

**IASC Small Group Brainstorming  
January 22, 2003**

**Results**

**Overview**

The IASC Brainstorming exercise occurred using the procedure described below in the Attachment that follows. Twenty-five people participated in the exercise to make up three small groups. The groups were slightly uneven in number and representation, but each group had a reasonable cross-section of expertise present. The groups were broken up as follows:

**Group 1** – Facilitator – Bruce Oulrey -- Recorder – Kurt Malone

Sam Jackson, NV BAQP  
Mike Beasley, NPS – Yosemite  
Gary B. Fildes, USFS  
Erich Linsee, Emeritus Meteorologist  
Corky Conover, NPS – PWR  
Jeff Lancero, ARB  
Kurt Malone, BAAQMD  
Kemal Gurer, ARB  
Annie Esperanza, NPS

**Group 2** – Facilitator/Recorder – Jeff Lindberg

Katy Warner, NPS  
John Kennedy, EPA  
Trent Procter, USFS  
Arndt Lorenzen, ARB  
Ann Hobbs, Placer Co. APCD  
Tom Sandelin, CDF  
Jerry McGowan, USFS  
Kristy Riggs, NPS – Point Reyes  
Jose Martinez, SJVAPCD  
Tom Larsen, CDF

**Group 3** – Facilitator – Ed Virgin -- Recorder – Cheryl Haden

Melissa Nicholas, TCAPCD  
Lloyd Green, NCUAQMD  
Chris Fontana, USFS  
Dick Duker, BAAQ MD  
Cheryl Haden, ARB  
Susan Engstrom, SMUAQMD

## **Overview (Cont.)**

Each group conducted a 1 ½ hour brainstorming session to identify strengths and weaknesses of California's Smoke Management Program and to suggest prioritized steps that should be taken to improve the Program. Each group's prioritized strengths, weaknesses, and next steps are summarized below.

### **Prioritized Strengths**

#### **Group 1**

- 1) Improved Communication Among Burners and Air Managers
  - a) Understanding of Mutual Goals
  - b) Day to Day Communication
  - c) Meteorologist to Meteorologist Communication
- 2) Better Analytical and Predictive Tools
- 3) Improved and More Consistent Burn Plan/SMP
- 4) Identification of Appropriate Monitoring Technologies
- 5) Networking Among All Agencies and Shared Resources

#### **Group 2**

- 1) IASC
  - a) More Agency Involvement
  - b) Improved Communication
  - c) Improved Cross-training
- 2) Communication Improved Among Agencies, Burners, Public, and Media
- 3) Public Education and Outreach
- 4) Standardization of Tools
- 5) More Cooperative Funding

#### **Group 3**

- 1) Strong Interagency Communication
  - a) Daily Reporting of Burns and Post Burn Evaluation
  - b) Daily Conference Calls
- 2) Better and More Public Education and Outreach on Routine Basis
- 3) More Attention from Management to Allocate Money and Resources
- 4) District Authority Heightened
- 5) Better Information on Emissions

## **Prioritized Weaknesses**

### **Group 1**

- 1) What Constitutes a Valid Complaint (Nuisance Call)
  - a) Consistency of Definition and Use from Air District to Air District
  - b) Use for Measuring Smoke Impact and for Issuing Notice of Violation
- 2) Poor Dissemination of Smoke Management Information to the Public
  - a) To Help Public Understand Issues and the Law
  - b) To Help Public Understand Forest Health/Public Health Trade-offs
- 3) Forecasters Need to Understand How Things Work in the Field
  - a) Need Feedback from Burners
  - b) Need Actual Field Observation
  - c) Difficulties with Full Fall Burn Season
  - d) Sharing of Lessons Learned
- 4) Slow Development of Forecasting Tools – (PFIRS, MM5, etc.)
- 5) Non-uniform PM Monitoring

### **Group 2**

- 1) Problems with PFIRS Development
- 2) Lack of Uniform Requirements
  - a) Air District to Air District
  - b) Agency to Agency
  - c) Area to Area
  - d) Burner to Burner
- 3) Technical Tools Development
  - a) Inventory
  - b) Monitoring
  - c) Modeling
  - d) Data Availability
- 4) Cost of Implementing Rules
  - a) Equity is Needed Between Prescribed Burn Fees and Ag Burn Fees
  - b) Costs Should be Addressed in Government Budget Versus Fees
- 5) More Incentives Should Be Provided for Alternatives to Burning

### **Group 3**

- 1) PFIRS is Still Not Available
- 2) Lack of State of the Art Meteorological Tools and Procedures
- 3) SMP Should Not Specify Parameters (e.g., Mixing Height) Which Can't Be Measured By Burner in the Field
- 4) Budget Constraints
- 5) Difficulty with Conducting Long-term Burns
- 6) Complaints from Public Burners about Why Agency Burns Can Occur on No-burn Days

