

## **NBTT Management & Content Team Conference Call**

6/18/01

Participants:

Mark Fitch, Carl Gossard, Pete Lahm, Darla Potter, Jim Russell, Mike Ziolk, Rebecca Reynolds

### Structure (Darla)

Darla presented the revised Policy Structure. Discussion centered on the Appendices:

- What definitions to include beyond “natural” and “anthropogenic”?
- If the definitions were the only thing in the Appendices, the suggestion was made to eliminate the Appendix and put the definitions in the Background section.
- Where should 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence from old policy statement 7 be included? Appendix? Bob Annotation?
- Should the wildfire tables/graph and Condition Class tables be kept? [Later during the discussion on magnitude, the group decided not to keep the tables or graph.]

The group also discussed the use of the term “annotation” to label the explanatory part of the Policy. There was some concern that “annotation” might not capture exactly what the group intended. Others felt it was fine. Decision was for Darla and Rebecca to take it under advisement and to consider other possible terms, e.g., “Discussion”, “Intent”, “Explanation”, and “Polly”.

### Issues (Rebecca)

The group reviewed the Issues document Rebecca put together from the PM Workshop notes. They decided which issues would be addressed/included in the Policy Annotation, and which ones would not – the decision is as follows:

### **Classification Policy (Emily)**

#### **Prescribed Fire**

1, 3, 4) Restore & Maintain: new language to be made clear, “fire resilient condition” and “ecologically functional ecosystem”. Also clarify how the new language applies to federal, state, and private land.

2, 5, 11) One decision to be made for classification: Maintenance or Other Fire. Federal, state or private decision to be made at the local level – explain, i.e., whoever initiates the proposed burn is responsible for classification.

6, 7, 9) Put in “Background”

8) Captured in previous items – disregard this specific interpretation

10) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy

12) Take out CRP from Annotation for Maintenance Burning

13) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy

14) “Ecologically functional” & “fire resilient” are new terms – keep in mind this reminder to use language consistently in annotation. NO to sending this to any outside sources for review as suggested!

15) Clarify this statement for private land or do not address in Annotation

16) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF ESMP Task Team.

### **Wildfire**

- 1) 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – what to do with it?? NOT in Emily. Put in either Bob Annotation or an Appendix (Mark & Pete will discuss and decide, group can review decision when draft comes out)
- 2) Carry forward in Annotation

### **Native American**

- 1) Local designation explanation from above – use same language in Annotation here (3 choices instead of just two: Cultural, Maintenance, Other)
- 2) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy – since we are not doing magnitude
- 3) Reinforce in scope & Applicability and preface to Emily statements
- 4) Delete “Inter and Intra Tribal” everywhere
- 5) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy – beyond the scope of what we can address

### **Implementation Policy (Bob)**

#### **Manage & Control**

- 1a) Language consistency w/ GCVTC & RHR – YES throughout!
- 1b) Recognition of increased fire emissions: put in Background & Bob
- 1c) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF
- 2) Alternatives to Burning
- 3) Put in “Background”
- 4) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy - (except acknowledge all policies should be equitable among sources in the “Scope and Applicability”, i.e., wildland, agricultural land, tribal, etc.)
- 5) Keep in Annotation – elements of “BSMP/ESMP” explain difference (watch language!)
- 6) Delete Condition Class Table - since we are not doing magnitude (except suggestion to add the narrative elements into the “Background” regarding the increase of burning and the Condition Classes)
- 7) Delete Condition Class Table – since we are not doing magnitude
- 8) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy
- 9, 10) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF Emissions Task Team
- 11) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF: applicable to Emissions Task Team, Alternatives to Burning Task Teams, as well as guidance to be established on “feasibility” phrase to be incorporated in Bob
- 12, 13, 14) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy
- 15) Generally: define terms, be clear throughout entire document
- 16) Keep in Annotation
- 17) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy

#### **Tracking**

- 1) Yes – carry forward in Annotation, but this should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF Emissions Task Team
- 2, 3, 4) Do Not Address in Recommended Policy

## **RESTRUCTURED LIST OF ISSUES**

The following is the resultant list of which issues should be addressed/included in the Policy Annotation and where. Sometimes the “how” is deletion which is noted. The Original Issue is in normal text and the *Team’s discussion is in Italics*.

