

Raw Data from Spring 2018 Community Issues Forum Residential Wood Burning Topic

During the Spring 2018 Community Issues Forum – a joint event between the City of Fort Collins and the CSU Center for Public Deliberation -- one of the two topics explored was the issue of residential wood burning. This preliminary document has all of the raw data collected before and during the event. A separate report is being completed that provides an analysis of this information and suggestions for moving forward.

Section	Page #
Part 1: Pre-survey results from online event RSVP	2
Part 2: Keypad results from event	6
Part 3: Written comments from event worksheets	9
What do you most want city council to know about your opinion on this issue?	17
Part 4: Notes from table discussions	20

Part 1: Pre-survey results from online event RSVP

Participants were asked to RSVP to the event through an online link, and were asked an initial set of questions about the topics. This section has the results provided by the 96 individuals that provided information.

Q2 - How often have you or anyone in your household ever experienced air quality impacts from a neighbor's property that you would consider to be a health concern or nuisance in or around your residence due to wood smoke from outdoor residential burning?

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Frequently	10.3%	10
2	Occasionally	13.4%	13
3	Rarely	23.7%	23
4	Never	52.6%	51
	Total	100%	97

Q3 - I think the City of Fort Collins should:

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree or disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Count
Respond to concerns with education and outreach regarding safety and health impacts of smoke, and offer use of the City's free neighbor mediation program.	24	35	25	7	5	96
	25%	36%	26%	7%	5%	
Provide rebates for alternative fuel outdoor recreational fires, such as propane or natural gas.	13	18	27	13	24	95
	14%	19%	28%	14%	25%	
Require neighbor notification prior to wood burning.	7	14	28	21	25	95
	7%	15%	29%	22%	26%	
Implement policies that mandate wood fires are extinguished when a reasonable nuisance concern is reported.	17	23	31	12	13	96
	18%	24%	32%	13%	14%	
Implement policies that prohibit wood burning on days when regional air pollution is high (generally during the winter).	31	28	20	8	9	96
	32%	29%	21%	8%	9%	
Implement policies that prohibit wood fires after a certain time of day.	11	16	31	16	22	96
	11%	17%	32%	17%	23%	
Implement policies that prohibit or ban use of wood as a fuel for outdoor recreational fires.	18	7	22	20	28	95
	19%	7%	23%	21%	29%	

Text from “Other” option at the end of the “I think the City of Fort Collins should” question

- Permanently ban this ignorant form of narcissistic entertainment
- For those living in rural FC, wood burning may be primary way to dispose of refuse.
- I don't see this as a problem
- This should include no "smokers" for meat.
- No supervised burning either barbeque grills or leaves or trash, especially when windy.
- ban gasoline mowers!
- Educate public on negative health impacts, and contribution to brown cloud and air quality degradation compounding summer red alert air quality days.
- Stop inventing problems to solve. There are more important things to focus on.
- Ban the sale of firepits (the stand-alone kind) and prohibit builders/remodelers from building wood-burning firepits (the way we have banned most indoor wood fireplaces). There is no way to make an outdoor wood pit that eliminates the odor and particulates from the smoke so they should be banned altogether.
- If backyard wood fires are regulated, then wood burning stoves and fireplaces will need to be also.
- People have a right to be able to not have their home smell like woodsmoke . people also have a right to have clean(not smoky) air in their home. In the summer it is too hot to close the windows and even if one has air conditioning it gets sucked into the air intake.
- All wood is not created equal, provide guidelines for 'acceptable' natural products

Any questions or comments about the above list?

- Encouraging use of natural gas for outdoor fires is not in line with Climate Action Plan goals for reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.
- My thinking is that all the cars with outdated exhaust systems are a greater threat to our health and more of a problem. Might it not be better to vastly improve our public transit system and offer city rebates for electric and hybrid vehicles.
- Just the other day some one had a back yard fire, the smoke was so bad we had to leave our house. It took 2 days of fresh air to get rid of the fire smell from our furniture and rugs. How the hell is that freedom to pursue happiness? Want to have a camp fire? GO CAMPING!!! Ban fire pits.
- n/a
- Our city has more pressing concerns than this issue.
- What about barbecues ? And other outdoor smoke producing devices in backyards and parks? Stoves
- What are you going to control next...outdoor bar-b-q-ing?
- The ban would be most preferable, due to health concerns. 2. If no ban, then we support some of the other items as indicated.
- The city of Fort Collins is all about shutting down something when a few people complain. Now you want to dictate what I can and can't do at my home. I understand controlling the size of a fire and ensuring people are burning clean firewood, but shutting it down completely is ridiculous. This city has a lot more problems than outdoor fire pits. You have

a serious speeding issue, people think traffic signs are a suggestion, and there are no consequences even if you kill someone. People drive in the bike lanes all of the time. You are so concerned about stepping on people's little sensitive emotions, that you are not making Fort Collins safe. The sole focus is downtown. Used to love living in Fort Collins but it is becoming another Boulder, and it is getting ridiculous living here.

- Colorado's very dry and now, often windy weather cannot afford the luxury of open fires.
- Enjoy your property without poisoning my air. It is stupid that the city regulates chimney smoke that goes over my house but not pit smoke that goes in my house.
- Not enough information; What motivates this as a priority (other than some complaints)? How much of a real issue does this represent?
- I'd been told years ago that outdoor fires were not allowed in town. So good to find that they are allowed.
- This should be a community health and safety priority and an immediate ban on backyard recreational burning should be instituted. To date, education and mediation have been ineffective. A compromise on this issue compromises human health.
- no
- The list, like the website and the policy position overall, pre-supposes a problem. The reality is, 56 complaints in 10 years is hardly worthy of the city's attention. The reality is, listing toxins in smoke is a useless factoid unless you also list how much of that toxin is dangerous and how much is actually disbursed into the environment. The reality is, even the EPA has stopped short of condemning outdoor smoke (the page the city links to refers to indoor smoke hazards and lists the possibility of haze as the only outdoor harm). The fact is, the social benefits of outdoor firepits that bring neighbors together FAR outweigh any social harms that you might try to use to justify city action.
- Given the density of the population within city limits, and how wood-burning fires impose wood smoke on everyone in the neighborhood, as well as the overall impact on air quality and fire danger, I strongly feel the practice should be banned.
- N/A
- Our community has unanimously responded to second hand smoke as a health issue and banned smoking in public places. Why does the city not embrace wood smoke, which is more harmful, as a health issue similar to the second hand smoke. Both woodsmoke and second hand cigarette smoke cannot be controlled outdoors and travels beyond personal borders to adversely affect others.
- Aren't there more important issues to be addressing in Fort Collins? Why not provide a rebate for residents who update their fences?
- Not sure where this is going. What data supports this? How is wood different than any other potential particulate sources?
- not well informed on this issue
- A ban is the only way that this issue can be addressed. There is no way that an outdoor fire is "safe" for anyone who breathes. Education about why there will be a ban should be part of the process, but allowing people who think this is their "right" to dictate policy is wrong. This isn't a "traditional" activity. It's relatively new and needs to be nipped in the ... I would say bud but it's too late for that... nipped before the seeds set.

- What is COMPLETELY ironic is there is a blind eye to the HEALTH implications of how we GET natural gas and propane! These are fossil fuels and obtain them, via fracking, has serious health and environmental implications - THIS FACT needs to be part of the discussion and STUDY.
- Not at this time
- Clean air to breathe is a right. Burning wood in the back yard where the smoke blows into your neighbors' windows and air intakes is a health hazard.
- It is apparent from the questions the City intends to act based upon predetermination of a problem.
- This doesn't speak to if there would be a ban on burning wood for heat indoors on high pollution days - which many older homes need to do.
- Part of the mediation can also be an expansion of "Neighborhood Services, Neighbor Connections" (not sure of exact title) that encourages and promotes being neighborly and connecting with the people you live by so conversations about outdoor burning can occur in a non-confrontational, friendly way.
- No
- Too many city regulations already.
- Basic education on materials to burn/not to burn; fire starters, etc. are necessary. Many have little or no idea of fires, pollution, and safety.

Q24 - How often do you burn an outdoor recreational wood fire at your home?

