

# **WRAP Policy**

## **Annual Emission Goals for Fire DRAFT**

**Reviewer Comments  
December 1, 2002**

## **Introduction**

The Annual Emission Goals Task Team works under the auspices of the Fire Emissions Joint Forum (FEJF) of the Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP). The FEJF is responsible for preparing technical and policy tools for the WRAP to assist states and tribes in the WRAP region in the implementation of the Regional Haze Rule. The AEG Policy has been under development and review by the FEJF since January of 2002.

The AEG Task Team has conducted an outreach process to solicit broader comment on the draft AEG Policy document to support final recommendations of the FEJF to the WRAP. The outreach process has included the development of a representative list of stakeholders and then the solicitation of reviewers' official comment. This process was approved by the WRAP's Initiatives Oversight Committee in lieu of public workshops due to the timeframe of the WRAP approval process.

The AEG Task Team sent out review materials to some 100 stakeholder representatives and has received official comments from 12 individuals and their respective groups. All reviewer comments have been compiled into the single document that follows. These comments are the basis for the final revision of the draft WRAP AEG Policy that the FEJF will consider for approval on December 13, 2002.

The draft AEG Policy document that was used by reviewers and to which their section, page and line numbers refer, can be found on the AEG Task Team webpage under Policy Review.

## WRAP Annual Emission Goals Policy

Section #	Page #	Line #	Comment/Suggested Wording	Name
General			<p>I have no comments, which would improve the document further. All in all, I feel the changes made based on discussions, at the Tempe meeting, were worked in just fine. All parties should well understand that a goal is a future desired condition (hopefully quantitative) and is not regulatory, in principle. There is enough flexibility in the policy to satisfy the differences among states and their approaches to controlling overall emissions.</p> <p>In my opinion, developing an accurate tracking and emissions estimation process is critical to success of the states (and burners) being able to demonstrate reasonable progress toward national visibility goals.</p>	Bischof, Lawrence
General			Good work.	Olson
General – Footer Placement			To clearly distinguish the footer text from the footnote text the footer should be moved down to create a separation between the footer text and footnote text. I suggest changing the Page Setup to reflect a 0.5” from edge measurement for the footer vs. the current 1” from edge setting.	Potter
General			Any acronym should be listed in the glossary, for those of us who aren’t fire experts and don’t use these terms often.	Miller
General			I'm having trouble using the appendices because there is nothing to distinguish them visually from the main document. Can formatting be used to distinguish the appendices from the main body of the text? Perhaps the footer could say <i>WRAP AEG Policy Draft, APP C: October 24, 2002</i> . Or, the page # could be <i>App C, page x</i> .	Miller
General			Non-burning alternatives should not be discarded @ this time because State/Tribe could elect this alternative to meet their ABG/TIP/SIP “reasonable progress” requirement.	McLeod
Exec. Summ	i	34, 38	Use of the word “outline” may be overdone. The verbs “lists” or “contains” or “spells out” may be more appropriate.	Randall
Exec. Summ	ii	8	In this sentence I believe that the word “minimum” should be used instead of “minimize”.	Potter

Exec. Summ			Throughout, it is unclear what the emission goals actually are. Will they include a percent reduction from current emissions, or a tonnage reduction? Or, are the emission goals simply the adoption of methods that reduce emissions?	Gaffney
Policy Statements	1	6-7	The second sentence of Policy Statement A is a RHR requirement, not a policy statement. Both the executive summary and the annotated policy statements address this requirement. I realize the ESMP contains a similar requirement as a policy statement, but that does not mean we should continue using inappropriate statements only for sake of consistency. I would suggest this sentence be removed from Policy Statement A. The first sentence alone is a powerful policy statement and should remain.	Potter
Policy Statements	1	6-7	Second sentence is a requirement, not a policy statement. Both the exec summary and the annotated policy statements address this requirement. I realize the ESMP contains a similar requirement as a policy statement, but that does not mean we should continue using inappropriate statements only for sake of consistency. I would suggest this sentence be removed. The first statement alone is a powerful policy statement.	Olson
Policy Statements			Policy outlines a process for establishing AEG rather than establishing AEG.	Randall
Policy Statements	1	9	A couple of times I stumbled over the phrase, “achieve the minimum emission increase from fire”. Maybe it’s just me, but something about achieving the minimum (increase), flips my brain a little. I realize that the idea isn’t going for the “maximum emissions reduction”, and I couldn’t come up with better wording that still retained the original intent.	Gaffney
Policy Statements	1	12	Does “all fire sources” include agricultural, prescribed, and residential woodstoves and fireplaces? I think this is stated later. Maybe a footnote would be helpful.	Gaffney
Policy Statements	1	19	I think this is the first time in the body that ‘emission reduction techniques’ is introduced, may want to include the ‘ERT’ acronym here too, because I think it starts being used later on without being spelled out.	Gaffney
Footnote 23	5		Review everything after the open parens. Probably should delete one <i>WRAP</i> , and add close quotes and end parens at the end.	Miller
1	1	26&27	Will Tribes be able to request assistance from the WRAP on verifying the use of ERTs and if so what method will be available.	McLeod
1	1	6	Use of word “control”. As a term of art, “control” implies an actual and measurable reduction in emissions from a source. Uncontrolled → Emissions = A, controlled → Emissions = A(1-control efficiency). We get to our version of the definition of the word “control” on p. 6, line 22. Ours is not the traditional definition of the word control but it works for our purposes. I’m not sure how we plant our version of the “control” in the	Randall

