

FEJF Meeting
Sacramento, CA

April 18 - 19, 2000

Introductions

Co-Chair Update Session

Updates

IOC/TOC/Forum Co-chairs and Coordination Committee Meeting – Salt Lake City Late March

Funding –

The FY99 \$ 1.5 million budget has finally been allocated to the WGA/WRAP Refer to WRAP budget summary handout. FY 2000 has five million dollars set aside by EPA for regional haze, among the 5 regional haze regional bodies. Two million dollars is the max that WRAP is probably going to see (four million dollars is in FY 2000 budget). In order to meet potential shortfall, IOC pushed for delay of expenditures until 2001, TOC developed a budget reduction guidance document. (Refer to budget reduction handout). Meeting scheduled in mid-May for discussion budgeting strategies. Co- chairs, FLMs, environmentalists have pushed for line-item negotiations. The meeting also covered WRAP structure needs for a level that operates on behalf of the overall partnership outside of WRAP meetings, aside from the current Coordination Committee.

WRAP General Meeting in Tempe, Arizona 5/8-10

Discussions to include primarily:

- Market trading forum annex plans
- RFP Update
- Budget issues

FEJF Webpage

Dave Randall currently maintains the webpage, postings are irregular. The site seems to be working for folks, as no problems were brought forth. Task Team and Forum Roster handed out for any corrections

RFP/Scopes of work

BSMP – 2 scopes of work

Status – Cost estimate of 15k was returned for Sole Source with EC/R for continuation of Wildlands Survey. The budget will be monitored closely once the contract is signed.

25K was allotted. Ag. SMP RFP should use the left over 10K in addition to the \$25k set aside already. Ag SMP RFPs should be out by next week.

EPA/OAQPS

Meeting with Pete to discuss FEJF and EPA efforts. Who is doing what and what is going on? John Kennedy also attended by phone call in.

Topics -

- Natural Background
- Wildland fire emission factors
- Ag emission factors
- Sources of data inventories

Regional Haze Rule – EPA will address this issue and has assigned Lara Autry to put together the guidance document. Two documents – Natural Conditions and Tracking Progress are being drafted by early next year.

Natural Background: Draft in October, final in May 2001. Living document, so SIPs can have different definitions as they evolve over time .

Differences in regional areas are also an option and may be covered.

Natural background for groups of Class 1 Areas within a region may be an acceptable strategy for first SIP submittal. Concerns raised by Forum that this might create some problems

EPA looking to FEJF to push the envelope, and develop some methodology. EPA may be able to provide some financial support

Natural Background conference call (Lahm, Greef, Gossard to attend) – April 25th
Kennedy will try and get some info together on status of EPA group.

TIME SERIES Technology

Will provide some resolution to IMPROVE and transmissometer data, as well as a methodology of speciating chemicals using temporal analysis.

Emissions Factors

AP42 for fire sources has some problems

Regional modification to AP42 factors could be developed

2 New task team members for FEJF ETT from EPA OAQPS to help on issue

Draft Scope of work developed by Emissions TT, and funding is available from EPA-OAQPS

Plan:

- Develop an analysis of emissions estimations to revise AP42 for WRAP Region
- Develop emissions inventories
- Ag and wild land emissions (focusing on wildlands)

EPA as part of another project last year, created a 1989-1998 database for fire (national) inventory (activity and emissions data). Had been used to create emissions and correlation with IMPROVE data. Information is inconclusive at best.

Portland Meeting of Emissions Task team with Modeling and Emissions Forums

What is needed for modeling?

- Forum members need to be communicating between forums
- Scope of Work development by ETT

Tribal Data Development Workgroup

ITEP

238 tribes surveyed with questions:

- Do you have a smp?
- Are you affected by smoke from rx fire?

Many tribes are missing from the survey (65 were not surveyed), and the results may have errors (Refer to Survey)

Key concerns:

- Need to make survey more robust, and get it out to the tribes that didn't get surveyed
- For the tribes that do have programs get a refined survey to them and get them so questions that will be beneficial to the FEJF task teams.

Option from Co-chair

- John Graves and Bill Malone could help out to collect information
- Approach - Run through NTEC/Tribal Data Development
- Collect data from the tribes and the BIA using revised survey

May be a positive investment from the tribes so that one tribe will know how other tribes address smoke issues. Direct communication with the Tribes is ok.

Questions for the Tribes:

- If your tribe doesn't already have a SMP, if it would consider developing one?
- Would the tribe be willing to use the national policy guidelines for SMPs?