### **Memo to FEJF (various Task Teams)**

16. Need to have some measure of impacts versus emissions generated. Oregon has an element of its smoke management plan to account for burning under meteorological impairment. Additionally, burning of piles during optimum mixing may limit impacts to visibility as well as NAAQS. Thus, restoration burning may not have any impact on visibility – why shall emissions count? -- Teensma

*Emily 16) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF ESMP Task Team.*

1c. Annual emissions goals established cooperatively.

*Bob 1c) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF*

9. Consideration needs to be given to the awarding of credits for emission reduction practices.

10. Providing incentives to move systems toward maintenance may take the form of credits for the balance between wildfire and prescribed fire.

*Bob 9, 10) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF Emissions Task Team*

11. A cost-benefit analysis would be helpful in this process, e.g., the obvious benefits to suppression such as protection of property versus the costs of the new tracking and monitoring equipment/personnel that will be needed to deal with what is currently unmonitored fire.

*Bob 11) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF: applicable to Emissions Task Team, Alternatives to Burning Task Teams, as well as guidance to be established on “feasibility” phrase to be incorporated in Bob*

1. Suggested Modification: In Annotation, recognize the suggestions for the tracking system (e.g., credits, use of alternatives, emissions avoided) to be considered and evaluated by the FEJF or one of its task teams as the tracking system is developed. (*agreed*)

*Bob, Tracking 1) This should be sent on in a Memo to FEJF Emissions Task Team*

### **Entire Recommended Policy**

1a. First two Draft Policy Statements: expand to more closely reflect GCVTC and RHR language, e.g., manage for visibility impacts as well as public health and nuisance impacts.

*Bob, 1a) Language consistency w/ GCVTC & RHR – YES throughout!*

15. Definitions of natural, unnatural fuels, etc.

*Bob, 15) Generally: define terms, be clear throughout entire document*

## **Background / Scope & Applicability**

6. Need to recognize increase in burning on state and private land as well as federal land.

7. Consider alternatives to burning.

9. There needs to be a greater emphasis on clearing up fire hazard.

*Emily 6, 7, 9) Put in "Background"*

3. Add "regardless of land ownership" in Annotation. (*agreed*)

*Emily, Nat. Am. 3) Reinforce in scope & Applicability*

1b. Recognition of increased fire emissions controlled from increased fire.

*Bob, 1b) Recognition of increased fire emissions: put in Background*

3. Reference to USDA-FS and USDOJ Cohesive Strategies: There is a huge unnatural condition on the land out there – this needs to be confirmed in the NBTT Draft Policy.

*Bob, 3) Put in "Background"*

4. All burning is not equal, but all policies should work to be equitable. ...

*Bob, 4) acknowledge all policies should be equitable among sources in the "Scope and Applicability", i.e., wildland, agricultural land, tribal, etc.*

6. Condition Class Table on page 32 of the Draft Policy ... – need to include the Comprehensive Plan that discusses state and private lands, and incorporate the new information now available from the National Fire Plan. – \*Also priorities: wildland/urban interface.

*Bob, 6) suggestion to add the narrative elements into the "Background" regarding the increase of burning and the Condition Classes*

## **Appendix**

1. Draft Policy Statement #7 – Natural events like exemption: Clarify intent/calculations. Is the flagging of extreme events only for the calculation of natural conditions or for the tracking of progress toward the natural visibility goal over time? Assumption that "natural" prescribed fire would be flagged. Need additional clarification in the Draft Policy.

*Emily, Wild 1) 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – what to do with it?? NOT in Emily. Put in either Bob Annotation or an Appendix (Mark & Pete will discuss and decide, group can review decision when draft comes out)*

## **Emily**

### **Prescribed Fire**

1. Distinction between ecosystem restoration and maintenance. In the implementation – how will this distinction be made?

USDOJ and FS already have made the distinction, but how is private land figured in?

3. Need to better define maintenance vs. restoration. The distinction does not exist on the ground.

4. Difficult to define "sustainable ecosystem." This has been defined and redefined without success. How can we tighten this up?

*1, 3, 4) Restore & Maintain: new language to be made clear, “fire resilient condition” and “ecologically functional ecosystem”. Also clarify how the new language applies to federal, state, and private land.*

2. There needs to be a provision to allow for local or programmatic level assessment and adjustment of the gross scale analysis and strategy that differentiates between maintenance and restoration. This would need to take place across all land ownership.