			reader's mind earlier on...maybe include a footnote with our definition at this first use of "control".	
1	1	9	Suggest adding a sentence to the beginning of this policy statement: "Over the next 40 (?) years, it is generally recognized that land managers will increase the use of prescribed fire for the purpose of ecosystem restoration, ecosystem maintenance, and wildfire abatement (avoidance?, safety considerations)." It may also be wise to add this concept somewhere near the beginning of the Exec Sum. This notion is raised beginning on p. 4, line 24...I suggest that's a bit too late. Can site GCVTC report p. 23 and the Rule 64 FR 35735.	Randall
1	1	15-17	There is a subject/verb disagreement here...perhaps change "provide" to "provides" [application...provides] or make this policy statement two sentences. Also suggest adding "across all fire sources (excluding wildfire)" to the end of the first clause.	Randall
2.2	3	22-26	To further clarify the meaning of this sentence please consider rewording it as follows: [Include re-wording here]	Randall
2	2	fn 5	There are also three tribal vacancies that must be filled. Without noting this, it gives a misperception to the reader that the states naturally outnumber the tribes on the Board.	Gruenig
2	3	1-8	Can't seem to get a TIP out for Tribes dealing with health issues Air Programs, how can we realistically expect a TIP on TH rule? EPA needs some encouragement in respect to technical legal help from WRAP body.	McLeod
2.3	3	1-8	It might also be important to mention that tribes can also adopt "reasonably severable elements" of an air program, this indicating that tribes can adopt portions of a 309 TIP unlike the states that must implement every measure under a 309 SIP.	Gruenig
3	3	31	Suggest adding sentence: "Notwithstanding this recognition, it is the position of the WRAP that states and tribes will need to affirmatively address emissions from fire sources (excluding wildfire) in order to fulfill the SIP/TIP requirements of Sections 308 or 309 of the Regional Haze Rule and, where applicable, to include federally enforceable measures in SIPs/TIPs to minimize the increase in emissions from fire sources so as to adequately protect visibility." <i>This sentence, or something similar, is, I believe very important to achieve stakeholder buy-off on the AEG Policy. Although still not a prescriptive, quantitative "limit," this statement gives some sense that something "real" has to get done. Much of the rest of the AEG Policy talks about options and off-ramps and the recognized independence of states/tribes.</i>	Randall
3.1	3	27	ERT: no explanation is given for this acronym. It must be Emission Reduction Techniques but it took awhile to figure that out. Adding (ERT) after the term in the Glossary would help.	Miller