IITEP effort is going to require personal commitments, rather than just sending surveys out to the tribes.

Questions (General)

Jim- need to know what EPA is doing with natural background. Pete emphasizes that the groups will be working together, and fine-tuning will occur over the telephone.

Supplemental

Emission Inventory Survey from ETT will be coming out at the state level only initially.

WESTAR Survey (State Level) has been recently sent out to WESTAR States

Purpose: Address concerns about prescribed fire and air quality issues

Determine:

- Use of alternatives
- Agency commitment to smoke management
- Air Quality and NEPA Analysis
- What extent WESTAR should be involved

What is important to WESTAR, and how to best address and put forth effort towards air quality issues?

Task Team Reports

General – procure funding

BSMP – tribal data inventories

Emissions – develop scope of work, obtain the 96 inventories

FEJF storyline – comprehensive results for finalization

BSMP

Diane Riley

Status – Surveying

Ag – Surveying for the first time 19 states. Going to look at 25 local SMP's in addition to the 19 states. 22 questions total. May see something in August. Timeline: 30 days for bid, 90 days before contract is closed. Final report will come 19 weeks after contract is submitted. Send to Washington State University

Wildland – Surveying for the first time 19 states. (15 local SMP's) in addition to the 19 states. For states that weren't included, going to them for the first time, and going back to the states that have already included in the survey. 30 questions total. Sole Source with EC/R final report 17 weeks after contract is submitted. May see something in August as well.

Local programs – See list in BSMP TT Activities Page

AG Lands Burning Alternatives

Mark Wagoner
Pete Lahm

Scope of work has been developed with changes submitted to WGA for RFP bidding.

Looking at what crops are being burned and how much to prioritize ag burning alternatives.

Key tasks:

- Develop Alternatives to Ag burning
- Develop Alternatives to wildland burning
- Develop Emissions Inventory

Emissions

Pete Lahm
Dave Randall

Key Points:

- Inclusion between emissions and models
- 1996 has comprehensive meteorological data

Pollutants: PM10, 2.5, EC 2.5, OC 2.5, Nox, ROG, NH3, Sox, CO, CO2
(Ammonia has not been identified in the workplan).

The workplan for modeling has not been posted – nothing has been developed or scheduled. However, emissions inventory is due by the end of the year, 2000

Need:

- 1996 Emissions Inventory and speciation, 36 Km Hourly for the entire year
- Emissions data, hourly for the whole year
- Output at the hourly level – heat release also needed

1996 is going to be used as a baseline and for visibility model reconciliation

Challenge: need to model for the 20% cleanest and 20% dirtiest days

Idea: focus comprehensive information around episodes. (Client forums have not defined the episodes).

19 IMPROVE Sites throughout the west will be used.

CMAQ –

2 emissions loading models will be used:

- SMOKE
- MEPS

Neither model is fully functional for the task at hand because they don't use Models 3 framework yet, so there are problems getting inventories into the system

They have identified the data format that National emissions tracking system uses. The team does know what emissions inventory format is needed. Funding and effort, as well as capabilities are somewhat nebulous. The FEJF needs to be the ones who write s the parameters on how to split the information between distances and counties. Spatial and temporal algorithms requirements need to be considered as the inventories are compiled.

Contacts:

Kevin Goldin,
Doug Lattimer

Fire emissions may not be used in these models, however they may be tagged on as part as background at a later time.

Modeling mechanics: The Emissions Forum acknowledges the significance and difficulties of both developing an emissions inventory and avoiding modeling problems between the two task teams.

Emission Task Team focus:

- Emissions inventory for 96, where the data will come from,
- AP42 factors / OAQPS

Support from the Intermountain Fire Sciences Lab

Development of the Scope of Work:
Dave Randall

Opportunity to tap into some non-WRAP money

Pieces of the workplan

Identified phase 1 and 2

- Phase 1: Summarize and gather fire emissions estimation techniques
- Phase 2: Develop the guts of and emissions tracking system

Phase 1: The forum will be in charge of providing the contractor with the technical Materials, and to augment those materials with a survey from the contractor

Contractor expectation and requirements:

- Thumbs up or thumbs down from Task Team on the Scope of Work before it becomes a deliverable to the EPA. Kennedy indicates that the TT might be advising only. Dave doesn't want the use of this information to be polarized.

Phase 2:

No progress until emissions parameters have been identified.

What sources of information and strategies are needed?