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Frequently	6.12%	6
2	Occasionally	14.29%	14
3	Rarely	20.41%	20
4	Never	59.18%	58
	Total	100%	98

Part 2: Keypad questions – Gathered at the beginning of the event

1. What decade were you born?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
After 1990	5.45%	3
1980s	12.73%	7
1970s	10.91%	6
1960s	20%	11
1950s	34.55%	19
1940s	14.55%	8
1930s	0%	0
1920s	1.82%	1
1910s	0%	0
1900s	0%	0
Totals	100%	55

2. What is your household income?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Less than \$20,000	9.43%	5
\$20,000-34,999	9.43%	5
\$35,000-49,999	1.89%	1
\$50,000-74,999	20.75%	11
\$75,000 or \$99,999	16.98%	9
Over \$100,000	30.19%	16
Prefer not to answer	11.32%	6
Totals	100%	53

3. In which Fort Collins Council District do you live?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
District 1 (NE)	23.21%	13
District 2 (E)	7.14%	4
District 3 (SE)	3.57%	2
District 4 (SW)	16.07%	9
District 5 (W)	14.29%	8
District 6 (NW)	30.36%	17
Larimer County outside city	5.36%	3
Outside Larimer County	0%	0
Totals	100%	56

4. What best describes your racial or ethnic background?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
White, non-Hispanic	78.05%	32
Black or African American	0%	0
Asian / Pacific Islander	0%	0
Hispanic or Latino	4.88%	2
Middle Eastern	0%	0
Native American or American Indian	4.88%	2
Other	2.44%	1
Prefer not to answer	9.76%	4
Totals	100%	41

5. What best describes your gender identity?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Male	51.35%	19
Female	43.24%	16
Transgender	0%	0
Non-binary/Third Gender	2.70%	1
Prefer to self-describe	0%	0
Choose not to answer	2.70%	1
Totals	100%	37

To introduce the wood burning issue, a few questions were asked of the audience. These questions were essentially trivia questions to see the current level of understanding

6. Is this fire pit legal?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	21.43%	12
No	33.93%	19
Not enough info to know	44.64%	25
Totals	100%	56



The correct answer is no because containment walls must be above grade level. The fire must have containment around the entire perimeter with no large openings. Only a third of the participants answered correctly.

7. What fuels can be burned in an outdoor residential fire (select all that apply)

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Fresh cut wood	35.71%	20
Clean, dry wood	82.14%	46
Yard Waste	10.71%	6
Trash	5.36%	3
Propane or natural gas	62.50%	35
Totals		110

Because this question was “select all that apply,” the percentage column shows the percentage of participants that picked that answer as one of their answers. The correct answers were clean dry wood and propane or natural gas.

8. Is this fire pit legal?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	4.08%	2
No	83.67%	41
Not enough info to know	12.24%	6
Totals	100%	49



Pit was not legal because the wood pile should be no wider than 3 feet, or higher than 2 feet.

9. What distance should a fire pit be from combustible structures, such as a home, deck or fence?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
5 ft	3.77%	2
10 ft	15.09%	8
15 ft	32.08%	17
20 ft	30.19%	16
No restrictions, but reasonable safety precautions should be followed	18.87%	10
Totals	100%	53

Correct answer is 15 feet.

10. Is this fire pit legal?

	Responses	
	Percent	Count
Yes	86.79%	46
No	5.66%	3
Not enough info to know	7.55%	4
Totals	100%	53



This fire pit was legal.

Part 4: Written comments from event worksheets

During the process, participants were provided a worksheet that both provided the structure for the conversation as well as a place to write individual comments if they so chose. This section includes all the participants' comments, word for word. Participants were not asked to complete the worksheets fully, except for the final question asking them for what they would want city council to know about the issue after their conversation.

Comments on key features of current policy

- "Agreed" on 2nd and 3rd bullet points, In general, I support the current policy
- Apparently this is a big deal
- What about indoor wood burning fireplaces and stoves? Isn't there very little outside fire pits compared to indoor wood burning?

Supporting arguments for current policy

The worksheet listed four arguments that were developed from the analysis of public comments before the meeting. Participants had the opportunity to respond to those arguments.

Social benefit of enjoying the outdoors

- (checked)
- Agree
- Needs to be away from populated areas
- This is important for getting people together.

Personal investment made under current rules

- Agree
- If a total ban happened, could buy backs or trades for gas burning equipment be instituted.
- Not that many

- Perhaps rebates like lawn mowers

Concerns about government overreach

- Agree
- Allows HOA's to create stricter ordinances if they desire

Concerns that the limited number of complaints do not justify significant action

- Agree
- We have bad air already, so any major increase in complaints should trigger some regulations
- Very low # compared to # of city residents
- Do not agree. This may be an artifact of lack of awareness.

Additional comments

- Citizens who have respiratory issues. Difficulty being able to communicate with our neighbors.

Concerns about current policy

Nuisance to neighbors (particularly those without AC or that prefer to have windows open at night)

- (checked)
- Interrelated.
- Don't burn on still days - inversion
- if so, why not BBQ, smokers

Health concerns (particularly those with respiratory issues)

- (checked)
- Keep wood dry
- Primary concerns
- What is the impact? metrics?

Environmental concerns

- (checked)
- What is danger?
- Yes

Additional concerns

- Nothing in policy current that addresses smoke affecting others
- We moved here 5 years ago and chose a neighborhood with only gas burning fireplaces, no wood stoves. Nevertheless, we can smell smoke sometimes and need to close windows.
- Equity issues/discrimination for those with small properties.

Additional comments about current policy

- Inconsistencies. Who is monitoring air quality? "open burning" Where is the location? Is a house on fire?
- How much is the current policy known by citizens?
- The City could enhance education efforts and also encourage open communications among neighbors about being willing to work with one another to maintain good relations around fires.
- The # of complaints could/should have been divided according to health, fire safety, and environmental concerns and all of them.
- Is there any data about health impact and indoor air quality changes that are directly related to (consequences of) recreational outdoor fires?
- Why limit to only outdoor wood fires? Why exclude BBQ, smokers, and other outside fires/ Why exclude indoor fires? What about out disturbances such as smoking, noise, light trespassing? Dog barking!
- Have additional resource for complaint

Comments on potential compromises

The worksheet listed seven potential ideas that present potential compromises between the current policy and a total ban for participants to discuss.

- 1. Reasonable nuisance fire ban (complaints can lead to extinguishing the fire or limiting future fires)**
 - Yes Bonfires? Constant nuisance?
 - No
 - if multiple complaints by more than one party
 - multiple by more than one party
- 2. Limit in certain locations based on density**
 - maybe
 - Single family dwellings only?
 - no
 - None in Fort Collins neighborhoods
 - X (depends on density numbers)
 - on housing or people
 - ?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Yes - more chance of impacts to neighbors
 - Y
 - (checked)

3. Limit which days someone can have a fire (e.g. Friday and Saturday only)

- X
- no
- Enforcement?
- X
- No
- Doesn't make sense
- No!
- This assumes everyone has a schedule that has a "weekend" and is discriminatory
- N
- We need to breathe everyday
- Y
- No

4. Limit burning to certain hours of day (e.g. fires out by 11 pm)

- X
- Will this help an asthma inflicted person?
- no
- This should definitely be put in policy as people like to be home at night to sleep
- Ok
- Ok
- Yes
- No!
- This could be helpful for neighbors who wish to have open windows at night
- N
- by 4pm. or sunset. At night is more problematic
- N
- ??

5. Seasonal ban (warm or cold seasons)

- X
- no
- People burn fires year round
- X
- No
- No!
- No
- N
- Y
- No

6. Limit based on atmospheric conditions (e.g. high pollution advisory days)

- already available
- Yes
- no
- Public health
- Denver has high pollution day, no fire bans
- or high wind days
- Ok
- Yes, most important
- Yes
- No!
- Wouldn't address nuisance impact
- Y
- (checked)

7. Require longer distance from property line

- ?
- ?
- no
- Properties are too small
- X
- No
- what about small lot sizes?
- Yes
- N
- N
- No

Any additional potential compromises?