3.1	3	28	Minor point. This sentence suggests that states/tribes are on their own when it comes to how this Policy is to be integrated into the SIP/TIP. This seems contrary to other WRAP policies, which do provide some guidance on how to integrate into the SIP/TIP.	Finneran
3.2	4	7-8	See comment on Policy Statements, Page 1, Lines 6-7.	Potter
3.2	4	7, 15 (2x)	“control” – see comment above.	Randall
3	3	21- 24	If this is policy, is the WRAP committed to providing funding and technical assistance to Tribes?	McLeod
3	3	35- 37	Re-work last sentence. The WRAP believes that states and tribes, or EPA (on behalf of the tribes) maintain the ultimate responsibility for the implementation of the annual emission goal program. The way the sentence was constructed could have implied a sovereignty issue.	McLeod
3.3	4	28	Quote should be “... increased risk of <u>catastrophic</u> wildfire ...”. Footnote 13	Riley
3.3	5	Up to 19	Consider finishing the comparison between “target and cap” for stationary sources and “goal and ???” for fire sources. Because the language in the AEG Policy attempts to recreate the intentions and the spirit of the GCVTC, perhaps we could suggest that, in the event that AEGs fail to adequately protect visibility (as determined in the 308 and 309 SIP/TIP review process), that states/Tribes/(EPA?) may indeed need to establish some more formal/defined/concrete backstop to address emissions from fire sources.	Randall
3.4	6	1	<i>Requires</i> should be <i>requiring</i> .	Miller
3.4	6	3	Add “ ... all fire sources, <u>excluding wildfire</u> .”	Riley
3.4	6	Foot note 26	I find the clarifying text in footnote 26 to be unnecessary given the context of the sentence. The sentence (lines 7-9) clearly refers to “open burning activities on ... industrial property” not prescribed burning. In addition, the sentence regarding prescribed burning (page 5, lines 35-37) in combination with the definition of “wildland” in Appendix A, which specifically includes “silvicultural land, ... woodlots, and private timberlands” further clarifies the use of burning on “industrial forestland	Potter
3.5			the advantages of using ERTs should be emphasized. ERTs are clearly more quantifiable than emission goals. Easier to track, and easier to estimate emission reductions. Any attempt to set annual emission goals would be nothing more than a "best guess" and would not really accomplish much	Finneran
3.5	6	Foot note 27	This is a very important point and should not be buried in a footnote. It is discussed at length in the Appendices but should also be in the body of the Policy text.	Potter
3.5	6	14	Subject/verb agreement...same comment as above.	Randall

3.5	6	23	Note: This sentence mentions “biomass utilization” as one of several ERTs – yet it is clear this particular ERT is being excluded from the Policy.	Finneran
3.5	6	26-28	Suggest rewording sentence to: A key smoke management technique is the timing of ignitions for better smoke dispersion with the intention of avoiding smoke impacts to sensitive areas (e.g., non-attainment areas, Class I areas, nearby communities). Smoke management techniques may give consideration to downwind air quality (e.g., nuisance impacts and National Ambient Air Quality Standards) and visibility/regional haze.	Randall
3.5	6	31	Major point. This sentence says the Policy is focused on how to reduce fire emissions rather than setting “an emission LIMIT”. The requirement in the rule is for a GOAL not a LIMIT. This is an important distinction. And the issue here is whether EPA will accept implementation plans that do not contain an actual “goal” for fire emissions.	Finneran
3.5	6	31 on	This paragraph attempts to convey meaty and complicated subjects. Conceptually, I essentially agree with the concepts, but the para needs some improvements to do this really well. Perhaps R. Reynolds and P. Lahm and I could take 10 minutes to word-smith this paragraph into submission.	Randall
3.5	6-7	31 – 5	The clarification provided in this paragraph is very good and emphasizes the flexibility now and in the future for AEGs.	Potter
3.5	7	7	Major point. Shouldn’t this sentence (or paragraph) mention WHY the policy is substituting ERTs for annual emission goals?  <u>Overall comment:</u> there does not appear to be strong enough argument in section 3.5 of the Policy on why using ERTs is BETTER THAN trying to set actual goals. This is a major weakness in the Policy as it stands now. Without a strong argument being made, it increases the likelihood that the substitution of ERTs for annual emission goals could result in approvability issues with EPA or otherwise challenged.	Finneran
3.5	7	9	Replace “calculated” with “estimated”	Randall
3.5.1	7-8	30-25	I found the general paragraphs in this section (page 7 line 15-28, page 8, lines 27-30) to be appropriate for the body of the document but despite the disclaimers in the general paragraphs, the specifics lead the reader down the path of believing there are only two options. To eliminate this misconception, and to be consistent with the format instituted in other WRAP fire policies, the implementation specific (or “how”) paragraphs (page 7 line 30 through page 8 line 25) should be moved to the appendices and referenced in the body of the document.	Potter
3.5.1	8	8-9	Similar to the Executive Summary comment. What exactly is expected? A percent reduction, a tonnage reduction, tons reduced, or something else?	Gaffney
3.6	9	5	My interpretation of Policy Statement E led me to believe that land management	Potter