Discussion-

Potential sources of information and ways to get to it - Emissions inventories
Need to follow up forum survey with specific questions

The task of putting together 1996 inventory will be difficult. Dave recommends telling the emissions forum that a reasonable amount of time is needed. Mark Fitch counters with the other groups are probably encountering the same difficulties.

Direct addresses to coordinate their responses regionally

Task Team Reports-continued

Alternatives to burning – Wildlands

Shelley Nolde

Scope of work – should the contractor develop, for different fuel types, a determination of the cost curves for the use of alternatives compared to those costs incurred by burning?

Or, Rather identify general alternatives guide for each fuel type that lists alternatives, as well as relative costs of those alternatives at the regional or state level.

There should be some consistent methodology through comparative costs like the Ag group is doing among crops at the state or regional level. The costs at the project or site level will be difficult to quantify from year to year for wildlands.

NWCG Collaboration

Pete Lahm

Status of Workshop Final Reports

Most of the chapters have been put together.
The individual workshop reports as well as the raw data will become available soon.
The smoke management guide will be available in a draft form for review within a month. Who the reviewers are unknown beyond commissioning body of NWCG.

Impact avoidance is addressed - includes ecosystem emissions, and not just activity fuels.

Prescribed Fire Program Assessment

Pete Lahm

Scope of Work has not been assembled, however all of the elements of the scope have been compiled.

Enhanced Smoke Management Program

Mark Fitch

No News is good news.

FEJF Draft Storyline

John Kennedy

Audience:

- FEJF constituents and interested public and interested parties. Needs to say who FEJF is, what we do, and why we're here.
- Could probably be used and understood by the tribes.
- Needs to be used by the Communications Committee, who might be able to provide some insight.
- Needs to be comprehensive enough to be used by the state legislature, or to be mailed off to the general public.

Need to draw into WGA or NTEC? Probably not.

How will the document be circulated?

- On the Web – so could use links as a means to shorten the document and defer folks elsewhere for explanations.
- Storyline could be handed out as a brochure. (No budget for a brochure though).

Discussion of Storyline Structure -

Perhaps start off with the last couple of pages first – state who the FEJF is, and what we are doing, and then talk about fire and the reasons we're doing what we're doing.

Use the four categories as areas of attention, rather than task teams.

Tag the Regional Haze Rule specifically, in addition to the Commission's recommendations. This should be mentioned on the front page.

Agreed that the first couple of pages should contain information exclusive of FEJF and message, then background info. Document must be printable, however first page should contain some internal links.

Discussion of the conflict between air quality and fire using a question/answer type of format.

Pictures – use less Grand Canyon pictures, another Class I area perhaps

Discussion of Storyline Contents -

CAA/RHR should be addressed

Work products should be mentioned, although should only be included in the storyline as a reference to the FEJF website for current projects.

Timeline could be included as an insert, along with quotations

Grand Canyon Recommendations could be shortened, and includes as part of a caption.

Contact information, should also be included – not as a link

Lay out the representation of the WRAP

Strike out a lot of the GCVTC info

Should include Natural background and the role of fire in natural background as an independent topic.

Deadlines – two weeks for comments, two weeks in the communications committee, one week to incorporate suggestions into a final product. Moving forward with the text only.

Natural Background

Fred Greef

Preliminary definitions from **Natural Background Smoke Definitions** (Draft April 11, 2000 posted on FEJF website)

Four general definitions that would address the needs of all the stakeholders
Each Class one area will have different levels of natural background emissions, even though all areas will have the same definition of what “natural” is. Terms need to be consistent throughout, among all audiences. The document needs to have a lead-in that has a context in terms of the CAA and the Regional Haze Rule, Natural Conditions, and Fire Emissions. Include also EPA Interim policy definitions and framing. Need to separate out the anthropogenic component of natural background through defining what is natural. Motivation as it pertains to natural.

Temporal – Past, Present, Future

Maintenance-based fire used to accomplish a land management objective goes against a commodity-based natural background definition. Wildfire is not accounted for.

Look at each assumption carefully and not look at a definition that will not be valid in 20 years.

Also a long term and short-term strategy should be kept in mind. SIP’s are revised every ten years. Need to know where we’re going. Clearly delineate what temporal scale we’re looking at. Be clear that any option is defined in terms or a temporal viewpoint.

Ignition categories need to be included as part of a natural definition.

Wildfire is natural, despite the method of ignition.

Sam Sandberg recommended operating in a matrix, much as the Express Team (National Wildfire Coordinating Group and EPA-- national interagency workshop in Nebraska). They used matrix to brainstorm scientific technology development and implementation of models and data systems to manage the air quality impacts of wildland and prescribed fires

Nevertheless, need to choose the temporal scale in which you're looking to define natural.