## **Prioritized Next Steps**

### **Group 1**

- 1) IASC and Interagency Communication Must Continue
- 2) Air and Land Manger Agency Staff Need to Educate Agency Management and Decision Makers about the Need for Enhanced Tools, including Data Collection (Met and AQ), Modeling, and Analysis
- 3) Agency PIO Experts Need to Assist with Helping to Disseminate Information to the Public (in Plain English) about What We're Doing, Why, How, and the Consequences of Smoke
- 4) ARB/Air Districts/IASC Needs to Investigate How Air Districts Determine Public Nuisance Complaints and How That Information is Used to Issue NOVs and Fines
- 5) IASC and Member Agencies Need to Develop and Clarify Consistent Protocols for Reporting Burn Results

### **Group 2**

- 1) IASC Member Agencies Need to Wage a World-class Public Education Campaign on Prescribed Burning and Smoke Management. Must be:
  - a) Well Organized Plan
  - b) Have Upper Management Support
  - c) Have Sufficient Funding
  - d) Include PSAs, Improved Website, and More User-friendly
  - e) Consistent Message from All Agencies
- 2) Develop Mechanism for More Consistency and Uniformity Across Jurisdictions
  - a) Develop Lead Agency Type Management
  - b) Use Certified Equivalence of SMPs
  - c) Standardize Information from Burners
  - d) Develop Regional Sub-groups
  - e) Cover all Types of Burning
- 3) Continue Technical Tools Development
  - a) Consistent Monitoring
  - b) Provide Money for CANSAC
  - c) Emissions Reporting
  - d) Real Emissions Factors
  - e) Smoke Modeling
  - f) Education
  - g) PFIRS

### **Group 3**

- 1) Implement CANSAC and PFIRS
- 2) Complete ARB/FS MOU
- 3) Complete ARB/CDF MOU
- 4) Follow the Money
- 5) Improve Smoke Monitoring Infrastructure

## Attachment

### Smoke Management Program

#### IASC Small Group Brainstorming January 22, 2003

This small group breakout session is designed to give IASC members an opportunity to share their vision for how California's smoke management program (Program) should work in 2003 and beyond. The breakout session will help us to focus on the Program's strengths, weaknesses, and steps we (as IASC) can take to bring about our shared vision of an improved smoke management program. We'll break into three to six small groups -- depending on how many members are present -- and identify the top three to five most important ideas for each session topic (strengths, weaknesses, and next steps). Each group will have a facilitator, recorder, and time keeper, and all ideas will be recorded on chart paper. There is no such thing as a bad idea for this exercise. Once the exercise has begun, please remember there should be no cross-talking and no commenting on another person's idea until everyone has had a chance to get their idea recorded.

Group member ideas will be recorded using a round-robin technique (one idea per member in a circular fashion, until all member ideas for a given session topic are exhausted). We'll spend about one-half hour collecting and prioritizing ideas about strengths, then one-half hour using the process for weaknesses, and then one-half hour using the same process to identify next steps we can take to improve the smoke management program. Each idea should be kept to less than one minute. After the group has got all its ideas recorded for a given topic, discussion may begin to advocate for one idea over another. During the last five minutes for each topic area, group members will be asked to put a check mark next to the seven ideas they think are most important for that topic area. The top three to five group priorities for that topic area should then be restated on a separate piece of chart paper for later reporting out to the large group. The group will then move on to the next topic area and repeat the process. Time is of the essence.

After all three topic areas are completed, one or more group spokespersons will then prepare a five to ten minute synopsis of what the group came up with for each topic area and report back to the large group during the last half-hour of the exercise. Again, please try to stay on time for this exercise. Further discussion may occur if a group finishes all three topic areas early, and additional discussion may occur at future IASC meetings if this is a beneficial exercise. The prioritized ideas will be included in the IASC meeting summary that will be on the IASC webpage [www.arb.ca.gov/smp/progdev/iasc/iasc.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/smp/progdev/iasc/iasc.htm)

The process of aligning individual visions to create a shared vision of the future should be valuable in helping us to address the challenges we face together.

# **Smoke Management Program**

**Small Group Brainstorming  
January 22, 2003**

## **A G E N D A**

- |           |                                           |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------|
| 2:55 p.m. | Session Clarification – Break into Groups |
| 3:00 p.m. | Small Group -- Program Strengths          |
| 3:30 p.m. | Small Group -- Program Weaknesses         |
| 4:00 p.m. | Small Group -- Next Steps                 |
| 4:30 p.m. | Reconvene Large Group – Report-Outs       |
| 5:00 p.m. | Adjourn                                   |