5. The key to this (i.e., healthy ecosystems) is Condition Classes. What techniques will be used on what lands will be decided at a local level (e.g., land use planning, fire management planning, NEPA documents). *(agreed)*

11. Provision to allow for adjustments to the Cohesive Strategies – to happen at local or programmatic level. Suggest the definition of sustainable ecosystem be locally derived

*2, 5, 11) One decision to be made for classification: Maintenance or Other Fire.*

*Federal, state or private decision to be made at the local level – explain, i.e., whoever initiates the proposed burn is responsible for classification.*

12. Suggested language:

“...Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) in order to maintain a healthy and sustainable condition.” (Section 4, Discussion paragraph 2, page 13 of 32) *(agreed)*

*12) Take out CRP from Annotation for Maintenance Burning*

14. Draft Policy mixes sustainability with natural range of variability. Some ecosystems outside the natural range of variability are sustainable, and some that are within the natural range of variability are not sustainable (i.e., require active management). ... --Teensma

*14) “ecologically functional” & “fire resilient” are new terms – keep in mind this reminder to use language consistently in annotation.*

15. Section 5 – “Anthropogenic Fire” (page 5 of 32). “The needs of an individual flora or fauna species or human use, that is not vital to the overall ecosystem management, may be met through the use of prescribed fire.” The FLMs would not undertake a prescribed fire for a single species that is not also “vital” to the ecosystem management. The sentence seems out of place in Section 5. –Teensma

*15) Clarify this statement for private land*

## **Wildfire**

2. Need to clarify in the Annotation that if there is a lack of resources to suppress the fire it would fall into Draft Policy Statement #7. *(agreed)*

*2) Carry forward in Annotation*

## **Native American**

1. Define “cultural burning.” Let tribes or Tribal Council do it. In Draft Policy Statement & Annotation. *(agreed)*

*1) Local designation explanation from above – use same language in Annotation here (3 choices instead of just two: Cultural, Maintenance, Other)*

3. Add “regardless of land ownership” in Annotation. (*agreed*)

3) *Reinforce in preface to Emily statements*

4. Delete Inter and Intra-Tribal in Draft Policy Statement & Annotation. (*agreed*)

4) *Delete “Inter and Intra Tribal” everywhere*

## **Bob**

### **Manage & Control**

1a. First two Draft Policy Statements: expand to more closely reflect GCVTC and RHR language, e.g., manage for visibility impacts as well as public health and nuisance impacts.

1a) *Language consistency w/ GCVTC & RHR – YES throughout!*

1b. Recognition of increased fire emissions controlled from increased fire.

1b) *Recognition of increased fire emissions*

2. Biomass utilization is crucial to managing emissions. It should be endorsed and recognized as a concept.

2) *Alternatives to Burning*

5. Managing visibility impacts vs. reducing emissions – what is the difference?

5) *Keep in Annotation – elements of “BSMP/ESMP” explain difference (watch language!)*

6. Condition Class Table on page 32 of the Draft Policy: the picture it portrays is that 144 million acres need treatment. This is not a complete long-term picture – need to include the Comprehensive Plan that discusses state and private lands, and incorporate the new information now available from the National Fire Plan. – \*Also priorities: wildland/urban interface.

7. The specific figures from the DOI Cohesive Strategy need to be slightly adjusted to reflect the numbers in the Draft Final Version of the Strategy.

6, 7) *Delete Condition Class Table - since we are not doing magnitude*

16. Add alternatives to fire language in Annotation for Draft Policy Statement #1. (See above discussion in Prescribed Fire and suggested language under #5.) (*agreed*)

16) *Keep in Annotation*

## **Tracking**

1. Draft Policy Statement #7 – Natural events like exemption: Clarify intent/calculations. Is the flagging of extreme events only for the calculation of natural conditions or for the tracking of progress toward the natural visibility goal over time? Assumption that “natural” prescribed fire would be flagged. Need additional clarification in the Draft Policy.

*Emily, Wild 1) 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – what to do with it?? NOT in Emily. Put in either Bob Annotation or an Appendix (Mark & Pete will discuss and decide, group can review decision when draft comes out)*

1. Suggested Modification: In Annotation, recognize the suggestions for the tracking system (e.g., credits, use of alternatives, emissions avoided) to be considered and evaluated by the FEJF or one of its task teams as the tracking system is developed. (*agreed*)

1) *Yes – carry forward in Annotation*