- I support the current policy w/out any change, w/ possible #7
- Use gas
- Gas grills
- Are some of these already covered by existing rules?
- I would support 2 through 6 as compromises
- Do current burning restrictions (dry weather) extend to fire pits?
- Public education
- add safety, community/shared fire pits
- If had neighbor complaint, call and let them know you will be burning that night. Have more enforcement/repercussions for repeat offenders who burn banned substances. We have lived by the wildfires which are way worse.
- Increase education on what is allowable and how to handle situation
- 2 and 7 are combined , the idea is to have more buffer

- No partial ban. Only total ban

Mechanisms - Notifications to neighbors

- How to keep track of neighbor
- This is advisable but not likely to happen
- Smoke travels further than current neighbors
- Certain radius of neighbors to notify
- Allows one to close windows
- Who would notify whom?
- Maybe voluntary (not required, but just general neighborly "if our fires ever bother you, please tell us.")
- from whom to whom?
- Everyone or no one? Not realistic?
- No
- Ridiculous
- Not safe due to uncivil nature of current discourse

Mechanisms - note to city

- Not reasonable as not all cooking/recreational fires as planned
- Not realistic
- No
- N
- Ridiculous
- Enforcement has not been successful in resolving backyard burning complaints. Rather it has worsened with a higher rate of backyard burning and a higher rate of non-compliance

Mechanism - Permitting of set up

- 1 time check by city, voluntary, just to protect self. Requirement of homes to have fire extinguisher if so.
- How far? Need permit send texts to everyone registered
- maybe, if supported by data
- No, are you kidding?
- No
- N
- Ridiculous

Mechanism - Permit ind events

- This becomes way too much overreach
- No, city would want to have a fee set. You should not have to pay.
- ?
- No, are you kidding?

- No
- N
- Ridiculous

Additional mechanisms

- this becomes way too much overreach
- In my view, no additional changes are needed
- Communication and mediation most important
- Education campaign. Inversions
- education via city monthly ?? ??
send letter warnings
Enforce fines against 3x violations
- A continuation of limiting days and hours, notifying neighbors, especially those with sensitivities or to HOA to protect privacy as HOA can communicate to all neighbors, and permits/registration to city
City could create a map of folks burning when requiring a registration of days and time of fire so folks can avoid those areas.
- I would support potential mechanisms.
- City ought to offer incentives for gas fire pits as part of its commitment to clean air
- More public education
- Keep abreast of low cost technologies coming down the pike such as inexpensive sensors for air quality impediments that might be distributed to the community.
- Provide education and safety measures , add "must have requirements" e.g. hose, fire extinguisher, sand, etc.
- Notify specific neighbors who have had problems
- All of this is too difficult to implement
- We've reached a city-wide population and neighborhood

Support for total ban - fully addresses

- I support
- Yes
- Yes!

Support for total ban - easier to enforce

- I support
- Yes
- Yes!

Support for total ban – incentive

- No, this increases dependency on fossil fuels
- Good idea for smoke, doesn't help with other issues (noise, drinking)
- (checked)
- I like this. Like lawnmower rebate, but we shouldn't have a total ban.

- Not everyone has gas connections
- Sure
- Increase tax? who pays? cost?
- Yes!

Additional comments in support of total ban

- I do not support
- Gas and propane have issues as well

Concerns - takes ind right

- (checked)
- Agree
- TRUE
- No
- What about the rights of neighbor's impacted?
- Breathing is the right here and trumps social "fun"

Concerns - prior investment

- (checked)
- Agree
- TRUE
- How about a rebate to get rid of /replace with gas
- Air is not limited to one person's property

Concerns - gov overreach

- (checked)
- Agree
- very true
- this is a role of government
- Government should be involved in this issue as a public health concern.

Additional concerns

- Absolutely not, no ban! None of this addresses smoking of meat that puts out much more smoke than a fire. There are more complaints about pet noise than fire. There are more complaints about smoking downtown in violation of the smoking ban. Should get more focus than backyard fires.
- there isn't a mandate to enforce a ban
- With increase of complaints, maybe offer incentives to convert or end fire pits.
- Compromises necessary - currently few complaints per capita
- There is not enough (any) evidence that recreational outdoor fires are an actual problem beyond some people (ave ~ 15/yr) calling the city to complain about them.
- Total ban on ALL combustion. Indoor and outdoor. gas mowers, and automobiles.
- This is a human health, social justice issue. It is every human's right to breathe clean air.

What do you most want city council to know about your opinion on this issue?

- The scope of this investigation is too limited to be of any value. Without including woodburning stoves, fireplaces, and the like, this discussion/investigation is not a good use of resources. There is not an issue. The city should not be spending resources on this.
- Disagree with any changes; support the education of mediation.
- Sounds like the city has the problem under control
- I don't believe there is a problem that needs compromise or resolution. The current wood burning guidelines are sufficient.
- Ban wood burning. Okay gas only
- I support a total ban on outdoor wood burning. My right to breath clean air supercedes another's right to burn and pollute the air I breathe.
- Ban woodburning. Gas fire pits ok.
- Health issues requires action. If 1 in 4 residents have air quality issues, maybe gas only is the answer.
- Please all gas outdoor. Suggest only allow open wood fires by specific permit per incident, with strong enforcement and fines for violation.
- We live in a community and we need rules and framework that helps us account for each other's health considerations and preferences. At the very least, I hope there is some reasonable rules around outdoor burning.
- I think a total ban of wood fires would have alot of resistance from residents. Compliance with 15 foot setback would be helpful. A partial ban based on density may be helpful. Those with respiratory problems should have the option of no fires nearby.
- The information presented (and my lack of deep understanding of this as an issue) do not allow me to further contribute.
- Focus on the real issue behind this. Is it about air health concerns? That means other policy must be attended to first. Is it about the environment? other more pending policy must be attended to first (i.e. recycling and landfill filling up). If the real issue is government overreach, then we must offer incentives. if its about people not talking to neighbors, we must help change that culture first.
- If smoke is a major issue. Banning fires. In general health issues, how do we control other environmental issues that effect air, cars, construction, road work, etc. all will and do have potential health issues.
- To ban outdoor residential burning would be a complete overreach by government. Banning should only be considered in the case of atmospheric conditions. So, for that matter, more considerations should be taken for those with respiratory issue (i.e. fracking and large cattle feeding operations & large scale agriculture!!!)
- I think some elements of this worksheet (nuisance complaints, limits based on density, limits based on environmental conditions) are -- or could be -- covered by existing regulations/processes (nuisance reporting, fire distance regulations, burn bans, etc.). If possible, we should use regulations that already exist instead of making new ones.
- Do nothing.
- Use common sense, too small of percentage to address issue.

- I'm fine with the current policy. I would oppose a complete ban. Improve the mediation and education around specific concerns between neighbors.
- No issue has been identified. 50 people objecting to whatever_ does not constitute an issue that 150,000 people should be spending resources to consider.
- Stay out. Leave it alone. Current rules are good.
- it seems that having a registration system wherein people notify the city of wanting to be notified if a fire will be nearby (maybe 2 mile radius) of a specific address. Fire users could call in/email/use website to notify the city that they wanted to have a fire. Using a mapping system, the city could tell a potential user that it is ok. At the same time, the system would notify, those that wanted to be notified, that a fire has been approved to occur within 2 miles of their address.
- A total ban wouldn't eliminate wood burning fires - it's better to give folks choices and parameters to work in. Use a combo of partial ban ideas to create most effective policy that address concerns about health and smoke and allows people to enjoy the social aspect of fires.
- I don't have strong opinions about this but based on other's thoughts and compromise a yearly permit with electronic notification of concerned citizens when there will be a backyard fire might work.
- Total ban unlikely, but a centralized notification system that informs those sensitive to smoke before folks in their "neighborhood" start burning would be useful so windows can be closed.
- The smell of the smoke in the air.
- This is an important issue.
- No change to current policy is warranted.
- Unnecessary overreach given the limited scope of the problem city-wide.
- Based upon the few number of recorded complaints on this issue, I think concerns should be on hold unless the existing problems escalate over time.
- That a Vibrant Neighborhood Grants program is great. Let's keep fostering vibrant neighborhoods, focus on face to face problem solving among neighbors and fostering good will, and refrain from enforcing bans of wood burning.
- If the number of complaints were to increase by 100%, then this issue may need to create some restrictions.
- This seems like a minor issue compare to other more pressing community issues.
- Small issue - more important issues for city to deal with.
- More info needed. Appreciate the city's interest in planning ahead.
- Not for a ban.
- Identify the most vulnerable populations based on health concerns (asthma, COPD, etc.). Allow those people to register, once medical issue is verified, allow those families/households to create a "no-fire" zone in their neighborhood. The city would then inform the surrounding residents that fires are not allowed.
- Where are the most vulnerable populations. Create no fire zones near them - or petition neighbors on this.
- Need to monitor and periodically reconsider safety and health risks.