			objectives were an additional criteria by which the use of ERTs should be evaluated. However, the wording on lines 4-6 indicates that the land management objectives, not the use of ERTs, “be evaluated using these criteria”, which I interpret as being contrary to the Policy Statement language. If my interpretation is correct, please change the words “using these” on line 5 to “in addition to these”.	
3.7	9	13	The title of this section is awkward. “Establishing Collaborative Relationships” ??	Randall
3.7	9	19	Tribes should be capitalized like States.	Gruenig
3.8	9	38-39	The AEG Policy and FTS Policy were developed on parallel tracks and timeframes. The following language is suggested so that the AEG Policy can properly reflect the FTS Policy as currently proposed. “...Systems Policy identifies essential components of a fire tracking system that may be augmented with additional components so as to ...”	Potter
4	18	1	Why is 4.1 to 4.7 listed in the Appendix to the policy? Why not make it part of the main document? At a minimum, Section 4.2 belongs up front in the policy, as it contains a significant policy discussion about the use of non-burning alternatives. This discussion appears to be “hidden” in back in the appendix.	Finneran
4.2			Some explanation is needed on how non-burning alternatives are considered earlier in the planning process, rather than on a project-by-project basis like other ERTs. This would help explain why non-burning alternatives is an ERT but not appropriate for this policy. This is an important point. In Section 4.2, and in other sections where non-burning alternatives are be discussed, make sure you reference the FEJR Wildlands Alternatives Task Team work, and how the Comprehensive Manual on Non-Burning alternatives will be the tool for fully evaluating the use of alternatives.	Finneran
4.2	18	20	Strike “are”. Second word in sentence.	McLeod
4.2	18	32	Major point. This sentence seems to be saying two things about tracking non-burning alternatives: (1) that it’s not feasible to actually track alternative and (2) it’s not feasible to calculate the emission reductions from them. One could argue that the TRACKING could be done. The emissions calculation is clearly the difficult part. So the main point here is why shouldn’t the Policy recommend at least the tracking of non-burning alternatives? If tracking is not feasible, then more explanation is needed.	Finneran
4.2	19	1	Major point. This part of the Policy is making reference to the WRAP ESMP in regards to non-burning alternatives. This is good, but there should also be a reference to the work being conducted by the FEJF Wildland Alternatives Task Team – specifically the soon-to-be completed “Comprehensive Manual on Non-Burning Alternatives” being developed by Jones & Stokes consultants. This is an important document that should be	Finneran

			referenced in other parts of the main section of Policy as well, not just the Appendix.	
4.5	20	23	Minor point. Reference is made to EPA's BACM Document. As explained, this document identifies ERTs. One of the key ERTs that EPA supports is the use of non-burning alternatives. This Policy, by excluding non-burning alternatives, may be viewed as being inconsistent with EPA's BACM document.	Finneran
Appendix A	11	25-27, 42-44	Are the two definitions of "cap" and "emission cap" really necessary? If they are necessary, should there be additional definitions of "goal" and "target" added to compliment the definitions of "emission goal" and "emission target" for similar reasons?	Potter
Appendix A	12	3-5	In Policy Statement B we say that the AEG is quantifiable. Is this definition for emission goals in conflict ("may be ... a numeric indicator...")? At the FEJF meeting in Phoenix, I believe we decided to remove this definition and add one for AEG.	Riley
Appendix B	14	42	The formatting of the URL in this related document listing is not in the same format as the others in Appendix B.	Potter
Appendix B	15	17-22	It must be made clear that tribes are not required to meet designated deadlines for either 2003 or 2008 if they should go with their own TIPs.	Gruenig
Appendix C 1.	15	Table	The last row in the table is incorrect and incomplete. The FEJF and Natural Background Task Team took great pains not to use the word "exempt" in the WRAP Policy for Categorizing Fire Emissions. As a result of that attention to the wording in that Policy, I was very disturbed to find the word "exempted" used in the final row of the table. Please modify the heading to read "Other Sources", as the word "exempted" is not appropriate. The last row of the table is incomplete as the WRAP Policy for Categorizing Fire Emissions also mentions on page 8 that it does not apply to "other open burning activities". Please add a second bullet in the last row that reads "Other open burning activities" in the first column and "Not Covered" in the second column. WRAP Policy for Categorizing Fire Emissions, page 7, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	Potter
Appendix C 2.1	15-16	26 - 1	The last part of this sentence, starting with the last two words on page 15, appears to be a carryover from a previous version of the document and needs to be revised for consistency with the main body of the Policy. The sentence should be revised as follows "...Rule as a viable technique to control fire emissions."	Potter
Appendix C 2.1	16	5-7	I believe that this sentence does not appropriately represent the intent of Bullet 7 in the IOC Transmittal Letter referenced and should be modified as follows "...emissions beyond 2018 and, ..." This language is still general enough to leave the door open, without making a commitment, to employ the use of AEGs beyond 2018.	Potter Appendix C 2.1
Appendix C	16	39-	California has a complete smoke management program that extends beyond just the	Gaffney

