, other aren't/don't. Coordinate for assistance
- Who's making the 'burn call': habitat or producer organizations vs air quality agencies. Need coordination to reach a common goal
- Coordination is needed to get information about the "gaps" (burning that is not covered by a smoke management program) and to improve practices in these areas. Potential assistance from NRCS.
- Work toward smoke management program transparency: will greatly facilitate coordination... takes resources
- Coordinate "burn" "no burn" calls
- Coordination of who's planning to burn... USFS vs ag
- How to bring in climate change issues for all combustion
- Resources: fees to burn
- Need a driver: lawsuits, NAAQS,
- Use community informers to assist the program
- Need for 'mutual coordination' cuz nobody is overseeing the whole big picture
- Alternatives to burning:
 - Onsite biodiesel
 - Cellulosic biofuel
 - Soil enhancement
 - Straw board
 - Pellets

Burn Boxes; should States take on the cross program coordination role?

Executive Team Notes:

- They need to see ALL this information, not just one or two points. They need to see the whole picture.
- Need to include people attending this workshop in the Executive Meeting to ensure adequate coverage of the issues

Group #4: Eastern Washington

- Why coordinate?
 - Develop a more common vision
 - Better understanding among agencies on the reasons, use, and methods of burning
 - Be proactive, not reactive
 - Learn from each other: Education of the public, other agencies, managers
- Drawbacks to increased coordination/communication:
 - Resources and other commitments
 - Perceptions
 - Trust issues
 - Determining who to coordinate with
 - Speaking the same language and delivering the same message
 - Who takes the lead in bringing it all together

Barriers to increased communication

- Decision tools used and support for them
- Timing of decisions

How to overcome barriers:

- Develop baseline decision process: daily burn decision protocol
- Have a mechanism to share lessons learned
- Have information accessible to make decisions
- Develop a centralized system to track burning, smoke management decisions, monitoring data, and plume trajectory
- Training
- Find a sponsor group to bring together information or develop a consortium
- Better FARR/Tribal information sharing
- Develop one stop shopping for information

Definition/Goal:

- Determine agreed parameters for making a burn call (times & tools)
- Maximize the use of burning as a tool while protecting air quality
- Thorough cross training and education to work together

Executive team Suggestions:

- Need support and direction to make it happen

- Who will take the lead?
- RESOURCES

Group #5: Western Washington

- Increased coordination between State, Local and Tribal air agencies and appropriate health departments when issuing health advisories to the public when air quality levels reach elevated levels that could cause adverse health response. This would help build capacity to deliver health messages and involve public health agencies in delivering health messages. Not all health departments are currently prepared to issue health messages, thus care should be taken to develop a coordinated effort.
- Increase coordination in website construction and public notification among agencies. This coordination would include:
 - One Stop shopping
 - Weekly data transfer, use of centralized GIS for BlueSky-Reins.
 - Public outreach on rules of burning
 - Sharing resources
 - Increased public understanding of roles of different agencies,
 - Complaints
- Complaint driven problems identified without ‘finger pointing’.
 - Everyone knows their neighbor, rural volunteer fire departments often used as ‘enforcement agency’ but are reluctant to enforce against their neighbor.
- Monitoring (impacts) is an important tool (e.g. Naches Pilot Study) for realtime appropriate response
- Public outreach will increase awareness of burning, need for burning, and actions individuals may take to reduce exposure

Group #6: Western Oregon

- More communication on wildfire burning
 - Use satellite imagery to see where plume is going and include on websites
 - Interagency Fire Coordination Centers
 - Develop data base of historical burning on a given day
 - Early and often communication
 - Communication during a wildland fire use fire

Opportunity to mitigate health impacts:

- Share expertise & Data
- Protect those who are sensitive to smoke
- Quicker feedback is more useful
- Clear & coordinated communications

Opportunity for further regulation

Incident response barriers
Jurisdictional battles
Diverse players with diverse missions

Communication should focus on understanding other's 'mission'
Information Officer on wildland fire could provide information to local agencies
Incident communications tree
Centralized burn data base with modeled smoke plume, as close to realtime as possible
and visually displayed