- Concerned about equity. Is recreational burning accessible across all income and housing options? One's needs to be ?? in "for" or "against" debate
- Gather data about the impacts of outdoor recreational fire pit use on air quality and health before making any decisions. As far as I can tell from what was presented to us at the start of the meeting, the voices of a very small # of people is the only impetus and support for regulating/banning fires.
- Arbitrary. Too oriented.
- Total fire ban is overkill. City should not be able to implement a ban based on so few complaints. Restrictions are not the answer either. Education on nuisance people is great, similar to noise nuisances.
- I'm not in favor of a ban but more education would help. I'm in favor of limiting burning hours, as well as banning burning on high wind/fire danger days, and days with unhealthy air.
- What about education opportunities with respect to current regulations? Perhaps more live enforcement of current regulations?
- Based on data presented @ our table, this should not be an issue. Do nothing except: enforcement for repeat offenders notify complaining neighbors in advance?
- Please do not ban backyard fire pits for recreational fires. The current regulations are sufficient for the needs to address issues and concerns. Please do not require gas for fires unless the city is willing to pay for installation of gas fire pits for the residents.
- This is not a problem worthy of the city council's time. 57 complaints in 6 years. Major public opposition to effort (2017 Air quality survey). No scientific basis (studies about fire pits v. "smoke is bad"). And mischaracterizing the issue as a social problem when in fact it is a social hub. Councilmembers who vote for this will face serious opposition in elections.
- This is a property rights issue. A ban ensures that a property owner can enjoy their property and the right to breathe in their own backyard. Complaints as a number doesn't equal consensus.
- Where can we find more information? Where is this being communicated? What are the metrics on effects on wood burning on air quality, and health? Personal safety? How do these metrics compare to gas products? What was the process and results in peer cities?
- Public safety outweighs social/recreational enjoyment lean toward citywide ban or regulations to facilitate ease of enforcement.
- I support a total ban. This isn't anyone's "right." My right to breathe is more valid than someone's fire pit parties.
- Don't raise taxes to supplement or add a policy that takes away my civil rights as a property owner. Do not make Fort Collins into Boulder!
- I do not believe that outdoor firepits is something that government needs or should be involved in.
- Ban backyard recreational woodburning entirely within Fort Collins city limits.

Part 4: Table Notes

This session was held on May 5, 2018 at the Fort Collins Senior Center. There were 10 facilitated tables with 5-7 participants per table plus a CPD student facilitator and a notetaker. This document includes the notes captured by the students based on the conversations. The participants were each provided a worksheet that summarized the key arguments related to the issue based on analysis of the issue thus far, as well as a list of potential policy mechanisms to address the issue. The discussion on residential wood burning was split into four sections, and the notes below are organized based on those four sections:

- Discussion of current policy
- Discussions on potential compromises
- Comments on mechanisms
- Considering the total ban

In the notes below, the comments that are fully left justified are from the facilitator, other comments are from the participants. Information from the worksheet for each section is provided before the notes on that section for reference.

Section 1: Discussion of current policy

Information on participant worksheet

Key features

- Focus on fire safety concern (see cards for additional information)
- Rely on neighbors to address additional concerns
- Could increase educational efforts regarding health impacts and resources for improved neighbor communication

Support for current policy

- Social benefit of enjoying the outdoors
- Personal investment made under current rules
- Concerns about government overreach
- Concerns that the limited number of complaints do not justify significant action

Concerns about current policy

- Nuisance to neighbors (particularly those without AC or that prefer to have windows open at night)
- Health concerns (particularly those with respiratory issues)
- Environmental concerns
- Difficulty of relying on neighbor to neighbor communication (not always clear where smoke is coming from, neighbor relationship could be strained, and problems could begin late at night)

Table 1

How might people feel about our current policy, as far as when the city is able to step in to fire burning disputes?	
	No reactions
How do people feel about govt overreach?	
	Maybe there should be a hotline that people can call and report neighbors. The city would then send information about current city rules.
	What counts as crossing the line for the city? We can't stop people from smoking cigarettes outside of their homes.
	Not many homes are able to follow the 15 foot rule. It makes fires almost not an option in backyards.
	It was surprising that there weren't really any concerns mentioned about wildfire season and the presentation was more focused on health concerns.
Back to the policy - what about people with windows open at night and health concerns? What might they think about our current policy?	
	It would be difficult to approach neighbors who are having a fire for entertainment and tell them to stop. It is difficult to relegate the issue to between neighbors only.
	As stated directly above, Fort Collins is also bad about being neighborly with each other.
	People should be able to report nuisances of any kind without having to confront their neighbor.

Table 2

What stands out to you in this section?	
	Currently, we don't have a lot of government regulation
	I'm concerned too many regulations might restrict my freedom
	Term "overreach" is a loaded term
	"overreach" implies there is something negative about it
	Government regulation is inevitable for living in an urban area
	as we get more urbanized, we have to tighten down on the rules
	As the population density grows, we need more regulations
	Burning wood is very environmentally problematic
	One of my concerns is that I don't know where the smoke is coming from
	I have asthma and other breathing problems

	Open burning is banned in the city. This seems inconsistent to me
	Wood burning is a right, not a privilege
	This is getting out of control
How do you feel about these rule inconsistencies?	
	What we're talking about is open burning. I thought this was banned fifty or sixty years ago.
	Where's the enforcement? That's not happening
	They'll send you a letter
	If they can figure out who it is
	The city is kind of just letting (woodburning) happen
	Now people see (woodburning) as an entitlement, but if you have health problems, this is not a joke.
	Policy is not keeping up with new innovations on the market (smaller, outdoor chimneys)
	The government did not go back and take wood-burning fireplaces out of old homes once the regulation passed
	It takes a while for me to catch up with the new laws and regulations
	As a former city staff person, if a series of new regulations happen, a department is going to say "we don't have the staff for this"
	We can smell (smoke) and we can see it, but we can't do anything about it
	If you look in the evenings at the streetlights, we'll see smoke in the air, but you don't know where it's coming from
	To me, the city is the only place that this can be dealt with, because we cannot do it as individuals
	They tell us to take it up with our neighbors, but which neighbors? The wind blows it away. I can't figure out who it belongs to.
	1 in 4 households have people with a respiratory issue. That's pretty significant.
	We have to look at the health of the community at large rather than individual
	The older sections of town were grandfathered in (in terms of having woodburning fireplaces)
	Education by the city is another important piece of this

Table 3

General thoughts	
	generally good policy so far, need some adjustments and clarifications for rules (esp. 15 feet rule on source found was only meant for mobile firepits, not all firepits) & what does the city qualify as a portable fireplace?

Shouldn't ban, but understand necessity for restrictions. IF current rules are fine, leave it alone
Allergies- therapeutic to sit at the firepit. No problem using good wood, don't use on days when windy, done by ten, have water nearby incase something happens- be sure to put out complete. Bothered by incentive (\$3000 for incentives- fine but most people not able, can't afford to get a propane) ... small percentage of reports for town this size.
So upset they are thinking of moving, and this is their "Death house"- want to stay here forever
Sounds like they have things covered already so why has this become an issue?
If gonna give incentive, give bigger incentive so that I can afford to get better air conditioning to avoid necessity to open windows.
No way you can please everyone and when you have small fraction of city controlling what everyone does, that's not good- Concern for Government Overreach if more restrictions or ban was imposed -- Should only have safety regulations, after that "go away"
Incentives similar to having energy efficient things, but these are things you can't do yourself, need to licensed contractors and have people in to install energy saving.... buy an air conditioners for them.