Also account for land use changes, and vegetation changes.

Dynamic/static view defined

The challenge is initially to try to agree on an approach in which management decisions will be made.

Modeling need

Administrative/Management need

Impact need

Main charge is to give the modeling forum a means to categorize smoke: Natural and anthropogenic.

Fire (Historic, LM Current Objectives, LM Future Objective)

Need to identify goals

It's important to develop the framework for discussions. Under what context do we define the Natural smoke options, and for that matter, which new options are there. What are some basic assumptions?

Recommend using the options on the table to develop the framework and assumptions for the policy options.

Has to be consistent framework under which were going to assess the viability of each policy option.

Framework must accommodate both sides so that natural and anthropogenic doesn't get cut short in terms of allowable emissions.

How to frame the issues and the problems and giving thoughts to added the complexity of source issues.

Outline the Terminology and pros and cons to develop the assumptions. If we can decide on what would be some good ground rules, and start writing some headings and listing

assumptions and developing matrix, the development of the framework for the workshop will have been developed.

Possible Definitions:

- Smoke from human caused fire used to achieve commodity related objectives
- All wildland smoke is natural, regardless of ignition or vegetation type..
Conversely, no wildland smoke is natural because of the fuel loading.

The Natural Background Debate

In wilderness areas.....

Smoke produced in the application of fire that moves the ecosystem towards a more natural condition is natural- regardless of ignition type, unless its arson, because wilderness is managed on the legal and social situation

“Natural” as defined by the 1964 Wilderness Act: – untrammelled or unimpacted by man.

Moving towards a natural fire regime is natural by reducing the fuel loading

Assumptions and parameters (outline)

- Ignition source
- Fire Frequency (range/average)
- Land used classifications (including Ag lands, rangelands)

Are rangelands Aglands, or wildlands, and is fire on rangelands natural, or is it unnatural, as part of a commodity-based management?

(Rangelands will be included as wildlands for the purpose of the FEJF work).

Conservation Reserve Program lands must be classified as well.

Will emissions between natural and unnatural lands vary anyway?

- Ecosystem conditions
- Visitor enjoyment
- Viewing the scenery (value of clean air)

- Management Objectives

Is natural defined based on Ecosystem management or visibility management?

Considerations:

- Land use
 - Ecosystem
 - Visibility
 - Legality
- Land ownership
 - Legal considerations Assumption: (SMOKE MANAGEMENT PLANS ARE NOT JUST EPA GUIDANCE. UNDER THE REGIONAL HAZE RULE THEY ARE MANDATORY IF YOUR STATE IS LIKELY TO HAVE VISIBILITY OR HEALTH IMPACTS AS A RESULT OF FIRE EMISSIONS ON FEDERAL, STATE OR PRIVATE LANDS)
 - Temporal and spatial parameters.
Past, present, and future (now to 2064)

SMP's - all smoke that can be managed per unit area in terms of emissions reduction will be managed

FRAMEWORK

- Scenario development
- Regulatory goals
- Assessment of current conditions in lieu of the goal- what are we after in 2064, where are we now
- Regulatory approach of the source
- Range of options

Assess what the impacts of the definition might be on the ability of the individual or the agency to implement other mandates (legal constraints)

Social and economic impact consideration

Smoke Emissions between natural and unnatural need a different set of goals and strategies to address visibility

Managed for ecosystem protection or visibility protection

Assessment of visibility impacts

In closing,

Natural Background

Some development of assumptions and framework. A rough matrix has been created, although it needs some more refinement. Prior to the next FEJF meeting, sometime in May (30th or 31st), natural background task team workshop involving all interested parties (oaqps, sandberg, veranth, communications committee woman, leu – Kennedy's friend, ag, hayslip, Whitman, Perkins) will be held in Portland. Perhaps piggyback after another meeting to ensure possibilities of attendance.

Basic Smoke Management Program

ITEP - will be conducting the follow-up survey once they receive one from the task team. Talked with Paul about the study, he said that environmental managers, program managers, and environmental technicians were surveyed from 254 tribes. Probably have the results of the second survey sometime in September. Revised survey questions will be completed, finalized, and submitted to the forum in two weeks.

Emissions Task Team - Pete summarizes

Scope of work – being honed and developed before going to EPA, draft will be posted on FEJF site in a week or two for review.

Storyline

New rough draft has been created. Kennedy needs a copy first thing Thursday. Will be posted on the website in a week or two.