		42	agricultural residues mentioned in the current draft. Full information on the program is located at the following link: <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/smp/smp.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/smp/smp.htm</a>	
App C, 4.2	18	20	<i>ERTs are can be planned...</i> Something wrong in this phrase.	Miller
App C, 4.2	18	2nd para	<p>I'm troubled at simply saying it's not feasible to track the use of non-burning alternatives, and have just been discussing this with Frances. Reducing emissions from fire is only half the story--the other half is reducing the use of fire as well. I understand that there aren't any good tracking measures in place. But it seems to me that we have to start somewhere, and that non-fire techniques involve personnel and equipment taking some sort of physical action on an identifiable number of acres with a describable kind of vegetation. Some sort of manager must be keeping track of the use of their manpower at least.</p> <p>Just tracking a number of acres not burned, or treated before burning is used, is a primitive activity measure. But performance measures have to begin somewhere, and they usually start with activity measures. We're in a primitive state of understanding fire emissions, and an activity measure is better than nothing. I understand the reluctance of FLMS to produce wild estimates that could be misused in some way, but focusing only on reducing emissions from the use of fire is essential at some point.</p> <p>Perhaps the AEG document could elaborate on how we might move toward adding the other half of the story.</p>	Miller
Appendix C, Sect 4.2	18-19		I am still concerned about the AEG policy not addressing non-burning alternatives (as many others were at the FEJF meeting in Phoenix). I have also heard from FLMS that non-burning alternatives <u>cannot</u> be addressed at the programmatic-level and must be addressed at the project-level. I think it could happen either way. This is not an adequate justification for not addressing non-burning alternatives. To distinguish ERTs (as defined in the draft AEG policy) from non-burning alternatives is artificial. Non-burning alternatives are a type of ERT. I would say the science is limited, but it is there enough to begin tracking and calculating the use of non-burning alternatives. The science is limited for "ERTs" as well but the draft policy proposes to go forward with them. The result is that this draft policy will delay the process unnecessarily.	Riley
Appendix C 4.4	20	9-10	Language should be included to point out that both air and non-air quality environmental limitations need to be evaluated. A few non-air quality environmental limitations are listed on page 19 in lines 23 and 24.	Potter
Appendix C	20	30-36	Were any Tribes present for the three workshops conducted in 1999? If so were there any comments from those folks?	McLeod
Appendix C	22	9-16	Does the FEJF have data from Tribes in the transport region? If so where and how was the data compiled? If in fact there is no baseline fire data from Tribes. How do Tribes	McLeod

			address “reasonable progress” toward ABG?	
Appendix D	23	6	The parenthetical statement in line 6 is confusing as it leads me to believe that further work will take place within Appendix D prior to final approval by the WRAP. The statement is contrary to the statements made earlier in the document regarding the development of guidance, in a similar format to that in Appendix D, which will occur outside the Policy approval process. This left me wondering three things: 1) is the Policy going to be revised to incorporate an expanded table <u>prior</u> to final approval by the WRAP, 2) is a guidance going to be developed in a similar format to that in Appendix D after the Policy is approved, or 3) both of the above. The Policy, including the Appendices, should present a consistent message regarding Appendix D, depending on the appropriate interpretation as to the “further development”.	Potter

## WRAP AEG Policy Reviewer List

<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Returned Comment</b>
USDA Forest Service – Region 2	Brian Bischof	bbischof@fs.fed.us	X
CO DHE	Dan Ely	dan.ely@state.co.us	X
OR DEQ	Brian Finneran	finneran.brian@deq.state.or.us	X
CA ARB	Patrick Gaffney	pgaffney@arb.ca.gov	X
CO DHE	Sarah Gallup		X
Council of Western States Foresters	Jim Lawrence	jimlaw@colostate.edu	X
Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of Montana	Lewis McLeod	lewism@cskt.org	
UT DAQ	Jan Miller	janmiller@utah.gov	X
WY DEQ	Dan Olson	dolson@state.wy.us	X
WY DEQ	Darla Potter	dpotte@state.wy.us	X
Air Sciences	Dave Randall	drandall@airsci.com	X
ID DEQ	Diane Riley	driley@deq.state.id.us	X