Table 4

Current Policy: Key Features	
Oldtown near library--came out of curiosity because we heard there were some concerns of fire pits. We built one two years ago and are concerned that we're not able to use, but we are open minded to middle ground	
We always tell our neighbors if they have a problem--trying to be proactive	
I just don't have people burning stuff around my place	
We have three homes on our block that have fire pits, but none are going daily. More so once every week or so	
Can you smell them?	
No, more so just see them	
We try not to burn if there's a breeze because that effects others--we burn season wood, keep the wood covered, and for the most part people are pretty respectful	
I've never seen all three or four going at the same time	
No competition going on	
I've thought about it in the perspective of the wood burning fireplace in our house--when I'm outside and I smell all the fireplaces going, you know you notice that. There are codes	

	for that, at least for any new house built. We love sitting around a firepit, if you had a lot of people doing it, you'd have to say at what point should there be a restriction?
	You know health issues
	The social benefit is good, but that could also become a gas and therefore health issues. Very concerned about government overreach--I don't like government in my face. Environmental concern is the biggest concern, but here we are in Fort Collins trying to get to carbon free

Table 5

What thoughts do you have about the questions in general?	
	50 complaints with thousands of homes is a pretty low number of complaints. There are people who are insensitive but overall I think it's probably not an issue according to the numbers.
	I agree. I want to know where the threshold is where it became a problem for the city.
	yeah, not to mention the research part of it. Where is the research supporting this issue as more important than others
	I get your point that the stats are small, but it only takes one death from the health issues causing this. Some years ago I know we had a problem here with fires nearby the city that created more
	Putting everything together I think it's a matter of awareness. This could be stemming from knowledge so talking about it now may yield more information about whether it should be categorized as a nuisance in the future. As the city is going however, things are trending from nothing to what will become an issue. (it could be silent majority but it is a trend so we should catch onto this now before it's reversed.) Ultimately I think this is a good thing and the demographics aren't clear but it is a social issue.
	We should view this with equal pros and cons. i usually associated this activity with going camping. Now people are doing it in their own yard. Things pile up when it's rural. People are accustomed to living in a county and now the city is large enough.
	The county does have rules though. I have neighbors in the county burning sticks and leaves. They will say, "I live in county, I can burn whatever I want" and we handled that situation interpersonally. Some people think they can burn anything because they are not within the city. People are pretty good about working with neighbors first though.
	I know we've had a few circumstances regarding asthma. She's tried to talk to neighbors who weren't okay with stopping fires. The question is what do you do with that person who is suffering where they live?

	Seems like there is a sense of intensity and then a sense of consistency. We have an outdoor fire pit too and then there's a neighbor that sits on the porch and smokes. I feel like I can understand the "intensity" of a fire pit vs. cigarette and it's a bad problem if people have health issues. It seems there should be "some" recourse.
	well I don't have a pit but my neighbor does. It's nice. I would hate for that social aspect to be broken because other neighbors weren't accepting.

Table 6

Thoughts on the current policy?	
	unsure of why this was a priority issue at this time
	Agree with all four items in support. Knows of several people who have health issues who this could benefit
	Why is the city researching this when they get more complaints about smoking downtown?
	If it ain't broke don't fix it"
	Concerned about government overreach. Don't want to be stifled by ordinances that they can't control
Is anything really lacking in the current policy?	
	I like that the current policy does take safety into consideration while still allowing people to have fun. Also can issue a fire ban when they need to.
	What good are these rules if they don't enforce them? To what extent are they enforced?
	Wife has COPD, always wished that the neighbors would let them know about when or if they would be having a fire so that they could leave.
	Lives in an apartment complex now- doesn't know if the current policy is necessarily lacking, but wishes that there was more awareness around having fires

Table 7

Initial reactions	
	I have asthma so I'm open to regulations and more restrictions on wood burning but I don't know much about it
	Why are we only talking about wood fires and I don't understand if this is a problem of outdoor fires or neighborhood nuisances in general? It's not clear to me why we are focusing on these and excluding others, it doesn't seem very legitimate to me. you can't get an honest evaluation of the issue if you exclude things.

	Want to learn more about these issues and I have outdoor fires regularly during the summer
	I'm here to get some background, a city wide ban is an interesting idea to me. Why ban something that so many people do? I want to figure out what the real story is, like how many people file complaints. Seem like not enough complaints to make it such a big issue.
	25 complaints in an entire year doesn't seem like that big of a deal.
	Doesn't seem like the current policy relies on neighbor-to-neighbor interactions, the city will intervene. Neighbor-to-neighbor is in both and that doesn't seem like an accurate representation from the introduction
	It is a real health issue but from what I saw it was more neighbors not getting along with each other. I'm not keen on people whipping out their hibachis because it doesn't matter to me what they're going to have for dinner so this conversation is incredibly limited.
	Some neighbors in Old Town were rowdy and have in many instances disturbed their neighbors and there was a city council meeting last year over this one issue. I agree that we're focusing on a minute piece of a very large problem- people not being considerate of each other
Do you think current policy adequately addresses the nuisance piece?	
	No it's not effective at intervening
	It depends on who it goes to. A letter to college students might not be effective but it might be to a family. People are more afraid to just contact their neighbor in person.
	I've written letters to neighbors and it made no difference
	I'm not sure the city knows what they're talking about because it seems like they're contradicting themselves
Does the current policy address the health concerns?	
	I haven't seen any evidence that there are health concerns. I haven't seen anything that says indoor air quality is affected by outside fires or people with respiratory issues are affected. If you tried to prove that, there wouldn't be much of a leg to stand on. The city could measure this and show that indoor air quality is affected by fire pits or not. So it's a difficult argument for me to buy.
	Why exclude barbecues? People have smokers that they leave on for a long time and they're also a health concern.
	I live in an apartment and can smell neighbors barbecuing even with windows closed
	Higher density buildings can be a bigger issue because there are more cigarette and marijuana smokers, higher density of people

Table 8

What are some reactions to the status quo?	
	I think its absurd that the city is making this a problem, there is only 56 reports so this is not a problem. Brings up a survey on the different kinds of fire concepts. Very upset about this being an issue and a huge waste of time. Very passionate about this
Any reactions to what he said	
	Same as him. Was told at the time that she moved here that you can't have it and knows its ok, seems ridiculous to make a ban. Don't think it's that bad. Use other ideas to resolve it.
	When this invitation came out I was surprised that this was being discussed. Agreeing on the idea that this is a waste of time. Not worth the investment of time an energy from the city. Small number being made for the size of the area we live in.
	Does anyone have a different perspective?
	I live in a condo and we can't have fires and my neighbors are abusing the rules that we currently have. The breathing difficulty is the main issue here and its not to ban fires its to make sure we are accommodating them and the people who will burn responsibly.
	The idea of burning responsibly would indicate that you are able to do this correctly. The issue is property lines and you can't keep the smoke off their property. Often the wood burner is not following the rules. Wife was chased down by wood burner and its ridiculous to hold this down.
	There may be more people who have these concerns but not complaining
	Conflict in the idea of how much smoke is problematic. Continuing on the idea of the science not being there on the health problems.
	If you can contain your smoke to your property its ok.
Would you say its an issue if you see this done well?	
	No problem

Table 9

Thoughts on the status quo?	
	concern over smoke vs just status on how it is only concerned about the flame.
	member of HOA and they have a mediation between neighbors banning wood burning.
	Concerns about government overreach likes the HOA option to self regulate, each neighborhoods could be strict or not
	HOA only makes a portion of the city, however and it could vary greatly according to each neighborhood.

	Concerned about who to contact the department and city for talking about the issue.
	Concern about difference between EPA and Fire authority and nuisance claim, WHO regulates WHAT? and also about what each one does about each issue.
About the mediation in question	
	Neighborhoods it can be really hard to find the source of the smoke and that can make it hard who to regulate.
	Who are you supposed to go and talk to about smoke if you can't find the source
	Is there a license you have to get? or a permit?
	Small backyard metal ones are legal without a permit.
Has to be a safe distance and requirements	
	If there is smoke from those fires coming into my environment then it is too close. My wife has severe asthma issues and fire causes severe health concerns and no-one should burn wood near any residences. The doesn't go anywhere and stays in the environment. We moved away from New York to here to avoid some of this.
More concerns and ideas?	
	How the fires are put out and contained? just a little bit of ash can cause a lot of problems.
	Registering to be inspected? What about that?
	Needs to be away from populated areas. Enjoy the outdoors and not in FoCo
	People might not be able to get out there and not enjoy those areas
	Too bad its a health concern just like you can't smoke in a bar you shouldn't be able to smoke here.

Table 10

What are your initial thoughts?	
	Local native, don't have a problem, but understand why there could be issues
	Been working on this issue and working to implement an all-out ban
	Never anything that I thought much about, and now it happens all the time. Affects our ability to keep our house cool. We don't have air conditioning. And it's just a bad smell. I support a ban or some restrictions.
	Totally get why people enjoy fire pits, but I lean on the idea of the public health harm that's done to people by what is purely recreational
	Lived in FoCo for 10 years, it's not recreational, it's a social gathering. We're not having a fire just to do it. We do it to have events.
	Haven't heard about this before, but I'm interested

	Sometimes it bothers me because during the day we keep the house closed up, and at night, we open the windows, and smoke comes in.
Thoughts on current policy?	
	FoCo has above average rate of asthma
	Social justice issue because other populations may not be able to attend city meetings and things like that.
	People don't have a choice about breathing, so there are some issues from the health perspective and the science.
	Smoke that is closer to the ground is worse than smoke from chimneys because it will go straight into windows
	We already have a problem with trapped ozone, and smoke is just adding to this.
What are some of your thoughts in support of the current policy?	
	I never thought I could complain, so that's not a valid support for the current policy. There are low complaints because there aren't good mechanisms for making complaints.
I'm hearing that if we were to keep the current policy, we should implement more education and information about how to submit complaints?	
	I think if people were more aware of the effects of fires, they might reconsider how often they do it.
	How does this look in different parts of town? Could we implement a district policy, in which different districts have different restrictions?
	If there's some way to contain the smoke on your property, then that's okay.
What about government outreach?	
	What I do on my property, is that really the government's concern?
	The role of government is to protect one citizen from the actions of another.
	I could argue both sides of this. Where is the line, or the demarcation of that grey area? I don't know. I could see people concerned about government taking too much place in individual property.
	What about smoking cigarettes, or smoking marijuana? If I go out on my porch and smoke a cigarette, and it goes into my neighbor's house, what will we do about that? Where do we draw the line?
	The difference between a firepit and a cigarette is that you're not smoking on your porch for 2 hours nonstop.
	You can't control where the smoke goes though, regardless of the source. How do you regulate that?

Section 2: Discussions on potential compromises

Information on participant worksheet

Options for partial bans

1. Reasonable nuisance fire ban (complaints can lead to extinguishing the fire or limiting future fires)
2. Limit in certain locations based on density
3. Limit which days someone can have a fire (e.g. Friday and Saturday only)
4. Limit burning to certain hours of day (e.g. fires out by 11 pm)
5. Seasonal ban (warm or cold seasons)
6. Limit based on atmospheric conditions (e.g. high pollution advisory days)
7. Require longer distance from property line

(in the notes, students referred to these compromises as C1, C2, etc.)

Notes from Table 1

What are possible compromises?	
	More dense areas should have different regulations than those more spread out.
	Pollution is increasing in FTC and we are just adding to it with fires.
	The 15 ft rule be enforced more as a compromise. People might not be as informed as they should be.
	Not everyone knows where the Burn Bans exist.
	Fires put out by 11pm would be reasonable, but it could be difficult for the city to regulate.
Out of the examples, what are your favorite compromises?	
	#6, if there are more polluted days than normal, then it should be limited.
	#4 and #6. #6 because of environmental conditions increasing danger. #4 could solve noise complaints and complaints of those with health concerns/open windows.
	Any compromise could "rile" people up and it would be hard to motivate them to follow any regulation.
Which of these compromises might be concerning?	
	3,5,7. 3: Too arbitrary, if you're irritated by a fire, then you're going to be irritated any time a fire is lit.
	3 could cause people to claim the govt is overreaching.

Table 2

Thoughts on the potential compromises?	
	I think this is unrealistic.
	We're in an urban area. We don't have enough space to provide for this
	I live in one of the largest lots in my subdivision--it's 12,000 sq feet
	Densities are going up to provide for new housing
	Then you get this issue of proximity
	I went through every single one of these. Am I only supposed to have asthma mon-fri?
	My windows are open in the warmer season
	I have people say "close your windows" but I have a right to breathe fresh air
	I think gas is the compromise
	Sure, gas can be a nuisance, but it doesn't impede on my health
	Add #8 on here: gas only
	Smoke from one cigarette can be smelt a distance away. Imagine that with a fire
	A campfire is just a random process of burning which has no way of being controlled

Table 3

Thoughts on the potential compromises?	
	C2 Lots of money, can afford
	ID threshold to justify it's an issue... at what point is it an issue? because I complain or because 50 people complain about his firepit. Shouldn't be discussing yet... making assumption there is something to be compromised. Is there anything to be compromised? Is there anything to be discussed.
	Education is always a good thing- if they really think people feel they aren't being heard, then try education first on both sides (sure they're doing it right now). Mandates on something like this is "really jumping the gun"

Table 4

Thoughts on the potential compromises?	
	Well yes, of course with the fire
	There are some aesthetics involved--looking at a fire going, it's not like looking at a kitchen stove

	That's my main concern, the environment
	Tied closely with the health issue--air quality will be poor and those particles will effect the people who have respiratory problems. Surprised that 1 in 4 households have some respiratory issue. Seems really high to me.
	Minor the number of fire pits total now--
	Can't think of a single time that I have been irritated by a single fire pit in Fort Collins, doesn't seem like a huge problem in Fort Collins
	Yes I agree x 10
	And have to think about the enforcement?
	Number four looks reasonable
	C2 Density I have a question for--is that apartments? More people effected?

Table 5

Thoughts on the potential compromises?	
	<p>C1 - on number one I see multiple complaints by more than one party</p> <p>is there an option for community fire resource options instead of individuals complaining to a person about private fire? people can come together?</p> <p>Tangential topic: air quality in general is not as good in Fort Collins.</p> <p>Could you comment on decline of air quality as a whole due to fires?</p> <p>There are larger particles in the air. there's an index available. Overall it is fairly good quality in relation to others but it has been reducing. Even though we may not be on the bad side, in general we do have a baseline from different sources. there's also other chemicals decides the particles.</p>
	<p>C7 - I got a small lot, of 15 feet in my yard. If I want to put out a fire pit I really can't. I find it discriminatory. We find other places. if you're in an apartment you can't do much. There are many that don't have the capability for a fire pit.</p> <p>Condos are subject to specific rules regarding pits in the first place right?</p> <p>15 ft. is just too much. I'd wonder if 15 ft. is the space between homes anymore.</p> <p>Right, if you have a lot large enough you can but otherwise tough luck.</p>
	<p>C6 I like number 6 regarding city alerts. At least it's advisable not to have a fire that day. Well there's also the issue of communication [privacy vs. convenience]</p>
	<p>C3 - I feel like it's the opposite of this. I feel like it would be annoying if it was on different times and different days. people have different schedules, there is no reason to concentrate the smog.</p>
	<p>C5 - maybe people can have education that goes with prevention. can we add another option for wind warnings and education classes if you have a fire pit?</p> <p>Yeah the practicality of that seems difficult.</p>

	There's also no recording the data and quantify or measure the fire pit issues. how do we collect the number of fires on at any given time? there's not data. Is there a way to convince community members to put them outside their houses so they go off if the neighbors are creating too much smoke? Fire pits must have a smoke detector within a certain amount of feet from the fire.
	C2 1 - This is important, the quantitative data is necessary. The idea of a fire signal going off in public is annoying but it doesn't seem to set this up. In all seriousness with technology, it may be possible for sensors to come about that we don't know of yet.
	Other Compromise - brought up earlier in the conversation but needing to be mentioned already, This is about educational options for a new way to impart the data.

Table 6

Does this actually help people who have health issues if it only limits the fire slightly?	
	C4 "bedtime hours are different for different people, so this might need to be figured out between neighbors or community members rather than citywide"
	What would this achieve? Confused
	C7 properties aren't the same size
	Don't we already have this?
	Does pollution get concentrated in certain areas?
	Do we have seasonal restrictions now?
How do insurance companies come into play?	
	Insurance companies can require different things as far as coverage for your home when you have fires or grills
	C3 Doesn't think it's reasonable because people have different schedules
	C5 Same as above
Would any participants consider supporting any of these compromises?	
	6, which is already there.
	C2 More or less freedom depending on type of dwelling and density

Table 7

Which do you think you support and which do you have concerns about?
--

	I'm not okay with any of them
Reactions to that?	
	That seems random to me to just pick a time
	I'm opposed to all of these because they're not addressing the problem- the problem is teaching people how to interact with their neighbors and how to deal with issues person-to-person. The first step should be to approach your neighbors, talk first. Sometimes you have to put up with nuisances. Living in a big city involves that
	I might have to close my windows if it's loud outside because of dogs- it's a similar situation. My dog doesn't bark at 4am so maybe can you take yours inside earlier? You can work with your neighbors. There are so few complaints, changing the policy seems overkill to me. There should be consequences for people who are doing dangerous things.
	There are consequences but if people are being loud at night that's the real problem, not the fire
	I lived in an apartment where some people lit the building on fire
	C1 Is that just a nuisance call or can they ban you from having future fires?
	They haven't decided yet, this is just an idea
	Maybe getting a fine for fires is more like getting a fine for parties- just being loud
If we went for an educational approach- is that the city's role and what should that look like?	
	People are not friendly in this community, if I felt that it was friendlier then I could fo up to people and approach them about it
	What would the city do? I don't think it's the city's job to say when we can have a fire. It's not based on the fires. I don't know how we could educate and what is there to educate about when there are only 25 complaints a year?
	Educate about people with breathing issues, people who could be affected more by air quality
	Educating about complaints is a good place to start, legal privileges and legal obligations based on complains. But it seems like a waste of time
	Neighbor to neighbor education. City's arbitration services. That could give people to have a third party to intervene.
Education about existing resources?	
	If we don't have neighbors with health issues then it doesn't apply to us
	If there are options to those who are doing legal burning- can you burn at this time of day or move it to the other side of the yard neighbor-to-neighbor communication and compromise
	If I have a neighbor who smokes- it's a health problem to me but I wouldn't criticize them because that's their right
	Air is communal space and we have to share it
	If a neighbor told me your fires are affecting me negatively in these ways I would be open to that discussion, I wouldn't be offended

	Recently a neighbor told me that the light on the house bothers the neighbor and offered to help change the lightbulbs, I turned it off and replaced the fixture- just a question of someone coming up and bringing up a problem to my attention in a polite way
	Maybe there should be some recourse for education if you're not open to nice discussion
If people aren't neighborly, education could be useful. Does this change based on location or density of housing?	
	We have rules on what we can't do and neighbors do them anyway
	Nuisance complaints can be for anything. Some people are just jerks..
	Nuisances are subjective.
	A noise at 3pm I can deal with but at midnight it won't make me happy, context matters
	but if you worked nights the 3pm noise could be a problem

Table 8

Where is the middle ground here? What are reactions to the compromises?	
	What if there was a time limit? Similar to a noise regulation. But if you know its gonna end you can get some sort of piece of mind
	Different parts of the city there could be different regulations related to this because of areas to AC.
	Why is my neighbors right greater than mine when it comes to this. I think that a time limit works best because this could be different.
	I have a general concern with the police being involved but I think there are other ways for this to work on this.
	Police would have to enter property at night with people who have been drinking, I don't think regulation is necessary I think there are other options
	The more dense it's getting the more we need to have regulation because its our city plan, but it hurt people and we need this. We may not need everything in this plan but there has to be something to change.
Has calling the fire department worked?	
	No
What do we need to do to make it effective?	
	Make the fuel different
	I don't buy that the status quo is bad I don't think to change anything. Maybe enforce the current regulations more, but this is not something there needs to be new things.
	Discussion related to wildfire and how this is related to being year round

	Difference between wildfire/ to a fire in the backyard. Sometimes you expect it but you may need to think of the people that don't want to be around this. People can be struggling with this and its tough to discuss this from that perspective.
	I don't think we need to get rid of the back yard fire, but there are some things that can be troublesome on some days so there needs to be more enforcement on this topic.
	Difference between two sets of rights, compromise in between these two sides like the noise ordinance.
	Increased education can be huge to help through PFA or city itself to help out what is allowed. Don't burn trash or green wood. Public information is a large component.
	One comment I would make is limiting the days of the week could assume people have the same schedule, we don't want to limit certain people or demographics.
	Want more information about education, discussion about backyard burning and information.

Table 9

Other cities ideas and approaches and could any work for us	
	A start for us would be some kind of permit process and checking for safety issues and addressing concerns
What kind of permits? Yearly or event?	
	Should be like number 4 certain hours of the day?
What kind of hours and restrictions?	
	option 2 seems like the only one that works for me
	maybe 15 min very little
	Summer people might want to keep them all open
	Maybe by each neighborhood
Back to option two I know you said outside the city	
	Spring creek trail fire pit makes no sense with all the people walking and biking by seems like a bad idea.
	Zone about not smoking in FoCo and not smoking in bars
	gradually introduced issue, First in restaurants, then public buildings, then certain areas. Gradual ban till meeting the ban.
	Some options could capture a more holistic option. Maybe combine a few aspects to create a more effective regulation.
	Could get too complicated
	How so?

	Dates could be forgotten and people like to drink and could just make one.
Notifying neighbors and current standard: Is there another way we could notify?	
	How far and how many people would you have to notify?
	Are your neighbor's home? Must be a better way to notify such as a permit?
	Maybe notifying people in a specified radius?
I keep hearing a permit talks about ideas other cities implemented: Would we like to see either of these?	
	I think the permits are a good idea because you cant define a neighbor hood and having everyone register and have them sign up to email/texts to send it to those in neighborhood who is sensitive.
	People who are effected by it are notified. So you're notified.
	General registration like a license you just have to notify the city when you want to burn 24 hours before
	Just like the party registration for the city now.
	City would have to set up the system.
	Have a maybe option and a time limit? for people coming to dinner
	And if you could know the location for being in a certain zone of the city
	If there is an area how many fires in that zone at one time?
	if there isn't a ban I guess there could be a lot?
	older houses would be effected more.
If registration put a limit on the number of houses in a neighborhood or population or set number	
	Could be based on population density based on certain areas. Urban Vs ranch
	(Looking at Sheet) particles can pierce homes.

Table 10

Thoughts on compromises	
	Boulder by design is a dense city and so is Denver. The more dense that we become, the more regulations are needed.
	Boulder had night inspectors and they tried weekend education, and they had to give up because nothing worked.
	Wood burning is really unhealthy, even if it smells good.
	I think a lot of them are reasonable, and they would require a lot of education. I know that you mentioned how it was done in Boulder and Denver, and it didn't work there.

	Number 5 doesn't seem like it works because of the unpredictability of seasons in CO
	Seems like it could be a waste of time to implement all of this education if it isn't going to work.
	We usually do ours in the spring and summer time, when the weather is nice.
	I'm good with 1, 2, and 6.
	3, 5, and 7 are no's.
	I don't agree with any of the potential mechanisms. I think that they're ridiculous.
Do you have another idea?	
	No.
	Our neighborhood isn't what it used to be. People don't talk to each other anymore.
	Even if you have a good relationship with your neighbor, if you ask them to stop doing something that they find fun, it taints things.
	It would be great if neighbor talking was always good, but it's not.
	I like 2 and 7. If you have a lot that is a certain size, you can have a fire.
	I know that homes in FoCo had burning fireplaces before the ban. What about people who spent a lot of money on this?
	We have a fireplace, but we don't really ever use it.
	What if you registered your firepit on a certain night, and if it bothers a neighbor then they can call?
	When one of my neighbors wanted to get chickens, we had to sign forms about agreeing to it.
	I'm still worried about the social justice issue because there are so many populations which are not being represented here and not getting to speak up about this issue.
	1 in 3 kids in our community have an inhaler.

Section 3: Comments on Mechanisms

Information on participant worksheet

- A. Notification to neighbors (potentially just to those that have sensitivities)
- B. Notification to city
- C. Permitting of set up
- D. Permitting of individual events

Table 1

What about neighbors talking to each other?	
	Neighbors already don't talk to each other. We need to begin facilitating these convos in neighborhoods. Might not be a bad way to somehow force this.
	Overwhelming table consensus: Even if you made these rules, people would just ignore them.
What are other mechanisms not on the list?	
	Permitting, force people to pay for fires just like parking. People will stop having fires.
	With permitting, firepits must be inspected by the city. People might not follow it anyway.

Table 2

Mech A (note to neighbors)	
	Who do you complain to and what are you going to do about it?
	People are scared to complain because they may be retaliated against
	This is like fighting fog. You don't always know where it comes from, so I don't know who to complain to
	Should we call the fire department? Or are we having a wildfire? Or is someone having a campfire in their backyards
	We could smell the yellowstone fires
	Who do you complain about that to?
Mech C (set up permit)	
	I think this is the viable one
	Then they have to go to talk to a city authority before they can set up a fire
	There's a lot of cost involved
	A lot of burden on the city and the taxpayers

	I'd like to find a way to do this without adding financial burden
	Rather than worry about enforcement, let's help our community understand why this isn't healthy
	If it's gas, you don't need a permit. For any open wood fires, there needs to be a city permit
	It would need to be per incident rather than an ongoing one.
	The thing I think that is completely missing from this is air quality monitoring.
	I don't know how they're doing that and I don't think they are
	We winter in Hawaii with a big volcano. It's worse here than it is in Hawaii
	Why aren't fines on here?
	Let's add F for fines
	There are several air quality monitoring stations around the city
	How many people are going to check the pollution and atmospheric conditions when they want to burn a fire
	We live in an environment where we have an inversion. Sometimes the air doesn't circulate
	Where you live matters. Those who live in the foothills have more of a problem
	The average joe doesn't know what air quality measure means in regards to our behavior
	Education needs to go with it in order to make it relevant
	And when people are stoned and drunk, are they paying any attention to rules and regulations?

Table 3

	Firepits in by a certain date grandfathered in, new firepits have more specifications/permits so that if calls come in, the city has a reference and to make sure safety requirements are met -- contractors still building with new houses, not all 15 feet. things that can be done there to enforce the policy.
	If there is an issue (doesn't see it as one yet), want to have a fire pit, fine \$10 fee for one time inspection to make sure it meets city codes. should be a fee because it costs city money to send someone, and then it's on record. Now, until there is complaint they don't have checks on their fire pits.
	People don't know differences between types of wood and the effect it has on fires... different woods have different smoke/effects on surroundings... specifications on types of woods to better inform people
	Permits for Safety only.. not can/cannot have, but to ensure it meets safety standards.

	Need a process that will attend to those being negatively in productive and impactful way (education, outreach) not just a city ban...
	Want something safe, permit at beginning is a good idea, at that point if you're complying with pit the way it was design than that should be enough.
	Ban is penalizing the many for the actions of the few (small minority)

Table 4

Mech A (note to neighbors)	
	what if number one was implemented, do you think more people would feel comfortable saying "I can't handle the wood smoke"?
	I would hope people would do that anyway.. don't know if people would do that more
	Consistent number of complaints then put that fire out
	So more people would be willing to complain?
	Isn't there already nuisance things on the books
	Not necessarily for fire
	For noise, parking
	If there's a disposed mattress, then you're gonna hear from the city real quick
	We have that in the city, the neighborhood mediation between neighbors to resolve issues
	Potential Mechanisms: Do Y'all Agree or Disagree? Why?
	Not sure how to notify neighbors if you don't know all their business
	Is this coming from the fire pit owner?
	Do y'all think the person more sensitive should contact or the person putting on a fire?
	Very subjective--like saying I'm going to put cedar siding on my house, does anyone have an allergy?
	Burden to people with compromised immune systems
	Seems if you have a fire pit that you should notify--seems a little much to me.
Mech D (event permit)	
	Too much government overreach for D
Mech D (event permit)	
	Yes, same for me
	Could the permits in C and D eliminate the fact neighbors would need to go door to door?
Mech C (set up permit)	

	Some mechanism to register--seems a bit much to me though
	How do you notify? Seems if you're going to have a fire just tell them
	See them in the front yard, yell across the fence, ask if they want to join
	For the most part, if you're well established in a neighborhood you know the people around you
Other Mech	I like the incentive program--like the electric lawnmower. Support some incentive program

Table 6

Mech A (note to neighbors)	This can't be enforced
Other Mech	Doesn't feel like this is an actual issue that needs to be addressed at this point.
Mech A (note to neighbors)	Would like if this could be just worked out amongst neighbors without adding new legislation. Receptive to mediation
Mech A (note to neighbors)	People don't often plan fires ahead of time, it's usually a spur of the moment thing.

Section 4- Considering the total ban

The participant worksheet including these arguments for reaction:

Supporting arguments:

- Fully addresses concerns about current policy
- Easier to enforce and monitor
- Could be supplemented by an incentive program to purchase gas fire pits

Concerns:

- Takes away an individual right and social benefit that is currently enjoyed
- Impacts personal prior investments
- Government overreach

Table 1

What do you think about total ban?

Make people use gas instead of wood.
An increase stockpile of wood would could increase the danger of hazardous fires breaking out if people switched to gas.
People would switch to gas if they had proper incentives.
At what point do we change community policy for a small population?
If we regulated this for them, then we should also have to regulate policies in regard to cars and other possible health irritants.

Table 2

Somebody's right to burn impinges on my right to breathe clean air
Who's right in that instance? Whose right is more important?
Government overreach is ideological and political
We live in a society, which implied shared rules
The issue is burning, not government
Outdoors and the environment are so important to me

Table 3

Agriculture... metaphor comparing to contractors building houses around a dairy farm and complaining about the smell when the farm has been there for decades.
The few complaints by comparison to total population... what's 55 people divided by 150,000... less than 1%. What's the justification for a ban?
If someone was here that had real bad issues with smoke... That's what need to be dealt with, just that one situation not a mandate across the city . if city want's to get involved with being arbitrator (there is a whole arbitration process...couldn't confirm/deny).. .seems like things are already in place to target on individual process but maybe just throw in a permit and call it done.
Care emissions more of a problem... turn of engines when waiting for train, yet turn signals in this town you wait three lights burning emissions before you can turn... focus on other issues that have a larger impact on more of the community
Concerns of ban doesn't fully address anything.
Dangerous path to go down considering a ban for such a small number of people. Allergic to gluten. "I think i need to gather 50 of my friends and go to the city demanding a ban on restaurants selling products with gluten" ... going down a dangerous path wit enforcing ban; wasting city money, time, resources
if there was a vote with the city, would be voted down

Don't want to change things, but realization/acknowledgement/comment that they Don't want people to suffer either... brought in comment about daughter and how she has health issues and they have a fire pit and have fires occasionally.
--

Table 4

I accept the fact that when you have a fire you're discharging gas in the air, but i think it's so rare how often it happens. Compare that to driving, we're such a small clip in the air quality
Seems like overkill to ban firepits out right
Total bans just wouldn't work--very unreasonable
I agree, but the city could offer incentives to purchase gas--doesn't need to go along with total ban
I would say that if the number of complaints were to increase or double, then it does become a problem
If we go back in the 30's and 40's with 80% of houses using fire pits then yes there's some concern, but that's not case we're in now
Same as wood burning stove

Table 6

Would stop having fires if his neighbor told him to stop
"Doesn't make any sense to me"
Agrees with listed concerns about ban

Table 7

Concerns about ban	
	Incentivize people to purchase gas fire pits- no, we don't want people to burn natural gas. We don't want people to purchase those.
	Total ban is complete government overreach
Support for ban	
	Bigger picture- my concerns are clean air and health issues. IF there are only 15-20 people with breathing issues then so what. Environmentally- we want clean air
Concerns about ban	

We need to know what the impact is for this occasional recreational burning vs. the impact of driving your car every day. To me this isn't as big of a deal.

Table 10

Thoughts on total ban?	
	I know that I could move, but because this is happening anywhere, where am I going to move?
	The questions I have for the total ban is who is going to monitor this? Are we going to have to employ new people or create a new department? Will this raise our taxes? I already pay my share, and I don't want to have to pay more for this. The city's budget doesn't have money to allocate for this, so this is a major concern.
	I think that the garden centers will be disappointed if we ban fires, because they sell so much for fires.
	This is something which your generation has done. We hardly had fires for campouts!